

UNITED NATIONS

ECONOMIC COMMISSION
FOR LATIN AMERICA
AND THE CARIBBEAN



Distr.
LIMITED

LC/L.458 (CFM.4/6)
3 August 1988

ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

Fourth Regional Conference on the Integration of Women
into the Economic and Social Development
of Latin America and the Caribbean
Guatemala, 26 to 30 September 1988

WOMEN, WORK AND CRISIS

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	v
I. MAJOR CHANGES AFFECTING WOMEN AND THEIR WORK	1
A. The background of economic and social development	1
B. Major changes in the population and their impact on female employment	2
C. The relationship between cultural changes and changes in education and the work of women	3
II. MAJOR CHANGES IN FEMALE EMPLOYMENT: 1960-1980	5
A. Major trends from the sixties onwards. Activity ratios	5
1. Activity and age	6
2. Activity and education	7
3. Activity, education and civil status	8
B. Changes in the type of work and female occupational polarization	9
1. Participation by branch of activity	10
2. Participation by occupational group	10
3. Manual and non-manual work	12
C. Domestic work	14
III. THE CRISIS AND ITS REPERCUSSIONS ON FEMALE EMPLOYMENT	16
A. The crisis in the 1980s: background	16
B. Crisis and unemployment by sex	19
C. Occupational insertion by sex	22
D. Income distribution by sex	25
E. The repercussions of the crisis on families in low-income sectors	29
Notes	32
Statistical annex	37



Introduction

This document analyses the work carried out by women during two periods of time: the long term, between 1960 and 1980, and during the period of crisis between 1982 and 1985. An examination is, first of all, made of the major changes to have affected women and their work, with reference to the major features and to the changes recorded in the economic, demographic, cultural and educational spheres which have led to the transformation of the patterns of women's participation, as well as of social perception of women's work.

This is followed by an outline of the major changes in women's participation on the labour market between 1960 and 1980, in terms of age, civil status and education. Attention is also directed to the forms taken by women's insertion in the labour market by occupational group, branch of activity and occupation. It is also revealed how the work carried out by women has become increasingly polarized, between a manual sector, essentially made up of workers providing personal services, and a non-manual and highly-skilled sector, mainly constituted by professionals. This section examines a number of features connected with the domestic work carried out by women and which have a marked incidence on the job opportunities offered by the market.

The final section, dealing with the crisis, attempts to provide an assessment of its repercussions on the work carried out by women: increased unemployment, growing tertiarization and the decline in women's income, which, together with the expansion of domestic work illustrates how female employment has attained extremely high levels, particularly in low-income sectors.

Strictly speaking, there is barely sufficient relation between the major trends described in the first part and the sphere analysed in the second part, as the sources of data are different; consequently, an attempt has been made to draw the broadest social implications from the scant data available, in order to stimulate further research into the topic. There are two fields in which this is most urgently needed: the informal sector of the economy and in rural areas. In view of the limitations affecting the information, this study focuses on an analysis of urban women.



I. MAJOR CHANGES AFFECTING WOMEN AND THEIR WORK

A. THE BACKGROUND OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT 1/

Over the past three decades (1950 to 1980), the region's main economic indicators rose regularly. Total product increased fivefold and per capita product doubled. The most significant features of the transformation which took place may be summed up as follows.

A huge increase in the population, has been accompanied by a process of growing urbanization. From a figure of 164 million in 1950, the population rose to 360 million in 1980. In 1950, 40.9% of the population lived in urban areas, while in 1980 the figure was 63.3%. The process of urbanization was fundamentally attributable to considerable internal migration within countries. This was reflected in the size of the labour force available in cities, whose numbers swelled the ranks of the informal and domestic sectors. Thus, towards 1980, the region as a whole was predominantly urban.

A variety of processes took shape within the economic structure: a) national markets incorporating the majority of the population, albeit in an unequal and discriminatory manner, emerged; b) industrial manufacture of goods expanded and was accompanied by a certain development of the capacity to establish links with other sectors of the economy; c) the nature of production units underwent a change as their size increased; d) industrial employment, and employment in the tertiary sector expanded to the detriment of agricultural employment, and e) in respect of the tertiary sector, it became increasingly heterogeneous, as extremely modern service sectors coexisted alongside a services sector marked by low productivity, but which provided employment. Generally speaking, the period between 1950 and 1980 was marked by a rapid absorption of labour into jobs in both the modern and informal non-agricultural sectors. Increased employment of women was one of the most noteworthy features of this process. Thus, the average annual growth rate by sex of the labour force between 1960 and 1970 were 3.7% in the case of women, and 2.1% in that of men, while between 1970 and 1980 the respective figures were 5.1% and 2.5%.^{2/} At the same time there occurred a gradual decline in agricultural underemployment together with a steady growth of urban underemployment.

With regard to social stratification, the most significant feature during the period was the process of domestic diversification, both within sectors of urban workers and the peasantry. As far as this sector is concerned, it is worth mentioning the emergence of salaried agricultural workers employed by large-scale agricultural export firms, which predominantly employ women, particularly in fruit firms, and the expansion of a considerable sector of

casual or seasonal workers. In respect of the rural sector this raises the need to redefine the relationship between peasants and land. While the total economically active population grew by 2.1% per year between 1950 and 1960, and by 2.3% between 1960 and 1970, in the case of agriculture it only rose by 0.9% ^{3/} and in some countries the agricultural labour force actually fell in absolute terms. As far as the industrial proletariat is concerned, it grew sharply until the 1960s and its diversity in terms of wages, skills and organization corresponded to the growing heterogeneity of the industrial sector.

Middle-income sectors grew sharply during this period and came to constitute a new group of technocrats and bureaucrats within the State and private spheres. The establishment of financial markets brought into being an extremely modern tertiary sector connected to the transnational financial market. Census data illustrate four significant features of the changes which took place between 1960 and 1980: a) the size of the lowest sector declined in relative terms in almost all countries; b) the number of workers providing personal services barely rose and stabilized at approximately 12% of the active population (women constituted an extremely high proportion of this sector); c) the sector of manual workers grew in relative terms in most countries, although the most marked growth occurred in the sector of non-manual occupations, and d) in those countries whose active population grew more rapidly, this affected occupations requiring higher qualifications and providing better income. In those countries of greatest economic growth, many groups succeeded in improving their position, in spite of any modification to the relative distribution of power and of income. An upward and horizontal shift occurred in the social structure on account of the changes inherent in any transformation from a rural to an urban society, giving these groups the impression of upwards social mobility for themselves and for their offspring.

B. MAJOR CHANGES IN THE POPULATION AND THEIR IMPACT ON FEMALE EMPLOYMENT ^{4/}

Over the last three decades, Latin America has simultaneously experienced economic and social changes together with major transformations in the behaviour of the population, which in turn have led to changes in the behaviour of labour, and in particular in that of women. These changes may be summed up as follows:

a) Population growth, particularly of the urban population, which has become centred on two or three main cities in each country.

b) Domestic migration, involving, in addition to urban concentration, a change in the age and sex structures of the population, be it urban or rural, on account of the selective nature of migration which mainly involved young adults and women.

c) A sharp decline in total fertility, and in fertility within each age group in almost all countries in the region. Towards 1980-1985 only three countries in Latin America possessed fertility rates in excess of six children per woman, while eight possessed rates of less than four children per woman.

Variations were also recorded in respect of each age group: fertility rose in the case of younger women, as a consequence of the displacement of the modal age from the group of 25 to 29 year olds to the 20 to 24 year-old group. This raises a number of questions regarding the increase in the fertility of young women and adolescents despite increased knowledge and use of contraceptive methods.

d) This decline in overall fertility led to a fall in the size of households, particularly from the 1960s onwards. It has also brought about changes in the composition of households and it is possible to observe an increase in households whose heads are women. This phenomenon affects households in the lower socioeconomic group, although in countries at a more advanced stage of modernization, it is also increasingly the case among the highest-income sectors.

e) Life expectancy has increased in all countries. Between 1950 and 1955 the life expectancy for both sexes of the 80% of the population of Latin America living in 14 countries was less than 55 years; by 1980-1985, life expectancy in the 15 countries making up 90% of the continent's population had risen to over 60 years. In Cuba and Costa Rica, life expectancy for both sexes was more than 70 years. As life expectancy increases, the gap between that of men and that of women, who live longer, also widens.

These major changes have had significant repercussion on the life of women. Towards 1980, women, who mainly live in cities, had become acquainted with and made use of contraceptive methods, as a result of which they had fewer children; they also lived longer and in smaller households, and were the heads of almost 20% of these.^{5/} These changes also offered women greater opportunities to work outside the home, a fact which was reflected in their incorporation into the labour market.

C. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CULTURAL CHANGES AND CHANGES IN EDUCATION AND THE WORK OF WOMEN ^{6/}

One of the most striking features of social development in Latin America in recent decades has been the change in the educational profile of the population and of the economically active population in particular. Between 1950 and 1960, enrollment in elementary and secondary level education increased enormously; from a total of 13.2 million it rose to 28.5 million and virtually doubled again in the 1960s. The rate of growth declined as from the 1970s. If the figure of 100 is adopted for the total population enrolled in education in 1970, it rose to 129 in 1975, to 156 in 1980 and to 175 in 1985. The number of women registered grew at an even faster rate, particularly in higher education, where the number of women rose from 35% of the total in 1970 to 45% in 1985.

As well as representing a form of participation and of symbolic fulfilment for the population as a whole, the major changes in education have meant that the economically active population has undergone a rapid training process. This phenomenon is all the more apparent in the case of female labour, whose educational level in Latin America is higher in comparison with

that of women outside the labour market, and with that of the male population. Consequently, those women who have taken their place in the labour market in greatest numbers have been the most skilled and best educated, and have been incorporated primarily into non-manual occupations.

While the huge expansion in education has been a key factor in maintaining the rate of social mobility recorded during this period, such mobility has been more apparent than real. In actual fact, the increase in the levels of education of the economically active population has been accompanied by a process of devaluation of education, hence a far higher level of education is now required in order to aim for the same jobs.

The changes which have ensued from the social and economic development of recent decades in the fields of education and health have brought about a series of ideological changes with regard to which jobs society considers to be suitable for women, as well as to the notions underlying women's own perception of their role in society.

Thus, one of the most significant ideological changes to have taken place in the region in recent decades has been the acknowledgement of the dichotomy between the domestic and social work carried out by women. The entry of huge numbers of women from middle- and high-income sectors onto the labour market clearly revealed that working women in fact accomplish a double work day in one: a paid working day came on top of the unpaid working day devoted to domestic work. However, this recognition has not led to any change in the ideological distinction dividing work into domestic and social, as women are still primarily classed in the first category. This has considerable repercussions on the manner in which women enter the labour market as well as on the sex characterization of occupations.

A further qualitative change which has affected women from the 1960s onwards has been the distinction between sexuality and reproduction. This has been facilitated by the popularization of birth-control methods, which allowed women to have fewer children, more spaced out over time. With fewer children, women were able to take a greater share of work outside home.

Women's movements, and in particular feminist movements which to a greater or lesser degree emerged in all the countries of the region in the form of social movements with specific objectives for women contributed towards social awareness of these ideological changes.

II. MAJOR CHANGES IN FEMALE EMPLOYMENT: 1960-1980 7/

A. MAJOR TRENDS FROM THE SIXTIES ONWARDS. ACTIVITY RATIOS

In recent decades, the activity ratios for the population on the labour market have fallen and tended to even out among the different countries in the region. This is in part attributable to a better measurement of the phenomenon, although to a greater extent it is the result of two social processes: the increase in educational coverage for young people, which has extended the length of time they spend in school, and the expansion of social security coverage, which has allowed broader sectors of the over-65 population to receive a pension. This holds true for the active population as a whole, although if changes in the activity rates of each sex are examined, it is possible to observe that men and women behave differently in respect of the labour market. Thus, between 1960 and 1980, the rates of male activity fell in all countries in the region while on the other hand, the participation of women increased in 15 countries, remained stable in two and declined in three.

If the countries of the region are divided into four groups, 8/ on the basis of their degree of modernization, two distinct patterns may be observed in group I, made up of relatively modern countries, depending on whether the female activity rate in 1960 was higher or lower than 20%. In the first case (Argentina, Uruguay), activity rates rose less between 1960 and 1970; moreover, the group whose activity rates were initially extremely low in 1960 increased them by a greater proportion between 1970 and 1980, as was the case in Cuba and Venezuela, where the number of women incorporated into the economically active population increased three- and two-fold respectively, over 20 years.

In group II, made up of countries whose modernization has been rapid but unbalanced (Brazil, Colombia and Mexico), female activity rates increased markedly, particularly during the 1970s.

In group III, made up of countries which have experienced partial modernization (the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Paraguay and Peru), female activity rates remained stable in Ecuador and Paraguay, while they rose in Peru and the Dominican Republic.

Finally, in group IV, made up of countries where modernization is incipient, in some cases the activity rates of the 1960s were maintained, while in others a sharp decline occurred, essentially as a result of the

process of urbanization which withdrew female labour from agriculture. This decline was also influenced by the different method of measuring women's activity, as the method by which all activities carried out by women were recorded was replaced by one which recorded instead only the principal activity, with the result that women tended to declare the activity which they themselves considered to be their main activity, which is, in general, domestic work.

To sum up, in most countries in the region, and in particular in those countries in groups I, II and III, women's participation in the labour market increased in proportion to the degree of "modernization" attained.

In contrast with that of men, women's behaviour on the labour market is determined by which phase in their life cycle they have reached, as their participation is generally affected by their civil status and number of children, as well as by their place of residence, level of education, and other features linked to demand for female labour. Consequently, we shall now examine female activity rates in terms of age, civil status and education.

1. Activity and age

The female activity rates by age increased during the period in all age groups between 20 and 64, a trend which coincides with the above remarks regarding the expansion of educational and social security coverage. Only in Brazil⁹ and Mexico was a higher proportion of under-15s recorded in the labour force, a fact which should be taken together with the enormous expansion of their economies' demand for labour.

In all countries, the most numerous female age group on the labour market is that between 20 and 29, with the exceptions of Cuba and Venezuela, where the highest activity rates are in the 30 to 34 year-old group, as the age at which women start work in these countries has been put back on account of the expansion of educational opportunities and because women have not withdrawn from the labour market when they marry and have children. Furthermore, its concomitant is the fact that other women have entered the labour market after having completed the first stage of child rearing. In the case of Cuba, it is also necessary to take into account the powerful incentives encouraging women to join the labour market, as well as the day-care facilities provided for their children.

If a systematic analysis is made of an age cohort over the past 20 years, it is possible to identify the behaviour of a single age group and the manner in which activity ratios alter over the various stages of the female life cycle. Thus, the behaviour of a cohort during the last 20 years varies according to the degree of modernization of countries. In the first group, the predominant trend is towards an increase in female activity rates, from one decade to the next, and as the age of women increases. Only in Argentina is there a withdrawal between 30 and 34 followed by a subsequent return between 40 and 44.

In those countries which have undergone rapid but unbalanced modernization, there is a slightly downward trend between 1960 and 1970 among

women between the ages of 30 and 34, with a rise in the following decade, when these same women are between 40 and 44. This might well be connected to the increase which has taken place over the past decade in posts in industry and services, which are almost exclusively filled by women.

As far as the group of countries whose modernization is partial and incipient is concerned, the predominant trend was towards a diminution of activity rates between 1960 and 1980, as women grew older, in other words, they withdrew from the labour market after the age of 25.

The patterns of female behaviour observed in the first two groups of countries indicate that in the course of modernization more young women enter the labour market and remain there longer, a trend which it is assumed will persist and even grow in the future.

Recchini calls this the "cohort effect" or the process of "succeeding generations": "... women who are more likely to take their place in the world of work when young (on account of social and cultural patterns in their youth), seem to maintain their propensity to work throughout the whole of their lives".^{10/}

This trend is of greater interest if we examine age as an indirect variable of the stage in the life cycle. From this angle, it may be asserted that most women over 25 are married and have small children, and that their continued presence on the labour market during that stage in their life cycle when most domestic work is required indicates that they will not subsequently withdraw. If we further take into account the impact of the present economic crisis it is possible to draw the conclusion that they will remain on the labour market, as their contribution to the household is of fundamental importance.^{11/}

2. Activity and education

Between 1960 and 1980 changes in the educational characteristics of the labour force in all countries revealed a sharp decline in the economically active population with less than three years education. The difference in the degrees of modernization and hence in progress in education is indicated by the size of the population with lower levels of education. However, in merely 20 years the economically active population with less than three years education declined by between 15 and 30 percentage points.

In those countries where modernization is advanced and in which education is most developed (Argentina, Chile, Panama and Uruguay), there occurred, on the one hand, a decline in the active population with between four and six years education, and on the other, an increase in the group with between seven and nine years education. It should be borne in mind that in all countries the active population with over 10 years education increased constantly, and that the levels of education of the female labour force were higher than those of their male counterparts, both in 1960 and in 1980. Thus, in 1980, in Argentina, Chile and Panama, more than 60% of working women had received over seven years education, and in the last two countries, 44% had received more than 10 years education.

3. Activity, education and civil status

If data is restricted to activity and education it is impossible to grasp one of the fundamental features affecting women's participation on the labour market: the family and children. Civil status constitutes a rough indicator of the life cycle, a variable which censuses take into account but which does not always adequately reflect changes; this is because not all divorces and separations are recorded, while married women, spinsters and widows are recorded in full.

If civil status, education and activity on the labour market are compared, the activity rates of single women are greater in all countries than those of women in the ever-married category. As recorded, the data fail to reveal two contradictory processes: on the one hand, married women tend to participate less in the labour market than those who are separated, divorced or widowed, although in numerical terms, the latter is an extremely small group. Similarly, as the level of education increases, activity rates rise in the seven countries for which this data is available.

However, if civil status and education are compared, the difference between the activity rates of single and ever-married women tends to decline and virtually disappears, as the level of education increases. In the case of women with more than 13 years education, the relationship is reversed in all countries, and consequently the activity rates of ever-married women are greater than those of single women (except in Brazil).

It should also be pointed out that the group of women with the highest activity rates, regardless of their civil status, is made up of women who have received post-secondary education, with the highest rates in Panama and Brazil. In contrast, the group of women with the lowest participation on the labour market is that of married women with less than three years education (Honduras and Panama).

It is possible to conclude that where low levels of education are concerned, women's civil status exerts considerable influence over their decision to work, and that as the level of education increases, it becomes less important and disappears altogether in the case of post-secondary levels of education.

It is possible to account for this by bearing in mind that higher levels of education make it possible to earn higher family income, and to gain access to the market for the goods and services necessary for the daily reproduction of the family. This makes it possible to employ other women to carry out domestic work and to increase the number of goods and services purchased on the market (launderettes, child-care centres, semi-processed meals, etc.). Although a woman may thus transfer responsibility for domestic work, this does not entail a delegation of her responsibility, and in certain cases, the higher status of the family may impose a heavier domestic burden, which will make itself felt and sharply interfere with the woman's role as a salaried worker.

To sum up, it is possible to distinguish two clear logics underlying women's participation on the labour market:^{12/} first of all, a logic of determination, which compels lower-income women to work, regardless of which stage of their life cycle they have reached, their educational level and the income they are capable of earning. These women are those whom it is most difficult for population censuses to record as their work is carried out within the informal sector of the economy. On the other hand, a logic of choice, which corresponds to higher-income women, who carry out salaried work not only in search of an income, but also to achieve personal fulfillment. This group, which belongs to the formal sector of the urban economy, is satisfactorily recorded by censuses and is the most numerous group of female workers in countries at an advanced level of modernization.

It is thus possible to draw the following profile of women present on the labour market in the 1980s:

a) The highest levels of participation of the central age groups (20 to 59) are to be found in those countries in which modernization is advanced as well as in those whose modernization is rapid but unbalanced and which have experienced relatively strong economic growth. These are principally Brazil, Cuba, Panama and to a lesser extent Peru. In countries in which modernization is partial and incipient (Paraguay and Guatemala), the trend is towards the maintenance of the same structure of participation by age groups as in 1960.

b) A major change occurred between 1960 and 1980 in all countries in the educational level of the active population, a change which was even more marked in the case of women, and in most countries there was a huge expansion of intermediate levels of education, in other words, secondary education became a mass phenomenon. On the basis of the above differentiation between countries, it is clear that countries in which modernization is advanced (Argentina, Chile and Panama), considerably expanded educational coverage, a fact which is reflected in the size of the active female population with more than 10 years education in 1960, which became even more pronounced towards 1980.

c) Finally, the relationship between participation and civil status, where the level of education remains constant, reveals that in both 1960 and in 1980 the impact of civil status is cancelled out in the case of women with high levels of education, and consequently the activity rates for women are high, be they married or single.

B. CHANGES IN THE TYPE OF WORK AND FEMALE OCCUPATIONAL POLARIZATION

The manner in which women take their place in production together with the way in which this role has changed in recent decades make it possible to determine —from the angle of the production system— the nature of labour requirements as well as which branches of activity, sectors of the economy and occupational groups women join.

1. Participation by branch of activity

During the above period, regardless of the degree of modernization of countries, most women were employed in the services sector. The data available for 1980 indicate that the percentage of women in the services sector ranged from 55% in Panama to 38% in Peru, and between 45% and 55% in all other countries.

However, the services sector has evolved irregularly, and, depending on the degree of development of countries, a downward trend could be observed between 1960 and 1980 in those in which modernization was most advanced. This phenomenon is attributable to the diminution in the group made up of personal services, although the decline may have been mitigated by the increase in social services connected with the State bureaucracy; this would seem to be the case in Brazil, where the labour employed in this branch expanded between 1970 and 1980.

In countries where modernization was partial (Ecuador and Paraguay) the proportion of women in this group increased, particularly as a result of the employment of young migrant women in domestic service. Finally, in Guatemala, where modernization is incipient, women's participation in this sector declined.

As far as women's employment in agriculture is concerned, it declined sharply in all countries, in varying degrees and depending on the level of development reached. Thus, by 1960, countries where modernization was advanced employed less than 8% of active women in this sector, a figure which declined even further in the following two decades.^{13/} In turn, in those countries where modernization is partial (Ecuador, Paraguay and Peru ^{14/}), as in Brazil, the proportion remained higher in 1980.

Towards 1980 trade was undoubtedly the sector of greatest importance for female employment. In this connection, it is necessary to distinguish between established trade and street trade, as the latter has proved extremely flexible in absorbing labour during periods of crisis.

Finally, the most modern area of female employment, that of finance, has increased in all countries in line with their greater degree of economic development and modernization. The jobs in question are in financial establishments, insurance, banks, real estate and services to firms.

2. Participation by occupational group

As has already been indicated, the distribution among the major occupational groups in 1960, 1970 and 1980 reveals that the highest concentration of women was to be found in the occupational group made up of workers providing personal services, with an extremely uneven evolution. Thus, between 1960 and 1970, this group increased in Argentina and Brazil and fell slightly in all other countries; between 1970 and 1980—in all countries for which data are available—it maintained its predominant position, with between 30% and 20% of the total number of women active on the labour market, although a downward trend could be perceived.

The nature of salaried domestic work changed during this period. Towards 1980 the trend in countries whose level of modernization was advanced was towards an increase in "non-resident" domestic labour, although the group made up of "resident" employees remains predominant in almost all countries. For example, in Chile, in 1980 the group of "resident" employees represented 58% of domestic employees, while "non-resident" employees accounted for 42%, while the respective percentages in 1984 were 54% and 46%. In 1980, in Greater Buenos Aires, only 23% of all domestic employees were resident.^{15/}

In addition, this trend was also affected by the increase in the group of "non-resident" domestic employees during periods of crisis, as this is an extremely flexible labour supply which can be joined by young educated women who fail to find any other form of occupation, heads of household or women with unemployed husbands, as they are able to combine this work with work in their own home. In addition, it may be assumed that as the wages of domestic employees fall, demand increases. This is confirmed by, for example, the case of Chile between 1980 and 1984, as the information available from household surveys reveals that open unemployment among women over 15 of age rose from 10.7% in 1980 to 19.0% in 1984, while the number of domestic employees rose by 16 000 over the same period (3 000 "resident" and 13 000 "non-resident").

In 1980, office employees made up the second largest group in Argentina, Chile and Panama, and the third largest in Brazil and Ecuador. This was in part connected to the levels of development of each country and is reflected in a larger government administration, as in the case of countries at an advanced level of modernization (Argentina, Chile and Panama); however, it is this occupational group which has grown regularly in all countries in recent decades.

Furthermore, the proportion of women in the professional and technical category has increased on account of the improvement in levels of education in recent years. In Ecuador this category is the second largest, while in Argentina, Brazil, Panama and Uruguay it is the third. Generally speaking, the numbers of professional women and female technicians tend to increase, particularly in the case of teaching which is a typically female profession and which extends women's private role in socialization to the social sphere.

As has already been pointed out, the numbers of female agricultural workers are declining generally, and in 1980 remained high only in Brazil --where they were the second largest group-- and Ecuador. Between 1960 and 1980 a sharp decline (of almost 50%) was recorded on account of internal migration of women to cities in Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Ecuador. In Panama their numbers declined somewhat less, while in Uruguay the sector increased between 1963 and 1975, although it remained extremely small.

Women employed in factories, female artisans and workers who were a very large group in Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Ecuador, and to a lesser extent in Panama towards 1960, declined markedly in number towards 1970 and 1980, except in Brazil where their numbers rose, probably on account of the economic boom which took place at that time. The majority of this occupational group is made up of women in the textile and clothing industries.

Saleswomen and shopkeepers are quite numerous and their numbers rose between 1960 and 1980 in all countries.

Particular attention was devoted to examining whether the increase in certain occupational groups corresponded exclusively to women, in other words, whether it was possible to speak of a segmented "feminization" of certain occupations, or whether on the contrary, the phenomenon involved an expansion of employment affecting both sexes. Similarly, an attempt was made to investigate whether over the last two decades either men or women had been displaced from certain occupations. In this respect, it may be inferred that the most pronounced "feminization", i.e., the highest percentage of women in any occupational group is to be found in the group of domestic and laundry employees, between 89% and 98% of whom are women. The men employed in this category are waiters in restaurants, hotel employees, etc. An extremely small proportion work in private houses, and those who do so receive considerably higher wages than women. The other category in which it is possible to discern a trend towards "feminization" is the group of professional women and female technicians; in 1980 more than half of these were women (except in Ecuador), mainly because the activities which make up this group (education and health) are mostly performed by women.

Another occupation group which is extremely "feminized" is that made up of spinners, seamstresses and dressmakers, more than half of whom are women.

No great changes are apparent in female participation by occupational groups between 1960 and 1980 as far as the proportion of women in the various categories are concerned. Generally speaking, the only professions which become somewhat more "feminized" are those of office employees and salespersons, although towards 1980 women were still in a minority in these categories. To sum up, the labour market has remained highly segmented in so far as there has been no change in those occupations conventionally defined as female, and on the other hand no large number of new occupations have opened up to them. In Mexico it is also possible to observe that the division between female and male occupations accepted and reinforced by society has not undergone any major changes.^{16/}

3. Manual and non-manual work

Broadly speaking, it should be pointed out that during these two decades a considerable increase occurred in the non-manual stratum in all countries. The contribution of women to the non-manual stratum has been calculated using the percentage increase in non-manual female employment against the total increase in non-manual employment. In this respect, two features are worthy of note: the contribution of women to the increase in the non-manual group is in the region of 50%, or far higher, depending on the country, and the rates of increase were distinct in the two decades; hence the greatest increase in the non-manual group attributable to the contribution of women occurred between 1970 and 1980 in all countries. The case of Uruguay is particularly striking: female employment increased by 105% in the non-manual group in this country, with the consequent decline in the number of men employed in the group, mainly on account of the huge international migration recorded during the 1970s.

While the number of women workers in the non-manual group has increased considerably, even so towards 1980 they only accounted for between 36% and 41% of the group, with the exception of Panama, where they made up almost half of the group.

In the same year, women constituted between 60% and 70% of the group of workers providing personal services, although an extremely slight decline occurred over the two decades in the proportion of women. The proportion of women in the manual, secondary and primary groups was low and on the decline in 1980.

It should nonetheless be recalled that the figures in respect of women employed in manual activities are the most unsatisfactory recorded either by censuses or by household surveys, and it is consequently reasonable to assume that their number was considerably higher than that recorded, particularly in agriculture and in the informal urban sector (services).

The clearest conclusion to be drawn from the available information is that women are taking on non-manual occupations to a greater degree than manual ones, as a result of their access to higher levels of education, although this does not mean that they earn higher income. Data from the Brazilian census, which includes income, clearly reveal that in the 1980s women had a higher level of education and their participation in the economy increased twofold during the decade; however, if the respective Lorenz curves for women and men are compared, they reveal that women's share of income has worsened since 1970 in comparison with that of men.^{17/} In other words, although women have gained access to non-manual jobs, they continue to receive lower incomes than men for the same jobs, regardless of their level of education. This phenomenon will be analysed in greater detail in the following section, in connection with the examination of the impact of the crisis on female employment.

It may be assumed that the disparity of income and occupations between men and women will be different depending on the degree of modernization of the country. Thus, in countries at an advanced level of modernization, where women traditionally play a greater role on the labour market, it is to be expected that income disparity between the sexes will be lower than in countries which have recently modernized.

Data from two household surveys carried out in Buenos Aires (1980) and São Paulo (1982), respectively,^{18/} reveal that in the former, the average income of women was 68% of that of men; in São Paulo, a highly industrialized city in Brazil where women have made a huge entry into the manufacturing sector, their average income is 57% of that of men, while in the manufacturing sector itself, their income is 44% of that of men.

A more careful scrutiny of the disparity in wages between men and women in the case of Buenos Aires referred to above reveals that if age, civil status, education and occupation are analysed, "most of the income differences between men and women on the labour market may be attributed to occupational segregation, to the different manner in which men and women take their place in the occupational structure".^{19/}

To summarize, the information provided by the censuses and surveys makes it possible to conclude that the incorporation of women into production has been sharply polarized: an extremely broad sector of women work in the manual group, almost exclusively as domestic employees, while the other group predominates in non-manual occupations, professional women, office staff and saleswomen.

During the period under review, it has been clearly demonstrated that female participation has declined in agriculture and in manufacturing industry, thereby continuing the process of tertiarization. Nevertheless, in countries whose modernization has been rapid and is advanced, the internal composition of the services sector has altered; female employment has increased in the social services sector, while it has declined in that of personal services.

Finally, the evolution of the female occupations over the two decades reflected a considerable incorporation of women into the non-manual group, since female employment accounts for more than half the increase in this category. Although this might seem to suggest a trend towards an improvement of the status of women in these occupations, the information which it has been possible to gather for some countries in the region indicates that the improvement in women's level of education together with their employment in non-manual jobs has not been accompanied by an improvement in their share of income, since women are still segmented into jobs which are considered as being "for women", and which carry less prestige and offer lower income.

C. DOMESTIC WORK

Attention has so far been focused on the work carried out by women on the labour market. In order to grasp the nature of work outside the home, it is also necessary to examine the domestic work carried out by women in their homes. Housewives constitute between 30% and 50% of the female population of over 15 years of age in the region.

Any definition of domestic work is problematic. At an overall theoretical level it covers the "set of maintenance activities required for the daily reproduction of the labour force, including the transformation of goods into use values for consumption".^{20/} All societies have distinguished between domestic and non-domestic work and have considered the former to be mainly the preserve of women. However, the actual definition of the forms taken by domestic work is extremely heterogeneous, and varies in accordance with cultural, ecological and circumstances, as well as with the degree of development and modernization and depends upon the social class concerned as well as being heavily determined by the ideological conceptualization adopted in respect of the role of the woman-mother-spouse-housewife.

Until recently, no quantitative studies had been made to measure the domestic work carried out by women in Latin America.^{21/} This was attributable to the fact that in addition to being extremely heterogeneous, the unpaid domestic work done by women is not considered to be work in the proper sense of the word, since it is not bought and sold on the market, and it is

consequently not recorded in national accounts. However, ideological changes which occurred at the beginning of the 1970s regarding the role of women in society and the concept held of their work began to stress the importance of unpaid domestic labour for the reproduction of the population. This trend was reinforced by the crisis, as a result of which the value of domestic labour particularly among low-income groups became even more apparent. These groups were obliged to count on female domestic labour to offset the diminution of the goods and services making up their basic "shopping basket". Thus, the significance of domestic labour helps to account for the relatively low participation rates of married women, particularly in low-income strata.

The pioneering study carried out by the ILO 22/ reveals that in Latin America the time devoted to domestic tasks is equal or even greater than that devoted to paid activities on the market, and that consequently a high proportion of housewives are in fact "overemployed". In a study carried out in Chile, it was calculated that housewives not elsewhere employed worked an average of 56.3 hours per week, while those also employed outside the home worked an average of 37.9 hours per week, without counting their work outside the home. Thus, the head of household worked an 8-hour working day without a day's rest, while the housewife employed outside the home worked a total of 12 hours per day.23/ In value terms, the calculations indicate that domestic work might represent between one third and a half of the monetary income of families. In the case of poor households, the figure is higher as domestic work is a key factor in the survival strategy. The same study on Chile estimated that the domestic work carried out by women represented 30% of gross national product, a figure only exceeded by that of the manufacturing sector.

In addition, the studies carried out by the ILO in Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Mexico, Peru, Venezuela and Uruguay have provided confirmation for a number of major hypotheses:

a) The incorporation of women into the labour market does not signify a corresponding diminution of domestic work; in other words, those women who work actually work a double work day.

b) The rise in family income has not meant less domestic labour for the housewife; what has changed is the composition of such work, as the most unpleasant tasks have become the responsibility of others. Housewives still continue to carry out domestic work and have even taken on new tasks connected with their higher social status.

c) Even when housewives possess modern domestic appliances, they still devote almost as much time to domestic tasks as those women who do not possess such appliances. The main difference lies in the intensity of the personal effort required, as the development of technology in fact tends to re-shape women's role as a reproducer.

d) As far as the economic crisis is concerned, while domestic work has indeed increased, men have not taken on a greater share thereof. Thus, although men's role as providers has declined, this has not led to any corresponding increase in their share of domestic work. Some of these trends are examined in the section on the repercussions of the crisis on low-income sectors.

III. THE CRISIS AND ITS REPERCUSSIONS ON FEMALE EMPLOYMENT

A. THE CRISIS IN THE 1980s: BACKGROUND

For three decades since the 1950s, as illustrated in section I, despite some ups and downs, the countries of Latin America experienced sustained economic growth. However, as from 1980 growth fell dramatically.^{24/} The factors which sparked off the crisis were the drop in net capital inflow, as from 1982, and the increase in payments of profits and interests abroad. In 1982, on account of the cutback in the flow of loans and foreign investment together with the huge capital flight from certain countries in the region, it was necessary to finance more than half the current account deficit by a dramatic reduction of international reserves.^{25/}

In the domestic sphere, these changes were compounded by the huge fall in real wages, and worsened by the rise which affected prices in spite of the fall in wages and the increase in unemployment. Thus, the quickening of inflation was one of the negative domestic features which made the largest contribution to the deterioration in real wages.

All of these discouraging trends in the evolution of domestic variables were closely linked to the external sector, where "the deterioration in the terms of trade, the striking fall in imports, the draining away of international reserves, the frequent and sometimes enormous rises in the exchange rates and, above all, the overwhelming weight of the servicing of the external debt, forced most of the countries of the region to renegotiate their commitments with the international private banks and with their official creditors".^{26/}

A sharp decline occurred in the gross domestic products of the countries of Latin America as a whole. Between 1982 and 1983 GDP fell in absolute terms for the first time in 40 years. Excluding Brazil, which accounts for one third of regional gross domestic product and has a sharp impact on the region as a whole, Latin America's global product rose by a mere 2% between 1980 and 1986.^{27/} Between 1980 and 1986 the evolution of per capita gross domestic product was particularly striking, as it rose at a lower rate than the population. However, an even more revealing indicator of the drop in the population's standard of living is per capita national income. In Latin America as a whole, it was 14% lower than in 1980, while its 1986 value was similar to that achieved in 1976.

The economic behaviour of countries during this period was disparate (see table 1). With the exceptions of Brazil, Colombia, Cuba and Panama, all countries recorded negative rates of growth between 1981 and 1986. The negative repercussions were far greater in the case of petroleum-exporting countries, on account of the slump in the price of crude petroleum. The year in which the crisis was most deeply felt also varied from one country to another. This was not only because nations had achieved extremely diverse levels of development of their productive forces, but also attributable to the different types and degrees of linkage with the international economy. These two factors combined when the governments of the region, to a greater or lesser extent, applied unorthodox adjustment policies, including restrictive monetary and fiscal measures. Among other objectives, governments aimed to reduce fiscal credit by increasing taxation, public-sector tariffs and by reducing current expenditures. In addition, in the course of the adjustment process, the real rate of exchange rose while real wages fell and an effort was made to maintain positive interest rates.

The repercussions of the crisis and of the adjustment policies adopted were reflected in three main ways on the labour market:^{28/} a) through a decline in the rate of growth of employment; b) through a change in the type of employment created, with an increase in informal and tertiary employment, and c) through a decline in real wages.

Broadly speaking, for the labour force as a whole rates of unemployment rose. Between 1980 and 1985 the number of unemployed in the region grew by 48%. In respect of the second of the above consequences, the change in the types of employment created, three trends should be highlighted: the increase of informal work, of work in the tertiary sector together with variations in the makeup of employment in the public sector in comparison with the private.

The clearest consequence of the crisis was the fall in real wages. Between 1980 and 1985 wages indexes fell by between 12% and 18% in some countries in the region.^{29/} This was attributable to spiraling inflation as well as to the increase in unemployment and in underemployment. However, not all sectors were affected equally. The brunt was borne by public employees and workers in the construction sector, while those in manufacturing industry suffered less.

The fall in real wages exceeded the decline in gross income and per capita product. In conjunction with the sharp fall in minimum wages between 1980 and 1985, this implies that the brunt of the crisis was borne by workers, and that income distribution consequently deteriorated.

Table 1

LATIN AMERICA: EVOLUTION OF PER CAPITA GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT, 1981-1986

Country	Annual growth rates						Cumulative variation 1981-1986 a/
	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986 a/	
Latin America (excluding Cuba)	-1.9	-3.7	-4.7	0.9	0.4	1.2	-7.6
Petroleum-exporting countries	2.8	-2.9	-8.1	0.2	-0.8	-4.4	-13.1
Bolivia	-2.3	-5.4	-9.0	-3.5	-4.4	-6.3	-27.3
Ecuador	0.8	-1.8	-4.0	1.5	1.4	-1.2	-3.3
Mexico	5.4	-2.6	-7.6	0.9	0.1	-6.3	-10.4
Peru	1.3	-2.5	-14.2	1.2	-1.0	5.9	-10.1
Trinidad & Tobago	-0.8	-0.5	-10.6	-7.6	-4.2		
Venezuela	-3.9	-4.1	-8.2	-3.7	-3.2	-1.0	-21.9
Non-petroleum-exporting countries	-4.5	-4.2	-2.6	1.5	1.1	4.3	-4.6
Argentina	-8.2	-7.8	1.4	0.6	-5.9	3.9	-15.5
Barbados	-2.7	-5.9	-0.4	2.4	-0.6		
Brazil	-4.2	-0.8	-4.8	2.6	5.9	5.7	4.0
Chile	3.5	-14.5	-2.2	4.3	0.7	3.2	-6.2
Colombia	0.1	-1.1	-0.3	1.4	0.4	3.0	3.6
Costa Rica	-5.0	-9.7	0.0	5.1	-1.7	0.4	-11.0
Cuba b/	15.3	3.0	3.9	6.3	3.7	1.5	38.1
Dominican Republic	1.5	-1.1	1.9	-1.9	-4.3	-1.6	-5.4
El Salvador	-9.6	-6.5	-0.2	0.5	0.1	-1.8	-16.7
Guatemala	-1.8	-6.1	-5.4	-2.8	-3.7	-2.8	-20.7
Guyana	-2.6	-12.6	-12.0	3.9	-0.1		
Haiti	-4.4	-5.2	-1.1	-1.4	1.6	-3.2	-13.1
Honduras	-2.4	-4.9	-3.9	-0.3	-1.8	-1.2	-13.8
Jamaica	1.1	-1.5	-0.2	-1.4	-6.7		
Nicaragua	2.0	-4.4	1.3	-4.8	-5.9	-3.1	-14.1
Panama	1.7	2.7	-2.2	-2.5	1.1	0.6	1.3
Paraguay	5.3	-4.0	-6.0	0.0	0.9	-1.9	-6.0
Uruguay	0.9	-10.3	-7.0	-3.2	-0.2	4.2	-15.3

Source: ECLAC, on the basis of official gross domestic product figures. The figures for population correspond to CELADE estimates published in the Demographic bulletin, Year XIX, No. 38, July 1986.

a/ Preliminary estimates subject to review.

b/ Refers to global social product.

B. CRISIS AND UNEMPLOYMENT BY SEX 30/

Unemployment was one of the consequences of the crisis which was felt most dramatically and rapidly on the labour market. Urban unemployment rose between 1978 and 1984. With the exception of Brazil, where it fell to one half between 1984 and 1986, in all other countries the decline was extremely slight and unemployment remained relatively stable between 1985 and 1986, although its level was higher than those recorded prior to the crisis. In Colombia, it continued to rise until 1986 (see table 2).

In 1985 rates of unemployment in five selected Latin American cities ranged between 5.2% (São Paulo) and 13.6% (Bogotá). The comparison by sex reveals that male rates of unemployment varied considerably less than female rates: while the former ranged from 5 to 10, the latter ranged from 5 to 19. Thus, in the various cities --with the exception of Caracas-- rates of female unemployment were higher than rates of male unemployment as were the variations between countries. This may be attributable to the difficulties in measuring female unemployment, which is frequently concealed within the category defined as domestic chores (see table 3).

In historical terms, female rates of unemployment have been higher than male rates. The information gathered by the Regional Employment Programme for Latin America and the Caribbean (PREALC) 31/ on six countries in the region revealed that between 1970 and 1980 rates of female unemployment were higher than male rates in all major countries. The widest gap was in Panama and the narrowest in Brazil.

In order to account for higher female unemployment it is necessary to bear in mind that in Latin America economies are insufficiently dynamic to absorb the growing labour force available. In addition, there is an excess supply of female labour for the small number of jobs open to women, on account of the high degree of segmentation by sex on the labour market. Furthermore, it is claimed that since in most cases women are not heads of households, they can "afford" to remain unemployed since they are not the main economic support of the family group. This is the traditional argument invoked by employers to justify hiring fewer women or paying lower wages.32/ However, it is in sharp contrast with the fact that in recent years women have grown into between one fifth and one third --in the case of the Caribbean-- of the total number of heads of households.33/

Economic circumstances in Brazil are an exception from the overall trend recorded in other countries. Until 1986, in comparison with the rest of Latin America, Brazil had successfully solved the problem of its external imbalances without any major recessionary cost. As mentioned above, prior to the crisis Brazil made considerable progress with regard to the growth of gross per capita domestic product and the creation of new jobs for both men and women. However, this also went hand in hand with deep inequalities in income distribution and in access to the various sectors of the labour market.34/ Recent information indicates that the impact of the crisis on this market --both informal and formal-- had no repercussions on female activity rates. Quite the contrary, they continued to grow during the worst moments of the Brazilian economic crisis, although in a more pronounced manner in the formal sector than in the informal.35/

Table 2

SELECTED LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES: AVERAGE RATES OF
URBAN UNEMPLOYMENT, 1977-1986

	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986 a/
Brazil b/	...	6.8	6.4	6.3	7.9	6.3	6.7	7.1	5.3	3.8
Colombia c/	9.0	9.0	8.9	9.7	8.2	9.3	11.8	13.5	14.1	14.2
Costa Rica d/	5.1	5.8	5.3	6.0	9.1	9.9	8.6	6.6	6.7	6.7
Panama d/	...	9.6	11.6	9.8	11.8	10.3	11.5	11.0	11.8	9.0
Venezuela d/	5.5	5.1	5.8	6.6	6.8	7.8	10.5	14.3	14.3	11.8

Source: ECLAC, *The crisis of social development: challenges and possibilities* (LC/L.413), Santiago, Chile, February 1987.

a/ Preliminary figures.

b/ Metropolitan areas of São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, Belo Horizonte, Porto Alegre, Salvador and Recife.

c/ Bogotá, Barranquilla, Medellín and Cali.

d/ National urban.

Table 3

SELECTED LATIN AMERICAN CITIES: RATES OF UNEMPLOYMENT
BY SEX AND AGE, 1985

	Population over 15	Population between 15 and 19	Population between 20 and 24
Bogotá	13.6	33.9	22.3
Men	10.1	32.3	17.8
Women	18.6	35.6	27.2
Caracas	9.8	21.5	15.6
Men	10.5	23.8	16.1
Women	8.6	16.7	14.8
Panama	10.4	32.3	22.7
Men	9.4	30.6	19.9
Women	12.2	34.7	27.7
San José	7.3	19.8	13.1
Men	6.8	18.5	11.7
Women	8.2	21.8	15.3
São Paulo	5.2	13.7	7.2
Men	5.0	13.4	7.2
Women	5.6	14.2	7.2

Source: ECLAC, Social Development Division, special tabulations from Household Surveys, 1985.

Between 1982 and 1985 female unemployment multiplied almost fivefold in Bogotá and in Caracas it almost doubled. In São Paulo it rose slightly, while it declined in Panama and San José (see table 4). The highest rates of unemployment were those for young people, of between 15 and 19 years of age, which reached 30% in Bogotá and Panama. In Mexico, between 1984 and 1987 unemployment was higher among the 15- to 19-year old population and of those unemployed the percentage of those seeking work for the first time was higher among women than among men.^{36/}

Table 4

SELECTED LATIN AMERICAN CITIES: FEMALE RATES OF
EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT, 1982 AND 1985

	<u>Rates of employment</u>		<u>Rates of unemployment</u>	
	Total women	Women from 15 to 24	Total women	Women from 15 to 24
Bogotá				
1982	35.8	29.5	4.2	8.7
1985	39.9	33.0	18.6	30.0
Caracas				
1982	35.3	26.9	4.8	8.3
1985	37.2	27.5	8.6	15.3
Panamá				
1982	33.6	24.4	14.2	29.3
1985	33.8	21.4	12.2	30.3
San José				
1982	37.7	34.1	9.2	18.5
1985	32.4	29.4	8.2	17.5
São Paulo				
1982	35.4	49.5	4.7	7.5
1985	42.5	51.1	5.6	10.5

Source: ECLAC, Social Development Division, special tabulations from Household Surveys 1982 and 1985.

As the rate of female unemployment rose in most cities, a simultaneous increase occurred in the number of jobs available, a trend which is apparent from the behaviour of the rate of employment.^{37/} This trend is clearly apparent in three of the five cities: Bogotá, Caracas and São Paulo. A similar phenomenon can be observed in Uruguay, where more women joined the labour market, in an irreversible process.^{38/} These considerations as a whole indicate that while historical trends towards the incorporation of women into the labour market were maintained, there was also an increase in female participation on account of the fall in family income. Thus, female

participation on the Latin American labour market during the crisis of the 1980s has moved in the opposite direction to that recorded during the crisis of the 1930s in the United States, where women withdrew from the labour market so as to open up greater job opportunities for the male population.

In Latin America, as family income fell in the course of the recession, other members of the household, in particular young women, entered the labour market in search of paid work to offset the fall, and their participation in both the formal and informal markets increased.^{39/} There is no clear explanation for this difference in behaviour; it may be hypothesized that the value attached to female employment has changed, and that consequently women now attach greater importance to work outside the home. However, there is every likelihood that women in the middle- and high-income groups behave in a similar way to American women in the 1930s; in terms of the logic adopted by the latter, they withdraw from the labour market as salaries decline. As far as women in low-income groups are concerned, force of circumstances has compelled them to work outside the home, and to take up all the opportunities offered by the formal and particularly informal labour markets.

The circumstances described above indicate that during the crisis there has been a considerable increase in the level of unemployment, particularly among women and young people and that the capacity to absorb the labour force has declined. The diversity between countries is attributable to the distinct trends in the evolution of income, the greater or lesser capacity of the economy to generate new jobs, the adjustment policies adopted and public and social investment programmes.

Consequently, it is possible to argue that the trends apparent since the 1980s towards an expansion of the labour market for women have persisted. However, the considerable rise in the rate of growth of the female labour force recorded between 1950 and 1980 found no counterpart capable of ensuring their absorption as a productive force, a shortcoming which had a particular impact on young people who had recently joined the labour market.

The crisis has altered the internal composition of female participation; rates of employment have continued to increase, albeit at a slower rate, while there has been a sharp rise in the rates of unemployment.

C. OCCUPATIONAL INSERTION BY SEX

The crisis has also been reflected on the labour market through segmentation, both general and by sex. Consequently, it is worthwhile analysing how those jobs defined as being for women are evolving over time as well as the way in which the crisis has affected this definition.

As far as segmentation of the labour market is concerned, between 1970 and 1980 in six countries there was an increase in the number of jobs available in the formal sector for both men and women, although more were available for the latter. However, things were quite different in the informal sector. In the case of men, the number increased in four countries and remained stable in two, while the participation of women fell in every case

and dramatically so in Paraguay, Ecuador and Panama. However, the proportion of women in the domestic sector declined in all cases.^{40/}

As far as labour market segmentation in respect of women between 1982 and 1985 is concerned, no spectacular changes took place (see table 5). Thus, the formal sector fell slightly in Bogotá and San José, remained stable in Caracas and increased in Panama. This coincides with a relative increase in the informal sector in Bogotá and San José and a decline in Caracas and Panama. The impact of the crisis becomes even more apparent from an analysis of the trend in domestic service, which increased in most cities in relative terms towards 1985.

Table 5

SELECTED LATIN AMERICAN CITIES: LABOUR MARKET SEGMENTATION.
WOMEN OF 15 AND OVER, 1982 AND 1985

Sector		Bogotá	Caracas	Panama	San José	São Paulo
Formal	1982	51.3	62.5	64.7	71.3	-
	1985	49.3	62.1	66.7	70.3	58.8
Informal	1982	21.5	14.7	13.1	12.4	-
	1985	25.1	12.2	8.4	13.4	14.9
Domestic service	1982	27.2	22.8	22.3	16.4	-
	1985	25.5	24.1	24.9	16.0	18.0
Undeclared	1982	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-
	1985	0.1	1.6	0.1	0.2	8.3
Total	1982	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	-
	1985	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Source: ECLAC, Social Development Division, special tabulations from Household Surveys, 1982 and 1985.

The distribution of the female labour force among the various occupations between 1982 and 1985 reveals the changes in their occupational structure (see table 6). Over the short term, the only group to increase markedly in the total number of women employed was that of professional women; the proportion of office employees and saleswomen rose in two cities and fell in two others, while the proportion of own-account traders, in which street traders are mainly found, fell in all cities. Rather than an actual decline in the number of women in the informal sector, this trend would seem to reflect the absence of statistical data on the sector, particularly when street trading is punished by law. Finally, domestic employees and women providing personal services made up the largest group of women, both in 1982 and in 1985. The sole exception was San José, where the largest occupational group in both of these years was made up of office employees.

Table 6

SELECTED LATIN AMERICAN CITIES: DISTRIBUTION OF THE ACTIVE FEMALE POPULATION
BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS, 1982 AND 1985

	<u>Bogotá</u>		<u>Caracas</u>		<u>Panama</u>		<u>San José</u>		<u>São Paulo</u>	
	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
Professionals	11.4	9.5	10.4	13.6	6.3	8.1	6.9	7.8		9.5
Technicians	2.0	1.5	8.4	6.8	11.8	11.3	8.6	10.4		4.2
Executives, managers and administrators	2.7	3.7	2.7	2.8	3.4	3.0	2.4	1.4		3.7
Office staff	20.0	19.9	32.2	24.6	28.0	28.7	19.7	21.2		20.0
Saleswomen	8.6	9.5	4.2	5.0	5.6	4.6	18.6	17.2		6.6
Own-account saleswomen	7.3	6.6	4.3	5.9	6.4	3.6	7.5	6.1		4.3
Industrial workers	11.3	13.6	10.3	11.0	2.1	2.2	4.4	5.2		
Semi-skilled workers	2.4	3.6	0.7	1.0	4.5	3.8	6.2	6.2		19.3
Unskilled workers	2.5	2.1	2.3	1.5	2.3	2.0	8.9	8.2		
Domestic employees	31.9	30.0	24.4	26.3	22.3	24.9	16.4	16.0		29.3
Others					8.4 ^{a/}	5.3 ^{a/}				
Don't know, did not reply				1.5		2.5	0.5	0.2		2.7
Total	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>		<u>100.0</u>

Source: ECLAC, Social Development Division, special tabulations from Households Surveys, 1982 and 1985.

a/ Corresponds to government workers and workers in the Canal Zone.

The structure of female occupations has remained stable in spite of the crisis and there are no grounds for anticipating, at least in the short term, any significant changes in the segmentation by sex of the labour market. Thus, it is possible to conclude that occupational segmentation by sex has not been sharply affected by economic changes in themselves, but rather that the ideological rigidity which defines jobs as either "for women" or "for men" has remained unshaken.

In order to push the analysis further, it is necessary to review the register of the types of female participation in the informal sector. Much of the qualitative research carried out has revealed that in times of crisis women from the poorest sectors join the labour force without being adequately registered either by population censuses or by household surveys.^{41/}

D. INCOME DISTRIBUTION BY SEX

Income distribution in Latin America has always been unequal, albeit with variations depending on the degree of development of the country and the political and social model concerned. Consequently, income concentration among the higher sectors has reflected differentiated access to property and to the use of goods and services.

No studies have been carried out at the regional level into income differentials between men and women. Some studies have been made at the national level, and in all cases they reveal that the income received by women is lower than that of men, although the difference varies from one country to another. In the case of Chile, for example, between 1960 and 1985 average female income was no more than 68% of male income, after adjustment for the level of education. This ratio has not changed over the past quarter of a century.^{42/}

If average income differentials by age and sex are analysed, it is clear that they are far smaller among the younger sector of the population, and the gap widens with age. This leads to the conclusion that women progress less than men thereby accounting for the wider income disparity between men and women as they grow older.^{43/}

In 1985, figures for five metropolitan areas indicate that the female population received between 53% and 84% of average male income, in the following order: São Paulo (52.8%), Caracas (60.8%), Bogotá (66.3%), San José (79.9%), and Panama (83.5%).

There is reason to wonder whether the income differential between men and women is a consequence of the latter's lack of training. However, in the five cities the average income of working men and women with the same level of education is marked by considerable differences, and in all cases there is a greater difference of income between men and women the higher the level of education. Thus, there is virtually no difference between illiterate men and women, and in San José average female income is slightly higher. At the university level (more than 13 years education) income differentials are markedly greater between men and women. The extreme case is to be found in São Paulo, where average male income at this level is twice that of average female income (see table 7).

Table 7

SELECTED LATIN AMERICAN CITIES: INDEXES OF THE AVERAGE INCOME OF THE
ACTIVE POPULATION BASED ON SEX AND LEVEL OF EDUCATION, 1985 ^{a/}

	<u>Bogotá</u>		<u>Caracas</u>		<u>Panama</u>		<u>San José</u>		<u>São Paulo ^{b/}</u>	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Without formal education	61	42	53	40	-	-	70	76	50	23
Primary 0 to 6 years	69	52	76	46	63	42	77	52	78	37
Secondary 7 to 12 years	93	70	104	65	99	83	104	82	142	77
University 13 and more	263	152	221	134	251	157	175	140	335	150
Total	<u>115</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>116</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>106</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>107</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>62</u>
Average income of the population		100		100		100		100		100

Source: ECLAC, Social Development Division, special tabulations from the 1985 Household Surveys.

^{a/} The average income of the total population is taken as the basis for the index (=100).

^{b/} Levels of education in São Paulo are the following: no formal education, from 1 to 4 years; from 5 to 8 years; from 9 to 11 years and 12 years or more.

If the indexes of average income by occupation for men and women are analysed (see table 8), in every case male income is higher than female income for the same occupation. Once again, rising through the scale of occupations from manual to non-manual, income disparities increase and the greatest differences are to be found between average male and female income among professionals and managers, administrators and executives which are the highest paid jobs for both men and women.

The income of heads of household is far higher than that of the population as a whole, be they men or women. However, the difference between male or female heads of household is far greater than in the population as a whole (see table 9). This pattern is to be found on a similar scale in all countries, thereby raising the need to devote attention to the group of female heads of household whose living conditions are among the worst in the region.

Table 8

SELECTED LATIN AMERICAN CITIES: INDEXES OF AVERAGE INCOME OF THE ACTIVE
POPULATION ON THE BASIS OF SEX AND OCCUPATION, 1985 ^{a/}

	<u>Bogotá</u>		<u>Caracas</u>		<u>Panama</u>		<u>San José</u>		<u>São Paulo b/</u>	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Professionals	313	193	240	143	317	180	200	175	340	142
Technicians and allied professions	197	154	138	71	164	118	167	125	168	72
Executives, managers, government administrators	540	373	205	175	195	158	234	124	347	191
Secretaries and cashiers	105	85	77	70	91	101	98	50	95	102
Employees in commerce	89	43	102	76	110	76	93	69	114	52
Own-account traders	163	78	118	49	67	51	116	79	149	69
Skilled and semi-skilled workers	75	49	89	60	88	67	81	73	86	93
Unskilled workers	61	51	75	46	69	65	75	63	40	33
Domestic employees	58	54	48	40	60	33	80	46	28	20
Total	<u>116</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>116</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>106</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>107</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>62</u>
Average income of the population		100		100		100		100		100

Source: ECLAC, Social Development Division, special tabulations from the 1985 Household Surveys.

a/ The average income of the total population was taken as the average for the index (=100).

It is in São Paulo that the greatest income disparity between men and women, both for the population as a whole and for heads of household is to be found. This city has recorded one of the most spectacular increases in female participation in recent years. However, this has been made possible by the far lower salaries which women have had to accept in comparison with those of men. In this case, as in Uruguay "female employment corresponds to "a stagnant labour reserve" made up of active but irregularly employed workers whose wages fall below the normal working class level".^{44/}

Table 9

SELECTED LATIN AMERICAN CITIES: INDEXES OF AVERAGE INCOME
FOR HEADS OF HOUSEHOLD OF EACH SEX, 1985 ^{a/}

	Total			Heads of household		
	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women
Bogotá	100	116	74	134	140	95
Caracas	100	116	70	133	140	81
Panama	100	106	88	118	123	95
San José	100	107	85	119	127	84
São Paulo	100	117	62	135	141	80

Source: ECLAC, Social Development Division, special tabulations from Household Surveys, 1982 and 1985.

^{a/} The average income of the total population was taken as the basis of the index (=100).

Between 1982 and 1985 the average relative income of women fell in Bogotá and in Caracas; in Panama it remained stable and rose only in San José, where employment declined sharply, in other words, quite the opposite to the case of São Paulo. As far as levels of education are concerned, those women whose average income fell most were those who had received an intermediate education, i.e., between seven and twelve years schooling. During the same period, the average income of those with the highest and lowest levels of education tended to draw together, hence the income differential in respect of education was far lower in 1985 (see table 10). Consequently average female wages fell; in other words, the levelling out was the result of a trend towards lower levels of income.

As far as occupations are concerned, the women whose income fell most during the period were office staff, a fact which coincides with the trend in respect of intermediate levels of education, and own-account traders. The average income of professionals only fell in Caracas. In all the other cities it remained stable and even increased (see table 11). If the average income of those occupations with lower and higher incomes are compared, it may be observed that income concentration by occupation increased in Bogotá, and the gap between them widened. In contrast, in Caracas and San José wage differentials declined, while in Panama they remained stable.

From an initial impression of events it is apparent that income inequality between male and female workers increased. Women's wages declined, hence greater income concentration, with the result that the differences attributable to different levels of education and types of occupation tended to narrow, leading to a widespread drop in income, particularly pronounced in the intermediate levels.

Table 10

SELECTED LATIN AMERICAN CITIES: INDEX OF AVERAGE INCOME OF THE ACTIVE
FEMALE POPULATION ON THE BASIS OF EDUCATION, 1982 AND 1985 a/

Education	Bogotá		Caracas		Panama		San José	
	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
Without formal education	50	42	46	40	28	-	29	76
1 to 6 years	63	52	53	46	41	42	46	52
7 to 12 years	117	70	81	65	84	83	73	82
13 years and more	161	152	146	134	148	157	137	140
Total	<u>98</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>86</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>85</u>
Average income of the population	100		100		100		100	

Source: ECLAC, Social Development Division, special tabulations from Household Surveys, 1982 and 1985.

a/ The average income for the total population was taken as the basis of the index (=100).

To sum up, the crisis has been deeply felt on the labour market and has affected all workers, although its brunt has been borne by women. This has implications for specific social policies towards women, as well as towards those women who have been particularly affected, female heads of household and young women.

E. THE REPERCUSSIONS OF THE CRISIS ON FAMILIES IN
LOW-INCOME SECTORS 45/

The analysis has so far been concerned with the repercussions of the crisis on female workers. An extremely large group of women has yet to be considered: these are those women who work in the home and on whom no quantitative records exist. Consequently, there now follows a presentation of the results of some studies of an essentially qualitative nature providing a picture of events in the domestic sphere of low-income sectors.

As illustrated above, women were particularly affected by the crisis. The already precarious circumstances of housewives in low-income sectors were further worsened. This was reflected in particular in the difficulty they encountered in finding paid work and in the high rates of unemployment which affected both women and men in low-income sectors. Furthermore, a concomitant of the crisis was its impact on family life, on daily domestic tasks and on the burden of domestic work which fell on women.

Table 11

SELECTED LATIN AMERICAN CITIES: INDEX OF AVERAGE FEMALE INCOME
FOR SELECTED OCCUPATIONS, 1982 AND 1985 a/

	<u>Bogotá</u>		<u>Caracas</u>		<u>Panama</u>		<u>San José</u>	
	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985	1982	1985
Professionals	173	193	181	154	173	180	163	175
Technicians and allied trades	163	154	79	71	95	118	123	125
Executives, managers and administrators	179	373	197	175	184	158	159	124
Office staff	130	85	74	70	100	101	88	50
Sales personnel	92	43	81	76	74	76	53	69
Own-account traders	80	78	61	49	50	51	102	79
Domestic employees	37	54	42	40	36	33	25	46
Total	<u>98</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>85</u>
Average income of the population		100		100		100		100

Source: ECLAC, Social Development Division, special tabulations from Household Surveys, 1982 and 1985.

a/ The average income of the total population was taken as the basis for the index (=100).

A number of data on the region have revealed an increase in extended families, hence each dwelling housed several family groups, who were generally related. In most cases, these were those of offspring who had founded their own families but not succeeded in finding an alternative dwelling. Distant relatives or non-relatives who had raised makeshift constructions on the same sites and with whom water, electricity and in some cases meals are shared are also to be found. This phenomenon, designated by the term "unrelated co-habitational family groups", covers groups sharing the same plot, the same dwelling and the same plot and totally integrated family groups. Both in Chile and Brazil this process of growth of non-related family groups has been described at length. It has also been demonstrated that during the crisis the number of workers or active individuals per family has increased, particularly in low-income sectors where minors are frequently involved in a variety of informal and self-employed activities.

Various studies indicate that prolonged unemployment gives rise to a variety of strategies in respect of family life which are different in the case of men and of women. The strategy adopted by men initially focuses on a search for work in their own field or in a field in which they had previously worked, through contacts with friends and ex-workmates, while subsequently

they extend the search to any type of job, be it self-employed or in other cases sporadic low-income activities which generally lead to their swelling the ranks of the informal sector of the economy. Frequently, this constant sense of frustration during prolonged periods of unemployment leads to excessive consumption of alcohol, giving rise to family problems, conflicts and violence within the family.

For their part, women adopt a variety of strategies. Together with men, they seek new sources of income, through part-time, irregular, unstable and extremely low paid activities, which are also largely an extension of their domestic role: sewing, washing, hourly-paid domestic service, sale of meals, etc. Another quite distinct alternative is their participation in groups of women who combine to face their problems of subsistence, either by earning income or by jointly ensuring supply of the goods necessary for the subsistence of the family group. This type of response is innovative in that women tackle the problem of subsistence collectively rather than individually. At the same time as they provide a more "social" vision of the problem, these solutions widen the horizons of female participation and self-esteem, as what had hitherto usually been considered a domestic task thus becomes work on its own right.

The successive phases in terms of domestic organization are various and directly lead to an increase in the burden of work borne by women. Initially, bills cease to be paid: mortgages, if there are any, gas and electricity bills, and finally, water bills. This means that women are obliged to cook with wood, which in many cases means they also have to gather wood, to fetch water from public standpipes some distance from the home, etc. Subsequently, household possessions are sold off: the refrigerator, the cooker, crockery, clothing, materials to repair the home and others. All of these sales place a further burden on women, as they deprive them of their essential tools for carrying out domestic work. Finally, things which wear out, such as clothing, shoes and household equipment are not replaced. Nor does the family possess the minimum cash necessary to pay for transport in search of work, as all the money gathered is spent on food. In addition, the place of purchase, as well as the amounts spent and the volumes purchased change, as a result of which domestic work becomes excessive. Nor is it possible to plan for the future. "Concern with immediate problems and the solution of permanent small crises gradually comes to constitute the way of life of low-income sectors."^{46/}

This increase in domestic work with its excessive burden of labour resulting from the crisis in conjunction with the sensation felt by women that they are not adequately fulfilling the reproductive role assigned to them by society is generally reflected in the large numbers of housewives suffering from deep depression and psychosomatic symptoms.

This raises the question as to how great the actual scale of the crisis would have been if women had not made up for a considerable proportion of the deprivation resulting therefrom at a high cost in terms of personal sacrifice and work.

To sum up, the statistical and qualitative data presented make it possible to draw the conclusion that the repercussions of the crisis have been felt differently by workers of each sex. The studies reveal that higher

unemployment was caused among women than among men in all the cities analysed, and that the high rates of female unemployment remained stable and even rose proportionally more, particularly among youth. In these circumstances, women have adopted an anti-cyclical behaviour. In response to dramatic falls in household income, they have joined both the formal and informal labour markets at an even faster rate. Thus, activity rates have continued to rise, although their internal composition varies, as employment is increasing more slowly while unemployment is rising markedly, particularly in the 15 to 19-year old group.

Segmentation by sex of the labour market has not undergone any major changes attributable to the crisis. The informal sector has increased in size, although household surveys do not provide a totally exhaustive record thereof. Domestic work, which had gradually declined between 1970 and 1980, increased during the period from 1982 to 1985. Hence, the structure of those occupations considered to be "for women" remained unchanged in spite of the crisis, and there are no grounds for expecting major changes in the segmentation by sex of the labour market in the short term.

Finally, as far as income distribution by sex is concerned, it may be concluded that it is in this sphere that the disparities between workers of each sex are most clearly apparent. This inequality has been accentuated by the crisis, with the result that average female incomes have in some cases fallen to half that of average male income. This discrepancy is even greater in the case of heads of household. If the data are compared on the basis of level of education and types of occupation, it is apparent that it was the average incomes of women and low-level non-manual occupations which fell most sharply; i.e., those of own-account traders, office personnel and other professions corresponding to the groups with intermediate levels of education, in other words, from seven to 12 years schooling.

Moreover, the maintenance and reproduction of the labour force, which is the responsibility of women, particularly in low-income sectors, is becoming increasingly arduous. Thus, women in these sectors are compelled to lengthen and intensify their working day in order to make up for the shortage of goods and services brought about by the crisis.

Notes

1/ This section is based on the following documents: ECLAC, The crisis of social development: challenges and possibilities (LC/L.413), Santiago, Chile, February 1987; ECLAC, Transición estructural, movilidad ocupacional y crisis social en América Latina: 1960-1983 (LC/R.547), Santiago, Chile, November 1986; Norberto García y Víctor Tokman, "Changes in employment and the crisis", CEPAL Review, No. 24 (LC/G.1324), Santiago, Chile, December 1984. United Nations publication, Sales No.:E.84.II.G.5; Enzo Faletto and Germán Rama, Algunas reflexiones sobre los procesos de cambio social en América Latina (E/CEPAL/SEM.10/R.2), Santiago, Chile, September 1983.

2/ International Labour Office (ILO), Economically active population: estimates, 1950-1985, projections 1950-2025, vol.III, Latin America, Paris, 1986.

3/ See Inter-American Development Bank, Economic and social progress in Latin America; Report 1987, Washington, D.C., 1987.

4/ The sources of the data are: Latin American Demographic Centre (CELADE), "América Latina: Indicadores demográficos, sociales y económicos de la población femenina", Demographic Bulletin, Year 20, No. 39 (LC/DEM/G.52), Santiago, Chile, 1987 and IDB, op. cit.

5/ See ECLAC, La mujer en el sector popular urbano. América Latina y el Caribe (LC/G.1326), Santiago, Chile, 1984. United Nations publication, Sales No.:S.84.II.G.15.

6/ The statistical data are from the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), Statistical Yearbooks for 1970, 1985 and 1987.

7/ This section provides a summary of the information set out in the ECLAC document entitled América Latina: las mujeres y los cambios socio-ocupacionales 1960-1980 (E/CEPAL/R.504), Santiago, Chile, 1986. The information is taken from the 1960, 1970 and 1980 population censuses. Special tabulations were drawn up using census samples from Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Honduras, Panama and Uruguay. In the case of Chile, in 1980 the Household Survey was used, as the census sample for 1982 was not available. Even though censuses inadequately record female labour in rural areas and in the informal sector, they are the sole statistical instrument available to provide a picture of long-term changes.

8/ "For the purposes of classification in terms of modernization four categories of countries have been defined: a) countries at an advanced level of modernization (Argentina, Chile, Uruguay, Costa Rica, Cuba, Panama and Venezuela); b) large countries whose modernization has been rapid and unbalanced (Brazil, Colombia and Mexico); c) medium-sized and small countries in which modernization has been partial (Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru and the Dominican Republic); and d) countries in which modernization is incipient (Bolivia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras and Nicaragua). The classification adopts indicators based on the dominant indicator, which is that for urbanization, as there is a high degree of congruency between this and the set of social indicators --life expectancy, education, occupational structure and social stratification-- and in terms of trend, with per capita product". (See Germán Rama, "La evolución social en América Latina (1950-1980). Transición y cambio estructural", paper presented at the Seminar on Development Alternatives in Latin America, Colombia, 1984, p. 8.)

9/ The process in Brazil is of a different nature from those in other countries in the region, as it has been characterized by an increasingly youthful economically active urban population and low levels of education. See Felicia Reicher Madeira, "Youth in Brazil: old assumptions and new approaches", CEPAL Review, No. 29 (LC/G.1427), August 1986.

10/ Zulma Rechinni de Lattes, Dinámica de la fuerza de trabajo femenina en la Argentina, Paris, UNESCO, 1983.

11/ This is from the angle of labour supply. However, it is well known that during crises there is a trend towards greater unemployment among women, particularly in the low-income sector, on account of which a considerable proportion of the low-skilled female labour force takes on paid domestic work or carries out various activities in the informal sector which censuses do not adequately record: washing, cleaning, street trading, and others.

12/ See ECLAC, Las mujeres latinoamericanas en los ochenta (LC/R.412), Santiago, Chile, 1985.

13/ It should also be remembered that the sector most affected by the lack of data on the female labour force is agriculture. See Zulma Rechinni and Catalina Wainerman, El trabajo femenino en el banquillo de los acusados: la

medición censal en América Latina, Population Council, Editorial Terra Nova, 1981. See also, Arturo León and Irma Arriagada, Women in the informal sector in Latin America: Methodological aspects, INSTRAW-ECLAC-UNSO, Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, 1987.

14/ The return of the economically active female population in Peru to the primary sector (1972-1981) is apparently attributable to the lack of jobs in the formal sector of the economy.

15/ The data is taken from the respective household surveys.

16/ Orlandina de Oliviera, "Empleo femenino en México en tiempos de expansión y recesión económica: tendencias recientes", Mexico City, Colegio de México, 1987.

17/ See data on income from the 1980 Brazilian Population Census.

18/ The information is taken from ECLAC, Análisis estadístico de la situación de la mujer en países de América Latina a través de encuestas de hogar (LC/R.418/SEM.24/2), Santiago, Chile, 1985.

19/ Ibid., p. 117.

20/ See Lourdes Benería, Reproducción, producción y división sexual del trabajo, Dominican Republic, Ediciones CIPAF, Colección Teoría, 1985, p. 25.

21/ For an exhaustive discussion of the methods for measuring domestic work, see, Luisella Goldschmidt, "Unpaid work in the household", ILO, Geneva, 1983. This article examines the value imputed to domestic work in terms of the cost of a substitute, as well as in terms of wages for an equivalent function on the market, of opportunity cost and of average or minimum market wages.

22/ International Labour Office (ILO), Mujeres en sus casas: estudio sobre el trabajo no remunerado en el hogar, Lima, 1984.

23/ See Lucía Pardo, "La dueña de casa y su aporte al PGB", Revista de economía, No. 15, Santiago, Chile, Universidad de Chile, 1983.

24/ Information on economic indicators is taken from ECLAC, Crisis of social development: challenges and possibilities, op. cit.

25/ See ECLAC, The economic crisis: policies for adjustment, stabilization and growth, Cuadernos de la CEPAL series, No. 54 (LC/G.1408/Rev.2), Santiago, Chile, 1986. United Nations publication, Sales No.:E.86.II.G.12.

26/ See ECLAC, Crisis and development: the present situation and future prospects of Latin America and the Caribbean (LC/L.332(SEM.22/3)), Santiago, Chile, 1985, vol. II, p. 2.

27/ Brazilian global product increased by 18% over the same period.

28/ In this respect see Victor Tokman, "Crisis, ajuste económico y costo social", Trimestre económico, vol. 53(1), No. 209, Mexico City, January-March 1987, as well as, by the same author, "Ajuste y empleo: los desafíos del presente", paper presented at the twenty-first session of ECLAC, Mexico City, April 1986.

29/ See ECLAC, The crisis of social development: challenges and possibilities, op. cit., p. 73.

30/ The information presented here corresponds to special tabulations prepared on the basis of the tapes for household surveys from ECLAC's data bank. The household surveys for 1982 and 1985 —the periods of greatest crisis— were analysed in respect of five metropolitan areas: Bogotá, Caracas,

Panama, San José and São Paulo. Information for 1982 is to be found in the statistical annex to the ECLAC document La mujer en el sector popular urbano. América Latina y el Caribe, *op. cit.* The tabulations for 1985 are to be found in the statistical annex.

31/ Regional Employment Programme for Latin America and the Caribbean (PREALC), El mercado de trabajo en cifras: 1950-1980, Santiago, Chile, 1982.

32/ See Lucia Ribeiro and Teresita de Barbieri, "La mujer obrera chilena: una aproximación a su estudio", Chile: mujer y sociedad, UNICEF, Santiago, Chile, 1978.

33/ See ECLAC, La mujer en el sector popular urbano, *op. cit.*, and Joselyn Massiah, La mujer como jefe de familia en el Caribe: estructura familiar y condición social de la mujer, Paris, UNESCO, 1984.

34/ ECLAC, La transformación socio-ocupacional del Brasil 1960-1980 y la crisis social de los '80 (LC/R.518), Santiago, Chile, September 1986, and also ECLAC, América Latina, las mujeres y los cambios socio-ocupacionales 1960-1980, *op. cit.*

35/ Cheyva, R. Spindel, "A mulher frente a crise econômica dos anos 80 (Algumas reflexões com base em estatísticas oficiais)", São Paulo, IDESP/FUC-SP, No. 18, 1987.

36/ Orlandina de Oliveira, *op. cit.*

37/ The employment rate is the ratio of the number of persons actually employed to the population of working age. In other words, in contrast with the activity rate it does not include either those who are unemployed or those seeking work for the first time.

38/ See Suzana Prates, "Participación laboral femenina en un proceso de crisis", Montevideo, Centro de Informaciones y Estudios del Uruguay (CIESU), 1987.

39/ See International Centre for Research on Women (ICRW), "Weathering economic crisis: women's response to the recession in Latin America and the Caribbean", proposal submitted to the Ford Foundation, Washington, D.C., 1986.

40/ See Arturo León and Irma Arriagada, *op. cit.*

41/ In this respect, see Dagmar Raczynski and Claudia Serrano, Vivir la pobreza: testimonios de mujeres, Santiago, Chile, PISPAL-CIEPLAN, 1985. See also, ECLAC, La mujer en el sector popular urbano, *op. cit.*, and Arturo León and Irma Arriagada, *op. cit.*

42/ Alicia Leiva, "Las desigualdades en el trabajo de mujeres y hombres", Coyuntura Económica, No. 14, Programa de Economía del Trabajo (PET), Santiago, Chile, April 1987.

43/ Agrupación de Economistas Socialistas (AES), Grupo de Economía Feminista, "El trabajo tiene sexo", Santiago, Chile, August 1987.

44/ See Suzana Prates, *op. cit.*

45/ This section is based on the following documents: Clarisa Hardy, Estrategias organizadas de subsistencia: los sectores populares frente a sus necesidades en Chile (LC/R.480(SEM.30/6)), Santiago, Chile, 1985, paper presented at the Inter-American Seminar on Small-scale Urban Production, Recife, 1985; Elizabeth Jelin and Mónica Gogna, "Los pobres: familia y vida cotidiana", paper presented at the Fourteenth General Assembly of the Latin American Social Science Council (CLACSO), Recife, Brazil, 1987; Zuleica Oliveira, "A crise e os arranjos familiares da trabalho urbano", study presented at the DAWN/MUDAR meeting in Bolivia, 1987; and Dagmar Raczynski and Claudia Serrano, *op. cit.*

46/ See Jelin and Gogna, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

STATISTICAL ANNEX

Some characteristics of women in metropolitan areas
of Latin America

The tables presented in this statistical annex were prepared on the basis of household surveys available in the data bank of the Statistics and Projections Division. The surveys used, which were initially processed and standardized by that Division, were as follows:

- Brazil: Pesquisa Nacional por Amostra de Domicílios, nacional, 1985. The metropolitan area of Sao Paulo was selected for the purposes of the tables in this annex.
- Colombia: National Household Survey, seven principal cities, March 1985. The city of Bogotá was selected.
- Costa Rica: National Household Survey. Employment and Unemployment (national), July 1985. The city of San José was selected.
- Panama: Household Survey for the Metropolitan Area of the Country, March 1984. Includes Colón and the Canal Zone.
- Venezuela: Household Survey conducted at national level by sampling, second-half of 1985. Metropolitan Caracas was selected.

The tables presented below, containing data broken down by population strata and age groups, were set up on the basis of a special system of tabulation designed by the Social Development Division.

The population strata were determined on the basis of distribution of per capita family income. Stratum 1 applies to the 20% of the households comprising the poorest group; stratum 2 is made up of the 30% of the households with incomes less than the average per capita family income. Stratum 3 applies to the 30% of the households in the following group and stratum 4, to the 20% of the households in the highest income group. The survey carried out in Costa Rica included that 25% of the population which made no declaration of income in 1985. In view of the large number of households involved, an additional stratum was created for them.

The age groups, which are considered in terms of occupation, were as follows: 15-19 years, 20-24 years, 25-34 years, 35-44 years and 45 years and over. In some tables, some of these age groups were telescoped as follows: 15-24 years, 25-44 years and 45 years and over.

In the majority of the surveys the employment classification used varied. For that reason the data was recodified in an attempt to standardize it on the basis of the International Standard Industrial Classification (ISIC). For this purpose, the employment, category of employment and level of education variables were used.

INDEX OF TABLES

Tables	Title of table	Bogotá 1985	Caracas 1985	Panama 1984	San José 1985	Sao Paulo 1985
1	Number of people 15 years old and older, by sex, position in household and stratum, as determined by per capita family income bracket	X	X	X	X	X
2	Women 15 years old and older, by type of activity and stratum according to per capita family income bracket	X	X	X	X	X
3	Population of 15 years and over, by sex, marital status, age group and per capita family income bracket	X	X	*/	*/	*/
4	Women 15 years and over, by level of education, age group and per capita family income bracket	X	X	X	X	X
5	Women 15 years and over, by position in household, category of employment and per capita family income bracket	X	X	X	X	X
6	Employed women 15 years and over, by occupational group and per capita family income bracket	X	X	X	X	X
7	Employed female heads of household 15 years and over, by occupation group and per capita family income bracket	X	X	X	X	X
8	Population 15 years and over by income decile, sex and position in household	X	X	X	X	X
9	Indexes of personal average incomes of employed women 15 years and over, by occupational groups and per capita family income brackets	X	X	X	X	X
10	Indexes of personal average incomes of employed men 15 years and over, by occupational groups and per capita family income brackets	X	X	X	X	X
11	Indexes of personal average incomes of employed women 15 years and over, by educational level, age group and per capita family income bracket	X	X	X	X	X

Tables	Title of table	Bogotá 1985	Caracas 1985	Panama 1984	San José 1985	Sao Paulo 1985
12	Indexes of personal average incomes of employed men 15 years and over, by educational level, age group and per capita family income bracket	X	X	X	X	X
13	Activity rates and rates of unemployment for women 15 years and over, by age group and per capita family income bracket	X	X	X	X	X

*/ In the surveys relating to Panama City, San José and Sao Paulo, the Marital Status variable was not included.

Table 1

BOGOTA: NUMBER OF PEOPLE 15 YEARS OLD AND OLDER, BY SEX, POSITION IN HOUSEHOLD AND STRATUM AS DETERMINED BY PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%
<u>Both sexes</u>										
Heads of household	907.3	31.5	179.8	34.7	273.7	31.9	272.8	29.6	181.0	31.4
Spouses	667.4	23.2	143.7	27.6	207.3	24.2	194.2	21.1	122.2	21.2
Children	885.1	30.8	143.7	27.6	279.9	32.6	305.3	33.2	156.2	27.1
Others	348.6	12.2	51.7	9.9	94.8	11.0	132.0	14.3	70.1	12.1
Domestic employees	67.4	2.3	1.2	0.2	2.4	0.3	16.6	1.8	47.2	8.2
<u>Total both sexes</u>	<u>2 875.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>520.1</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>858.1</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>920.9</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>576.7</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>Women</u>										
Heads of household	181.9	11.6	32.6	11.5	54.7	11.9	58.9	11.8	35.7	11.0
Spouses	662.4	42.3	142.1	50.1	206.1	44.9	192.6	38.6	121.6	37.6
Children	450.2	28.7	73.6	25.9	141.8	30.9	156.2	31.3	78.6	24.3
Others	204.5	13.1	34.4	12.1	53.8	11.8	75.0	15.0	41.3	12.8
Domestic employees	66.8	4.3	1.2	0.4	2.4	0.5	16.6	3.3	46.6	14.4
<u>Total women</u>	<u>1 565.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>283.9</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>458.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>499.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>323.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>Men</u>										
Heads of household	725.4	55.4	147.2	62.3	219.0	54.8	213.9	50.7	145.3	57.5
Spouses	5.0	0.4	1.6	0.7	1.2	0.3	1.6	0.4	0.6	0.2
Children	434.9	33.2	70.1	29.7	138.1	34.6	149.1	35.4	77.6	30.7
Others	144.1	11.0	17.3	7.3	41.0	10.3	57.0	13.5	28.8	11.4
Domestic employees	0.6	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.6	0.2
<u>Total men</u>	<u>1 310.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>236.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>399.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>421.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>252.9</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Table 2

BOGOTA: WOMEN 15 YEARS OLD AND OLDER, BY TYPE OF ACTIVITY AND STRATUM
ACCORDING TO PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%
<u>Total (15 years and over)</u>										
Employed	623.9	39.9	74.1	26.1	148.9	32.5	223.8	44.8	177.1	54.8
Unemployed	96.9	6.2	27.8	9.8	36.9	8.0	21.8	4.4	10.4	3.2
Seeking work for first time	46.1	2.9	12.0	4.2	18.3	4.0	11.8	2.4	4.0	1.2
<u>Total active female population</u>	<u>766.9</u>	<u>49.0</u>	<u>113.9</u>	<u>40.1</u>	<u>204.1</u>	<u>44.5</u>	<u>257.4</u>	<u>51.6</u>	<u>191.5</u>	<u>59.2</u>
Housewives	503.1	32.1	115.8	40.8	172.8	37.7	146.7	29.4	67.8	20.9
Students	205.0	13.1	36.3	12.8	55.7	12.1	69.1	13.8	43.9	13.6
Women of independent means, retirees and others	90.8	5.8	17.9	6.3	26.3	5.7	26.2	5.2	20.4	6.3
<u>Total inactive female population</u>	<u>798.9</u>	<u>51.0</u>	<u>170.0</u>	<u>59.9</u>	<u>254.8</u>	<u>55.5</u>	<u>242.0</u>	<u>48.4</u>	<u>132.1</u>	<u>40.8</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>1 565.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>283.9</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>458.9</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>499.4</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>323.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>15-19 years</u>										
Employed	57.9	21.5	4.5	8.0	12.1	14.2	21.9	26.2	19.4	43.1
Unemployed	13.6	5.0	4.8	8.6	5.8	6.7	1.9	2.3	1.1	2.5
Seeking work for first time	18.4	6.8	5.6	10.0	7.3	8.4	4.5	5.4	1.0	2.1
<u>Total active female population in age group</u>	<u>89.9</u>	<u>33.3</u>	<u>14.9</u>	<u>26.6</u>	<u>25.2</u>	<u>29.3</u>	<u>28.3</u>	<u>33.9</u>	<u>21.5</u>	<u>47.7</u>
Housewives	22.1	8.2	7.4	13.1	10.1	11.8	4.5	5.4	0.2	0.4
Students	147.4	54.6	30.2	54.0	46.4	54.4	47.5	56.9	23.2	51.5
Women of independent means, retirees and others	10.7	4.0	3.5	6.3	3.8	4.5	3.2	3.9	0.2	0.4
<u>Total inactive female population in age group</u>	<u>180.2</u>	<u>66.8</u>	<u>41.1</u>	<u>73.4</u>	<u>60.3</u>	<u>70.6</u>	<u>55.2</u>	<u>66.2</u>	<u>23.6</u>	<u>52.3</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>270.1</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>56.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>85.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>83.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>45.1</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>20-24 years</u>										
Employed	131.8	43.1	11.5	24.4	31.0	34.0	53.8	51.3	35.5	57.3
Unemployed	31.4	10.3	8.0	16.9	13.0	14.2	7.4	7.1	3.0	4.8
Seeking work for first time	17.9	5.9	2.4	5.1	7.0	7.7	5.6	5.3	2.9	4.7
<u>Total active female population in age group</u>	<u>181.1</u>	<u>59.3</u>	<u>21.9</u>	<u>46.4</u>	<u>51.0</u>	<u>55.9</u>	<u>66.8</u>	<u>63.7</u>	<u>41.4</u>	<u>66.8</u>
Housewives	67.8	22.2	19.4	41.1	29.1	31.9	16.3	15.5	3.0	4.8
Students	47.8	15.6	4.5	9.5	7.5	8.2	19.2	18.3	16.6	26.8
Women of independent means, retirees and others	8.7	2.9	1.4	3.0	3.7	4.1	2.6	2.5	1.0	1.6
<u>Total inactive female population in age group</u>	<u>124.3</u>	<u>40.7</u>	<u>25.3</u>	<u>53.6</u>	<u>40.3</u>	<u>44.1</u>	<u>38.1</u>	<u>36.3</u>	<u>20.6</u>	<u>33.2</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>305.4</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>47.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>91.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>104.9</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>62.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Table 2 (Cont.)

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%
25-34 years										
Employed	213.1	53.6	24.8	31.2	48.3	42.8	77.3	63.6	62.7	75.0
Unemployed	36.2	9.1	10.1	12.7	11.5	10.2	9.3	7.6	5.3	6.3
Seeking work for first time	6.9	1.7	2.9	3.6	2.9	2.5	0.9	0.8	0.2	0.2
<u>Total active female population in age group</u>	<u>256.2</u>	<u>64.4</u>	<u>37.8</u>	<u>47.5</u>	<u>62.7</u>	<u>55.5</u>	<u>87.5</u>	<u>72.0</u>	<u>68.2</u>	<u>81.5</u>
Housewives	125.6	31.5	38.1	47.8	46.4	41.1	29.9	24.6	11.2	13.4
Students	7.4	1.9	1.0	1.3	1.3	1.1	2.1	1.7	3.0	3.6
Women of independent means, retirees and others	8.6	2.2	2.7	3.4	2.5	2.3	2.1	1.7	1.3	1.5
<u>Total inactive female population in age group</u>	<u>141.6</u>	<u>35.6</u>	<u>41.8</u>	<u>52.5</u>	<u>50.2</u>	<u>44.5</u>	<u>34.1</u>	<u>28.0</u>	<u>15.5</u>	<u>18.5</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>397.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>79.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>112.9</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>121.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>83.7</u>	<u>100.0</u>
35-44 years										
Employed	123.0	52.0	17.3	38.9	33.8	47.6	39.3	54.7	32.6	66.1
Unemployed	11.4	4.8	3.5	7.9	4.8	6.8	2.4	3.3	0.7	1.4
Seeking work for first time	2.4	1.0	0.6	1.4	1.0	1.4	0.8	1.1	-	-
<u>Total active female population in age group</u>	<u>136.8</u>	<u>57.8</u>	<u>21.4</u>	<u>48.2</u>	<u>39.6</u>	<u>55.8</u>	<u>42.5</u>	<u>59.1</u>	<u>33.3</u>	<u>67.5</u>
Housewives	92.5	39.1	21.4	48.2	29.8	42.0	27.4	38.1	13.9	28.1
Students	1.3	0.5	0.2	0.5	0.3	0.4	-	-	0.8	1.6
Women of independent means, retirees and others	6.1	2.6	1.4	3.1	1.3	1.8	2.0	2.8	1.4	2.8
<u>Total inactive female population in age group</u>	<u>99.9</u>	<u>42.2</u>	<u>23.0</u>	<u>51.8</u>	<u>31.4</u>	<u>44.2</u>	<u>29.4</u>	<u>40.9</u>	<u>16.1</u>	<u>32.5</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>236.7</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>44.4</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>71.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>71.9</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>49.4</u>	<u>100.0</u>
45 years and over										
Employed	98.1	27.6	16.0	28.2	23.7	24.1	31.5	26.8	26.9	32.2
Unemployed	4.3	1.2	1.4	2.5	1.8	1.8	0.8	0.7	0.3	0.4
Seeking work for first time	0.5	0.1	0.5	0.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Total active female population in age group</u>	<u>102.9</u>	<u>28.9</u>	<u>17.9</u>	<u>31.6</u>	<u>25.5</u>	<u>25.9</u>	<u>32.3</u>	<u>27.5</u>	<u>27.2</u>	<u>32.6</u>
Housewives	195.1	54.9	29.6	52.3	57.4	58.4	68.6	58.4	39.5	47.3
Students	1.1	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.4
Women of independent means, retirees and others	56.7	15.9	8.8	15.6	15.1	15.4	16.3	13.9	16.5	19.7
<u>Total inactive female population in age group</u>	<u>252.9</u>	<u>71.1</u>	<u>38.7</u>	<u>68.4</u>	<u>72.7</u>	<u>74.0</u>	<u>85.2</u>	<u>72.5</u>	<u>56.3</u>	<u>67.4</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>355.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>56.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>98.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>117.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>83.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Table 3

BOGOTA: POPULATION OF 15 YEARS AND OVER BY SEX, MARITAL STATUS, AGE GROUP
AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	men	women	men	women	men	women	men	women	men	women
<u>15 years and older</u>										
Single	552.1	594.9	81.0	81.6	166.3	155.2	194.5	211.4	110.2	146.7
Married, cohabiting	713.2	721.9	149.6	151.4	221.2	223.8	211.3	215.0	131.1	131.7
Widowed, separated, divorced	44.8	248.9	5.7	50.8	11.8	79.9	15.7	72.9	11.6	45.3
<u>Total</u>	<u>1 310.0</u>	<u>1 565.7</u>	<u>236.3</u>	<u>283.8</u>	<u>399.3</u>	<u>458.9</u>	<u>421.5</u>	<u>499.3</u>	<u>252.9</u>	<u>323.7</u>
<u>15-19 years</u>										
Single	208.6	245.3	44.3	47.8	76.8	76.0	62.7	77.5	24.8	44.0
Married, cohabiting	3.0	20.2	1.1	6.5	1.7	7.7	0.2	5.0	-	1.0
Widowed, separated, divorced	-	4.5	-	1.6	-	1.8	-	1.1	-	-
<u>Total</u>	<u>211.6</u>	<u>270.0</u>	<u>45.4</u>	<u>55.9</u>	<u>78.5</u>	<u>85.5</u>	<u>62.9</u>	<u>83.6</u>	<u>24.8</u>	<u>45.0</u>
<u>20-24 years</u>										
Single	195.6	180.0	24.0	18.1	56.3	42.6	73.4	69.4	41.9	49.9
Married, cohabiting	51.8	108.8	13.0	24.2	20.1	41.6	15.3	32.3	3.4	10.7
Widowed, separated, divorced	2.7	16.6	0.2	5.0	0.6	7.2	1.6	3.0	0.3	1.4
<u>Total</u>	<u>250.1</u>	<u>305.4</u>	<u>37.2</u>	<u>47.3</u>	<u>77.0</u>	<u>91.4</u>	<u>90.3</u>	<u>104.7</u>	<u>45.6</u>	<u>62.0</u>
<u>25-34 years</u>										
Single	113.1	106.7	8.0	7.8	25.3	23.2	46.2	43.2	33.6	32.5
Married, cohabiting	212.2	246.2	48.3	59.8	69.6	76.2	61.0	66.2	33.3	44.0
Widowed, separated, divorced	8.2	44.9	1.0	11.9	1.8	13.6	3.0	12.2	2.4	7.2
<u>Total</u>	<u>333.5</u>	<u>397.8</u>	<u>57.3</u>	<u>79.5</u>	<u>96.7</u>	<u>113.0</u>	<u>110.2</u>	<u>121.6</u>	<u>69.3</u>	<u>83.7</u>
<u>35-44 years</u>										
Single	22.6	27.6	2.9	2.6	5.3	5.6	8.2	9.3	6.2	10.1
Married, cohabiting	191.7	169.1	48.0	24.7	60.2	49.6	48.6	51.2	34.9	33.6
Widowed, separated, divorced	8.5	40.0	1.0	7.2	1.9	15.7	2.9	11.3	2.7	5.8
<u>Total</u>	<u>222.8</u>	<u>236.7</u>	<u>51.9</u>	<u>44.5</u>	<u>67.4</u>	<u>70.9</u>	<u>59.7</u>	<u>71.8</u>	<u>43.8</u>	<u>49.5</u>
<u>45 years and over</u>										
Single	12.1	35.3	1.8	5.3	2.6	7.8	4.0	12.0	3.7	10.2
Married, cohabiting	254.5	177.6	39.2	26.2	69.6	48.7	86.2	60.3	59.5	42.4
Widowed, separated, divorced	25.4	142.9	3.5	25.1	7.5	41.6	8.2	45.3	6.2	30.9
<u>Total</u>	<u>292.0</u>	<u>355.8</u>	<u>44.5</u>	<u>56.6</u>	<u>79.7</u>	<u>98.1</u>	<u>98.4</u>	<u>117.6</u>	<u>69.4</u>	<u>83.5</u>

Table 4

BOGOTA: WOMEN 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION, AGE GROUP AND
PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985

	Total		Years of education						
	thousands	%	No educ.	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	13-16	17 or more
<u>Total female population</u>									
<u>15 years and over</u>	<u>1 565.6</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>4.8</u>	<u>10.9</u>	<u>22.6</u>	<u>20.5</u>	<u>29.7</u>	<u>7.2</u>	<u>4.3</u>
20% lowest income group	283.8	100	8.8	18.9	28.0	23.6	18.3	1.9	0.5
30% next income group	458.7	100	6.2	12.8	27.4	25.9	24.9	2.2	0.6
30% next income group	499.4	100	3.2	7.8	20.7	20.5	36.7	8.4	2.7
20% highest income group	323.7	100	1.9	6.0	13.9	10.0	35.6	17.2	15.4
<u>Total 15-19 years</u>	<u>269.9</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>0.7</u>	<u>5.6</u>	<u>16.1</u>	<u>36.1</u>	<u>37.8</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>-</u>
20% lowest income group	56.0	100	-	6.8	17.1	44.3	30.5	1.3	-
30% next income group	85.4	100	0.6	4.1	17.8	41.5	34.8	1.2	-
30% next income group	83.5	100	1.0	4.8	12.5	32.6	43.7	5.4	-
20% highest income group	45.0	100	1.6	8.4	18.4	22.0	41.3	8.2	-
<u>Total 20-24 years</u>	<u>305.2</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>0.5</u>	<u>4.9</u>	<u>14.5</u>	<u>21.8</u>	<u>38.3</u>	<u>16.4</u>	<u>3.6</u>
20% lowest income group	47.0	100	1.3	10.2	27.2	27.9	28.5	4.3	0.6
30% next income group	91.5	100	0.3	4.4	17.3	32.0	39.6	5.8	0.6
30% next income group	104.8	100	0.3	2.5	9.5	18.5	47.5	19.6	2.1
20% highest income group	61.9	100	0.7	6.0	9.5	7.4	27.6	35.9	12.9
<u>Total 25-34 years</u>	<u>397.6</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>1.3</u>	<u>9.0</u>	<u>19.9</u>	<u>20.5</u>	<u>30.5</u>	<u>9.2</u>	<u>9.6</u>
20% lowest income group	79.5	100	3.3	19.5	31.2	24.9	17.9	2.3	1.0
30% next income group	112.9	100	1.2	11.6	27.5	28.6	26.9	3.0	1.2
30% next income group	121.5	100	0.5	3.5	12.9	21.1	43.9	11.7	6.4
20% highest income group	83.7	100	0.6	3.2	9.3	5.0	27.7	20.7	33.5
<u>Total 35-44 years</u>	<u>236.7</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>4.8</u>	<u>15.3</u>	<u>30.1</u>	<u>15.6</u>	<u>25.2</u>	<u>4.5</u>	<u>4.5</u>
20% lowest income group	44.5	100	9.7	29.2	38.9	11.2	9.0	1.3	0.7
30% next income group	70.9	100	6.1	19.5	40.6	18.5	14.0	0.7	0.7
30% next income group	71.9	100	2.5	8.9	27.5	20.9	34.8	2.5	2.9
20% highest income group	49.4	100	2.0	6.0	10.9	7.7	42.1	15.6	15.6
<u>Total 45 years and over</u>	<u>355.9</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>15.6</u>	<u>19.3</u>	<u>32.5</u>	<u>10.6</u>	<u>18.0</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>2.2</u>
20% lowest income group	56.6	100	30.7	29.2	26.9	7.4	5.3	0.5	-
30% next income group	98.2	100	22.4	24.6	36.0	8.7	7.9	-	0.2
30% next income group	117.5	100	10.6	18.6	40.4	12.9	15.2	0.9	1.2
20% highest income group	83.6	100	4.2	7.3	21.1	11.8	42.3	6.0	7.3

Table 5

BOGOTA: WOMEN 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY POSITION IN HOUSEHOLD, CATEGORY OF EMPLOYMENT
AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%
Total	624.0	100.0	74.1	100.0	148.9	100.0	223.8	100.0	177.2	100.0
Heads of establishment	10.0	1.6	0.5	0.6	1.0	0.6	2.7	1.2	5.8	3.3
Wage-earners	454.2	72.8	37.9	51.3	100.3	67.4	173.8	77.7	142.2	80.3
Working on own account	132.0	21.2	28.5	38.4	37.4	25.1	40.3	18.0	25.8	14.5
Unpaid family members	27.8	4.4	7.2	9.7	10.2	6.9	7.0	3.1	3.4	1.9
Total heads of household	105.8	100.0	20.0	100.0	30.9	100.0	34.4	100.0	20.5	100.0
Heads of establishment	2.9	2.7	0.3	1.6	0.3	1.0	0.8	2.3	1.5	7.0
Wage-earners	66.8	63.1	10.7	53.6	20.6	67.4	22.9	66.5	12.6	61.7
Working on own account	35.9	33.9	9.0	44.8	9.8	31.6	10.7	31.2	6.4	31.3
Unpaid family members	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total non-heads of household	518.2	100.0	54.1	100.0	118.1	100.0	189.4	100.0	156.6	100.0
Heads of establishment	7.0	1.4	0.2	0.3	0.6	0.5	1.9	1.0	4.3	2.8
Wage-earners	387.3	74.7	27.2	50.3	79.7	67.6	150.9	79.7	129.5	82.7
Working on own account	96.2	18.6	19.5	36.1	27.7	23.4	29.6	15.6	19.4	12.4
Unpaid family members	27.7	5.3	7.2	13.3	10.1	8.5	7.0	3.7	3.4	2.1

Table 6

BOGOTA: EMPLOYED WOMEN 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP
AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%
Professionals	24.6	3.9	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.2	4.0	1.8	20.0	11.3
Technicians and related occupations	9.3	1.5	0.8	1.1	0.5	0.3	2.4	1.1	5.6	3.2
Teachers	35.3	5.6	1.0	1.3	3.4	2.3	13.8	6.1	17.1	9.7
Directors and managers in public administration	4.8	0.8	-	-	-	-	0.3	0.1	4.5	2.5
Directors and managers in private sector	18.4	2.9	2.7	3.7	6.1	4.1	5.0	2.2	4.6	2.6
Secretaries and typists	90.2	14.5	3.4	4.5	13.3	8.9	44.5	20.8	29.0	16.3
Other office workers	33.5	5.4	1.8	2.4	4.5	3.0	13.9	6.2	13.3	7.5
Trade employees	59.1	9.5	10.4	14.0	18.3	12.4	22.9	10.2	7.5	4.2
Working on own account in trade (street vendors)	40.9	6.6	7.0	9.5	13.0	8.7	13.1	5.9	7.8	4.4
Spinners and weavers	15.2	2.4	3.0	4.1	4.2	2.8	6.4	2.9	1.6	0.9
Tailors and dressmakers	58.9	9.4	10.6	14.3	18.5	12.4	24.0	10.7	5.8	3.3
Packers in factories	11.3	1.8	1.4	1.9	4.6	3.1	4.5	2.0	0.8	0.5
Semi-skilled and skilled labourers	22.4	3.6	1.1	1.5	9.3	6.2	9.1	4.1	2.9	1.6
Unskilled labourers and journeywomen	12.8	2.1	1.9	2.6	6.6	4.4	3.2	1.4	1.1	0.6
Domestic workers ^{a/} Launderers, cooks and ironers	96.3	15.4	12.0	16.2	14.6	9.8	22.6	10.1	47.1	26.6
Other service workers	62.6	10.1	14.7	19.9	26.0	17.5	19.7	8.8	2.2	1.3
Unspecified	28.2	4.5	1.8	2.4	5.8	3.9	14.4	6.4	6.2	3.5
	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	624.0	100.0	74.1	100.0	149.0	100.0	223.8	100.0	177.1	100.0

^{a/} It was not possible to consider domestic employees in isolation from the household in which they work, which explains why they are concentrated in the highest income bracket.

Table 7

BOGOTA: EMPLOYED FEMALE HEADS OF HOUSEHOLD 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY OCCUPATION GROUP
AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%
Professionals	3.6	3.3	-	-	-	-	1.0	2.8	2.6	12.5
Technicians and related occupations	1.0	0.9	0.2	0.8	-	-	0.2	0.5	0.6	3.1
Teachers	5.7	5.4	-	-	0.8	2.6	2.7	7.9	2.2	10.9
Directors and managers in public administration	0.8	0.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.8	3.9
Directors and managers in private sector	4.9	4.7	1.1	5.6	1.4	4.7	1.4	4.2	1.0	4.7
Secretaries, typists	10.0	9.4	0.8	4.0	1.4	4.7	4.5	13.0	3.3	15.7
Other office workers	4.2	4.1	0.6	3.2	0.6	2.1	1.6	4.7	1.4	7.0
Trade employees	7.5	7.1	1.3	6.4	2.4	7.8	2.7	7.9	1.1	5.5
Working on own account in trade (street vendors)	12.0	11.2	2.6	12.8	4.1	13.0	3.2	9.3	2.1	10.2
Spinners and weavers	2.9	2.7	0.5	2.4	1.1	3.6	1.1	3.3	0.2	0.8
Tailors and dressmakers	14.0	13.2	3.0	15.2	3.9	12.4	4.7	13.5	2.4	11.7
Packers in factories	2.2	2.1	0.8	4.0	0.8	2.6	0.6	1.9	-	-
Semi-skilled and skilled labourers	3.6	3.5	0.3	1.6	1.4	4.7	1.4	4.2	0.5	2.3
Unskilled labourers and journeymen	3.9	3.8	0.6	3.2	1.9	6.2	0.8	2.3	0.6	3.1
Domestic workers	7.6	7.1	2.8	13.6	2.9	9.3	1.6	4.7	0.3	1.6
Launderers, cooks and ironers	17.3	16.3	5.1	25.6	7.4	23.7	4.2	12.1	0.6	3.1
Other service workers	4.6	4.4	0.3	1.6	0.8	2.6	2.7	7.9	0.8	3.9
Total	105.8	100.0	20.0	100.0	30.9	100.0	34.4	100.0	20.5	100.0

Table 8

BOGOTA: POPULATION 15 YEARS AND OVER BY INCOME DECILE, SEX AND POSITION IN HOUSEHOLD, 1985

Deciles	Total population			Heads of household		
	thousands	%	Cum. %	thousands	%	Cum. %
Both sexes						
First decile	160.0	0.2	0.2	48.0	0.1	0.1
Second decile	155.0	2.0	2.2	59.2	1.2	1.3
Third decile	162.6	4.1	6.3	72.5	2.8	4.1
Fourth decile	174.5	5.8	12.1	58.4	3.1	7.2
Fifth decile	186.7	6.8	18.9	75.9	4.4	11.6
Sixth decile	117.0	5.0	23.9	48.8	3.3	14.9
Seventh decile	156.6	8.0	31.9	80.6	6.5	21.4
Eighth decile	173.9	11.9	43.8	99.9	10.8	32.2
Ninth decile	158.9	16.2	60.0	94.1	15.2	47.4
Tenth decile	143.4	40.0	100.0	111.5	52.6	100.0
Total	1 588.6	100.0		748.8	100.0	
Men						
First decile	86.2	0.2	0.2	40.2	0.1	0.1
Second decile	86.2	1.6	1.8	46.7	1.0	1.1
Third decile	92.3	3.3	5.1	58.1	2.5	3.6
Fourth decile	101.9	4.8	9.9	48.2	2.8	6.4
Fifth decile	109.6	5.7	15.6	64.3	4.1	10.5
Sixth decile	61.8	3.8	19.4	40.6	3.1	13.6
Seventh decile	94.4	6.9	26.3	70.4	6.4	20.0
Eighth decile	111.7	10.9	37.2	89.0	10.8	30.8
Ninth decile	104.6	15.3	52.5	82.7	15.0	45.8
Tenth decile	115.9	47.5	100.0	102.9	54.2	100.0
Total	964.6	100.0		643.0	100.0	
Women						
First decile	73.8	0.4	0.4	7.8	0.3	0.3
Second decile	68.8	3.1	3.5	12.5	2.6	2.9
Third decile	70.3	5.9	9.4	14.4	5.5	8.4
Fourth decile	72.6	8.2	17.6	10.2	5.3	13.7
Fifth decile	77.1	9.4	27.0	11.6	6.5	20.2
Sixth decile	55.2	8.0	35.0	8.2	5.4	25.6
Seventh decile	62.2	10.8	45.8	10.2	8.1	33.7
Eighth decile	62.2	14.2	60.0	10.9	11.3	45.0
Ninth decile	54.3	18.4	78.4	11.4	17.5	62.5
Tenth decile	27.5	21.6	100.0	8.6	37.5	100.0
Total	624.0	100.0		105.8	100.0	

Table 9

BOGOTA: INDEXES OF PERSONAL AVERAGE INCOMES OF EMPLOYED WOMEN 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKETS, 1985 ^{a/}

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index
Professionals	24.6	194	0.3	10	0.3	26	4.0	120	20.0	214
Technicians and related occupations	9.3	155	0.8	1	0.5	41	2.4	98	5.6	211
Teachers	35.2	114	1.0	22	3.4	61	13.8	89	17.1	149
Directors and managers in public administration	4.8	379	-	-	-	-	0.3	93	4.5	394
Directors and managers in private sector	18.4	56	2.7	14	6.1	53	5.0	79	4.6	180
Secretaries and typists	90.2	85	3.4	22	13.3	49	44.6	76	29.0	123
Other office workers	33.4	100	1.8	27	4.5	57	13.9	79	13.2	146
Trade employees	59.2	43	10.4	8	18.4	37	22.9	46	7.5	99
Working on own account in trade (street vendors)	41.0	78	7.0	18	13.0	38	13.1	72	7.8	208
Spinners and weavers	15.2	44	3.0	19	4.2	42	6.4	56	1.6	43
Tailors and dressmakers	58.9	54	10.6	210	18.6	41	24.0	57	5.8	98
Packers in factories	11.4	52	1.5	24	4.6	51	4.5	58	0.8	74
Semi-skilled and skilled labourers	22.4	49	1.1	17	9.3	39	9.1	55	2.9	76
Unskilled labourers and journeywomen	12.8	52	1.9	20	6.6	42	3.2	68	1.1	114
Domestic workers	96.2	55	12.0	19	14.6	30	22.6	52	47.0	73
Launderers, cooks and ironers	62.7	42	14.7	28	26.1	41	19.7	52	2.2	58
Other service workers	28.2	73	1.8	17	5.8	48	14.4	67	6.2	124
Total	624.0	75	74.1	23	149.0	42	223.8	66	177.1	135

^{a/} The average primary income of the total employed population was taken as the base (=100).

Table 10

BOGOTA: INDEXES OF PERSONAL AVERAGE INCOMES OF EMPLOYED MEN 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKETS, 1985 ^{a/}

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index
Professionals	62.2	313	2.1	9	2.9	73	11.5	165	45.8	380
Technicians and related occupations	31.8	198	2.6	28	5.0	64	12.3	118	12.0	372
Teachers	17.3	170	0.8	3	2.2	59	6.1	103	8.2	268
Directors and managers in public administration	20.2	541	0.2	-	-	-	2.7	168	17.3	605
Directors and managers in private sector	20.0	157	1.8	20	5.9	73	6.1	116	6.2	316
Secretaries and typists	36.8	109	1.8	33	10.6	72	16.0	107	8.5	173
Other office workers	88.5	107	5.1	35	23.7	60	37.1	89	22.6	202
Trade employees	85.8	89	18.4	25	24.3	53	30.4	90	12.6	251
Working on own account in trade (street vendors)	82.9	163	15.0	27	21.9	61	27.0	115	18.9	564
Spinners and weavers	4.8	53	0.8	29	2.1	59	1.4	56	0.5	55
Tailors and dressmakers	37.0	60	7.8	25	13.3	61	13.4	72	2.4	188
Packers in factories	25.1	51	6.7	28	9.6	52	8.0	67	0.8	71
Semi-skilled and skilled labourers	184.6	76	31.7	29	67.2	58	65.9	83	19.8	184
Unskilled labourers and journeymen	185.9	62	60.0	30	72.5	57	45.4	86	8.0	199
Domestic workers	1.0	58	4.0	25	0.3	43	0.3	76	0.3	55
Launderers, cooks and ironers	23.0	61	-	-	7.8	60	9.3	71	1.9	94
Other service workers	57.3	76	9.9	36	21.1	69	20.8	87	5.4	128
Total	964.0	117	168.7	28	290.4	59	313.7	94	191.2	319

^{a/} The average primary income of the total employed population was taken as the base (=100).

Table 11

BOGOTA: INDEXES OF PERSONAL AVERAGE INCOMES OF EMPLOYED WOMEN 15 YEARS AND OVER,
BY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL, AGE GROUP AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985 ^{a/}

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index
<u>Total 15 years and over</u>	<u>624.0</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>74.1</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>149.0</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>223.9</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>177.0</u>	<u>14</u>
No education	24.3	42	7.4	22	8.3	36	4.2	58	4.4	74
1-6 years, primary	205.1	52	39.7	21	63.7	42	59.2	60	42.8	87
7-11 years, secondary	293.3	70	24.3	19	72.8	44	130.6	67	65.6	123
12 years or more, university	101.3	152	2.7	15	4.5	63	29.9	93	64.2	192
<u>Total 15-24 years</u>	<u>189.8</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>16.0</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>43.2</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>75.7</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>54.9</u>	<u>86</u>
No education	2.0	57	0.2	30	0.2	41	0.5	58	1.1	66
1-6 years, primary	52.8	54	5.8	20	9.9	30	16.5	52	20.6	73
7-11 years, secondary	110.6	51	9.4	20	31.8	38	48.8	54	20.6	79
12 years or more, university	24.3	94	0.6	22	1.3	59	9.9	69	12.5	120
<u>Total 25-44 years</u>	<u>336.2</u>	<u>86</u>	<u>42.1</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>82.1</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>116.6</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>95.4</u>	<u>156</u>
No education	8.2	43	2.7	24	13.0	35	1.1	62	1.4	76
1-6 years, primary	104.6	48	24.3	21	38.1	45	27.2	59	15.0	81
7-11 years, secondary	153.2	76	13.1	19	37.8	50	69.8	75	32.5	134
12 years or more, university	70.1	168	1.9	13	3.2	65	18.6	102	46.4	207
<u>Total 45 years and over</u>	<u>98.1</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>16.0</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>23.7</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>31.5</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>26.9</u>	<u>162</u>
No education	14.2	39	4.5	20	5.1	36	2.6	57	1.9	74
1-6 years, primary	47.7	59	9.6	20	15.4	39	15.5	69	7.2	137
7-11 years, secondary	29.5	108	1.7	10	3.2	43	12.0	81	12.5	164
12 years or more, university	6.9	203	0.2	-	-	-	1.4	145	5.3	225

^{a/} The base taken for the index (=100) was the average primary income for the whole employed population of both sexes in the age group 15 years and over.

Table 12

BOGOTA: INDEXES OF PERSONAL AVERAGE INCOMES OF EMPLOYED MEN 15 YEARS AND OVER,
BY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL, AGE GROUP AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985 ^{a/}

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index
<u>Total 15 years and over</u>	<u>964.6</u>	<u>115</u>	<u>168.7</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>290.6</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>314.2</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>191.3</u>	<u>300</u>
No education	19.3	61	7.1	24	6.9	58	4.7	67	0.6	469
1-6 years, primary	329.6	58	92.9	32	128.6	55	89.0	62	19.1	184
7-11 years, secondary	439.4	88	61.9	29	138.7	61	176.6	83	62.2	222
12 years or more, university	176.5	265	6.8	11	16.4	61	43.9	136	109.4	364
<u>Total 15-24 years</u>	<u>237.4</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>39.2</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>82.4</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>87.0</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>28.8</u>	<u>114</u>
No education	1.5	28	0.6	16	0.5	30	0.2	55	0.2	54
1-6 years, primary	58.6	20	15.7	15	24.0	43	16.3	51	2.6	67
7-11 years, secondary	153.0	52	21.9	24	53.0	42	63.2	61	14.9	88
12 years or more, university	24.6	102	1.0	20	5.0	42	7.4	65	11.2	160
<u>Total 25-44 years</u>	<u>509.8</u>	<u>121</u>	<u>97.6</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>151.0</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>155.5</u>	<u>109</u>	<u>105.6</u>	<u>294</u>
No education	7.4	53	2.7	33	2.7	63	1.8	68	0.2	66
1-6 years, primary	168.9	67	56.6	36	67.5	67	38.1	95	6.7	183
7-11 years, secondary	220.6	101	33.3	33	70.7	72	86.7	109	29.9	219
12 years or more, university	112.9	246	5.0	9	10.1	70	29.0	132	68.8	338
<u>Total 45 years and over</u>	<u>217.4</u>	<u>169</u>	<u>32.0</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>57.1</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>71.5</u>	<u>119</u>	<u>56.8</u>	<u>409</u>
No education	10.4	71	3.8	19	3.7	58	2.7	69	0.2	1 638
1-6 years, primary	102.1	63	20.6	35	37.1	65	34.6	103	9.8	233
7-11 years, secondary	65.8	132	6.7	25	15.0	81	26.7	133	17.4	343
12 years or more, university	39.0	423	0.8	12	1.3	68	7.5	167	29.4	501

^{a/} The base taken for the index (=100) was the average primary income for the whole employed population of both sexes in the age group 15 years and over.

Table 13

BOGOTA: ACTIVITY RATES AND RATES OF UNEMPLOYMENT FOR WOMEN 15 YEARS AND OVER,
BY AGE GROUP AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985 ^{a/}

	Per capita family income bracket				
	Total	Lowest 20%	Next 30%	Next 30%	Highest 20%
	thousands index	thousands index	thousands index	thousands index	thousands index
<u>15 years and over</u>					
Activity rate	49.0	40.2	44.4	51.6	59.2
Rate of unemployment	18.6	35.0	27.0	13.1	7.5
<u>15-19 years</u>					
Activity rate	33.2	26.6	29.5	33.9	47.8
Rate of unemployment	35.6	69.8	52.0	22.6	9.8
<u>20-24 years</u>					
Activity rate	59.3	46.4	55.9	63.7	66.8
Rate of unemployment	27.2	47.5	39.2	19.5	14.3
<u>25-34 years</u>					
Activity rate	64.4	47.5	55.5	72.0	81.5
Rate of unemployment	16.8	34.4	23.0	11.7	8.1
<u>35-44 years</u>					
Activity rate	57.8	48.0	55.6	59.2	67.2
Rate of unemployment	10.1	19.2	14.6	7.5	2.1
<u>45 years and over</u>					
Activity rate	28.9	31.6	26.0	27.5	32.6
Rate of unemployment	4.7	7.8	7.1	2.5	1.1

^{a/} Activity rate: women 15 years and over in the active population as a coefficient of the total female population 15 years and over.

Rate of unemployment: women 15 years and over who are unemployed or seeking employment for the first time as a coefficient of the total number of women 15 years and over in the active population.

Table 1

CARACAS: NUMBER OF PEOPLE 15 YEARS OLD AND OLDER, BY SEX, POSITION IN HOUSEHOLD AND STRATUM, AS DETERMINED BY PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	Thousands	%	thousands	%
<u>Both sexes</u>										
Heads of household	697.7	32.3	139.2	35.0	201.7	29.1	210.2	31.7	146.6	36.1
Spouses	478.7	22.2	87.3	22.0	143.7	20.8	147.5	22.3	100.2	24.7
Children	600.7	27.8	106.0	26.7	220.5	31.9	183.1	27.6	91.0	22.4
Others	340.7	15.8	63.9	16.1	122.9	17.8	109.0	16.5	44.9	11.0
Domestic employees	40.0	1.9	0.7	0.2	2.8	0.4	12.9	1.9	23.6	5.8
<u>Total both sexes</u>	<u>2 157.7</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>397.1</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>691.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>662.7</u>	<u>100.00</u>	<u>406.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>Women</u>										
Heads of household	137.2	12.4	42.9	19.1	38.3	10.9	36.9	11.1	19.1	9.4
Spouses	478.7	43.1	87.3	39.0	143.7	41.0	147.5	44.3	100.2	49.5
Children	273.6	24.6	54.8	24.5	100.6	28.7	77.6	23.3	40.6	20.0
Others	183.7	16.5	38.4	17.1	65.2	18.6	58.3	17.5	21.8	10.7
Domestic employees	37.4	3.4	0.7	0.3	2.8	0.8	12.7	3.8	21.2	10.4
<u>Total women</u>	<u>1 110.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>224.1</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>350.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>333.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>202.9</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>Men</u>										
Heads of household	560.5	53.5	96.3		163.4	47.9	173.3	52.5	127.5	62.7
Spouses
Children	327.0	31.2	51.2		119.9	35.2	105.5	32.0	50.4	24.8
Others	157.0	15.0	25.5		57.7	16.9	50.7	15.4	23.1	11.3
Domestic employees	2.6	0.3	.		.	.	0.2	0.1	2.4	1.2
<u>Total men</u>	<u>1 047.1</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>173.0</u>		<u>341.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>329.7</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>203.4</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Table 2

CARACAS: WOMEN 15 YEARS OLD AND OLDER, BY TYPE OF ACTIVITY AND STRATUM
ACCORDING TO PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	Thousands	%	thousands	%
<u>Total (15 years and over)</u>										
Employed	412.7	37.1	54.9	24.5	111.8	31.9	142.9	42.9	103.1	50.8
Unemployed	32.4	2.9	5.6	2.5	12.9	3.7	9.8	3.0	4.1	2.0
Seeking work for first time	6.4	0.6	1.9	0.9	1.8	0.5	1.4	0.4	1.3	0.6
<u>Total active female population</u>	<u>451.5</u>	<u>40.6</u>	<u>62.4</u>	<u>27.9</u>	<u>126.5</u>	<u>36.1</u>	<u>154.1</u>	<u>46.3</u>	<u>108.5</u>	<u>53.4</u>
Housewives	487.1	43.8	118.6	52.9	168.5	48.0	131.5	39.4	68.5	33.7
Students	137.2	12.4	33.3	14.9	44.8	12.8	38.0	11.4	21.1	10.4
Women of independent means, retirees and others	35.0	3.2	9.6	4.3	10.9	3.1	9.5	2.9	5.0	2.5
<u>Total inactive female population</u>	<u>659.3</u>	<u>59.4</u>	<u>161.5</u>	<u>72.1</u>	<u>224.2</u>	<u>63.9</u>	<u>179.0</u>	<u>53.7</u>	<u>94.6</u>	<u>46.6</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>1 110.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>223.9</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>350.7</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>333.1</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>203.1</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>15-19 years</u>										
Employed	22.4	14.1	3.5	8.1	7.5	12.7	8.5	20.8	2.9	18.5
Unemployed	3.2	2.0	0.6	1.4	1.3	2.2	1.3	3.2	-	-
Seeking work for first time	1.3	0.8	0.8	1.9	0.5	0.8	-	-	-	-
<u>Total active female population in age group</u>	<u>26.9</u>	<u>16.9</u>	<u>4.9</u>	<u>11.4</u>	<u>9.3</u>	<u>15.7</u>	<u>9.8</u>	<u>24.0</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>18.5</u>
Housewives	32.7	20.6	10.5	24.4	16.4	27.6	4.6	11.3	1.2	7.6
Students	91.8	57.8	25.3	58.9	31.0	52.3	24.1	59.1	11.4	72.6
Women of independent means, retirees and others	7.4	4.7	2.3	5.3	2.6	4.4	2.3	5.6	0.2	1.3
<u>Total inactive female population in age group</u>	<u>131.9</u>	<u>83.1</u>	<u>38.1</u>	<u>88.6</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>84.3</u>	<u>31.0</u>	<u>76.0</u>	<u>12.8</u>	<u>81.5</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>158.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>63.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>59.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>40.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>15.7</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>20-24 years</u>										
Employed	65.3	40.7	6.3	23.4	19.2	34.5	25.9	51.6	13.9	50.3
Unemployed	8.0	5.0	1.1	4.1	2.9	5.2	2.6	5.2	1.4	5.1
Seeking work for first time	3.4	2.1	0.6	2.2	1.0	1.8	0.7	1.4	1.1	4.0
<u>Total active female population in age group</u>	<u>76.7</u>	<u>47.8</u>	<u>8.0</u>	<u>29.7</u>	<u>23.1</u>	<u>41.5</u>	<u>29.2</u>	<u>58.2</u>	<u>16.4</u>	<u>59.4</u>
Housewives	45.5	28.4	11.7	43.6	20.0	36.0	9.2	18.3	4.6	16.7
Students	33.2	20.7	7.0	26.0	10.2	18.3	10.1	20.1	5.9	21.4
Women of independent means, retirees and others	4.9	3.1	0.2	0.7	2.3	4.2	1.7	3.4	0.7	2.5
<u>Total inactive female population in age group</u>	<u>83.6</u>	<u>52.2</u>	<u>18.9</u>	<u>70.3</u>	<u>32.5</u>	<u>58.5</u>	<u>21.0</u>	<u>41.8</u>	<u>11.2</u>	<u>40.6</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>160.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>26.9</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>55.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>50.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>27.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Table 2 (concl.)

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	Thousands	%	thousands	%
<u>25-34 years</u>										
Employed	156.6	50.9	22.3	35.2	38.3	43.6	52.1	55.5	43.9	70.0
Unemployed	13.0	4.2	1.8	2.9	5.4	6.2	4.5	4.8	1.3	2.1
Seeking work for first time	1.7	0.6	0.5	0.8	0.3	0.3	0.7	0.8	0.2	0.3
<u>Total active female population in age group</u>	<u>171.3</u>	<u>55.7</u>	<u>24.6</u>	<u>38.9</u>	<u>44.0</u>	<u>50.1</u>	<u>57.3</u>	<u>61.1</u>	<u>45.4</u>	<u>72.4</u>
Housewives	121.6	39.5	36.6	57.8	40.0	45.5	31.9	34.0	13.1	20.9
Students	11.0	3.6	0.6	0.9	3.4	3.8	3.6	3.8	3.4	5.4
Women of independent means, retirees and others	3.8	1.2	1.5	2.4	0.5	0.6	1.0	1.1	0.8	1.3
<u>Total inactive female population in age group</u>	<u>136.4</u>	<u>44.3</u>	<u>38.7</u>	<u>61.1</u>	<u>43.9</u>	<u>49.9</u>	<u>36.5</u>	<u>38.9</u>	<u>17.3</u>	<u>27.6</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>307.7</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>63.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>87.9</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>93.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>62.7</u>	<u>100.00</u>
<u>35-44 years</u>										
Employed	106.4	53.1	15.0	37.0	32.0	49.7	35.3	59.4	24.1	66.8
Unemployed	6.0	3.0	1.6	4.0	2.7	4.2	1.3	2.2	0.4	1.1
Seeking work for first time	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Total active female population in age group</u>	<u>112.4</u>	<u>56.1</u>	<u>16.6</u>	<u>41.0</u>	<u>34.7</u>	<u>53.9</u>	<u>36.6</u>	<u>61.6</u>	<u>24.5</u>	<u>67.9</u>
Housewives	84.9	42.4	23.0	56.8	29.3	45.5	21.8	36.7	10.8	29.9
Students	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.5	-	-	0.2	0.3	-	-
Women of independent means, retirees and others	2.7	1.3	0.7	1.7	0.4	0.6	0.8	1.4	0.8	2.2
<u>Total inactive female population in age group</u>	<u>88.0</u>	<u>43.9</u>	<u>23.9</u>	<u>59.0</u>	<u>29.7</u>	<u>46.1</u>	<u>22.8</u>	<u>38.4</u>	<u>11.6</u>	<u>32.1</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>200.4</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>40.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>64.4</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>59.4</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>36.1</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>45 years and over</u>										
Employed	62.0	21.8	7.8	15.5	14.8	17.7	21.1	23.7	18.3	30.0
Unemployed	2.2	0.8	0.5	1.0	0.6	0.7	0.1	0.1	1.0	1.6
Seeking work for first time	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Total active female population in age group</u>	<u>64.2</u>	<u>22.6</u>	<u>8.3</u>	<u>16.5</u>	<u>15.4</u>	<u>18.4</u>	<u>21.2</u>	<u>23.8</u>	<u>19.3</u>	<u>31.6</u>
Housewives	202.4	71.4	36.8	73.3	62.8	75.2	64.0	72.0	38.8	63.6
Students	0.8	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.2	-	-	0.4	0.7
Women of independent means, retirees and others	16.2	5.7	4.9	9.8	5.1	6.1	3.7	4.2	2.5	4.1
<u>Total inactive female population in age group</u>	<u>219.4</u>	<u>77.4</u>	<u>41.9</u>	<u>83.5</u>	<u>68.1</u>	<u>81.6</u>	<u>67.7</u>	<u>76.2</u>	<u>41.7</u>	<u>68.4</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>283.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>50.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>83.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>88.9</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>61.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Table 3

CARACAS: POPULATION OF 15 YEARS AND OVER BY SEX, MARITAL STATUS, AGE GROUP
AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	men	women	men	women	men	women	men	women	men	women
<u>15 years and older</u>										
Single	417.4	396.2	65.7	80.5	146.2	129.7	139.8	122.0	65.7	62.0
Married, cohabiting	603.8	602.7	105.8	117.2	188.1	188.6	182.5	176.7	127.4	120.2
Widowed, separated, divorced	25.8	113.8	1.5	26.4	6.6	32.2	7.3	34.4	10.4	20.8
<u>Total</u>	<u>1 047.0</u>	<u>1 110.7</u>	<u>173.0</u>	<u>224.1</u>	<u>340.9</u>	<u>350.5</u>	<u>329.6</u>	<u>333.1</u>	<u>203.5</u>	<u>203.0</u>
<u>15-19 years</u>										
Single	166.2	143.5	41.3	38.8	65.2	52.1	44.4	38.8	15.3	13.8
Married, cohabiting	2.8	15.3	0.7	4.3	1.5	7.2	0.6	1.9	-	1.9
Widowed, separated, divorced	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Total</u>	<u>169.0</u>	<u>158.8</u>	<u>42.0</u>	<u>43.1</u>	<u>66.7</u>	<u>59.3</u>	<u>45.0</u>	<u>40.7</u>	<u>15.3</u>	<u>15.7</u>
<u>20-24 years</u>										
Single	115.6	101.2	12.4	14.9	37.8	32.7	43.0	35.1	22.4	18.5
Married, cohabiting	35.6	57.1	6.7	11.7	15.2	22.7	10.7	13.9	3.0	8.8
Widowed, separated, divorced	0.2	2.0	-	0.4	-	-	-	1.3	0.2	0.3
<u>Total</u>	<u>151.4</u>	<u>160.3</u>	<u>19.1</u>	<u>27.0</u>	<u>53.0</u>	<u>55.4</u>	<u>53.7</u>	<u>50.3</u>	<u>25.6</u>	<u>27.6</u>
<u>25-34 years</u>										
Single	95.6	81.8	6.8	10.1	30.3	23.0	38.9	30.2	19.6	18.5
Married, cohabiting	184.2	212.4	36.4	50.3	59.9	61.7	50.1	59.0	37.8	41.4
Widowed, separated, divorced	5.4	13.5	-	3.0	1.4	3.3	2.4	4.5	1.6	2.7
<u>Total</u>	<u>285.2</u>	<u>307.7</u>	<u>43.2</u>	<u>63.4</u>	<u>91.6</u>	<u>88.0</u>	<u>91.4</u>	<u>93.7</u>	<u>59.0</u>	<u>62.6</u>
<u>35-44 years</u>										
Single	22.7	27.1	2.5	7.3	6.8	8.0	7.9	6.7	5.5	5.1
Married, cohabiting	170.2	154.6	33.6	29.4	51.3	50.7	52.3	47.9	33.0	26.6
Widowed, separated, divorced	5.3	18.6	0.2	3.8	1.2	5.6	0.8	4.8	3.1	4.4
<u>Total</u>	<u>198.2</u>	<u>200.3</u>	<u>36.3</u>	<u>40.5</u>	<u>59.3</u>	<u>64.3</u>	<u>61.0</u>	<u>59.4</u>	<u>41.6</u>	<u>36.1</u>
<u>45 years and over</u>										
Single	17.3	40.6	2.7	9.4	6.1	13.9	5.6	11.2	2.9	6.1
Married, cohabiting	211.0	163.3	28.4	21.5	60.2	46.3	68.8	54.0	53.6	41.5
Widowed, separated, divorced	14.9	79.7	1.3	19.2	4.0	23.3	4.1	23.8	5.5	13.4
<u>Total</u>	<u>243.2</u>	<u>283.6</u>	<u>32.4</u>	<u>50.1</u>	<u>70.3</u>	<u>83.5</u>	<u>78.5</u>	<u>89.0</u>	<u>62.0</u>	<u>61.0</u>

Table 4

CARACAS: WOMEN 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION, AGE GROUP AND
PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985

	Total		Years of education							
	thousands	%	No educ.	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	13-16	17 or more	Unknown
<u>Total female population</u>										
<u>15 years and over</u>	<u>1 110.9</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>5.4</u>	<u>6.2</u>	<u>30.2</u>	<u>23.1</u>	<u>19.9</u>	<u>7.0</u>	<u>6.9</u>	<u>1.3</u>
20% lowest income group	224.1	100.0	10.0	1.5	40.6	24.3	10.0	3.0	0.7	1.9
30% next income group	350.7	100.0	6.9	8.3	34.8	27.0	15.5	4.5	1.7	1.3
30% next income group	333.1	100.0	3.1	26.0	23.4	26.8	9.2	6.4	1.3	3.8
20% highest income group	203.0	100.0	1.4	3.3	17.6	14.5	27.0	12.3	23.4	0.5
<u>Total 15-19 years</u>	<u>158.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>0.9</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>20.7</u>	<u>43.0</u>	<u>27.8</u>	<u>5.3</u>	-	<u>0.1</u>
20% lowest income group	43.1	100.0	0.7	2.6	30.6	45.9	18.1	2.1	-	-
30% next income group	59.3	100.0	1.5	2.5	20.6	46.6	25.3	3.2	-	0.3
30% next income group	40.7	100.0	0.5	1.7	15.0	36.9	37.3	8.6	-	-
20% highest income group	15.7	100.0	-	1.3	8.3	37.5	39.5	13.4	-	-
<u>Total 20-24 years</u>	<u>160.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1.1</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>21.6</u>	<u>25.3</u>	<u>24.0</u>	<u>21.4</u>	<u>4.2</u>	<u>0.2</u>
20% lowest income group	26.9	100.0	2.6	1.9	32.3	27.1	19.0	16.7	0.4	-
30% next income group	55.4	100.0	0.9	1.5	35.4	40.0	24.4	17.8	1.8	-
30% next income group	50.3	100.0	1.0	2.4	13.5	21.5	32.7	23.7	5.2	-
20% highest income group	27.7	100.0	0.7	4.3	10.8	15.2	20.6	35.4	11.9	1.1
<u>Total 25-34 years</u>	<u>307.7</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>4.6</u>	<u>28.2</u>	<u>23.4</u>	<u>20.9</u>	<u>8.7</u>	<u>11.9</u>	<u>0.5</u>
20% lowest income group	63.3	100.0	5.4	8.8	49.8	25.6	6.2	1.7	1.7	0.8
30% next income group	88.1	100.0	0.8	6.1	37.4	29.4	15.7	5.4	4.5	0.7
30% next income group	93.7	100.0	0.7	1.9	18.6	26.3	30.0	12.4	9.9	0.2
20% highest income group	62.6	100.0	1.0	2.2	8.1	8.5	29.7	14.7	35.5	0.3
<u>Total 35-44 years</u>	<u>200.4</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>7.8</u>	<u>34.0</u>	<u>21.5</u>	<u>19.2</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>9.6</u>	<u>0.9</u>
20% lowest income group	40.6	100.0	10.6	15.0	46.3	21.2	4.4	0.5	0.5	1.5
30% next income group	64.4	100.0	4.0	10.1	43.5	23.0	14.9	1.4	1.4	1.7
30% next income group	59.4	100.0	0.7	4.0	24.9	25.1	30.0	4.9	10.1	0.3
20% highest income group	36.0	100.0	-	2.0	17.8	13.3	25.8	7.2	33.9	-
<u>Total 45 years and over</u>	<u>283.7</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>15.4</u>	<u>11.4</u>	<u>40.0</u>	<u>11.5</u>	<u>12.5</u>	<u>0.8</u>	<u>4.9</u>	<u>3.5</u>
20% lowest income group	50.2	100.0	27.1	15.7	37.8	5.0	7.8	-	0.4	6.2
30% next income group	83.5	100.0	23.6	17.8	39.7	9.8	5.6	-	0.5	3.0
30% next income group	89.0	100.0	9.4	7.3	46.5	14.4	13.3	1.0	3.7	4.4
20% highest income group	61.0	100.0	3.4	5.1	32.9	15.1	24.4	2.1	16.2	0.8

Table 4 (concl.)

	Total		Years of education							
	thousands	%	No educ.	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	13-16	17 or more	Unknown
<u>45 years and over</u>	<u>76.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>4.7</u>	<u>14.8</u>	<u>34.0</u>	<u>5.7</u>	<u>10.7</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>1.7</u>	<u>1.1</u>
20% lowest income group	11.4	14.9	1.1	4.4	4.4	0.7	0.4	0.1	-	0.3
30% next income group	13.3	17.4	0.9	3.1	7.8	0.6	0.6	0.2	-	0.1
30% next income group	13.8	18.0	0.5	2.4	6.7	1.0	2.0	0.7	0.5	-
20% highest income group	9.2	12.0	0.2	0.7	3.6	1.0	2.1	1.0	0.5	0.1
Unspecified income group	28.8	37.7	2.0	4.2	11.5	2.4	5.6	1.8	0.7	0.6
<u>Total unknown age group</u>	<u>1.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>			<u>0.2</u>	<u>0.1</u>	<u>0.3</u>	<u>0.4</u>	<u>0.2</u>	<u>0.4</u>
20% lowest income group	0.1	6.2	-	-	-	-	-	0.1	-	-
30% next income group	0.3	18.8	-	-	-	-	0.1	-	-	0.2
30% next income group	0.1	6.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.1	-
20% highest income group	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Unspecified income group	1.1	68.8	-	-	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.2

Table 6

CARACAS: EMPLOYED WOMEN 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP AND
PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%
Professionals	26.7	6.5	0.5	0.9	1.1	1.0	7.4	5.2	17.7	17.2
Technicians and related occupations	28.1	6.8	4.0	7.3	8.6	7.7	10.5	7.3	5.0	4.9
Teachers	29.2	7.1	0.4	0.7	6.0	5.4	13.8	9.7	9.0	8.7
Directors and managers in public administration	2.1	0.5	-	-	-	-	0.8	0.6	1.3	1.3
Directors and managers in private sector	9.6	2.3	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.2	2.7	1.9	6.5	6.3
Secretaries and typists	11.7	2.8	0.8	1.5	3.2	2.8	5.3	3.7	2.4	2.3
Other office workers	89.8	21.9	7.6	13.8	24.8	22.2	39.3	27.5	18.1	17.6
Trade employees	20.7	5.0	1.9	3.5	6.2	5.5	7.2	5.0	5.4	5.2
Working on own account in trade (street vendors)	24.3	5.9	6.7	12.2	7.0	6.3	6.7	4.7	3.9	3.8
Spinners and weavers	1.5	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.2
Tailors and dressmakers	36.1	8.7	8.5	15.5	16.2	14.5	8.7	6.1	2.7	2.6
Packers in factories	7.6	1.8	1.2	2.2	3.3	2.9	2.3	1.6	0.8	0.8
Semi-skilled and skilled labourers	4.3	1.0	0.5	0.9	1.4	1.3	2.0	1.4	0.4	0.4
Unskilled labourers and journeywomen	6.3	1.5	1.7	3.1	2.5	2.2	2.1	1.5	-	-
Domestic workers a/ Launderers, cooks and ironers	39.3	9.5	1.2	2.2	2.6	2.3	14.1	9.9	21.4	20.8
Other workers in domestic service	60.2	14.6	18.6	33.8	25.0	22.3	14.8	10.4	1.8	1.7
Unspecified	9.1	2.2	0.5	0.9	2.9	2.6	3.4	2.4	2.3	2.2
	6.1	1.5	0.4	0.7	0.3	0.3	1.3	0.9	4.1	4.0
Total	412.7	100.0	54.9	100.0	111.9	100.0	142.9	100.0	103.0	100.0

a/ It was not possible to consider domestic employees in isolation from the household in which they work, which explains why they are concentrated in the highest income bracket.

Table 7

CARACAS: EMPLOYED FEMALE HEADS OF HOUSEHOLD 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY OCCUPATION GROUP
AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%
Professionals	4.2	5.9	-	-	0.2	1.1	1.6	7.4	2.4	18.9
Technicians and related occupations	7.8	11.0	1.4	7.7	3.1	17.1	2.6	12.0	0.7	5.5
Teachers	2.7	3.8	0.2	1.1	0.5	2.8	1.1	5.1	0.9	7.1
Directors and managers in public administration	0.4	0.6	-	-	-	-	0.1	0.3	0.3	2.4
Directors and managers in private sector	1.7	2.4	0.2	1.1	0.2	1.1	0.5	2.3	0.8	6.3
Secretaries and typists	1.8	2.5	0.2	1.1	0.5	2.8	1.1	5.1	-	-
Other office workers	12.2	17.2	2.3	12.6	3.2	17.6	4.8	22.1	1.9	15.0
Trade employees	3.7	5.2	0.7	3.8	0.7	3.9	1.3	6.0	1.0	7.9
Working on own account in trade (street vendors)	6.5	9.2	1.8	9.8	0.9	5.0	1.4	6.4	2.4	18.9
Spinners and weavers	0.2	0.3	-	-	-	-	0.2	1.0	-	-
Tailors and dressmakers	7.3	10.3	2.4	13.1	2.4	13.2	1.6	7.4	0.9	7.1
Factory packers	0.9	1.3	0.2	1.1	0.2	1.1	0.2	1.0	0.3	2.4
Semi-skilled and skilled labourers	0.5	0.7	0.2	1.1	0.2	1.1	0.1	0.3	-	-
Unskilled labourers and journeymen	1.4	2.0	0.7	3.8	0.5	2.8	0.2	1.0	-	-
Domestic workers	0.2	0.3	0.2	1.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Launderers, cooks and ironers	17.3	24.4	7.6	41.5	5.2	28.7	4.2	19.4	0.3	2.4
Other workers in domestic service	1.6	2.3	0.2	1.1	0.3	1.7	0.7	3.2	0.4	3.1
Unspecified	0.4	0.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.4	3.1
Total	70.8	100.0	18.3	100.0	18.1	100.0	21.7	100.0	12.7	100.0

Table 8

CARACAS: POPULATION 15 YEARS AND OVER BY INCOME DECILE, SEX AND
POSITION IN HOUSEHOLD, 1985

Deciles	Total population			Heads of household		
	thousands	%	cum. %	thousands	%	cum. %
<u>Both sexes</u>						
First decile	113.3	2.3	2.3	27.3	0.8	0.8
Second decile	116.1	3.9	6.2	24.1	1.3	2.1
Third decile	101.4	4.0	10.2	33.4	2.1	4.2
Fourth decile	138.3	6.3	16.5	50.4	3.6	7.8
Fifth decile	109.5	6.0	22.5	53.3	4.6	12.4
Sixth decile	104.9	6.8	29.3	47.5	4.8	17.2
Seventh decile	107.0	8.0	37.3	59.5	7.0	24.2
Eighth decile	143.2	14.0	51.3	88.3	13.6	37.8
Ninth decile	95.4	13.2	64.5	62.0	13.5	51.3
Tenth decile	124.1	35.5	100.0	104.4	48.7	100.0
<u>Total</u>	<u>1 153.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>		<u>550.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	
<u>Men</u>						
First decile	45.5	1.3	1.3	16.7	0.6	0.6
Second decile	51.2	2.3	3.6	15.1	0.9	1.5
Third decile	58.8	3.1	6.7	26.7	1.8	3.3
Fourth decile	83.3	5.1	11.8	43.5	3.4	6.7
Fifth decile	76.0	5.6	17.4	46.9	4.4	11.1
Sixth decile	67.0	5.8	23.2	40.7	4.5	15.6
Seventh decile	75.5	7.5	30.7	52.8	6.7	22.3
Eighth decile	103.6	13.6	44.3	79.6	13.3	35.6
Ninth decile	72.9	13.5	57.8	58.7	13.9	49.5
Tenth decile	106.7	42.2	100.0	98.7	50.5	100.0
<u>Total</u>	<u>740.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>		<u>479.4</u>	<u>100.0</u>	
<u>Women</u>						
First decile	67.8	5.1	5.1	10.6	4.0	4.0
Second decile	64.9	8.5	13.6	9.0	6.0	10.0
Third decile	42.6	6.6	20.2	6.7	5.3	15.3
Fourth decile	55.0	9.7	29.9	6.9	6.3	21.6
Fifth decile	33.5	7.1	37.0	6.4	6.9	28.5
Sixth decile	37.9	9.8	46.8	6.8	8.9	37.4
Seventh decile	31.5	9.3	56.1	6.7	9.9	47.3
Eighth decile	39.6	15.3	71.4	8.7	17.6	64.9
Ninth decile	22.5	12.3	83.7	3.3	9.5	74.4
Tenth decile	17.4	16.3	100.0	5.7	25.6	100.0
<u>Total</u>	<u>412.7</u>	<u>100.0</u>		<u>70.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	

Table 9

CARACAS: INDEXES OF PERSONAL AVERAGE INCOMES OF EMPLOYED WOMEN 15 YEARS AND OVER,
BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKETS, 1985 g/

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index
Professionals	26.7	154.9	0.5	14.6	1.1	89.7	7.4	139.9	17.7	169.5
Technicians and related occupations	28.2	71.5	4.0	44.6	8.6	59.1	10.5	76.7	5.1	103.0
Teachers	29.1	93.7	0.3	47.0	6.0	69.4	13.8	86.0	9.0	123.6
Directors and managers in public administration	2.1	175.6	-	-	-	-	0.8	129.2	1.3	203.9
Directors and managers in private sector	9.6	159.6	0.2	88.9	0.2	101.6	2.7	117.0	6.5	180.4
Secretaries and typists	11.7	70.9	0.8	49.7	3.2	55.7	5.3	61.2	2.4	120.2
Other office workers	89.8	68.0	7.6	46.7	24.8	53.6	39.3	69.0	18.1	94.6
Trade employees	20.7	76.1	1.9	42.6	6.2	46.0	7.2	79.5	5.4	117.5
Working on own account in trade	24.4	49.1	6.7	19.3	7.0	32.2	6.7	52.1	4.0	124.7
Spinners and weavers	1.5	48.1	0.2	38.2	0.6	47.6	0.5	42.5	0.2	76.2
Tailors and dressmakers	36.1	47.1	8.5	31.4	16.2	11.7	8.7	50.9	2.7	91.7
Factory packers	7.6	53.1	1.2	48.1	3.3	44.3	2.3	41.8	0.8	125.0
Semi-skilled and skilled labourers	4.2	60.3	0.5	38.2	1.4	52.8	2.0	56.3	0.3	147.9
Unskilled labourers and journeywomen	6.3	46.5	1.7	41.7	2.5	46.8	2.1	50.1	-	-
Domestic workers b/ Launderers, cooks and ironers	39.4	40.4	1.2	36.0	2.6	32.3	14.2	35.1	21.4	45.1
Others workers in domestic service	60.1	44.2	18.6	36.6	25.0	43.4	14.7	49.9	1.8	88.4
Unspecified	9.1	78.9	0.5	49.0	2.9	46.7	3.4	60.7	2.3	153.2
Total	412.7	70.8	54.8	36.5	111.9	49.2	142.9	68.4	103.1	115.6

g/ The average primary income of the total employed population was taken as the base (=100).

b/ It was not possible to consider domestic employees in isolation from the household in which they work, which explains why they are concentrated in the highest income bracket.

Table 10

CARACAS: INDEXES OF PERSONAL AVERAGE INCOMES OF EMPLOYED MEN 15 YEARS AND OVER,
BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKETS, 1985 a/

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index
Professionals	35.4	240.9	0.2	-	2.4	121.9	9.3	174.6	23.5	281.4
Technicians and related occupations	23.1	138.1	0.2	55.9	4.6	78.3	9.9	117.1	8.4	197.4
Teachers	14.4	158.6	0.4	82.5	2.0	102.2	6.1	124.6	5.9	218.3
Directors and managers in public administration	5.0	205.8	-	-	0.4	75.2	2.4	164.1	2.2	276.8
Directors and managers in private sector	58.4	256.2	1.0	80.6	5.4	109.7	20.8	162.3	31.2	350.3
Secretaries and typists	17.8	77.4	2.7	59.3	5.7	67.6	5.9	76.4	3.5	109.1
Other office workers	55.5	69.1	6.1	56.6	18.0	64.6	23.8	64.9	7.6	102.5
Trade employees	79.0	102.3	9.3	48.2	22.4	63.2	30.7	106.4	16.6	177.5
Working on own account in trade (street vendors)	47.2	118.7	8.3	42.0	14.5	69.1	14.8	110.1	9.6	273.4
Spinners and weavers	5.2	53.9	2.2	46.5	2.2	55.1	0.8	71.5	-	-
Tailors and dressmakers	23.2	72.0	4.4	59.7	10.3	60.1	7.3	77.7	1.2	183.2
Packers in factories	29.6	77.4	5.9	41.5	14.0	53.9	6.8	77.9	2.9	265.7
Semi-skilled and skilled labourers	97.0	89.4	17.0	56.4	36.3	70.1	33.4	95.7	10.3	191.1
Unskilled labourers and journeymen	134.5	75.8	33.2	58.2	60.0	68.8	34.3	85.6	7.0	157.3
Domestic workers	1.4	48.8	-	-	-	-	0.4	50.8	1.0	48.0
Launderers, cooks and ironers	38.4	66.9	9.1	46.0	16.5	57.3	10.0	75.4	2.8	160.7
Other workers in domestic service	47.0	91.5	7.3	55.7	15.4	64.7	16.6	91.4	7.7	178.9
Unspecified	28.4	252.6	0.4	68.6	2.2	101.3	8.6	164.4	17.2	320.8
Total	740.5	116.3	107.7	53.7	232.3	67.9	241.9	104.6	158.6	247.5

a/ The average primary income of the total employed population was taken as the base (=100).

Table 11

CARACAS: INDEXES OF PERSONAL AVERAGE INCOMES OF EMPLOYED WOMEN 15 YEARS AND OVER,
BY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL, AGE GROUP AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985 g/

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index
<u>Total 15 years and over</u>	<u>412.8</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>54.9</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>111.9</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>142.9</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>103.1</u>	<u>116</u>
No education	12.2	40	4.8	28	3.9	45	1.9	37	1.6	57
1-3 years, primary	22.4	41	4.9	29	7.9	40	5.3	46	4.3	51
4-6 years, primary	119.0	47	25.2	37	40.4	45	34.4	50	19.0	58
7-9 years, secondary	92.1	58	12.6	43	31.4	49	35.2	61	12.9	88
10-12 years, secondary	85.3	73	4.8	40	20.9	58	39.6	71	20.0	102
13-16 years, university	24.7	90	0.5	25	2.8	55	11.3	79	10.1	116
17 years and more, university	53.4	154	0.9	13	3.2	74	14.7	127	34.6	177
No declaration made	3.7	36	1.2	27	1.4	37	0.5	33	0.6	41
<u>Total 15-24 years</u>	<u>87.8</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>9.8</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>26.8</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>34.4</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>16.8</u>	<u>62</u>
No education	0.9	47	0.3	34	0.2	11	0.2	23	0.2	164
1-3 years, primary	2.9	46	0.2	25	0.6	35	1.1	64	1.0	37
4-6 years, primary	22.3	39	3.9	37	6.9	41	7.4	36	4.1	43
7-9 years, secondary	28.3	46	3.5	40	10.7	43	10.4	48	3.7	53
10-12 years, secondary	22.2	64	1.6	41	6.9	45	10.4	57	3.3	65
13-16 years, university	7.7	59	0.3	13	1.0	44	3.5	62	2.9	66
17 years and more, university	3.3	102	-	-	0.5	46	1.4	83	1.4	135
No declaration made	0.2	41	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.2	41
<u>Total 25-44 years</u>	<u>262.9</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>37.3</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>70.3</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>87.3</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>68.0</u>	<u>129</u>
No education	4.5	38	2.4	33	1.3	51	0.4	33	0.4	51
1-3 years, primary	14.6	39	4.2	30	5.6	43	2.7	38	2.1	46
4-6 years, primary	72.1	49	18.6	38	26.2	48	17.7	54	9.6	65
7-9 years, secondary	54.3	63	8.1	43	18.6	53	21.3	69	6.3	100
10-12 years, secondary	55.7	80	2.5	45	13.4	65	25.5	75	14.3	108
13-16 years, university	16.1	103	0.2	46	1.8	61	7.4	83	6.7	138
17 years and more, university	43.7	154	0.7	11	2.5	80	12.1	134	28.4	172
No declaration made	1.9	38	0.6	33	0.9	34	0.2	56	0.2	76

Table 11 (concl.)

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index
<u>Total 45 years and over</u>	<u>62.1</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>7.8</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>14.8</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>21.2</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>18.3</u>	<u>116</u>
No education	6.8	38	2.1	23	2.4	54	1.3	43	1.0	46
1-3 years, primary	4.9	44	0.5	25	1.7	31	1.5	44	1.2	68
4-6 years, primary	24.6	48	2.7	29	7.3	39	9.3	53	5.3	58
7-9 years, secondary	9.5	68	1.0	54	2.1	46	3.5	53	2.9	105
10-12 years, secondary	7.4	86	0.7	18	0.6	44	3.7	86	2.4	116
13-16 years, university	0.9	125	-	-	-	-	0.4	140	0.5	119
17 years and over, university	6.4	185	0.2	25	0.2	76	1.2	25	4.8	218
No declaration made	1.6	29	0.6	25	0.5	42	0.3	23	0.2	30

a/ The base taken for the index (=100) was the average primary income for the whole employed population of both sexes in the age group 15 years and over.

Table 12

CARACAS: INDEXES OF PERSONAL AVERAGE INCOMES OF EMPLOYED MEN 15 YEARS AND OVER,
BY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL, AGE GROUP AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985 a/

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index
<u>Total 15 years and over</u>	<u>740.6</u>	<u>116</u>	<u>107.6</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>232.5</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>241.9</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>158.6</u>	<u>248</u>
No education	18.5	53	7.6	43	7.4	56	2.7	70	0.8	59
1-3 years, primary	38.6	66	10.7	51	17.0	62	9.5	83	1.4	128
4-6 years, primary	231.4	78	50.9	55	101.8	68	62.2	91	16.5	164
7-9 years, secondary	159.8	84	23.5	59	57.6	66	64.1	92	14.6	162
10-12 years, secondary	134.0	128	10.9	50	34.0	70	53.0	109	36.1	235
13-16 years, university	47.8	140	2.1	53	6.3	75	19.7	112	19.7	197
17 years and more, university	103.7	259	0.8	56	5.5	110	28.1	163	69.3	312
No declaration made	6.8	68	1.1	49	2.9	66	2.6	81	0.2	67
<u>Total 15-24 years</u>	<u>140.0</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>19.2</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>56.4</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>47.9</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>16.5</u>	<u>112</u>
No education	1.7	48	0.9	32	0.5	56	0.3	55	-	-
1-3 years, primary	5.7	47	1.3	34	2.9	51	1.5	51	-	-
4-6 years, primary	42.4	49	8.9	37	21.3	45	10.2	58	2.0	89
7-9 years, secondary	46.4	56	4.2	43	20.9	49	18.3	57	3.0	125
10-12 years, secondary	32.0	63	3.5	46	10.0	45	11.6	59	6.9	104
13-16 years, university	8.6	85	0.2	36	0.6	52	4.1	62	3.7	120
17 years and more, university	2.6	109	-	-	-	-	1.7	91	0.9	144
No declaration made	0.6	42	0.2	38	0.2	44	0.2	55	-	-
<u>Total 25-44 years</u>	<u>418.8</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>66.5</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>125.9</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>134.0</u>	<u>112</u>	<u>92.4</u>	<u>228</u>
No education	8.6	58	3.5	51	3.7	57	0.8	88	0.6	61
1-3 years, primary	21.0	71	6.3	59	9.6	66	4.3	85	0.8	150
4-6 years, primary	121.3	76	32.4	58	53.6	71	29.8	96	5.5	134
7-9 years, secondary	86.5	88	16.1	62	29.8	74	33.7	101	6.9	147
10-12 years, secondary	76.7	120	5.7	45	18.8	77	33.2	116	19.0	195
13-16 years, university	33.1	136	1.7	53	5.3	80	12.6	116	13.5	187
17 years and more, university	69.2	235	0.4	15	3.7	107	19.2	156	45.9	281
No declaration made	2.4	75	0.4	54	1.4	86	0.4	55	0.2	66

Table 12 (concl.)

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index
<u>Total 45 years and over</u>	<u>181.8</u>	<u>158</u>	<u>21.9</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>50.2</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>6.0</u>	<u>124</u>	<u>49.7</u>	<u>330</u>
No education	8.2	48	3.2	37	3.2	54	1.6	62	0.2	51
1-3 years, primary	11.9	67	3.1	42	4.5	59	3.7	95	0.6	95
4-6 years, primary	67.7	99	9.6	60	26.9	79	22.2	99	9.0	199
7-9 years, secondary	26.9	120	3.2	60	6.9	87	12.1	120	4.7	209
10-12 years, secondary	25.3	234	1.7	74	5.2	88	8.2	152	10.2	400
13-16 years, university	6.1	238	0.2	87	0.4	46	3.0	162	2.5	357
17 years and more, university	31.9	321	0.4	96	1.8	117	7.2	200	22.5	380
No declaration made	3.8	69	0.5	44	1.3	45	2.0	88	-	-

g/ The base taken for the index (=100) was the average primary income for the whole employed population of both sexes in the age group 15 years and over.

Table 13

CARACAS: ACTIVITY RATES AND RATES OF UNEMPLOYMENT FOR WOMEN 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY AGE GROUP
AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985 ^{a/}

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%
<u>15 years and over</u>										
Activity rate	40.6		27.9		36.1		46.3		53.4	
Rate of unemployment	8.6		12.0		11.6		7.3		5.0	
<u>14-19 years</u>										
Activity rate	16.9		11.4		15.7		24.1		18.5	
Rate of unemployment	16.7		28.6		19.4		10.2		0.0	
<u>20-24 years</u>										
Activity rate	47.8		29.7		41.5		58.2		59.4	
Rate of unemployment	14.9		21.3		16.9		11.3		15.2	
<u>30-34 years</u>										
Activity rate	55.7		38.9		50.1		61.1		72.4	
Rate of unemployment	8.6		9.3		13.0		9.1		3.3	
<u>35-44 years</u>										
Activity rate	56.1		41.0		53.9		61.6		67.9	
Rate of unemployment	5.3		9.6		7.8		3.6		1.6	
<u>45 years and over</u>										
Activity rate	22.6		16.5		18.4		23.8		31.6	
Rate of unemployment	3.4		6.0		3.9		0.5		5.2	

^{a/} Activity rate: women 15 years and over in the active population as a coefficient of the total female population 15 years and over.

Rate of unemployment: women 15 years and over who are unemployed or seeking employment for the first time as a coefficient of the total number of women 15 years and over in the active population.

Table 1

PANAMA CITY: NUMBER OF PEOPLE 15 YEARS OLD AND OLDER, BY SEX, POSITION IN HOUSEHOLD AND STRATUM, AS DETERMINED BY PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1984

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%
<u>Both sexes</u>										
Heads of household	239.0	35.3	48.3	35.3	68.9	33.0	74.1	35.2	47.7	39.1
Spouses	161.2	23.8	32.3	23.6	49.6	23.8	48.9	23.2	30.4	25.0
Children	186.5	27.5	42.3	31.0	64.0	30.7	56.6	26.9	23.6	19.3
Others	70.4	10.4	12.0	8.7	21.9	10.5	25.0	11.9	11.5	9.4
Domestic employees	20.7	3.1	1.9	1.4	4.1	2.0	6.0	2.9	8.7	7.2
<u>Total both sexes</u>	<u>677.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>136.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>208.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>210.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>121.9</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>Men</u>										
Heads of household	182.1	55.7	34.8	54.2	53.4	52.1	55.8	53.5	38.1	68.0
Spouses	5.9	1.8	0.8	1.2	2.2	2.1	2.2	2.1	0.7	1.3
Children	100.0	30.9	22.9	35.7	34.7	33.9	31.7	30.4	11.6	20.7
Others	32.4	9.9	5.1	7.9	10.2	10.0	12.2	11.7	4.9	8.7
Domestic employees	5.6	1.7	0.6	1.0	1.9	1.8	2.4	2.3	0.7	1.3
<u>Total men</u>	<u>326.9</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>64.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>102.4</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>104.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>56.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>Women</u>										
Heads of household	56.9	16.2	13.5	18.6	15.5	14.6	18.3	17.2	9.6	14.6
Spouses	155.3	44.3	31.5	43.4	47.4	44.7	46.7	43.9	29.7	45.1
Children	85.6	24.4	19.4	26.8	29.3	27.6	24.9	23.4	12.0	18.2
Others	38.0	10.8	6.9	9.5	11.7	11.1	12.8	12.0	6.6	10.0
Domestic employees	15.1	4.3	1.3	1.8	2.2	2.1	3.6	3.4	8.0	12.1
<u>Total women</u>	<u>350.9</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>72.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>106.1</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>106.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>65.9</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Table 2

PANAMA CITY: WOMEN 15 YEARS OLD AND OLDER, BY TYPE OF ACTIVITY AND STRATUM ACCORDING
TO PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1984

	Per capita family income bracket										
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%		
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	
<u>Total (15 years and over)</u>											
Employed	118.5	33.8	10.6	14.6	24.7	23.2	43.8	41.3	39.4	59.7	
Unemployed and seeking work for first time	16.6	4.7	4.7	6.5	7.1	6.7	4.2	4.0	0.6	0.9	
<u>Total active female population</u>	<u>135.1</u>	<u>38.5</u>	<u>15.3</u>	<u>21.1</u>	<u>31.8</u>	<u>29.9</u>	<u>48.0</u>	<u>45.3</u>	<u>40.0</u>	<u>60.6</u>	
Housewives	140.0	39.9	42.4	58.5	50.5	47.4	35.3	33.3	11.8	17.9	
Students	46.5	13.2	9.6	13.2	17.3	16.2	13.8	13.0	5.8	8.8	
Women of independent means, retirees and others	29.4	8.4	5.2	7.2	6.9	6.5	8.9	8.4	8.4	12.7	
<u>Total inactive female population</u>	<u>215.9</u>	<u>61.5</u>	<u>57.2</u>	<u>78.9</u>	<u>74.7</u>	<u>70.1</u>	<u>58.0</u>	<u>54.7</u>	<u>26.0</u>	<u>39.4</u>	
<u>Total</u>	<u>351.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>72.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>106.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>106.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>66.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	
<u>15-19 years</u>											
Employed	8.3	13.3	0.8	5.2	1.0	4.4	2.9	17.9	3.6	43.4	
Unemployed and seeking work for first time	4.4	7.0	1.4	9.0	1.9	8.4	1.0	6.2	0.1	1.2	
<u>Total active female population in age group</u>	<u>12.7</u>	<u>20.3</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>14.2</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>12.8</u>	<u>3.9</u>	<u>24.1</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>44.6</u>	
Housewives	9.4	15.0	3.6	23.2	3.9	17.3	1.8	11.1	0.1	1.2	
Students	38.1	60.9	8.7	56.1	14.9	65.9	10.1	62.3	4.4	53.0	
Women of independent means, retirees and others	2.4	3.8	1.0	6.5	0.9	3.9	0.4	2.5	0.1	1.2	
<u>Total inactive female population in age group</u>	<u>49.9</u>	<u>79.7</u>	<u>13.3</u>	<u>85.8</u>	<u>19.7</u>	<u>87.2</u>	<u>12.3</u>	<u>75.9</u>	<u>4.6</u>	<u>55.4</u>	
<u>Total</u>	<u>62.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>15.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>22.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>16.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>8.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>	
<u>20-24 years</u>											
Employed	15.3	32.1	0.7	8.3	3.1	18.6	6.1	39.9	5.4	74.0	
Unemployed and seeking work for first time	5.8	12.2	1.6	19.1	2.5	15.1	1.6	10.4	0.1	1.4	
<u>Total active female population in age group</u>	<u>21.1</u>	<u>44.3</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>27.4</u>	<u>5.6</u>	<u>33.7</u>	<u>7.7</u>	<u>50.3</u>	<u>5.5</u>	<u>75.4</u>	
Housewives	16.8	35.3	4.7	56.0	7.8	47.0	3.8	24.9	0.5	6.8	
Students	7.7	16.2	0.8	9.5	2.2	13.3	3.4	22.2	1.3	17.8	
Women of independent means, retirees and others	2.0	4.2	0.6	7.1	1.0	6.0	0.4	2.6			
<u>Total inactive female population in age group</u>	<u>26.5</u>	<u>55.7</u>	<u>6.1</u>	<u>72.6</u>	<u>11.0</u>	<u>66.3</u>	<u>7.6</u>	<u>49.7</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>24.6</u>	
<u>Total</u>	<u>47.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>8.4</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>16.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>15.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>7.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>	

Table 2 (concl.)

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%
25-34 years										
Employed	43.4	49.0	3.4	19.2	8.8	32.8	16.3	61.5	14.9	85.2
Unemployed and seeking work for first time	5.2	5.9	1.3	7.3	2.3	8.6	1.3	4.9	0.3	1.7
<u>Total active female population in age group</u>	<u>48.6</u>	<u>54.9</u>	<u>4.7</u>	<u>26.5</u>	<u>11.1</u>	<u>41.4</u>	<u>17.6</u>	<u>66.4</u>	<u>15.2</u>	<u>86.9</u>
Housewives	37.3	42.1	12.2	68.9	14.9	55.6	8.2	31.0	2.0	11.4
Students	0.7	0.8	0.1	0.6	0.2	0.8	0.3	1.1	0.1	0.6
Women of independent means, retirees and others	1.9	2.1	0.7	4.0	0.6	2.2	0.4	1.5	0.2	1.1
<u>Total inactive female population in age group</u>	<u>39.9</u>	<u>45.1</u>	<u>13.0</u>	<u>73.5</u>	<u>15.7</u>	<u>58.6</u>	<u>8.9</u>	<u>33.6</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>13.1</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>88.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>17.7</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>26.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>26.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>17.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>
35-44 years										
Employed	32.4	52.4	3.5	25.2	7.7	43.3	12.2	64.9	9.0	79.6
Unemployed and seeking work for first time	0.7	1.2	0.3	2.2	0.2	1.1	0.2	1.1	-	-
<u>Total active female population in age group</u>	<u>33.1</u>	<u>53.6</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>27.4</u>	<u>7.9</u>	<u>44.4</u>	<u>12.4</u>	<u>66.0</u>	<u>9.0</u>	<u>79.6</u>
Housewives	27.3	44.2	9.4	67.6	9.5	53.4	6.2	32.9	2.2	19.5
Students	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Women of independent means, retirees and others	1.4	2.2	0.7	5.0	0.4	2.2	0.2	1.1	0.1	0.9
<u>Total inactive female population in age group</u>	<u>28.7</u>	<u>46.4</u>	<u>10.1</u>	<u>72.6</u>	<u>9.9</u>	<u>55.6</u>	<u>6.4</u>	<u>34.0</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>20.4</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>61.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>13.9</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>17.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>18.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>11.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>
45 years and over										
Employed	19.1	21.1	2.2	12.9	4.1	18.0	6.3	21.6	6.5	30.1
Unemployed and seeking work for first time	0.5	0.6	0.1	0.6	0.2	0.9	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.5
<u>Total active female population in age group</u>	<u>19.6</u>	<u>21.7</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>13.5</u>	<u>4.3</u>	<u>18.9</u>	<u>6.4</u>	<u>21.9</u>	<u>6.6</u>	<u>30.6</u>
Housewives	49.2	54.3	12.5	73.6	14.4	63.5	15.3	52.4	7.0	32.4
Students	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Women of independent means, retirees and others	21.7	24.0	2.2	12.9	4.0	17.6	7.5	25.7	8.0	37.0
<u>Total inactive female population in age group</u>	<u>70.9</u>	<u>78.3</u>	<u>14.7</u>	<u>86.5</u>	<u>18.4</u>	<u>81.1</u>	<u>22.8</u>	<u>78.1</u>	<u>15.0</u>	<u>69.4</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>90.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>17.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>22.7</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>29.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>21.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Table 3

PANAMA CITY: POPULATION 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY SEX, MARITAL STATUS, AGE GROUP AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1984

Note: The marital status variable was not included in this survey (see the index to this statistical annex).

Table 4

PANAMA CITY: WOMEN 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION, AGE GROUP AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1984

	Total		Years of education						
	thousands	%	No education	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	13-16	17 or more
<u>Total female population</u>									
<u>15 years and over</u>	<u>350.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	-	<u>6.4</u>	<u>27.9</u>	<u>21.8</u>	<u>30.8</u>	<u>8.3</u>	<u>4.8</u>
20% lowest income group	72.6	100.0	-	12.8	39.2	22.3	23.6	1.5	0.6
30% next income group	106.2	100.0	-	6.7	32.5	28.1	27.7	4.1	0.9
30% next income group	106.2	100.0	-	5.0	22.5	20.9	35.7	11.2	4.7
20% highest income group	65.8	100.0	-	1.4	16.4	12.2	36.3	17.9	15.8
<u>Total 15-19 years</u>	<u>62.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>	-	<u>1.8</u>	<u>15.7</u>	<u>39.7</u>	<u>40.1</u>	<u>2.7</u>	-
20% lowest income group	15.4	100.0	-	3.3	25.3	41.5	28.6	1.3	-
30% next income group	22.5	100.0	-	1.8	8.9	46.7	41.3	1.3	-
30% next income group	16.3	100.0	-	0.6	11.0	33.8	49.7	4.9	-
20% highest income group	8.3	100.0	-	1.2	25.3	28.9	39.8	4.8	-
<u>Total 20-24 years</u>	<u>47.7</u>	<u>100.0</u>	-	<u>1.5</u>	<u>18.2</u>	<u>21.6</u>	<u>35.0</u>	<u>20.8</u>	<u>2.9</u>
20% lowest income group	8.5	100.0	-	5.9	30.6	29.4	28.2	4.7	1.2
30% next income group	16.6	100.0	-	0.6	21.1	27.1	36.7	13.3	1.2
30% next income group	15.3	100.0	-	-	9.8	18.3	41.8	26.2	3.9
20% highest income group	7.3	100.0	-	1.4	15.1	6.8	24.6	45.2	6.9
<u>Total 25-34 years</u>	<u>88.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>	-	<u>4.0</u>	<u>23.9</u>	<u>21.2</u>	<u>30.4</u>	<u>11.8</u>	<u>8.6</u>
20% lowest income group	17.8	100.0	-	12.9	46.1	21.4	17.4	1.1	1.1
30% next income group	26.8	100.0	-	4.1	33.2	30.6	25.0	5.6	1.5
30% next income group	26.5	100.0	-	0.4	11.7	21.5	43.7	15.5	7.2
20% highest income group	17.4	100.0	-	-	6.3	6.3	31.6	26.5	29.3
<u>Total 35-44 years</u>	<u>61.7</u>	<u>100.0</u>	-	<u>7.0</u>	<u>37.0</u>	<u>17.6</u>	<u>24.3</u>	<u>6.8</u>	<u>7.3</u>
20% lowest income group	13.9	100.0	-	15.1	51.1	13.7	18.0	1.4	0.7
30% next income group	17.7	100.0	-	8.5	50.9	22.0	16.4	1.1	1.1
30% next income group	18.9	100.0	-	3.7	28.1	21.7	25.9	11.1	9.5
20% highest income group	11.2	100.0	-	-	12.5	8.9	42.0	15.2	21.4
<u>Total 45 years and over</u>	<u>90.4</u>	<u>100.0</u>	-	<u>14.4</u>	<u>38.8</u>	<u>12.7</u>	<u>27.2</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>3.6</u>
20% lowest income group	17.0	100.0	-	22.9	39.4	9.4	27.7	0.6	-
30% next income group	22.6	100.0	-	17.7	49.1	12.4	19.5	0.9	0.4
30% next income group	29.2	100.0	-	15.1	41.8	14.0	23.6	3.1	2.4
20% highest income group	21.6	100.0	-	3.2	23.6	13.9	39.8	8.3	11.1

Table 5

PANAMA CITY: WOMEN 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY POSITION IN HOUSEHOLD, CATEGORY OF EMPLOYMENT
AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1984

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%
<u>Total</u>	118.6	100.0	10.6	100.0	24.7	100.0	44.0	100.0	39.3	100.0
Heads of establishment	2.2	1.9	0.1	0.9	0.5	2.0	0.2	0.5	1.4	3.6
Wage-earners	108.3	91.3	8.3	78.3	21.9	88.7	40.7	92.5	37.4	95.1
Working on own account	7.5	6.3	1.7	16.1	2.2	8.9	3.1	7.0	0.5	1.3
Unpaid family members	0.6	0.5	0.5	4.7	0.1	0.4	-	-	-	-
<u>Total heads of household</u>	<u>30.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>5.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>8.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>11.1</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>6.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Heads of establishment	0.8	2.6	0.1	2.0	0.2	2.4	0.1	0.9	0.4	6.7
Wage-earners	26.0	85.8	4.0	80.0	7.2	87.8	9.5	85.6	5.3	88.3
Working on own account	3.5	11.6	0.9	18.0	0.8	9.8	1.5	13.5	0.3	5.0
Unpaid family members	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Total non-heads of household</u>	<u>88.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>5.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>16.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>32.9</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>33.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Heads of establishment	1.4	1.6	-	-	0.3	1.8	0.1	0.3	1.0	3.0
Wage-earners	82.3	93.2	4.3	76.8	14.7	89.1	31.2	96.8	32.1	96.4
Working on own account	4.0	4.5	0.8	14.3	1.4	8.5	1.6	4.9	0.2	0.6
Unpaid family members	0.6	0.7	0.5	8.9	0.1	0.6	-	-	-	-

Table 6

PANAMA CITY: EMPLOYED WOMEN 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP AND
PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1984

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%
Professionals	9.6	8.1	0.1	0.9	0.1	0.3	2.9	6.7	6.5	16.4
Technicians and related occupations	13.4	11.3	0.1	0.9	1.5	6.0	6.6	15.0	5.2	13.3
Canal Zone employees	1.5	1.3	0.1	0.9	0.2	0.9	0.5	1.2	0.7	1.7
Directors and managers	3.5	3.0	0.1	0.9	0.1	0.3	1.0	2.2	2.3	6.0
Office workers	34.0	28.7	0.9	8.4	5.3	21.5	15.0	34.1	12.8	32.5
Trade employees	5.4	4.6	0.3	2.8	1.8	7.3	2.5	5.8	0.8	2.0
Working on own account in trade and services	4.3	3.6	0.7	6.5	1.1	4.5	1.9	4.4	0.6	1.5
Semi-skilled and skilled labourers	4.5	3.8	0.4	3.7	1.3	5.4	2.2	5.1	0.6	1.5
Unskilled labourers	2.4	2.0	0.2	1.9	1.0	3.9	1.0	2.2	0.2	0.6
Industrial craftswomen	2.6	2.2	1.0	9.3	0.9	3.6	0.5	1.2	0.2	0.4
Domestic workers ^{a/}	29.6	24.9	5.5	51.4	8.2	33.2	7.8	17.8	8.1	20.6
Government employees	4.8	4.0	0.7	6.5	2.5	10.0	1.1	2.5	0.5	1.3
Unspecified	3.0	2.5	0.6	5.6	0.8	3.1	0.8	1.8	0.8	2.2
<u>Total</u>	<u>118.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>10.7</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>24.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>43.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>39.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>

^{a/} It was not possible to consider domestic employees in isolation from the household in which they work, which explains why they are concentrated in the highest income bracket.

Table 7

PANAMA CITY: EMPLOYED FEMALE HEADS OF HOUSEHOLD 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY OCCUPATION GROUP
AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1984

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%
Professionals	2.4	7.9	0.1	2.0	-	-	1.0	9.1	1.3	20.6
Technicians and related occupations	2.9	9.6	0.1	2.0	0.6	7.6	1.3	11.8	0.9	14.3
Canal Zone employees	0.4	1.3	0.1	2.0	0.1	1.3	0.1	0.9	0.1	1.6
Directors and managers	1.1	3.6	0.1	2.0	-	-	0.4	3.6	0.6	9.5
Office workers	6.4	21.3	0.3	6.0	1.4	17.7	3.1	28.3	1.6	25.5
Saleswomen	1.3	4.3	0.2	4.0	0.2	2.5	0.8	7.3	0.1	1.6
Working on own account in trade and services	2.0	6.6	0.2	4.0	0.4	5.1	1.0	9.1	0.4	6.3
Semi-skilled and skilled labourers	1.1	3.6	0.1	2.0	0.4	5.1	0.4	3.6	0.2	3.2
Unskilled labourers	1.0	3.3	0.2	4.0	0.5	6.3	0.2	1.8	0.1	1.6
Industrial craftswomen	1.0	3.3	0.4	8.0	0.3	3.8	0.2	1.8	0.1	1.6
Domestic workers	7.3	24.3	2.4	48.0	2.7	34.2	1.8	16.4	0.4	6.3
Government employees	1.9	6.3	0.4	8.0	1.1	13.9	0.3	2.7	0.1	1.6
Unspecified	1.4	4.6	0.4	8.0	0.2	2.5	0.4	3.6	0.4	6.3
<u>Total</u>	<u>30.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>5.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>7.9</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>11.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>6.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Table 8

PANAMA CITY: POPULATION 15 YEARS AND OVER BY INCOME DECILE, SEX AND
POSITION IN HOUSEHOLD, 1984

	Total population			Heads of household		
	thousands	%	cum. %	thousands	%	cum. %
<u>Both sexes</u>						
First decile	34.6	1.0	1.0	13.6	0.7	0.7
Second decile	35.2	2.9	3.9	14.4	1.9	2.6
Third decile	36.0	4.9	8.8	16.1	3.4	6.0
Fourth decile	30.8	5.3	14.1	15.0	4.1	10.1
Fifth decile	37.2	7.6	21.7	19.8	6.4	16.5
Sixth decile	41.6	10.3	32.0	24.0	9.4	25.9
Seventh decile	27.1	7.8	39.8	14.8	6.8	32.7
Eighth decile	32.3	11.2	51.0	17.5	9.6	42.3
Ninth decile	31.4	14.9	65.9	19.6	14.9	57.2
Tenth decile	33.8	34.1	100.0	25.8	42.8	100.0
<u>Total</u>	<u>340.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>		<u>180.6</u>		
<u>Men</u>						
First decile	23.6	0.8	0.8	11.1	0.6	0.6
Second decile	16.9	2.1	2.9	10.4	1.6	2.2
Third decile	23.4	4.6	7.5	12.7	3.1	5.3
Fourth decile	21.7	5.4	12.9	12.8	4.0	9.3
Fifth decile	25.4	7.5	20.4	16.6	6.2	15.5
Sixth decile	29.4	10.5	30.9	20.8	9.5	25.0
Seventh decile	17.2	7.2	38.1	12.4	6.6	31.6
Eighth decile	19.3	9.8	47.9	14.5	9.3	40.9
Ninth decile	19.5	13.4	61.3	16.3	14.2	55.1
Tenth decile	25.1	38.7	100.0	22.9	44.9	100.0
<u>Total</u>	<u>221.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>		<u>150.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>	
<u>Women</u>						
First decile	11.0	1.3	1.3	2.5	1.1	1.1
Second decile	18.3	4.7	6.0	4.0	4.0	5.1
Third decile	12.7	5.5	11.5	3.4	5.3	10.4
Fourth decile	9.1	5.0	16.5	2.2	4.5	14.9
Fifth decile	11.7	7.7	24.2	3.2	7.5	22.4
Sixth decile	12.2	9.7	33.9	3.2	9.1	31.5
Seventh decile	9.9	9.3	43.2	2.4	7.9	39.4
Eighth decile	13.0	14.5	57.7	3.0	12.0	51.4
Ninth decile	11.9	18.4	76.1	3.3	19.1	70.5
Tenth decile	8.7	23.9	100.0	2.9	29.5	100.0
<u>Total</u>	<u>118.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>		<u>30.1</u>	<u>100.0</u>	

Table 9

PANAMA CITY: INDICES OF PERSONAL AVERAGE INCOMES OF EMPLOYED WOMEN 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKETS, 1984 ^{a/}

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index
Professionals	9.6	180	0.1	-	0.1	103	2.9	143	6.5	201
Technicians and related occupations	13.4	119	0.1	47	1.5	87	6.6	102	5.2	149
Canal Zone employees	1.5	158	0.1	-	0.2	64	0.5	144	0.7	226
Directors and managers	3.5	160	0.1	36	0.1	85	1.0	122	2.3	183
Office workers	34.0	101	0.9	51	5.3	70	15.0	90	12.8	132
Salaried saleswomen and merchants	5.4	77	0.3	53	1.8	57	2.5	77	0.8	129
Working on own account in trade	4.3	52	0.7	10	1.1	34	1.9	49	0.6	140
Skilled and semi-skilled labourers	4.5	68	0.4	35	1.3	64	2.2	68	0.6	94
Unskilled labourers	2.4	66	0.2	36	1.0	67	1.0	68	0.2	81
Industrial craftswomen	2.6	29	1.0	22	0.9	24	0.5	46	0.1	56
Domestic workers	29.6	34	5.5	25	8.2	36	7.8	36	8.1	35
Government employees	5.2	49	0.7	42	2.5	51	1.1	57	0.9	74
<u>Total b/</u>	<u>118.5</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>10.6</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>24.7</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>43.9</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>39.3</u>	<u>137</u>

^{a/} The average primary income of the total employed population was taken as the base (=100).

^{b/} Includes unknown quantities and undeclared information.

Table 10

PANAMA CITY: INDEXES OF PERSONAL AVERAGE INCOMES OF EMPLOYED MEN 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKETS, 1984 ^{a/}

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index
Professionals	10.9	317	-	-	0.4	99	2.8	173	7.7	380
Technicians and related occupations	11.2	165	0.3	63	1.7	86	4.5	133	4.7	229
Canal Zone employees	10.7	196	0.4	38	1.7	115	4.8	168	3.8	286
Directors and managers	14.6	197	0.7	56	2.5	101	5.0	132	6.6	295
Office workers	13.9	92	0.6	50	4.2	77	6.2	94	3.1	117
Salaried sales personnel	9.2	111	0.7	37	2.6	60	3.3	93	2.6	205
Working on own account in trade	5.7	67	2.0	31	1.9	50	1.2	85	0.6	213
Skilled and semi-skilled labourers	34.6	89	2.8	50	12.0	75	15.4	94	4.4	133
Unskilled labourers	33.8	70	7.0	41	16.1	67	8.5	86	2.2	117
Industrial craftsmen	44.1	46	21.1	17	11.6	55	8.9	77	2.5	131
Domestic workers	15.1	60	3.2	41	6.1	61	4.8	72	1.0	68
Government employees	13.5	85	1.3	49	6.0	81	4.6	93	1.6	105
<u>Total ^{b/}</u>	<u>221.5</u>	<u>106</u>	<u>40.7</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>68.3</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>71.2</u>	<u>103</u>	<u>41.3</u>	<u>248</u>

^{a/} The average primary income of the total employed population was taken as the base (=100).

^{b/} Includes men who made no declaration.

Table 11

PANAMA CITY: INDEXES OF PERSONAL AVERAGE INCOMES OF EMPLOYED WOMEN 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL, AGE GROUP AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1984 ^{a/}

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index
<u>Total 15 years and over</u>	<u>118.5</u>	<u>89</u>	<u>10.6</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>24.7</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>43.9</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>39.3</u>	<u>137</u>
No education										
1-6 years, primary	32.7	123	6.0	27	10.2	42	9.9	49	6.6	50
7-11 years, secondary	54.9	83	3.2	35	12.2	58	24.3	81	15.2	118
12 years or more, university	28.5	158	0.2	32	1.9	76	9.3	115	17.1	190
<u>Total 15-24 years</u>	<u>23.5</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>9.0</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>8.9</u>	<u>64</u>
No education										
1-6 years, primary	6.2	28	0.5	20	1.0	24	1.5	26	3.2	32
7-11 years, secondary	12.3	55	0.8	19	2.6	53	5.8	61	3.1	40
12 years or more, university	5.0	92	0.2	47	0.5	67	1.7	77	2.6	44
<u>Total 25-44 years</u>	<u>75.8</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>6.9</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>16.5</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>28.6</u>	<u>90</u>	<u>23.8</u>	<u>157</u>
No education										
1-6 years, primary	17.8	192	4.1	28	6.7	44	5.1	54	1.9	53
7-11 years, secondary	35.9	89	2.1	37	8.4	60	16.1	87	9.3	128
12 years or more, university	20.9	165	-	-	1.4	77	7.2	125	12.3	198
<u>Total 45 years and over</u>	<u>19.2</u>	<u>91</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>4.1</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>6.3</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>6.6</u>	<u>164</u>
No education										
1-6 years, primary	8.7	49	1.4	25	2.5	39	3.3	51	1.5	84
7-11 years, secondary	6.7	105	0.3	48	1.2	56	2.4	85	2.8	149
12 years or more, university	2.6	224	-	-	-	-	0.4	143	2.2	240

a/ The base taken for the index (=100) was the average primary income for the whole employed population of both sexes in the age group 15 years and over.

Table 12

PANAMA CITY: INDEXES OF PERSONAL AVERAGE INCOMES OF EMPLOYED MEN 15 YEARS AND OVER,
BY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL, AGE GROUP AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1984 ^{a/}

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index
<u>Total 15 years and over</u>	<u>221.5</u>	<u>106</u>	<u>40.7</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>68.3</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>71.2</u>	<u>103</u>	<u>41.3</u>	<u>248</u>
No education										
1-6 years, primary	88.3	64	29.1	26	32.4	66	20.9	91	5.9	145
7-11 years, secondary	94.5	93	8.1	42	31.8	74	38.8	101	15.8	179
12 years or more, university	32.5	342	0.3	49	2.5	84	10.4	139	19.3	338
<u>Total 15-24 years</u>	<u>44.1</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>10.4</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>15.9</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>13.1</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>4.9</u>	<u>136</u>
No education										
1-6 years, primary	15.5	29	7.6	11	5.5	42	2.0	53	0.4	71
7-11 years, secondary	24.4	62	2.6	29	9.6	56	9.3	65	2.9	102
12 years or more, university	4.2	134	0.1	59	0.8	67	1.7	95	1.6	212
<u>Total 25-44 years</u>	<u>124.3</u>	<u>114</u>	<u>20.8</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>38.2</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>41.6</u>	<u>109</u>	<u>23.7</u>	<u>249</u>
No education										
1-6 years, primary	44.3	66	14.2	34	17.4	73	10.5	90	2.2	108
7-11 years, secondary	55.1	105	4.5	46	19.0	81	23.3	109	8.3	184
12 years or more, university	22.2	240	0.2	46	1.5	89	7.4	140	13.1	314
<u>Total 45 years and over</u>	<u>53.0</u>	<u>128</u>	<u>9.5</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>14.2</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>16.5</u>	<u>114</u>	<u>12.7</u>	<u>289</u>
No education										
1-6 years, primary	28.5	79	7.3	26	9.5	66	8.4	101	3.3	177
7-11 years, secondary	15.0	139	1.0	53	3.2	86	6.2	121	4.6	218
12 years or more, university	6.1	380	-	-	0.2	106	1.3	183	4.6	444

^{a/} The base taken for the index (=100) was the average primary income for the whole employed population of both sexes in the age group 15 years and over.

Table 13

PANAMA CITY: ACTIVITY RATES AND RATES OF UNEMPLOYMENT FOR WOMEN 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY AGE GROUP
AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1984 ^{a/}

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%
<u>15 years and over</u>										
Activity rate	38.5		21.1		29.9		45.3		60.6	
Rate of unemployment	12.3		30.7		22.3		8.8		1.5	
<u>15-19 years</u>										
Activity rate	20.3		14.2		12.8		24.1		44.6	
Rate of unemployment	34.6		63.6		65.5		25.6		2.7	
<u>20-24 years</u>										
Activity rate	44.3		27.4		33.7		50.3		75.3	
Rate of unemployment	27.5		69.6		44.6		20.8		1.8	
<u>25-34 years</u>										
Activity rate	54.9		26.6		41.4		66.4		86.9	
Rate of unemployment	10.7		27.7		20.7		7.4		2.0	
<u>35-44 years</u>										
Activity rate	53.6		27.3		44.4		66.0		79.7	
Rate of unemployment	2.1		7.9		2.5		1.6		-	
<u>45 years and over</u>										
Activity rate	21.7		13.5		18.9		21.9		30.6	
Rate of unemployment	2.6		4.4		4.7		1.6		1.5	

^{a/} Activity rate: women 15 years and over in the active population as a coefficient of the total female population 15 years and over.

Rate of unemployment: women 15 years and over who are unemployed or seeking employment for the first time as a coefficient of the total number of women 15 years and over in the active population.

Table 1

SAN JOSE: POPULATION 15 YEARS OLD AND OLDER, BY SEX, POSITION IN HOUSEHOLD AND STRATUM,
AS DETERMINED BY PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985

	Per capita family income bracket											
	Total		Income undeclared		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%
Both sexes												
Heads of household	164.2	34.8	46.1	38.7	23.5	29.4	35.6	33.6	35.2	33.2	23.8	38.9
Others	308.0	65.2	73.0	61.3	56.5	70.6	70.3	66.4	70.8	66.8	37.4	61.1
Total both sexes	472.2	100.0	119.1	100.0	80.0	100.0	105.9	100.0	106.0	100.0	61.2	100.0
Women												
Heads of household	42.1	16.6	14.1	21.9	7.1	15.7	8.4	14.7	8.0	14.3	4.5	14.2
Others	212.2	83.4	50.2	78.1	38.2	84.3	48.6	85.3	48.1	85.7	27.1	85.8
Total women	254.3	100.0	64.3	100.0	45.3	100.0	57.0	100.0	56.1	100.0	31.6	100.0
Men												
Heads of household	122.1	56.0	32.0	58.4	16.4	47.3	27.2	55.6	27.2	54.3	19.3	65.2
Others	95.8	44.0	22.8	41.6	18.3	52.7	21.7	44.4	22.7	45.5	10.3	34.8
Total men	217.9	100.0	54.8	100.0	34.7	100.0	48.9	100.0	49.9	100.0	29.6	100.0

Table 2

SAN JOSE: WOMEN 15 YEARS OLD AND OLDER, BY TYPE OF ACTIVITY AND STRATUM ACCORDING TO PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985

	Per capita family income bracket											
	Total		Income undeclared		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%
<u>Total 15 years and over</u>												
Employed	82.4	32.4	9.1	14.3	14.4	31.6	18.9	32.9	22.5	40.3	17.5	55.2
Unemployed	5.8	2.3	0.9	1.4	2.7	5.9	1.4	2.4	0.6	1.1	0.2	0.6
Seeking work for first time	1.7	0.7	0.3	0.4	0.5	1.1	0.4	0.7	0.5	0.9	-	-
<u>Total active population</u>	<u>89.9</u>	<u>35.4</u>	<u>10.3</u>	<u>16.1</u>	<u>17.6</u>	<u>38.6</u>	<u>20.7</u>	<u>36.1</u>	<u>23.6</u>	<u>42.3</u>	<u>17.7</u>	<u>55.8</u>
Housewives	122.5	48.2	38.7	60.7	21.4	46.9	29.8	51.9	22.0	39.4	10.6	33.4
Students	29.9	11.8	8.5	13.3	4.7	10.3	5.7	9.9	8.2	14.7	2.8	8.8
Retirees, women of independent means and others	12.0	4.6	6.3	9.9	1.9	4.2	1.2	2.1	2.0	3.6	0.6	2.0
<u>Total inactive population</u>	<u>164.4</u>	<u>64.6</u>	<u>53.5</u>	<u>83.9</u>	<u>28.0</u>	<u>61.4</u>	<u>36.7</u>	<u>63.9</u>	<u>32.2</u>	<u>57.7</u>	<u>14.0</u>	<u>44.2</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>254.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>63.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>45.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>57.4</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>55.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>31.7</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>15-19 years</u>												
Employed	7.1	19.0	0.8	9.1	1.5	19.0	2.6	28.9	1.8	20.0	0.4	15.4
Unemployed	0.8	2.2	-	-	0.5	6.3	0.2	2.2	-	-	0.1	3.8
Seeking work for first time	1.2	3.2	0.2	2.3	0.4	5.1	0.3	3.3	0.3	3.3	-	-
<u>Total active population</u>	<u>9.1</u>	<u>24.4</u>	<u>1.0</u>	<u>11.4</u>	<u>2.4</u>	<u>30.4</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>34.4</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>23.3</u>	<u>0.5</u>	<u>19.2</u>
Housewives	6.6	17.7	1.8	20.5	1.9	24.0	1.9	21.2	0.8	8.9	0.2	7.7
Students	20.6	55.2	5.8	65.9	3.0	38.0	4.0	44.4	5.9	65.6	1.9	73.1
Retirees, women of independent means and others	1.0	2.7	0.2	2.2	0.6	7.6	-	-	0.2	2.2	-	-
<u>Total inactive population</u>	<u>28.2</u>	<u>75.6</u>	<u>7.8</u>	<u>88.6</u>	<u>5.5</u>	<u>69.6</u>	<u>5.9</u>	<u>65.6</u>	<u>6.9</u>	<u>76.7</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>80.8</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>37.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>8.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>7.9</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>9.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>9.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Table 2 (cont.)

	Per capita family income bracket											
	Total		Income undeclared		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%
20-24 years												
Employed	15.0	39.4	0.8	12.7	2.1	27.6	4.1	39.4	5.1	55.4	2.9	63.0
Unemployed	2.4	6.3	0.2	3.2	1.3	17.1	0.6	5.8	0.3	3.3	.	.
Seeking work for first time	0.3	0.9	0.1	1.6	0.2	2.2	.	.
<u>Total active</u> <u>population</u>	<u>17.7</u>	<u>46.6</u>	<u>1.1</u>	<u>17.5</u>	<u>3.4</u>	<u>44.7</u>	<u>4.7</u>	<u>45.2</u>	<u>5.6</u>	<u>60.9</u>	<u>2.9</u>	<u>63.0</u>
Housewives	12.3	32.3	2.7	42.9	2.8	36.8	4.1	39.4	1.7	18.5	1.0	21.7
Students	7.7	20.2	2.2	34.9	1.4	18.5	1.5	14.4	1.9	20.6	0.7	15.3
Retirees, women of independent means and others	0.4	0.9	0.3	4.7	.	.	0.1	1.0
<u>Total inactive</u> <u>population</u>	<u>20.4</u>	<u>53.4</u>	<u>5.2</u>	<u>82.5</u>	<u>4.2</u>	<u>55.3</u>	<u>5.7</u>	<u>54.8</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>39.1</u>	<u>1.7</u>	<u>37.0</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>38.1</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>6.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>7.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>10.4</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>9.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>4.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>
25-34 years												
Employed	27.4	47.2	3.2	28.3	4.5	39.8	6.0	42.6	7.3	54.5	6.4	80.0
Unemployed	2.0	3.4	0.6	5.3	0.8	7.1	0.2	1.4	0.3	2.2	0.1	1.2
Seeking work for first time	0.2	0.3	.	.	0.1	0.9	0.1	0.7
<u>Total active</u> <u>population</u>	<u>29.6</u>	<u>50.9</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>33.6</u>	<u>5.4</u>	<u>47.8</u>	<u>6.3</u>	<u>44.7</u>	<u>7.6</u>	<u>56.7</u>	<u>6.5</u>	<u>81.2</u>
Housewives	26.7	46.0	6.9	61.1	5.5	48.7	7.6	53.9	5.4	40.3	1.3	16.3
Students	1.4	2.4	0.5	4.4	0.2	1.8	0.1	0.7	0.4	3.0	0.2	2.5
Retirees, women of independent means and others	0.4	0.7	0.1	0.9	0.2	1.7	0.1	0.7
<u>Total inactive</u> <u>population</u>	<u>28.5</u>	<u>49.1</u>	<u>7.5</u>	<u>66.4</u>	<u>5.9</u>	<u>52.2</u>	<u>7.8</u>	<u>55.3</u>	<u>5.8</u>	<u>43.3</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>18.8</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>58.1</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>11.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>11.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>14.1</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>13.4</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>8.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Table 2 (cont.)

	Per capita family income bracket											
	Total		Income undeclared		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%
<u>35-44 years</u>												
Employed	44.4	45.4	1.9	24.7	3.0	42.3	4.1	39.8	5.3	51.0	5.1	70.8
Unemployed	0.4	1.0	-	-	0.1	1.4	0.3	2.9	-	-	-	-
Seeking work for first time	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Total active</u>												
<u>population</u>	<u>19.8</u>	<u>46.4</u>	<u>1.9</u>	<u>24.7</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>43.7</u>	<u>4.4</u>	<u>42.7</u>	<u>5.3</u>	<u>51.0</u>	<u>5.1</u>	<u>70.8</u>
Housewives	22.3	52.2	5.6	72.7	3.8	53.5	5.7	55.3	5.1	49.0	2.1	29.2
Students	0.1	0.2	-	-	0.1	1.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retirees, women of independent means and others	0.5	1.2	0.2	2.6	0.1	1.4	0.2	2.0	-	-	-	-
<u>Total inactive</u>												
<u>population</u>	<u>22.9</u>	<u>53.6</u>	<u>5.8</u>	<u>75.3</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>56.3</u>	<u>5.9</u>	<u>57.3</u>	<u>5.1</u>	<u>49.0</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>29.2</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>42.7</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>7.7</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>7.1</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>10.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>10.4</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>7.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>45 years and over</u>												
Employed	44.0	17.0	2.1	7.3	3.2	27.8	2.1	15.8	3.0	21.7	2.6	28.3
Unemployed	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.4	-	-	0.1	0.7	-	-	-	-
Seeking work for first time	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Total active</u>												
<u>population</u>	<u>13.2</u>	<u>17.3</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>7.7</u>	<u>3.2</u>	<u>27.8</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>16.5</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>21.7</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>28.3</u>
Housewives	53.8	70.3	21.3	74.2	7.3	63.5	10.2	76.7	9.0	65.2	6.0	65.2
Students	0.1	0.1	-	-	-	-	0.1	0.8	-	-	-	-
Retirees, women of independent means and others	9.4	12.3	5.2	18.1	1.0	8.7	0.8	6.0	1.8	13.1	0.6	6.5
<u>Total inactive</u>												
<u>population</u>	<u>63.3</u>	<u>82.7</u>	<u>26.5</u>	<u>92.3</u>	<u>8.3</u>	<u>72.2</u>	<u>11.1</u>	<u>83.5</u>	<u>10.8</u>	<u>78.3</u>	<u>6.6</u>	<u>71.7</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>76.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>28.7</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>11.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>13.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>13.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>9.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Table 2 (concl.)

	Per capita family income bracket											
	Total		Income undeclared		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%
<u>Age unknown</u>												
Employed	0.5	31.2	0.3	30.0	0.1	50.0	-	-	-	-	0.1	100.0
Unemployed	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Seeking work for first time	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Total active</u> <u>population</u>	<u>0.5</u>	<u>31.2</u>	<u>0.3</u>	<u>30.0</u>	<u>0.1</u>	<u>50.0</u>	-	-	-	-	<u>0.1</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Housewives	0.8	50.0	0.4	40.0	0.1	50.0	0.3	100.0	-	-	-	-
Students	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retirees, women of independent means and others	0.3	18.8	0.3	30.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Total inactive</u> <u>population</u>	<u>1.1</u>	<u>68.8</u>	<u>0.7</u>	<u>70.0</u>	<u>0.1</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>0.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>	-	-	-	-
<u>Total</u>	<u>1.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>0.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>0.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>	-	-	<u>0.1</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Table 3

SAN JOSE: POPULATION 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY SEX, MARITAL STATUS, AGE GROUP AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985

Note: The marital status variable was not included in this survey (see the index to this statistical annex).

Table 4

SAN JOSE: WOMEN 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION, AGE GROUP AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985

	Years of education									
	Total		No education	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	13-16	17 or more	Unknown
	thousands	%								
Total female population										
15 years and over	254.3	100.0	7.8	23.2	78.2	44.4	60.4	27.0	11.1	2.2
20% lowest income group	45.2	17.8	2.1	7.3	17.4	9.5	5.9	2.3	0.2	0.5
30% next income group	57.1	22.5	1.3	5.5	21.1	12.9	12.1	3.3	0.5	0.4
30% next income group	56.1	22.0	1.5	3.7	15.3	9.8	15.4	7.3	3.1	
20% highest income group	31.5	12.4	0.3	1.3	4.8	3.1	10.5	6.6	4.6	0.3
Income undeclared	64.4	25.3	2.6	5.4	19.6	9.1	16.5	7.5	2.7	1.0
Total 15-19 years	37.3	100.0	0.5	1.4	7.8	13.7	11.3	2.5	-	0.1
20% lowest income group	8.0	21.4	0.2	0.4	2.7	3.1	1.2	0.3	-	0.1
30% next income group	8.9	23.9	0.2	0.4	2.7	3.2	2.0	0.4	-	-
30% next income group	9.0	24.1	-	0.4	1.0	3.5	3.6	0.5	-	-
20% highest income group	2.6	7.0	-	0.1	0.1	0.7	1.3	0.4	-	-
Income undeclared	8.8	23.6	0.1	0.1	1.3	3.2	3.2	0.9	-	-
Total 20-24 years	38.1	100.0	0.5	0.4	6.0	7.7	14.6	7.7	1.2	-
20% lowest income group	7.5	19.7	0.1	0.1	2.5	2.1	1.7	1.0	-	-
30% next income group	10.4	27.3	-	0.1	1.7	3.4	3.9	1.3	-	-
30% next income group	9.2	24.1	0.2	-	0.9	1.0	4.3	2.4	0.4	-
20% highest income group	4.5	11.8	-	0.1	0.2	0.4	2.2	1.3	0.3	-
Income undeclared	6.5	17.1	0.2	0.1	0.7	0.8	2.5	1.7	0.5	-
Total 25-34 years	58.1	100.0	1.1	2.8	14.8	10.6	14.3	8.2	5.8	0.5
20% lowest income group	11.2	19.3	0.4	1.1	4.5	2.4	1.9	0.6	0.2	0.1
30% next income group	14.0	24.1	-	0.7	4.1	3.7	3.8	1.2	0.4	0.1
30% next income group	13.5	23.2	0.5	0.4	2.9	2.5	3.6	2.0	1.6	-
20% highest income group	8.0	13.8	-	0.1	0.2	0.5	2.1	2.4	2.5	0.2
Income undeclared	11.4	19.6	0.2	0.5	3.1	1.5	2.9	2.0	1.1	0.1

Table 4 (concl.)

	Years of Education									
	Total		No education	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	13-16	17 or more	Unknown
	thousands	%								
<u>Total 35-44 years</u>	<u>42.7</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1.0</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>15.4</u>	<u>6.6</u>	<u>9.2</u>	<u>4.4</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>0.1</u>
20% lowest income group	7.0	16.4	0.3	1.3	3.3	1.2	0.7	0.2	-	-
30% next income group	10.2	23.9	0.2	1.2	4.8	2.0	1.7	0.2	0.1	-
30% next income group	10.5	24.6	0.3	0.5	3.8	1.8	1.9	1.7	0.5	-
20% highest income group	7.2	16.9	0.1	0.3	0.7	0.5	2.8	1.5	1.3	-
Income undeclared	7.8	18.2	0.1	0.5	2.8	1.1	2.1	0.8	0.3	0.1
<u>45 years and over</u>	<u>76.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>4.7</u>	<u>14.8</u>	<u>34.0</u>	<u>5.7</u>	<u>10.7</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>1.7</u>	<u>1.1</u>
20% lowest income group	11.4	14.9	1.1	4.4	4.4	0.7	0.4	0.1	-	0.3
30% next income group	13.3	17.4	0.9	3.1	7.8	0.6	0.6	0.2	-	0.1
30% next income group	13.8	18.0	0.5	2.4	6.7	1.0	2.0	0.7	0.5	-
20% highest income group	9.2	12.0	0.2	0.7	3.6	1.0	2.1	1.0	0.5	0.1
Income undeclared	28.8	37.7	2.0	4.2	11.5	2.4	5.6	1.8	0.7	0.6
<u>Total age unknown</u>	<u>1.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>			<u>0.2</u>	<u>0.1</u>	<u>0.3</u>	<u>0.4</u>	<u>0.2</u>	<u>0.4</u>
20% lowest income group	0.1	6.2	-	-	-	-	-	0.1	-	-
30% next income group	0.3	18.8	-	-	-	-	0.1	-	-	0.2
30% next income group	0.1	6.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.1	-
20% highest income group	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Income undeclared	1.1	68.8	-	-	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.2

Table 5

SAN JOSE: WOMEN 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY POSITION IN HOUSEHOLD, CATEGORY OF EMPLOYMENT AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985

	Per capita family income bracket											
	Total		Income undeclared		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%
Total	82.5	100.0	9.2	100.0	14.2	100.0	18.9	100.0	22.8	100.0	17.4	100.0
Heads of establishment	0.7	0.8	0.1	1.1	-	-	0.4	2.1	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.6
Wage-earners	71.0	86.1	7.0	76.1	11.4	80.3	15.8	83.6	20.9	91.7	15.9	91.4
Working on own account	9.1	11.0	1.4	15.2	2.5	17.6	2.3	12.2	1.5	6.6	1.4	8.0
Unpaid family members	1.7	2.1	0.7	7.6	0.3	2.1	0.4	2.1	0.3	1.3	-	-
Total heads of household	21.6	100.0	2.3	100.0	4.5	100.0	5.4	100.0	5.9	100.0	3.5	100.0
Heads of establishment	0.4	1.9	-	-	-	-	0.4	7.4	-	-	-	-
Wage-earners	17.4	80.6	1.5	65.2	3.3	73.3	4.3	79.6	5.3	89.8	3.0	85.7
Working on own account	3.7	17.1	0.7	30.4	1.2	26.7	0.7	13.0	0.6	10.2	0.5	14.3
Unpaid family members	0.1	0.4	0.1	4.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total non-heads of household	60.9	100.0	6.9	100.0	9.7	100.0	13.5	100.0	16.9	100.0	13.9	100.0
Heads of establishment	0.3	0.5	0.1	1.5	-	-	-	-	0.1	0.6	0.1	0.7
Wage-earners	53.6	88.0	5.5	79.7	8.1	83.5	11.5	85.2	15.6	92.3	12.9	92.8
Working on own account	5.4	8.9	0.7	10.1	1.3	13.4	1.6	11.9	0.9	5.3	0.9	6.5
Unpaid family members	1.6	2.6	0.6	8.7	0.3	3.1	0.4	2.9	0.3	1.8	-	-

Table 6

SAN JOSE: EMPLOYED WOMEN 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985

	Per capita family income bracket											
	Total		Income undeclared		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%
Professionals	6.4	7.8	0.7	7.6	0.1	0.7	0.4	2.1	1.6	7.0	3.6	20.8
Technicians and related occupations	8.6	10.4	1.2	13.0	0.4	2.8	1.2	6.4	2.7	11.9	3.1	17.9
Directors and managers	1.1	1.3	0.2	2.2	-	-	0.2	1.1	0.3	1.3	0.4	2.3
Office workers	15.9	19.3	2.2	23.9	1.1	7.6	2.5	13.3	5.7	25.1	4.4	25.4
Trade employees	14.2	17.2	1.7	18.5	3.5	24.3	3.4	18.1	3.8	16.8	1.8	10.4
Working on own account in trade	5.1	6.2	1.0	10.9	1.1	7.6	0.9	4.8	1.2	5.3	0.9	5.2
Industrial craftswomen	4.3	5.2	0.7	7.6	1.1	7.6	1.8	9.6	0.3	1.3	0.4	2.3
Semi-skilled and skilled labourers	5.1	6.2	0.3	3.3	0.8	5.6	1.9	10.1	1.1	4.9	1.0	5.8
Unskilled labourers	6.8	8.2	0.6	6.5	1.7	11.8	2.2	11.7	1.7	7.5	0.6	3.5
Domestic workers	13.2	16.0	0.5	5.4	4.4	30.6	3.9	20.7	3.8	16.7	0.6	3.5
Other service workers	1.5	1.8	0.1	1.1	0.1	0.7	0.3	1.6	0.5	2.2	0.5	2.9
Unspecified	0.2	0.2	-	-	0.1	0.7	0.1	0.5	-	-	-	-
Total	82.4	100.0	9.2	100.0	14.4	100.0	18.8	100.0	22.7	100.0	17.3	100.0

Table 7

SAN JOSE: EMPLOYED FEMALE HEADS OF HOUSEHOLD 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY OCCUPATION GROUP AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985

	Per capita family income bracket											
	Total		Income undeclared		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%
Professionals	1.0	4.6	0.1	4.4	-	-	-	-	0.2	3.3	0.7	20.7
Technicians and related occupations	1.9	8.8	0.3	13.0	0.1	6.8	0.4	7.3	0.5	8.3	0.6	17.6
Directors and managers	0.4	1.9	0.1	4.4	-	-	-	-	0.1	1.8	0.2	5.9
Office workers	1.8	8.3	0.4	17.4	0.2	4.5	0.3	5.5	0.6	10.0	0.3	8.8
Trade employees	3.3	15.3	0.5	21.7	0.7	15.9	0.9	16.4	0.7	11.7	0.5	14.7
Working on own account in trade	2.4	11.1	0.3	13.0	0.8	18.2	0.5	9.1	0.4	6.7	0.4	11.8
Industrial craftswomen	1.2	5.6	0.2	8.7	0.4	9.1	0.6	10.9	-	-	-	-
Semi-skilled and skilled labourers	0.6	2.8	-	-	0.1	6.8	0.1	1.7	0.2	3.3	0.2	5.9
Unskilled labourers	1.5	6.9	0.2	8.7	0.4	9.1	0.3	5.5	0.5	8.3	0.1	2.9
Domestic workers	6.7	31.0	0.2	8.7	1.7	38.6	2.2	40.0	2.3	38.3	0.3	8.8
Other service workers	0.8	3.7	-	-	-	-	0.2	3.6	0.5	8.3	0.1	2.9
Total	21.6	100.0	2.3	100.0	4.4	100.0	5.5	100.0	6.0	100.0	3.4	100.0

Table 8

SAN JOSE: POPULATION 15 YEARS AND OVER BY INCOME DECILE, SEX AND
POSITION IN HOUSEHOLD, 1985

Deciles	Total population			Heads of household		
	thousands	%	cum. %	thousands	%	cum. %
Income not declared	60.8	-	-	30.0	-	-
First decile	17.6	2.0	2.0	6.5	1.4	1.4
Second decile	14.0	3.2	5.2	6.8	2.5	3.9
Third decile	18.9	5.6	10.8	6.7	3.3	7.2
Fourth decile	20.4	7.1	17.9	9.1	5.2	12.4
Fifth decile	16.9	7.0	24.9	7.6	5.1	17.5
Sixth decile	14.6	6.8	31.7	8.3	6.3	23.8
Seventh decile	21.5	11.6	43.3	11.1	9.8	33.6
Eighth decile	18.0	11.8	55.1	11.1	11.8	45.4
Ninth decile	18.1	15.2	70.3	11.2	15.2	60.6
Tenth decile	18.0	29.7	100.0	14.3	39.4	100.0
<u>Total both sexes</u>	<u>238.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>		<u>122.7</u>	<u>100.0</u>	
Income not declared (men)	44.1	-	-	26.2	-	-
First decile	6.2	1.1	1.1	2.7	0.7	0.7
Second decile	6.4	2.1	3.2	3.4	1.5	2.2
Third decile	10.4	4.4	7.6	4.9	2.7	4.9
Fourth decile	13.4	6.7	14.3	7.2	4.7	9.6
Fifth decile	11.9	7.0	21.3	6.8	5.2	14.8
Sixth decile	10.8	7.1	28.4	7.4	6.4	21.2
Seventh decile	14.1	10.8	39.2	10.0	10.0	31.2
Eighth decile	12.2	11.4	50.6	9.5	11.6	42.8
Ninth decile	12.3	14.7	65.3	10.0	15.6	58.4
Tenth decile	14.5	34.7	100.0	13.0	41.6	100.0
<u>Total men</u>	<u>156.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>		<u>101.1</u>	<u>100.0</u>	
Income not declared (women)	16.7	-	-	3.8	-	-
First decile	11.4	4.4	4.4	3.8	6.1	6.1
Second decile	7.6	5.7	10.1	3.4	9.5	15.6
Third decile	8.5	8.6	18.7	1.8	7.0	22.6
Fourth decile	7.0	8.3	27.0	1.9	8.7	31.3
Fifth decile	5.0	7.0	34.0	0.8	4.2	35.5
Sixth decile	3.8	6.0	40.0	0.9	5.4	40.9
Seventh decile	7.4	13.4	53.4	1.1	8.2	49.1
Eighth decile	5.8	13.0	66.4	1.6	13.9	63.0
Ninth decile	5.8	16.5	82.9	1.2	12.8	75.8
Tenth decile	3.5	17.1	100.0	1.3	24.2	100.0
<u>Total women</u>	<u>82.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>		<u>21.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	

Table 9

SAN JOSE: INDEXES OF PERSONAL AVERAGE INCOMES OF EMPLOYED WOMEN 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS
AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKETS, 1985 ^{a/}

	Per capita family income bracket											
	Total		Income undeclared		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index
Professionals	6.4	176	0.7	-	0.1	48	0.4	112	1.6	194	3.6	213
Technicians and related occupations	8.7	126	1.2	-	0.4	17	1.2	94	2.7	144	3.2	184
Directors and managers	1.0	124	0.2	-	-	-	0.2	133	0.3	136	0.3	198
Working on own account in trade	5.1	79	1.0	-	1.1	28	0.9	19	1.2	77	0.9	300
Industrial employees	15.8	103	2.1	-	1.1	47	2.5	86	5.7	110	4.4	165
Trade employees	14.2	70	1.8	-	3.4	44	3.4	76	3.8	85	1.8	143
Service employees	1.5	51	0.1	-	0.1	19	0.3	46	0.5	53	0.5	66
Semi-skilled and skilled labourers	5.1	74	0.3	-	0.8	51	1.9	74	1.1	76	1.0	109
Unskilled labourers	6.8	63	0.6	-	1.7	49	2.2	61	1.7	81	0.6	128
Industrial craftswomen and operators	4.3	47	0.6	-	1.2	34	1.8	51	0.3	70	0.4	130
Domestic workers	13.3	46	0.6	-	4.4	27	3.9	40	3.8	71	0.6	119
Unspecified	0.2	39	-	-	-	-	0.1	81	-	-	0.1	-
Total	82.4	86	9.2	-	14.3	37	18.8	65	22.7	102	17.4	173

^{a/} The average primary income of the total employed population was taken as the base (=100).

Table 10

SAN JOSE: INDEXES OF PERSONAL AVERAGE INCOMES OF EMPLOYED MEN 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS
AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKETS, 1985 g/

	Per capita family income bracket											
	Total		Income undeclared		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index
Professionals	9.3	200	2.4	-	0.1	50	1.0	157	2.3	223	3.5	335
Technicians and related occupations	11.8	167	1.9	-	0.8	85	1.5	103	3.5	160	4.1	290
Directors and managers	4.9	234	1.3	-	0.3	58	0.3	95	1.1	220	1.9	454
Working on own account in trade	17.3	116	4.9	-	2.3	51	2.9	97	3.8	121	3.4	335
Industrial employees	21.3	102	3.7	-	2.1	52	5.6	108	6.7	129	3.2	188
Trade employees	21.8	93	3.5	-	4.3	52	6.5	87	5.0	115	2.5	266
Service employees	3.4	99	0.4	-	0.4	2	1.0	96	0.8	156	0.8	149
Semi-skilled and skilled labourers	20.1	82	3.5	-	3.4	52	4.9	104	6.1	111	2.2	125
Unskilled labourers	24.7	76	2.7	-	6.7	51	7.6	87	6.3	106	1.4	150
Industrial craftsmen and operators	14.4	86	2.6	-	3.2	32	3.7	79	3.4	140	1.5	235
Domestic workers	5.8	80	0.6	-	1.2	44	2.1	88	1.2	86	0.7	189
Unspecified	1.6	51	0.8	-	0.1	74	0.2	49	0.4	145	0.1	86
Total	156.4	107	28.3	-	24.9	49	37.3	95	40.6	131	25.3	266

g/ The average primary income of the total employed population of both sexes 15 years and over was taken as the base (=100).

Table 11

SAN JOSE: INDEXES OF PERSONAL AVERAGE INCOMES OF EMPLOYED WOMEN 15 YEARS AND OVER,
BY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL, AGE GROUP AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985 a/ b/

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index
Total	65.8	81	10.4	38	17.1	54	21.7	80	16.6	119
No education	1.4	72	0.3	39	0.2	21	0.8	67	0.1	209
1-6 years	21.8	49	5.8	32	8.3	45	6.2	57	1.5	99
7-12 years	25.9	77	3.4	45	7.1	59	9.1	79	6.3	113
13 years or more	16.5	129	0.8	49	1.5	77	5.6	110	8.6	158
No declaration made	0.2	34	0.1	35	-	-	-	-	0.1	65
Total 15-24 years	18.6	55	2.5	30	6.2	45	6.7	58	3.2	88
No education	0.3	31	-	-	0.1	23	0.2	35	-	-
1-6 years	4.8	36	1.2	30	2.2	33	1.2	44	0.2	56
7-12 years	11.0	60	1.1	31	3.5	53	4.3	63	2.1	80
13 years or more	2.4	75	0.1	6	0.4	41	1.0	66	0.9	105
No declaration made	0.1	36	0.1	35	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total 25-44 years	37.7	93	5.8	45	8.9	62	12.1	93	10.9	146
No education	0.7	108	0.1	42	0.1	20	0.4	108	0.1	209
1-6 years	11.3	55	2.9	37	4.4	52	3.4	61	0.6	126
7-12 years	13.1	90	2.1	52	3.3	66	4.1	95	3.6	127
13 years or more	12.6	132	0.7	57	1.1	95	4.2	118	6.6	153
No declaration made	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total 45 years and over	9.4	80	2.1	28	2.0	46	2.8	78	2.5	156
No education	0.4	33	0.2	39	-	-	0.2	27	-	-
1-6 years	5.7	48	1.7	26	1.7	45	1.6	58	0.7	86
7-12 years	1.8	95	0.2	41	0.3	55	0.7	90	0.6	134
13 years or more	1.4	203	-	-	-	-	0.3	147	1.1	220
No declaration made	0.1	65	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.1	65

a/ Women for whom no declaration was made are not included in the total.

b/ The base taken for the index (=100) was the average primary income for the whole employed population of both sexes in the age group 15 years and over.

Table 12

SAN JOSE: INDEXES OF PERSONAL AVERAGE INCOMES OF EMPLOYED MEN 15 YEARS AND OVER,
BY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL, AGE GROUP AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985 a/ b/

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index
Total	112.3	112	17.4	53	32.5	82	37.9	105	24.5	206
No education	2.4	63	1.2	43	0.7	76	0.3	104	0.2	76
1-6 years	41.8	80	9.9	51	14.4	74	13.2	90	4.3	136
7-12 years	45.6	105	5.3	54	13.9	85	17.0	101	9.4	170
13 years or more	21.9	194	0.9	74	3.3	102	7.3	141	10.4	271
No declaration made	0.6	112	0.1	64	0.2	81	0.1	130	0.2	159
Total 15-24 years	27.2	72	4.9	46	6.8	65	11.0	76	4.5	104
No education	0.1	38	0.1	38	-	-	-	-	-	-
1-6 years	7.7	59	2.4	42	2.4	57	2.5	76	0.4	75
7-12 years	17.3	75	2.4	48	4.2	69	7.3	73	3.4	106
13 years or more	2.1	101	-	-	0.2	75	1.2	95	0.7	118
No declaration made	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total 25-44 years	57.0	124	9.4	56	18.5	88	17.0	119	12.1	230
No education	1.3	60	0.7	38	0.3	62	0.2	130	0.1	65
1-6 years	18.4	79	5.1	54	7.4	80	5.2	92	0.7	149
7-12 years	22.0	121	2.8	59	8.2	91	6.9	120	4.1	225
13 years or more	15.0	189	0.8	71	2.5	94	4.6	149	7.1	263
No declaration made	0.3	99	-	-	0.1	121	0.1	88	0.1	93
Total 45 years and over	28.1	127	3.1	54	7.2	81	9.9	113	7.9	214
No education	1.0	69	0.4	50	0.4	82	0.1	65	0.1	93
1-6 years	15.7	91	2.4	53	4.6	71	5.5	95	3.2	144
7-12 years	6.3	131	0.1	24	1.5	91	2.8	131	1.9	170
13 years and more	4.8	247	0.1	84	0.6	150	1.5	150	2.6	330
No declaration made	0.3	112	0.1	43	0.1	48	-	-	0.1	282

a/ Workers for whom no declaration was made are not included in the total.

b/ The base taken for the index (=100) was the average primary income for the whole employed population of both sexes in the age group 15 years and over.

Table 13

SAN JOSE: ACTIVITY RATES AND RATES OF UNEMPLOYMENT FOR WOMEN 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY AGE GROUP
AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985 ^{a/}

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total	Income undeclared	Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
			thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%
<u>15 years and over</u>										
Activity rate	35.4	16.1		38.6		36.1		42.3		55.8
Rate of unemployment	8.3	1.3		18.2		8.7		4.7		3.7
<u>15-19 years</u>										
Activity rate	24.4	11.4		30.4		34.4		23.3		19.2
Rate of unemployment	21.9	2.2		37.5		16.1		14.3		20.0
<u>20-24 years</u>										
Activity rate	46.5	17.5		44.5		45.2		60.9		63.0
Rate of unemployment	15.3	1.7		38.2		12.8		8.9		0.0
<u>25-34 years</u>										
Activity rate	50.9	33.6		47.8		44.7		56.7		81.3
Rate of unemployment	7.4	2.0		16.7		4.8		3.9		1.5
<u>35-44 years</u>										
Activity rate	46.4	24.7		43.7		42.7		51.0		70.9
Rate of unemployment	0.4	-		0.1		0.3		0.0		0.0
<u>45 years and over</u>										
Activity rate	17.3	7.7		27.8		16.5		21.7		28.3
Rate of unemployment	0.2	0.8		0.0		0.1		0.0		0.0

^{a/} Activity rate: women 15 years and over in the active population as a coefficient of the total female population 15 years and over.

Rate of unemployment: women 15 years and over who are unemployed or seeking employment for the first time as a coefficient of the total number of women 15 years and over in the active population.

Table 1

SAO PAULO: NUMBER OF PEOPLE 15 YEARS OLD AND OLDER, BY SEX, POSITION IN HOUSEHOLD AND STRATUM AS DETERMINED BY PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1965

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%
<u>Both sexes</u>										
Heads of household	4 350.2	42.8	899.4	45.4	1 273.3	41.7	1 308.6	41.6	868.9	44.3
Spouses	2 662.3	26.2	547.9	27.6	803.0	26.3	803.0	25.5	506.7	25.8
Children	2 362.6	23.3	419.5	21.2	751.8	24.6	794.1	25.2	397.7	20.3
Others	707.1	7.0	115.4	5.8	226.5	7.3	231.3	7.3	133.9	6.8
Domestic employees	70.5	0.7	0.4	0.0	2.8	0.1	11.6	0.4	55.7	2.8
<u>Total both sexes</u>	<u>10 152.7</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1 982.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>3 056.9</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>3 150.3</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1 962.9</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>Women</u>										
Heads of household	697.2	14.7	184.4	19.0	194.8	13.8	179.6	12.5	138.4	14.7
Spouses	2 646.8	55.6	546.4	56.2	798.0	56.7	799.2	55.9	503.2	53.3
Children	953.6	20.0	180.0	18.5	290.8	20.6	317.6	22.2	165.2	17.5
Others	387.6	8.2	60.4	6.2	122.0	8.7	122.8	8.6	82.4	8.7
Domestic employees	70.0	1.5	0.4	0.1	2.8	0.2	11.6	0.8	55.2	5.8
<u>Total women</u>	<u>4 755.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>971.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1 408.4</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1 430.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>944.4</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>Men</u>										
Heads of household	3 653.0	67.7	715.0	70.7	1 078.5	65.4	1 129.0	65.7	730.5	71.8
Spouses	15.5	0.3	1.5	0.2	5.0	0.3	5.5	0.3	3.5	0.4
Children	1 409.0	26.1	239.5	23.7	460.5	28.0	476.5	27.7	232.5	22.8
Others	319.5	5.9	55.0	5.4	104.5	6.3	108.5	6.3	51.5	5.0
Domestic employees	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0
<u>Total men</u>	<u>5 397.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1 011.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1 648.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1 719.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1 018.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Table 2

SAO PAULO: WOMEN 15 YEARS OLD AND OLDER, BY TYPE OF ACTIVITY AND STRATUM ACCORDING TO PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%
<u>Total (15 years and over)</u>										
Employed	2 019.6	42.5	337.2	34.7	560.8	39.8	646.8	45.2	474.8	50.3
Seeking work for first time and unemployed	119.2	2.5	40.0	4.1	40.8	2.9	22.0	1.5	16.4	1.7
<u>Total active female population</u>	<u>2 138.8</u>	<u>45.0</u>	<u>377.2</u>	<u>38.8</u>	<u>601.6</u>	<u>42.7</u>	<u>668.8</u>	<u>46.7</u>	<u>491.2</u>	<u>52.0</u>
Students	249.6	5.2	39.6	4.1	72.0	5.1	80.4	5.6	57.6	6.1
Housewives	2 181.2	45.9	516.4	53.2	681.6	48.4	627.2	43.9	356.0	37.7
Women of independent means and retirees	185.6	3.9	38.4	3.9	53.2	3.8	54.4	3.8	39.6	4.2
<u>Total inactive female population</u>	<u>2 616.4</u>	<u>55.0</u>	<u>594.4</u>	<u>61.2</u>	<u>806.8</u>	<u>57.3</u>	<u>762.0</u>	<u>53.3</u>	<u>453.2</u>	<u>48.0</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>4 755.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>976.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1 408.4</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1 430.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>944.4</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>15-19 years</u>										
Employed	278.4	44.5	65.6	41.3	101.6	45.9	78.4	47.2	32.8	41.4
Seeking work for first time and unemployed	46.0	7.4	18.0	11.3	15.6	7.1	8.0	4.8	4.4	5.6
<u>Total active female population in age group</u>	<u>324.4</u>	<u>51.9</u>	<u>83.6</u>	<u>52.6</u>	<u>117.2</u>	<u>53.0</u>	<u>86.4</u>	<u>52.0</u>	<u>37.2</u>	<u>47.0</u>
Students	195.2	31.2	34.0	21.4	61.6	27.9	62.8	37.7	36.8	46.4
Housewives	98.4	15.7	38.0	24.0	39.2	17.8	16.0	9.6	5.2	6.6
Others	7.2	1.2	3.2	2.0	2.8	1.3	1.2	0.7	0.0	0.0
<u>Total inactive female population in age group</u>	<u>300.8</u>	<u>48.1</u>	<u>75.2</u>	<u>47.4</u>	<u>103.6</u>	<u>47.0</u>	<u>80.0</u>	<u>48.0</u>	<u>42.0</u>	<u>53.0</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>625.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>158.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>220.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>166.4</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>79.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>20-24 years</u>										
Employed	391.6	57.1	46.4	38.3	112.8	53.0	150.8	68.8	81.6	61.7
Seeking work for first time and unemployed	30.4	4.4	9.2	7.6	13.2	6.2	3.6	1.6	4.4	3.3
<u>Total active female population in age group</u>	<u>422.0</u>	<u>61.5</u>	<u>55.6</u>	<u>45.9</u>	<u>126.0</u>	<u>59.2</u>	<u>154.4</u>	<u>70.4</u>	<u>86.0</u>	<u>65.0</u>
Students	44.4	5.3	1.2	1.0	6.0	2.8	11.2	5.1	18.0	13.6
Housewives	223.6	32.7	64.0	52.8	80.0	37.6	52.8	24.1	26.8	20.2
Others	3.6	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.8	0.4	0.8	0.4	1.6	1.2
<u>Total inactive female population in age group</u>	<u>263.6</u>	<u>38.5</u>	<u>65.6</u>	<u>54.1</u>	<u>86.8</u>	<u>40.8</u>	<u>64.8</u>	<u>29.6</u>	<u>46.4</u>	<u>35.0</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>685.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>121.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>212.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>219.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>132.4</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Table 2 (concl.)

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%
<u>Total 25-34 years</u>										
Employed	648.8	50.9	109.6	37.6	166.0	45.8	198.0	53.3	175.2	69.2
Seeking work for first time and unemployed	27.2	2.1	5.6	1.9	8.4	2.3	8.0	2.2	5.2	2.1
<u>Total active female population in age group</u>	<u>676.0</u>	<u>53.0</u>	<u>115.2</u>	<u>39.5</u>	<u>174.4</u>	<u>48.1</u>	<u>206.0</u>	<u>56.1</u>	<u>180.4</u>	<u>71.3</u>
Students	41.6	0.9	2.4	0.8	2.4	0.7	4.8	1.3	2.0	0.8
Housewives	580.0	45.5	170.4	58.5	184.4	50.8	154.8	42.1	70.4	27.7
Women of independent means, retirees and others	7.6	0.6	3.6	1.2	1.6	0.4	2.0	0.5	0.4	0.2
<u>Total inactive female population in age group</u>	<u>599.2</u>	<u>47.0</u>	<u>176.4</u>	<u>60.5</u>	<u>188.4</u>	<u>51.9</u>	<u>161.6</u>	<u>43.9</u>	<u>72.8</u>	<u>28.7</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>1 275.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>291.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>362.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>367.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>253.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>Total 35-44 years</u>										
Employed	394.4	47.1	75.2	41.2	102.4	41.4	114.0	47.8	102.8	60.8
Seeking work for first time and unemployed	12.0	1.4	5.2	2.9	2.4	1.0	2.4	1.0	2.0	1.2
<u>Total active female population in age group</u>	<u>406.4</u>	<u>48.5</u>	<u>80.4</u>	<u>44.1</u>	<u>104.8</u>	<u>42.4</u>	<u>116.4</u>	<u>48.8</u>	<u>104.8</u>	<u>62.0</u>
Students	4.8	0.6	1.6	0.9	1.2	0.5	1.2	0.5	0.8	0.5
Housewives	416.8	49.8	97.2	53.2	138.4	56.0	118.8	49.9	62.4	36.8
Women of independent means, retirees and others	9.2	1.1	3.2	1.8	2.8	1.1	2.0	0.8	1.2	0.7
<u>Total inactive female population in age group</u>	<u>430.8</u>	<u>51.5</u>	<u>102.0</u>	<u>55.9</u>	<u>142.4</u>	<u>57.6</u>	<u>122.0</u>	<u>51.2</u>	<u>64.4</u>	<u>38.0</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>837.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>182.4</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>247.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>238.4</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>169.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>Total 45 years and over</u>										
Employed	305.6	23.0	40.4	18.6	78.0	21.4	105.6	24.0	81.6	26.4
Seeking work for first time and unemployed	3.6	0.3	2.0	0.9	1.2	0.3	-	-	0.4	0.1
<u>Total active female population in age group</u>	<u>309.2</u>	<u>23.3</u>	<u>42.4</u>	<u>19.5</u>	<u>79.2</u>	<u>21.7</u>	<u>105.6</u>	<u>24.0</u>	<u>82.0</u>	<u>26.5</u>
Students	1.6	0.1	0.4	0.2	0.8	0.2	0.4	0.1	0.0	0.0
Housewives	862.4	64.8	146.8	67.4	239.6	65.7	284.8	64.9	191.2	61.7
Women of independent means, retirees and others	158.0	11.8	28.0	12.9	45.2	12.4	48.4	11.0	36.4	11.8
<u>Total inactive female population in age group</u>	<u>122.0</u>	<u>76.7</u>	<u>175.2</u>	<u>80.5</u>	<u>285.6</u>	<u>78.3</u>	<u>333.6</u>	<u>76.0</u>	<u>227.6</u>	<u>73.5</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>1 331.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>217.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>364.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>439.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>309.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Table 3

SAO PAULO: POPULATION OF 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY SEX, MARITAL STATUS, AGE GROUP AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985

Note: The marital status variable was not included in this survey (see the index to this statistical annex).

Table 4

SAO PAULO: WOMEN 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION, AGE GROUP AND
PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985

	Total		Years of education					Unknown
	thousands	%	No educ.	1-4	5-8	9-11	12 or more	
<u>Total female population</u>								
<u>15 years and over</u>	<u>4 755.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>13.2</u>	<u>40.2</u>	<u>23.6</u>	<u>14.9</u>	<u>8.0</u>	<u>0.1</u>
20% lowest income group	971.6	100.0	25.5	49.0	22.1	3.0	0.3	0.1
30% next income group	1 408.4	100.0	15.1	47.3	26.8	9.5	1.3	0.0
30% next income group	1 430.8	100.0	8.5	37.9	25.7	20.3	7.4	0.2
20% highest income group	944.4	100.0	4.9	24.5	16.9	26.7	27.0	0.0
<u>Total 15-19 years</u>	<u>625.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>3.1</u>	<u>22.5</u>	<u>52.9</u>	<u>20.2</u>	<u>1.3</u>	-
20% lowest income group	158.8	100.0	5.3	39.0	49.9	5.8	0.0	-
30% next income group	220.8	100.0	2.9	21.9	60.1	14.7	0.4	-
30% next income group	166.4	100.0	1.9	10.6	52.4	33.2	1.9	-
20% highest income group	79.2	100.0	2.0	16.2	38.8	37.4	5.6	-
<u>Total 20-24 years</u>	<u>685.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>3.9</u>	<u>24.4</u>	<u>33.4</u>	<u>26.1</u>	<u>12.0</u>	<u>0.2</u>
20% lowest income group	121.2	100.0	8.6	46.2	38.0	6.9	0.0	0.3
30% next income group	212.8	100.0	3.9	28.9	43.9	19.7	3.6	0.0
30% next income group	219.2	100.0	2.0	13.3	31.2	40.0	13.1	0.4
20% highest income group	132.4	100.0	2.4	15.7	16.0	31.2	34.7	0.0
<u>Total 25-34 years</u>	<u>1 275.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>7.0</u>	<u>38.2</u>	<u>24.5</u>	<u>16.3</u>	<u>13.9</u>	<u>0.1</u>
20% lowest income group	291.6	100.0	17.1	56.6	23.0	2.2	1.0	0.1
30% next income group	362.8	100.0	6.7	52.1	28.2	11.1	1.9	0.0
30% next income group	367.6	100.0	2.5	28.2	30.2	25.5	13.4	0.2
20% highest income group	253.2	100.0	2.4	11.4	12.6	26.9	46.7	0.0
<u>Total 35-44 years</u>	<u>837.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>12.0</u>	<u>51.7</u>	<u>15.4</u>	<u>11.9</u>	<u>8.9</u>	<u>0.1</u>
20% lowest income group	182.4	100.0	30.5	57.7	9.6	2.0	0.2	0.0
30% next income group	247.2	100.0	11.7	60.1	12.8	5.8	0.6	0.0
30% next income group	238.4	100.0	4.5	50.4	24.3	12.6	7.9	0.3
20% highest income group	169.2	100.0	3.3	21.3	12.8	30.7	31.9	0.0
<u>Total 45 years and over</u>	<u>1 331.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>29.4</u>	<u>51.9</u>	<u>9.0</u>	<u>6.9</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>0.0</u>
20% lowest income group	217.6	100.0	56.6	40.3	2.4	0.7	0.0	0.0
30% next income group	364.8	100.0	39.5	54.2	4.6	1.4	0.3	0.0
30% next income group	439.2	100.0	21.5	61.9	9.9	5.4	1.2	0.1
20% highest income group	309.6	100.0	9.6	42.9	17.4	20.0	10.1	0.0

Table 5

SAO PAULO: WOMEN 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY POSITION IN HOUSEHOLD, CATEGORY OF EMPLOYMENT AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%
<u>Total</u>	<u>2 019.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>337.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>560.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>646.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>474.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Heads of establishment	39.2	1.9	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.5	9.2	1.4	27.2	5.7
Wage-earners	1 671.6	82.9	275.2	81.7	468.8	83.6	541.2	83.7	386.4	81.4
Working on own account	273.6	13.5	56.8	16.8	79.6	14.2	83.6	12.9	53.6	11.3
Unpaid family members	35.2	1.7	5.2	1.5	9.6	1.7	12.8	2.0	7.6	1.6
<u>Total heads of household</u>										
Heads of establishment	8.8	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.4	2.4	2.2	6.0	9.1
Wage-earners	307.2	81.2	82.0	80.4	86.8	83.4	88.0	82.4	50.4	76.9
Working on own account	62.0	16.4	20.0	19.6	16.8	16.2	16.4	15.4	8.8	13.4
Unpaid family members	0.4	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.6
<u>Total</u>	<u>378.4</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>102.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>104.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>106.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>65.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>Total non-heads of household</u>										
Heads of establishment	30.4	1.9	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.5	6.8	1.3	21.2	6.0
Wage-earners	1 294.4	82.4	192.8	82.1	379.2	83.6	441.6	83.6	280.8	79.3
Working on own account	211.6	13.5	36.8	15.7	62.8	13.8	67.2	12.7	44.8	12.7
Unpaid family members	34.8	2.2	5.2	2.2	9.6	2.1	12.8	2.4	7.2	2.0
<u>Total</u>	<u>1 571.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>234.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>454.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>528.4</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>354.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>Total domestic employees</u>	<u>70.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>0.4</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>11.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>55.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>
Wage-earners	70.0	100.0	0.4	100.0	2.8	100.0	11.6	100.0	55.2	100.0
<u>Total</u>	<u>2 019.6</u>		<u>337.2</u>		<u>560.8</u>		<u>646.8</u>		<u>474.8</u>	

Table 6

SÃO PAULO: EMPLOYED WOMEN 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%
Professionals	172.4	8.5	2.8	0.8	14.0	2.5	48.0	7.4	107.6	22.7
Technicians and related occupations	84.8	4.2	5.6	1.7	22.0	3.9	38.0	5.9	19.2	4.0
Directors and managers	95.6	4.7	0.4	0.1	5.6	1.0	24.4	3.8	65.2	13.7
Office workers	404.4	20.0	11.2	3.3	72.8	13.0	187.2	28.9	133.2	28.1
Trade employees	133.2	6.6	17.6	5.2	36.8	6.6	55.2	8.5	23.6	5.0
Working on own account in trade (street vendors)	86.8	4.3	13.2	3.9	20.8	3.7	32.4	5.0	20.4	4.3
Skilled and semi-skilled labourers	381.2	19.0	65.6	19.5	162.8	29.0	130.4	20.2	22.4	4.7
Unskilled labourers	6.0	0.3	3.6	1.1	1.2	0.2	1.2	0.2	0.0	-
Domestic workers	363.6	18.0	142.8	42.3	114.4	20.4	48.8	7.5	57.6	12.1
Women engaged in personal services	229.2	11.3	64.8	19.2	94.0	16.8	58.8	9.1	11.6	2.5
Transport workers	2.8	0.1	1.2	0.4	0.8	0.1	0.8	0.1	0.0	-
Defence and public security	2.4	0.1	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.8	0.1	1.6	0.3
Workers in primary sector	3.2	0.2	0.8	0.2	0.4	0.1	2.0	0.3	0.0	-
Unspecified	54.0	2.7	7.6	2.3	15.2	2.7	18.8	3.0	12.4	2.6
<u>Total</u>	<u>2 019.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>337.2</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>560.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>646.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>474.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Table 7

SAO PAULO: EMPLOYED FEMALE HEADS OF HOUSEHOLD 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY OCCUPATION GROUP
AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%
Professionals	25.2	6.7	0.8	0.8	2.0	1.9	7.2	6.7	15.2	23.2
Technicians and related occupations	24.8	6.5	2.8	2.7	5.2	5.0	10.8	10.1	6.0	9.1
Directors and managers	20.0	5.3	0.0	-	0.8	0.8	5.6	5.2	13.6	20.8
Office workers	46.4	12.3	2.0	2.0	10.4	10.0	17.6	16.5	16.4	25.0
Trade employees	17.6	4.6	2.8	2.7	2.4	2.3	7.6	7.1	4.8	7.3
Working on own account in trade (street vendors)	13.2	3.5	4.4	4.3	4.0	3.8	3.2	3.0	1.6	2.4
Skilled and semi-skilled labourers	66.4	17.5	15.2	14.9	23.2	22.3	25.2	23.7	2.8	4.3
Unskilled labourers	1.2	0.3	0.8	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.0	-	0.0	-
Domestic workers	77.6	20.5	45.6	44.7	23.6	22.7	8.0	7.5	0.4	0.6
Workers in personal services	74.0	19.6	26.0	25.5	28.4	27.3	16.8	15.7	2.8	4.3
Transport workers	0.8	0.2	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.8	0.7	0.0	-
Defence and public security	1.2	0.3	0.0	-	0.0	-	0.8	0.7	0.4	0.6
Unspecified	10.0	2.7	1.6	1.6	3.6	3.5	3.2	3.1	1.6	2.4
<u>Total</u>	<u>378.4</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>102.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>104.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>106.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>65.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Table 8

SAO PAULO: POPULATION 15 YEARS AND OVER BY INCOME DECILE, SEX
AND POSITION IN HOUSEHOLD, 1985

	Total population			Heads of household		
	thousands	%	cum. %	thousands	%	cum. %
<u>Both sexes</u>						
First decile	606.4	1.0	1.0	121.1	0.3	0.3
Second decile	665.2	2.4	3.4	178.8	0.9	1.2
Third decile	574.8	2.8	6.2	233.4	1.6	2.8
Fourth decile	701.6	4.4	10.6	301.4	2.6	5.4
Fifth decile	653.8	5.1	15.7	338.4	3.7	9.1
Sixth decile	604.8	5.9	21.6	379.6	5.2	14.3
Seventh decile	654.3	8.4	30.0	403.9	7.2	21.5
Eighth decile	655.7	11.4	41.4	467.2	11.2	32.7
Ninth decile	633.4	16.2	57.6	477.5	16.7	49.4
Tenth decile	642.1	42.4	100.0	540.1	50.6	100.0
<u>Total</u>	<u>6 392.1</u>	<u>100.0</u>		<u>3 441.4</u>	<u>100.0</u>	
<u>Men</u>						
First decile	216.0	0.5	0.5	71.5	0.2	0.2
Second decile	350.0	1.6	2.1	126.0	0.7	0.9
Third decile	346.0	2.1	4.2	187.0	1.4	2.3
Fourth decile	444.0	3.5	7.7	253.0	2.3	4.6
Fifth decile	451.0	4.4	12.1	298.0	3.4	8.0
Sixth decile	460.0	5.6	17.7	348.0	5.1	13.1
Seventh decile	505.5	8.1	25.8	371.5	7.1	20.2
Eighth decile	530.5	11.5	37.3	448.0	11.4	31.6
Ninth decile	525.0	16.8	54.1	453.5	17.2	48.8
Tenth decile	544.5	45.9	100.0	506.5	51.2	100.0
<u>Total</u>	<u>4 372.5</u>	<u>100.0</u>		<u>3 063.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	
<u>Women</u>						
First decile	390.4	3.5	3.5	49.6	2.2	2.2
Second decile	315.2	5.7	9.2	52.8	4.0	6.2
Third decile	228.8	5.7	14.9	46.4	4.8	11.0
Fourth decile	257.6	8.2	23.1	48.4	6.4	17.4
Fifth decile	202.8	8.1	31.2	40.4	6.6	24.0
Sixth decile	144.8	7.3	38.5	31.6	6.5	30.5
Seventh decile	148.8	9.8	48.3	32.4	8.7	39.2
Eighth decile	125.2	11.2	59.5	19.2	6.9	46.1
Ninth decile	108.4	14.2	73.7	24.0	13.0	59.1
Tenth decile	97.6	26.3	100.0	33.6	40.9	100.0
<u>Total</u>	<u>2 019.6</u>	<u>100.0</u>		<u>378.4</u>	<u>100.0</u>	

Table 9

SAO PAULO: INDEXES OF PERSONAL AVERAGE INCOMES OF EMPLOYED WOMEN 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKETS, 1985 ^{a/}

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	Index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index
Professionals	172.4	88	2.8	47	14.0	40	48.0	80	107.6	186
Technicians and related occupations	84.8	70	5.6	40	22.0	46	38.0	62	19.2	131
Directors and managers	95.6	108	0.4	37	5.6	58	24.4	98	65.2	203
Office workers	404.4	67	11.2	31	72.8	43	187.2	66	133.2	127
Trade employees	133.2	56	17.6	25	36.8	28	55.2	47	23.6	122
Working on own account in trade (street vendors)	86.8	48	13.2	21	20.8	28	32.4	58	20.4	84
Skilled and semi-skilled labourers	381.2	40	65.6	27	162.8	32	130.4	42	22.4	65
Unskilled labourers	6.0	38	3.6	26	1.2	42	1.2	47	-	-
Domestic workers	363.6	22	142.8	17	114.4	22	48.8	25	57.6	24
Workers engaged in personal services	229.2	46	64.8	24	94.0	31	58.8	41	11.6	86
Transport workers	2.8	93	1.2	92	0.8	69	0.8	119	-	-
Defence and public security	2.4	166	-	-	-	-	0.8	106	1.6	225
Workers in primary sector	3.2	4	0.8	0	0.4	0	2.0	13	-	-
Unspecified	54.0	51	7.6	20	15.2	30	18.8	50	12.4	104
<u>Total</u>	<u>62.4</u>		<u>9.6</u>		<u>16.4</u>		<u>22.4</u>			
	<u>2 019.6</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>337.2</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>560.8</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>646.8</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>474.8</u>	<u>135</u>

^{a/} The average primary income of the total employed population was taken as the base (=100).

Table 10

SAO PAULO: INDEXES OF PERSONAL AVERAGE INCOMES OF EMPLOYED MEN 15 YEARS AND OVER,
BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKETS, 1985 ^{a/}

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index
Professionals	184.5	179	2.5	43	10.0	88	41.0	168	131.0	419
Technicians and related occupations	125.0	129	4.5	49	19.0	76	54.0	133	47.5	259
Directors and managers	448.0	169	9.0	51	40.0	89	140.5	157	258.5	381
Office workers	432.5	85	33.5	43	121.0	59	197.0	84	81.0	156
Trade employees	306.0	111	40.0	33	91.5	53	104.0	106	70.5	252
Working on own account in trade (street vendors)	232.0	106	47.5	31	56.0	65	87.0	108	41.5	220
Skilled and semi-skilled labourers	1 602.0	77	324.5	38	623.0	57	530.5	78	124.0	131
Unskilled labourers	136.0	45	57.5	35	57.5	42	18.5	54	2.5	51
Domestic workers	23.0	39	12.5	18	8.5	37	1.0	90	1.0	12
Workers engaged in personal services	390.5	57	107.5	35	163.5	45	105.0	62	14.5	87
Transport workers	291.0	105	55.0	48	117.0	71	95.5	101	23.5	199
Defence and public security	76.0	107	9.5	36	24.0	76	29.5	108	13.0	211
Workers in primary sector	24.0	56	8.0	19	9.5	35	4.5	100	2.0	68
Unspecified	102.0	79	23.5	29	31.5	52	32.0	95	15.0	139
Total	4 372.5	118	735.0	38	1 372.0	61	1 440.0	105	825.5	305

^{a/} The average primary income of the total employed population was taken as the base (=100).

Table 11

SAO PAULO: INDEXES OF PERSONAL AVERAGE INCOMES OF EMPLOYED WOMEN 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL, AGE GROUP AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985 ^{a/}

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index
Total	2 019.6	62	337.2	22	560.8	32	646.8	55	474.8	135
No education	166.4	23	70.0	18	51.2	23	31.6	33	13.6	30
1-4 years, primary	679.2	37	170.0	21	247.2	30	184.4	47	77.6	68
5-8 years, primary	487.2	45	82.4	24	179.6	32	171.2	50	54.0	103
9-11 years, secondary	390.4	77	11.2	30	72.0	40	174.8	62	132.4	121
12 years or more, university	294.0	151	3.2	75	10.8	44	82.8	82	196.4	187
No declaration made	2.4	38	0.4	37	-	-	2.8	39	-	-
Total 15-24 years	670.0	39	112.0	20	214.4	30	229.2	45	114.4	62
No education	18.0	16	7.6	15	5.6	18	2.4	16	2.4	19
1-4 years, primary	141.2	25	45.6	18	49.6	25	25.2	37	20.8	27
5-8 years, primary	261.2	32	51.6	21	110.4	30	82.4	40	16.8	40
9-11 years, secondary	183.6	50	7.2	26	42.4	35	93.6	51	40.4	69
12 years or more, university	65.2	79	-	-	6.4	47	24.8	63	34.0	96
No declaration made	0.8	32	-	-	-	-	0.8	32	-	-
Total 25-44 years	1 043.2	72	184.8	23	268.4	34	312.0	62	278.0	153
No education	79.2	24	41.2	19	21.6	25	11.2	40	5.2	24
1-4 years, primary	389.2	39	106.8	23	153.2	33	98.0	48	31.2	90
5-8 years, primary	189.6	56	29.6	28	62.0	37	72.0	58	26.0	128
9-11 years, secondary	181.6	96	3.6	40	27.2	49	76.0	74	74.8	137
12 years or more, university	202.4	161	3.2	76	4.4	42	54.0	97	140.8	194
No declaration made	1.2	43	0.4	37	-	-	0.8	46	-	-
Total 45 years and over	305.6	67	40.4	19	78.0	26	105.6	49	81.6	154
No education	69.2	25	21.2	19	24.0	22	18.0	31	6.0	41
1-4 years, primary	148.8	44	17.6	19	44.4	26	61.2	50	25.6	77
5-8 years, primary	36.4	79	1.2	39	7.2	35	16.8	59	11.2	143
9-11 years, secondary	25.2	139	0.4	7	2.4	50	5.2	81	17.2	173
12 years or more, university	26.6	253	-	-	-	-	4.0	85	21.6	284
No declaration made	0.4	80	-	-	-	-	0.4	37	-	-
	0.8	80	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.8	80

a/ The base taken for the index (=100) was the average primary income for the whole employed population of both sexes in the age group 15 years and over.

Table 12

SAO PAULO: INDEXES OF PERSONAL AVERAGE INCOMES OF EMPLOYED MEN 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL, AGE GROUP AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985 g/

	Per capita family income bracket									
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Next 30%		Highest 20%	
	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index	thousands	index
<u>Total</u>	<u>4 372.5</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>735.0</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>1 372.0</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>1 440.0</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>825.5</u>	<u>272</u>
No education	337.5	50	140.5	32	125.0	44	62.0	64	10.0	113
1-4 years, primary	1 719.5	78	412.0	52	683.5	57	507.5	89	116.5	163
5-8 years, primary	1 127.0	84	160.5	40	409.5	63	435.0	104	122.0	193
9-11 years, secondary	671.0	118	19.5	35	131.0	73	306.0	121	214.5	243
12 years or more, university	513.0	164	2.5	60	21.0	66	127.0	146	362.5	383
No declaration made	4.5	81	0.0	-	2.0	45	2.5	104	0.0	-
<u>Total 15-24 years</u>	<u>1 153.5</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>196.5</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>411.5</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>409.0</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>138.5</u>	<u>118</u>
No education	36.5	32	12.0	24	14.0	32	9.5	44	1.0	23
1-4 years, primary	266.0	38	90.0	25	110.5	37	54.0	53	11.5	79
5-8 years, primary	523.0	43	84.5	27	218.5	37	191.0	53	29.0	72
9-11 years, secondary	260.5	192	7.5	33	61.5	48	128.5	69	63.0	118
12 years or more, university	66.0	128	0.5	20	6.0	50	25.5	92	34.0	171
No declaration made	1.5	32	0.0	-	1.0	23	0.5	49	0.0	-
<u>Total 25-44 years</u>	<u>2 341.5</u>	<u>135</u>	<u>432.0</u>	<u>43.9</u>	<u>715.5</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>731.5</u>	<u>126</u>	<u>462.5</u>	<u>328</u>
No education	165.0	51	85.0	41	57.0	54	21.0	74	2.0	168
1-4 years, primary	996.5	81	263.5	43	413.5	74	272.5	110	47.0	189
5-8 years, primary	508.5	112	71.0	48	170.5	77	209.5	123	57.5	249
9-11 years, secondary	315.5	165	11.0	50	60.5	81	143.5	145	100.5	250
12 years or more, university	354.0	333	1.5	67	13.0	89	84.0	168	255.5	402
No declaration made	2.0	75	0.0	-	1.0	67	1.0	84	0.0	-
<u>Total 45 years and over</u>	<u>877.5</u>	<u>155</u>	<u>108.5</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>245.0</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>299.5</u>	<u>113</u>	<u>224.5</u>	<u>371</u>
No education	136.0	53	43.5	32	54.0	46	31.5	75	7.0	148
1-4 years, primary	457.0	95	58.5	38	159.5	62	181.0	103	58.0	223
5-8 years, primary	95.5	163	5.0	44	20.5	75	34.5	135	35.5	258
9-11 years, secondary	95.0	252	1.0	23	9.0	89	34.0	149	51.0	355
12 years or more, university	93.0	489	0.5	92	2.0	60	17.5	179	73.0	577
No declaration made	1.0	181	0.0	-	0.0	-	1.0	181	0.0	-

g/ The base taken for the index (=100) was the average primary income for the whole employed population of both sexes in the age group 15 years and over.

Table 13

SAO PAULO: ACTIVITY RATES AND RATES OF UNEMPLOYMENT FOR WOMEN 15 YEARS AND OVER, BY AGE GROUP
AND PER CAPITA FAMILY INCOME BRACKET, 1985 ^{a/}

	Per capita family income bracket								
	Total		Lowest 20%		Next 30%		Highest 20%		
	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	thousands	%	
<u>15 years and over</u>									
Activity ratio	45.0		38.8		42.7		46.7		52.0
Rate of unemployment	5.6		10.6		6.8		3.3		3.3
<u>15-19 years</u>									
Activity rate	49.7		52.6		53.1		51.9		47.0
Rate of unemployment	14.2		21.5		13.3		9.3		11.8
<u>20-24 years</u>									
Activity rate	61.6		45.9		59.2		70.4		65.0
Rate of unemployment	7.2		16.5		10.5		2.3		5.1
<u>25-34 years</u>									
Activity rate	53.0		39.5		48.1		56.0		71.2
Rate of unemployment	4.0		4.9		4.8		3.9		2.9
<u>35-44 years</u>									
Activity rate	48.5		44.1		42.4		48.8		61.9
Rate of unemployment	3.0		6.5		2.3		2.1		1.9
<u>45 years and over</u>									
Activity rate	23.2		19.5		21.8		24.0		26.5
Rate of unemployment	1.2		4.7		1.5		0.0		0.5

^{a/} Activity rate: women 15 years and over in the active population as a coefficient of the total female population 15 years and over.

Rate of unemployment: women 15 years and over who are unemployed or seeking employment for the first time as a coefficient of the total number of women 15 years and over in the active population.

