

UNITED NATIONS

ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



Distr.
LIMITED

ST/ECLA/CONF.9/L.12
31 July 1962

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LATIN AMERICAN SEMINAR ON HOUSING STATISTICS AND PROGRAMMES
2-25 September 1962
Copenhagen, Denmark
Item 4.2 (e) of the tentative programme

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR HOUSING PROGRAMS
WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO LATIN AMERICA

Prepared by the
United Nations Demographic Center for Latin America

Sponsored by:

The United Nations
Economic Commission for Latin America
Economic Commission for Europe
Statistical Office
Bureau of Social Affairs Housing, Building and Planning Branch
Bureau of Technical Assistance Operations
The Government of Denmark
The Inter-American Statistical Institute

In collaboration with:

The Latin American Demographic Centre
The Inter-American Housing and Planning Centre

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1. Introduction	1
2. Demographic data and analysis	2
(a) Population growth	2
(b) Number and growth of households	4
(c) Size of households	7
(d) Household composition: Marital status	10
(e) Household composition: Relationship to head	13
(f) Household by structural type	15
(g) Life cycle of a family, a household, and a housing unit	18
(h) Urbanization and internal migration	24
3. Some demographic aspects of the measurement of housing needs	28
(a) Estimation of the current deficit	28
(b) Projections of households and household characteristics	31
(c) Regional estimates and projections	40
4. Basic sources of population data for housing programs..	42

1. Introduction

This paper presents a general discussion of the demographic aspects of the problems relating to the formulation of housing policies and programs for Latin America. Inasmuch as housing programs are intended to serve people, and shelter represents a basic personal need, demographic considerations are necessarily important in the formulation of housing policies and programs. There is a close connection between the population characteristics and trends of each of the Latin American countries and its housing problems. More specifically, demographic factors need to be taken into account in the analysis of the housing market, the evaluation of the current housing situation, and the determination of current and prospective housing needs. The need for housing is, of course, affected by population growth, marriage rates, rates of household formation and dissolution, birth and death rates, and other demographic changes. Knowledge about these changes represents only important background information, however. Housing policies and programs must also take into account various physical, economic, cultural, and technological factors. The conditions and age of housing units, the organization and costs of building construction, the level and distribution of personal and family income in relation to living costs, attitudes and desires of persons with regard to the type of housing needed and preferred, the state of the building arts and the level of skill of the labor force, etc., illustrate some of the non-demographic factors affecting the housing situation. In view of the principal orientation of this paper, however, only brief consideration will be given to such factors, and the focus will be on the more strictly demographic aspects of housing analysis.

This study should be viewed as preliminary at this time and subject to revision, since it takes account only of the more readily available data and depends in part on illustrative material. A more complete analysis of the pertinent data may be made at a later date.

2. Demographic data and analysis

(a) Population growth

It seems at first to review in some detail those general population characteristics and changes for national areas as a whole which may have an important relation to, and effect on, housing requirements.

The population of Latin America grew rapidly between 1955 and 1959 at an estimated average annual rate of 2.4 per cent and about 5 million persons are being added annually to the total. This rate may be compared with a world average of 1.7 per cent and a rate of 0.7 per cent for Northwestern Europe (see table A). The latter two figures illustrate moderate and low levels of population growth. The rate for Latin America is, in fact, higher than for any other continent. Although a few countries in Latin America have low or moderate growth rates (i.e., less than 2.0 per cent), as Argentina with 1.4 per cent and Uruguay with 0.4 per cent, the great majority have high rates (i.e., 2.5 per cent or more) and several have extremely high rates (i.e., 3.0 per cent or more), as, for example, Costa Rica with 3.4 per cent, the Dominican Republic with 3.0 per cent, and Guatemala with 3.0 per cent.

This high growth has resulted from a high level of fertility combined with moderate mortality. The average annual birth rate in Latin America during 1955-59 was about 43 per 1 000 population. This figure may be compared with a rate of 18 for Northwestern Europe in the same period. The lowest estimates for any Latin American country are 23 per 1 000 population for Argentina and 13 per 1 000 for Uruguay. Out of 21 areas, however, about three-fourths had estimated rates of 45 or more. The latter figure is well below the limits of female reproductive capacity; nevertheless, it represents a very high level of fertility. The crude death rate in Latin America in 1955-59 was about 19, which is still moderately high. A few countries have rates around 25 and Uruguay's and Argentina's rates are only about 8.

The rate of population growth in Latin America has been accelerating in recent decades, as a result of the decline of the death rate combined with the near stability of the birth rate:

<u>Period</u>	<u>Average annual rate growth</u>
1900-25	1.8
1925-35	1.9
1935-45	2.0
1945-55	2.4

It is a matter of speculation at this stage of knowledge, whether and when the birth rate in Latin America will show any substantial decline in the next decade or so. In any case, in view of the current level of the death rate and the likelihood for its further decline, it seems quite possible that in the near future there will be a greater decline in the death rate than in the birth rate and, hence, that the rise in the growth rate may very well continue.^{1/}

According to estimates and projections of the population of each country of Latin America for 1960 and 1970 prepared by the Economic Commission for Latin America in cooperation with the United Nations Demographic Centre for Latin America, it is expected that between 1960 and 1970 the population of the twenty republics (excluding Puerto Rico) will increase by 58 million or 29 per cent, from 199 million to 257 million (see table 1). These figures imply a somewhat higher rate of increase than in the past decade, or 2.6 per cent annually. The expected increases will vary from 9 per cent for Uruguay to 37 per cent for the Dominican Republic; all areas except Uruguay and Argentina are expected to increase by more than 20 per cent. Puerto Rico, with a population of 2 350 000 in 1960, is expected to have essentially the same population in 1970 as in 1960, as a result of a continuing heavy out-migration to the United States.^{2/}

It is important to note, in considering any summary figures for Latin America, that Brazil (66 million in 1960) now constitutes about one-third of the total, and Mexico (35 million in 1960), Argentina (21 million in 1960), and Colombia (15 million in 1960) together constitute a little more than a second third. The remaining 17 areas make up less than one-third of the total, therefore.^{3/}

- ^{1/} Christopher Tietze, "Human Fertility in Latin America", Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, March 1958, pages 84-93; and United Nations, Latin American Seminar on Population, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 5-16 December, 1955, New York 1958, Summary of Meeting 9, pages 40-42.
- ^{2/} Estado Libre Asociado de Puerto Rico, Junta de Planificación, Negociado de Economía y Estadísticas, Proyecciones del Desarrollo Económico de Puerto Rico, Diciembre, 1957, page 45.
- ^{3/} If the recently announced provisional figure from the 1960 census of Brazil - 70.5 million - is accepted, the total for Latin America in 1960 and the increase between 1950 and 1960 would be about 5 million greater. Furthermore, the average annual rate of increase between 1950 and 1960 would be 2.6 per cent rather than 2.4 per cent as stated above and the expected rate of growth between 1960 and 1970 would be about 2.9 per cent.

(b) Number and growth of households

Inasmuch as the consumer units in the housing market are households or families rather than individuals, we are more directly concerned with the growth in the number of married couples, families, or households than with the growth in the number of individuals. In other words, in the consideration of housing utilization and needs, households rather than individuals are the more important demographic unit for study because, in general, one housing unit is occupied, or required for occupancy, by one household.

According to the definition which has been recommended as an international standard, a household consists of an individual or a group of individuals who share their living quarters and their principal meals.^{4/} On this basis, in some cases more than one household may occupy a dwelling unit (especially where unrelated persons are living in the unit).^{5/} Generally, however, a household and a dwelling unit are complementary concepts. Classification of households vary between the censuses and surveys of different countries, and comparability of the data can be viewed as approximate at best.

A (census) family is a different unit than the household. It consists of a group of persons living together related by marriage and blood. Definitions vary, however. In some cases the definition refers to a more restricted group, the nuclear or biological family, consisting of the head of the household, his spouse, and their unmarried children.^{6/} In the joint or extended family, on the other hand, two or more generations of a biological family live in the same dwelling unit. A household may consist of more than one family, whether or two sets of related persons or two sets of unrelated persons; in practice, however, a family and a household are usually complementary concepts. These distinctions are important in the measurement of housing needs because, as will be described more fully below, housing standards should (ideally) take into account the structure of the household in terms of families and nuclear families.

^{4/} United Nations, Principles and recommendations for National Population Censuses, Statistical Reports Series M, N° 27, New York, 1958.

^{5/} A household may consist of a single person who lives alone in a dwelling unit or who, like a renter, occupies one or more rooms in a dwelling unit without sharing his quarters or meals with others. Or, the household may consist of two or more persons who occupy a dwelling unit in whole or part and who share their quarters and meals. It may be noted that this definition follows the housekeeping concept, according to which a household may occupy only part of a dwelling unit, rather than the dwelling unit concept, where the two correspond.

^{6/} United Nations, Multilingual Demographic Dictionary, Population Studies N° 29, English Edition, New York, 1958.

A small proportion of the population of each country lives outside private households in so-called institutional or non-family households. In addition to the population living in institutions (such as prisons, old age homes, hospitals for chronic illness, etc.), some persons live in such types of group quarters as boarding houses, lodging houses, hotels, convents, military barracks, etc. Data on the proportion of the population which lives outside private households are available only for some of the countries of Latin America. These figures are shown in table C, along with figures for several countries of Northwestern Europe for comparison. (These figures are, of course, affected by variations from one country to another in the definitions of private and non-family households used in the censuses.) The proportions for the Latin American countries vary greatly but they all fall well below 10 per cent and, with one exception, below 5 per cent. The proportions for the countries of Northwestern Europe also tend to fall below 5 per cent. This similarity seems surprising. One would expect a somewhat lower average for Latin America than for Northwestern Europe, as a result of the lesser availability of institutional facilities and the more cohesive family structure, etc., in the former region. In view of the small proportion of the population living in non-family households, and the fact that this part of the population does not have to be supplied with regular dwellings, we can largely omit the population living in non-family households from consideration in evaluating housing needs.

In spite of the considerable importance of information on the number and characteristics of households for various planning purposes, the data on families and households available for the countries of Latin America are quite limited. Data on households are not yet available from the few censuses taken around 1960. We have to turn to the 1950 censuses for any substantial body of statistics of this type. Anticipating the discussion below regarding the types of data on households which are pertinent to the analysis of housing needs, we may summarize the kinds of data available as follows. For 15 countries (excluding Bolivia, Chile, Guatemala, Honduras, Peru, and Uruguay) data are available from the 1950 censuses on the total number of private households, and for 14 countries (excluding these areas and Argentina) on the number of households by size and on the number of persons in private households by size. Eleven countries provided data on the relationship to the head of the household for members of private households. Beyond this, very few data on households are available from the censuses of 1950. Only a few countries provided data on households distributed by the age of the head of

/the household,

the household, and none provided data on households classified by structural type following the general lines suggested by the United Nations (see below).^{7/}

Census data on the number of households and the population in private households, for most countries of Latin America, around 1950, are presented in table D. It is evident that the number of households in a population bears a roughly consistent relationship to the number of persons. In general, people live in family groups and the average size of these family groups does not vary widely from one date to another in a given country or even from country to country. Although the ratio of households to population is fairly stable from year to year, however, relative changes in population and in households in a given period may show only a rough similarity and may, in fact, diverge greatly. Households may grow more or less rapidly than population, and the direction of the difference may not be the same from one period to another. Unfortunately, historical data on households are lacking for most countries of Latin America. Illustrative figures are given below for four countries of Latin America with comparative figures for Sweden and the United States:

		<u>Per cent increase</u>	
	<u>Period</u>	<u>Households</u>	<u>Population</u>
Brazil	1940 - 50	27.2	24.1
Costa Rica	1927 - 50	50.4	69.6
Panama	1940 - 50	17.2	33.2
Puerto Rico	1940 - 50	21.1	18.3
	1950 - 60	6.3	12.8
Sweden	1945 - 50	1.0	4.8
United States	1940 - 50	22.6	14.5
	1950 - 60	25.1	18.5

The very crude similarity of the rates or change results from the fact that general population growth is likely to be accompanied by roughly similar growth of the adult population, the population from which the heads of new households come.

^{7/} Panama represents an outstanding exception with respect to the type of data published: data are given, for example, on households by age, sex, and marital status of head, on households by age of head and number of children under 15, and on presence of wife for male heads by number of children and number of other relatives.

On the other hand, the specific factors involved in the growth of population and households are different. General population growth in a given period is largely a function of the birth and death rates in that period. Growth of households is dependent on the rate of growth of the adult population (or changes in birth and death rates in prior periods), its age distribution, age-specific marriage, divorce, and widowhood rates, and tendencies of nuclear families and individuals to live doubled up. Whether or not the number of households will increase and the magnitude of the increase or decrease depends on the configuration of these factors. High age-specific divorce rates support high growth rates for households; widowhood contributes to a decrease in households. The effect of marriage depends on the relative proportion of younger marriage partners, who tend to create new households, and the proportion of older ones, who tend to give up one or two previously existing households. (Further discussion of these factors is given below in relation to size of households.)

(c) Size of households

Households vary in size, age, structure, and other characteristics pertinent to an evaluation of housing needs. Household size and structure have an important impact on the needs for living space, and the age of the household or of the head of the household tends to bear an important relation to household size and structure. Other characteristics of households do not bear so directly on the physical need for space as they do on the preference or ability of the household to seek additional housing space: family income, occupation of the head, educational attainment of the members, etc. Let us consider first the factor of household size.

Data on the average size of private households for the countries of Latin America indicate the tendency for households to run relatively large, as would be expected from the age distribution of the population and the level of fertility. The regional totals indicate that household size was about 56 per cent greater in Latin America than in Northwestern Europe around 1950 (see table D). Households in Latin America averaged about 4.91 persons. No country for which data are available (14 countries) had a figure below 4.25, and several had figures over 5.25. Argentina, Mexico, and Panama, are on the relatively low side, with figures between 4.25 and 4.50, and Colombia, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica, are on the high side, with figures above 5.50. In contrast,

/average household

average household size for the countries of Northwestern Europe stood at 3.14 persons per household around 1950, varying from 2.90 for Sweden to 4.16 for Ireland. These figures are well below the levels for Latin America.

Statistics on the distribution of private households by number of members throw additional light on the matter of household size. One half of the households in Latin America have more than 4.6 members, in contrast with 2.9 for Northwestern Europe. Although about half of the households fall in the middle of the range (3 to 6 persons), as is true for the countries of Northwestern Europe, there is a notably greater percentage of large households (7 persons or more) than of small households (1 or 2 persons), quite unlike the situation in Northwestern Europe. Only about one-fifth of the households in Latin America have less than three members, but more than one-quarter have seven or more members; the corresponding percentages for Northwestern Europe are 42 per cent and 5 per cent, respectively. Panama fell at one extreme of the distribution for the countries for which data are available, with as much as 29 per cent of the households having less than 3 persons and only 22 per cent having seven or more persons (see table E). Even these figures do not reach the average for Northwestern Europe. In every country of Latin America at least 16 per cent of the households had seven or more members and at least 4 per cent had ten or more members. Because of the large proportion of large households, the population is concentrated in large households; about 46 per cent of the population lives in households with seven or more members and 17 per cent of the population lives in households with ten or more members.

A complex combination of demographic factors must be considered in accounting for differences in average size of household: (1) fertility rates; (2) marriage rates; (3) divorce rates; (4) widowhood rates; (5) tendencies of families to double up or to set up separate households; (6) tendency of households to include unrelated members such as lodgers, boarders, servants; and (7) age distribution. The first of these factors - fertility - simultaneously has a direct effect on the growth of the total population and of the number of children per family, but its effect on family size is more pronounced. In fact, of the several factors cited, the higher fertility of Latin America is the principal factor accounting for the larger size of household. It is estimated that the general fertility rate (births per

1 000 female population 15 to 44 years) for Latin America around 1950 was about 125 per cent higher than for the countries of Northwestern Europe. We may recall that the average size of households in Latin America exceeded the figure for Northwestern Europe by a large percentage also.

Associated with the high average size of household in Latin America is the very large proportion of children. This is a direct result of the high fertility rate. In most Latin American countries between 35 and 45 per cent of the population is under 15 years of age, whereas in Northwestern Europe and in North America, the proportion varies generally between 20 and 30 per cent (see table D). At the same time the proportions of persons in the age groups 15 to 64 and 65 and over in Latin America are relatively low.^{8/} The smaller proportion of older adults contributes further to raising average household size in Latin America in comparison with Northwestern Europe.

The available statistics on marriages are so defective that they do not permit a definite statement on the general level of the marriage rate in Latin America, but the census data on the marital status of the population may be employed instead to indicate variations in the recent tendency to marry. Data on the per cent of the population aged 25 to 29 years which had ever married, for the countries of Latin America and Northwestern Europe, suggest a roughly similar level of the marriage rate during the late 1940's in both regions (see table D). Although the extreme values were higher for Latin America, there was a general tendency for marriage rates to be lower there than in Europe. The variations from country to country in Latin America showed no particular relationships to household size; other factors apparently exerted more influence.

Because censuses in Latin America have not made a careful distinction between households, families, nuclear families, and married couples, and have not generally tabulated statistics of this kind, little is known about the tendency of families, married couples, or individuals to share the same dwelling unit. Valuable indications are given by data on the relationship of persons to the head of the household in which they live, particularly in combination with data on marital status. Some attention is given to these data below under the discussion of household structure.

8/ Vasilios G. Valaoras, "Young and Aged Populations", Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, March 1958, pp. 69-83.

(d) Household composition: Marital status

Housing needs clearly vary with the size of the household, but the relation between the number of rooms required or occupied and size of household is by no means constant. For evaluating housing needs more fully, it is necessary to take into account the composition of the household as well as its size. The principal basis of determining household composition is the marital status of the members and their relationship to the head of the household.

Data on the marital status of individuals are not only important in describing the household arrangements under which they live, but they are also useful in interpreting changes in the number and size of households, in the measurement of the current need for dwellings, and in the preparation of projections of households, families, and married couples. Data on marital status by age are directly useful for estimating the potential number of housing units required or desirable where various assumed levels of "undoubling" were to occur currently or at various future dates.

Five marital classes are usually distinguished in the census data for Latin America: (legally) married, consensually "married", widowed, divorced, and single (never married). The group "separated" is sometimes available independently and is sometimes included with the "divorced". (It is quite possible, however, that many persons who had separated from de facto unions reported themselves as single in the censuses rather than married, divorced, or separated.) The combination of divorced and separated persons (whether from legal or de facto unions) fits the needs for use of the data in relation to housing studies, since, for this purpose, the de facto status of the marital union is more significant than its legal status.

For Latin America, no analysis of households or of housing needs is adequate which fails to take into account de facto (consensual) unions because of their effect on the level and interpretation of the relevant data.^{9/} The incidence of de facto unions varies widely among Latin American nations. The

9/ United Nations, Latin America Seminar on Population, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 5-16 December 1955, ST/LAA/SER.C/33, New York, 1958, Summary of Meeting 10, pp. 60-62.

proportion of persons reported in "stable" de facto unions in the censuses taken around 1950 exceeded 20 per cent of the population 15 and over in El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama, and fell between 5 and 20 per cent in most other countries of the region (see table F). The proportion which this group made up of the total "married" population 15 and over rose to 68 per cent in Guatemala and 75 per cent in Haiti, but was only about 7 per cent for Chile. The validity of the numbers reported for consensual unions is subject to considerable question as a result of the tendency on the part of many persons living in consensual unions to report themselves as legally married or as single. The validity of the reports is very probably related to the degree of social stigma attached to such unions. The variability in reporting tendencies for consensual unions adds a considerable element of doubt regarding the accuracy and comparability of data on marital status for various areas and for a given area at different dates. In view of these considerations, it is believed that data which include de facto unions are much more accurate reflections of the "married" population, and hence more comparable, than data which omit them. The type of marriage clearly has an effect on the stability of family units and hence, on the rate of formation of households and the requirements for dwellings. Differences in the nature of marital unions also give rise to the possibility that the type of marriage (legal or de facto) has an effect on fertility; the most defensible hypothesis is that legal marriage tends to be associated with higher fertility and hence with larger families.

Data on the per cent distribution of the population by marital status, for age groups, for the 15 countries which tabulated such data (except Puerto Rico), are shown in table 2. The combined figures for this area are here considered as approximating the total for Latin America. About half of the males 15 and over, and about half of the females in this age range, were married. The proportions varied from 40 per cent (males and females) for Colombia to 58 per cent (males) for Bolivia and 59 per cent (females) for Guatemala. The proportion single was much higher among males than among females (46 per cent compared with 40 per cent for the entire area) and the proportion widowed was much lower (3 per cent compared with 8 per cent). The proportion of males who are married rises to a maximum of 79 per cent at ages

40 to 49, then drops gradually to 62 per cent for the group 70 and over; for females the maximum of 74 per cent is reached earlier (at ages 30 to 39) and is followed by a sharp decline to 21 per cent at ages 70 and over. The proportion of widowed persons moves in a complementary fashion. The proportion of widowers climbs slowly to 26 per cent for persons 70 and over, while the proportion of widows rises sharply to 58 per cent in this age range. In fact, by ages 60 to 69 the proportion of widows is higher than the proportion of married women. The large proportion of widows clearly has a very important bearing on housing needs for older persons.

The pattern of differences in marital composition between males and females results from differences between the sexes in death rates, marriage rates, and remarriage rates. Variations in the pattern from country to country results also from differences in these factors. In interpreting the general configuration of the distribution, the possibility of marked differences in mortality by marital status, indicated by data for some other areas, should be considered.

As far as housing needs are concerned, there is considerable interest in married couples. It would be desirable to distinguish directly the "married, spouse present" population among the total number of married persons, therefore. Generally, this cannot be done from the census data. If the data on the married population excluded all separated persons and were not affected by reporting errors, they would represent the number of married couples. This is not the case, however.^{10/} A rather direct (minimal) indication of the number of women "married, husband absent", is given by the count of married females who are heads of households, available for a few countries.

^{10/} An immediate cue for most countries that the published data on married persons does not represent married couples, in spite of the often stated exclusion of separated persons, is given by the large and consistent discrepancies between the number of married males and the number of married females. They represent essentially reporting errors and would tend to be negligible if all married persons lived as couples.

(e) Household composition: Relationship to head

Data on relationship to the head of the household represent another type of demographic information pertinent to the analysis of housing needs. The head is the person regarded as such by other members of the household; most often the head is the principal earner. Data of this kind may be employed to indicate the number and proportions of persons who are not members of the nuclear family of the head and the number and proportions of persons who are living in the household of persons to whom they are not related. Data on relationship to head are shown for 9 countries in Latin America, by sex, in table G. The proportion of persons other than heads, wives, and children should be taken as a minimal estimate of those not living as primary individuals or as members of primary nuclear families. (Strictly, some of the children would be married and should be counted as part of the doubled-up population - e.g., 2 per cent of the children in Brazil and 11 per cent in Venezuela.) The figure varied from 13 per cent for Mexico and Brazil to 29 per cent for Venezuela. The proportion of the population living as "other relatives" than the wife and children of the household head varied from 9 per cent for Mexico to 17 per cent for Nicaragua. Lodgers and servants living in the households of others constituted from 3 per cent of the population in Brazil to 7 per cent in Nicaragua, except in Venezuela where the reported figure was 14 per cent. Venezuela illustrates the case of a relatively concentrated use of housing space, with a large proportion of "other relatives" and nonrelatives; Mexico illustrates the opposite type.

The data on relationship to head taken alone are of rather limited usefulness for analyzing housing needs. Because they relate to individuals and not to households, they tell nothing about the number of households, nuclear families, or married couples affected by the doubling-up of families and individuals. One basis of increasing the value of data on relationship for the present purpose is to combine tabulation on relationship with tabulations on marital status. From such data we may ascertain more directly, first, the difference between the actual number of household heads and the potential number, and, second, the number of married couples who are not maintaining their own households. Such data are available from the 1950 census for Brazil, Venezuela, and, in part, Panama.

The gap between the reported number of heads, representing the actual number of households, and the potential number, may be considered first in terms of the variations in the proportion of heads according to marital status. The percentages of heads in each marital group for the three countries mentioned indicate that a very large proportion, but not all, married men are heads of separate households. (As expected, only a small proportion of married women are heads of households; these are presumably not living with their husbands.) A substantial portion of widowed and divorced persons, especially females, live in the household of others. Sixty to 70 per cent of widowers, only about half of the widows, and somewhat lower percentages of divorced persons of each sex maintain their own households. Less than one-quarter of the single persons 15 and over are heads of households.

The difference between the number of married couples and the number of "married heads, spouse present", represents the number of married couples not living in their own household. Illustrative data, consisting of correlative statistics for women, are shown for three countries of Latin America, with comparative figures for the United States (in thousands):

Country	Married women, spouse present a/	Married wives of head	Married couples without own household	
			Number	Per cent
Brazil ^{b/}	8 090	7 351	739	9
Venezuela	62	510	111	18
Panama	113	96	19	15
United States	35 006	32 704	2 302	7

a/ Married women excluding female married heads of households.

b/ Not adjusted for 465 000 "single" wives, who are in fact either members of consensual unions or are separated.

The proportion of married couples doubling-up is twice as high in Venezuela as in Brazil.

Two-thirds to three-quarters of the married females living in the households of others (i.e., not heads or wives of heads) were relatives of the head, according to data for Brazil and Venezuela. About one-third of the total

/were daughters

were daughters of the head, and about one-third to two-fifths were other relatives. Of the categories of potential heads other than married persons, the single lodgers and single "other relatives" make up a very large part, along with widowed parents (mostly female).

Changes in household composition and in size of household through the life cycle (to be considered below) are reflected in sets of age-sex specific ratios of heads to population or "headship" rates, particularly rates given separately for marital classes. General headship rates for Brazil and Panama are shown in table H. These data show that the rates rise rapidly from the youngest ages to a peak of about 87 or 92 per cent, respectively, at ages 50 to 59 and then decline slowly at the older ages. The rates for females reach a peak at a somewhat later age with values of about 30 to 40 per cent. In spite of substantial differences in the absolute level between the rates for Panama and Brazil, for males and females, the (percentage) patterns of the rates by age are quite close. This suggests the possibility of using the pattern of age-specific rates for one country in making estimates and projections of households for another. The levels and patterns of the age-sex specific rates for the various marital groups differ widely from one another (see table 4 which presents data for Panama). This suggests the desirability of incorporating the alternative patterns for marital groups into any estimation procedure where data on marital status are available.

(f) Households by structural type

A more complete basis for studying the influence of demographic factors upon housing needs, as well for preparing projections of households in the detail required for planning housing needs, is afforded by data on households by structural type. One classification of multipersonal households by structural types is that suggested by the United Nations as part of its recommended tabulation (second priority) for national censuses relating to households by structural type and size ^{11/}

^{11/} United Nations, Principles and Recommendations for National Population Censuses, Statistical Reports Series M, No 27, New York, 1958.

- I. A married couple without children.
- II. Both parents, or either one, and unmarried children.
- III. Both parents, or either one; married children who do not have their own children; and single children, if any.
- IV. Both parents, or either of them, married children and their children, and single, if any.
- V. Other (e.g., households with other relatives, or nonrelatives).

To our knowledge, no country in Latin America has actually employed this classification. However, a considerable body of data on households was published for Panama on the basis of the 1950 Census, and we may illustrate with these data.^{12/} Most multipersonal households in Panama - roughly 55 per cent - are of type II, consisting of a single nuclear family with no "other relatives", that is, a married couple and their unmarried children, or a single parent and children. Only about 12 per cent consisted of simply a married couple - type I. Many households include a second, related married couple, such as the parents of the head or of his wife (part of type V), or a married child and his or her spouse, whether without children (type III) or with children (type IV). Households of types III and IV - that is, the bulk of the households with a second married couple - cannot be determined separately from the Panamanian data but, in combination, they make up possibly one fifth of all households. A small percentage of the type V households and all of the type IV households are "two-generation" households, the latter containing grandchildren of the head and the former containing either parents and children of the head or grandchildren of the head. Some households consist of two or more unrelated individuals or families, or of a family and one or more unrelated individuals or families (all type V). In Latin America it is common in cities among middle and upper class families for household servants to live in the same housing unit as the principal family. For this reason a substantial proportion of city families may fall in type V.^{13/}

^{12/} República de Panamá, Censos Nacionales de 1950, Quinto Censo de Población, Volumen VI, "Características de la familia".

^{13/} These unrelated individuals or couples, who eat apart and manage their own finances separately, may be considered in some censuses as constituting separate households, following the housekeeping concept of a household. In the 1950 Census of Panama, however, the dwelling unit concept of the household was followed.

For the purpose of analyzing housing needs, it would seem desirable to extend the classification of households by subdividing type V to show one-person households, households with "other relatives", and households which contain families or individuals which are not related to the primary family or individual. Furthermore, as called for in the United Nations recommendations, the tabulation of private households by structural type and the tabulation by size should be combined, since space needs vary both on the basis of the composition of the household and its size, i.e., they vary for composition when size is constant and vice versa.^{14/} In addition, it would be desirable to have information regarding the numbers of persons in each relationship category (e.g., the number of children) and the sex of the members (e.g., sex of the single parent, sex of the children). Another factor in addition to the number and sex of household members affecting space needs is the age of the children; young children need less space than older children.

We may illustrate such tabulations with the simplest case - household type II. Separate tabulations for households with both parents, father only, and mother only, should be obtained as follows:

<u>Number and sex of children</u>	<u>Probabilities of combination shown for indicated total number of children</u>
1 child:	
1 boy	1/2
1 girl	1/2
2 children:	
1 boy and 1 girl	1/2
2 boys or 2 girls	1/2
3 children:	
1 boy and 2 girls, or 2 boys and 1 girl	3/4
3 boys or 3 girls	1/4
4 children:	
1 boy and 3 girls, or 3 boys and 1 girl	1/2
2 boys and 2 girls	3/8
4 boys or 4 girls	1/8
Etc.	

^{14/} Louis Winnick, American Housing and its Use, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1958, page 88.

In the absence of statistics by sex of children general probabilities can be applied as indicated in the last column on the right. In types III, IV and V, the number of married couples, the sex of single parents and the number of children of each couple by sex would need to be distinguished.

Additional insight into the influence of demographic factors on housing needs is provided by cross-tabulations of households by structural type and age of the household head. Size of the household is highly correlated with the age of the head, and the age of the head and the structural type bear a close relationship also. The size of the household is even more highly correlated with the age of the head when the latter data are specific for each marital class. A classification by structural type and age of head, made with reference to the marital status of the head, would serve not only to allow in large part for size variations but would also make possible a methodological link between projections of population by age and marital status, on the one hand, and projections of housing needs, on the other. For this purpose, the marital groups, married (spouse present) single, and other (by sex), or even married (spouse present) and other (by sex) would serve.

The theoretical desirable detail in tabulations of the characteristics of households for studying the influence of demographic factors upon housing needs and of measuring them, particularly for analyzing space requirements, may easily exceed the resources of any Latin American country to carry them out, if not those of more affluent countries elsewhere. Since the kinds and volume of data considered desirable and useful for these purposes may be very great, it will, in practice, be necessary to reduce the demands for data and carry out the appropriate analyses on a more limited basis.

(g) Life cycle of a family, a household, and housing unit

The individual family and household have a characteristic life history of their own, and although there is considerable variation from one family or household to another, a general pattern prevails. The life cycle of the nuclear family has been subjected to detailed analysis, especially in the United States,^{15/} but a corresponding analysis of the life cycle of the "nuclear" household has not been made. The general pattern differs somewhat for families

^{15/} See, for example, Paul C. Glick, "The Life Cycle of the Family", Marriage and Family Living, Vol. XVII, No 1, February 1955, pages 3-9; and Paul C. Glick, American Families, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1957, Chapters 3 and 4.

and households, however, as well as for households from country to country. The different stages in the family and household cycles correspond, approximately, to different housing needs; as, for example, the need to secure or give up a separate housing unit or to transfer to a larger or smaller unit.

Let us consider first the typical life cycle of a nuclear family. It originates with marriage, grows in size as children are born, contracts as children marry or leave home, and terminates when both parents have died, or when one parent has died and all the children have left home or married. The pattern is not static, however, and secular and cyclical changes in age of marriage, spacing of children, size of completed family, and length of life can affect the pattern of family formation, growth, and eventual dissolution. These family changes, of course, affect the pattern of housing needs. From the available statistical data, mostly from the 1950 censuses, only a few of the dynamic aspects of the family in contemporary Latin America can be described. More will be known with the accumulation of the results of special research studies^{16/} and with the tabulation and analysis of the 1960 censuses.

The estimated average (median) age of men at first marriage (including de facto unions) in Latin America in 1950 was about 25.6 years; and the average (median) age for women was about 21.3 years (see table I). These figures can be interpreted as applying to the group (cohort) of males and females born about 26 and 21 years before 1950, respectively. They are rough approximations derived indirectly from "1950" census tabulations of the population classified by marital status and age for 16 countries in Latin America (excluding

^{16/} For example: León Tabah and Raúl Samuel, "Encuesta de fecundidad y de actitudes relativas a la formación de la familia: resultados preliminares", Cuadernos Médico-Sociales, Vol. II, N° 2, Santiago, Chile; or Tabah and Samuel, "Preliminary Findings of a Survey on Fertility and Attitudes toward Family Formation in Santiago, Chile", paper presented at the Conference on Family Planning, New York, October 14, 1960, and reproduced by the Milbank Memorial Fund, New York.

Dominican Republic, Honduras, Mexico, Peru and Uruguay).^{17/} These figures imply a relatively low age at marriage for females and a "medium" age for males. About 86 per cent of the males in Latin America, and 83 per cent of the females eventually marry, and hence form nuclear families, according to 1950 census data on marital status (see table J).^{18/} In Northwestern Europe, the tendency is for persons, particularly women, to marry later but for a substantially larger proportion of the population eventually to marry. Estimates of median age at first marriage and the proportions eventually marrying for individual countries are shown in tables I and J.

^{17/} The use of census data on marital status fills in part the gap created by the general lack of adequate statistics on marriages. Specifically, the figures on median age at first marriage are based on census data on the proportions of the population that were ever-married, i.e., including the widowed and divorced in addition to those currently married. Data on the ever-married population were obtained from the compilation of 1950 census data given in: Instituto Interamericano de Estadística, La Estructura Demográfica de las Naciones Americanas, Vol. I, Características Generales de la Población, Tomo 2, "Estado Conyugal y Distribución de la Población por Hogares", and United Nations, Demographic Yearbook, 1955. The method of computing the median age at first marriage involves determining the age corresponding to one half the proportion ever-married at about age 55 (or ages 50 to 59). Since a number of different age or marriage cohorts (an age cohort and a marriage cohort being groups of persons who had been born or married in the same year, respectively) are represented in the census data at one date, the median age so computed is a synthetic measure and the reference date in terms of real cohorts is not clear. With similar data for a number of consecutive censuses, it is possible to compute the median for a specific age cohort. In either case, the weak but not too important assumption is made that the mortality rates for single and ever-married persons between the ages of 14 and 50 are the same.

^{18/} The proportion ever-married at about age 55 (ages 50-59) is taken as an estimate of the chance of eventual marriage. At this age the proportion ever-married hardly increases further with advancing age. The figure could be interpreted as referring to a cohort born 55 years or so prior to 1950. If it can be assumed that the age-specific proportions married have not been changing significantly over time, the figures above can be assumed to refer to any recent date. This estimate also implies similar mortality rates for single and ever-married persons between age 14 and 50.

The intervals between marriage and successive births (or the so-called pattern of child spacing) is not known. It may be reasonably assumed that the first child comes after an interval of about one year after marriage.^{19/} The mean age of childbearing is about 28.5 for Latin American women. It is estimated further, on the basis of the annual growth rate and the theoretical interrelationships of demographic characteristics in a "quasi-stable" population, that they will have had between 5 and 6 (about 5.6) children in their lifetime.^{20/} The corresponding data on "children per woman", for women of completed fertility (45 and over), available from the 1950 censuses, are so limited and subject to such underreporting that they can be used only to suggest the general minimal level of "lifetime" fertility. These statistics are consistent with the estimate given above. Table K presents data on the average number of children ever born per 1 000 women 45 years and over for several countries of Latin America and Northwestern Europe, and for the United States. The pattern of high fertility in Latin America appears to result from a moderately low average age at marriage and continuation of childbearing until a fairly late age in the reproductive period, as well as from high age-specific birth rates.

Availability of death rates for marital classes would make possible the direct computation of estimates of the life expectancy of a hypothetical cohort of men and women marrying at ages 26 and 21 (median ages at marriage), the average number of years of married life, and the average number of years

^{19/} The sample survey of fertility in Greater Santiago, Chile, conducted in 1959 by the United Nations Demographic Center for Latin America, showed that, for women married once, 61 per cent had their first child within the first year of marriage. See *op. cit.*, Tabah and Samuel, "Preliminary Findings ...". With respect to higher order births, most births occurred between one and two years after the previous birth, without much variation for the order of births. Results are not available from the survey regarding the age of mothers at the birth of their last child.

^{20/} This figure corresponds to the so-called cumulative fertility rate, or 2.06 times the gross reproduction rate. This rate was computed on the basis of the assumption that the population of Latin America approximates a quasi-stable population model with an annual average growth rate of 2.4 per cent (the actual growth rate for Latin America in 1950-59). Use was made of unpublished sets of tables prepared at the United Nations Demographic Center for Latin America presenting various statistics for stable and quasi-stable population models.

of widowhood. On the basis of official life tables for various past dates for the general population, it is estimated that life expectation in 1955-60 amounted to about 39 years for males at age 26 and 46 years for females at age 21, and, hence, that at the time of marriage males could expect to live to about age 65 and females to age 67. The 46 years of future lifetime for women who had just married would consist of approximately 33 years of married life and 13 years of widowhood; that is: more than one-fourth of the future lifetime of a newly married woman would be spent as a widow, if she did not remarry after widowhood.^{21/} Furthermore, in the commonest family situation the father would tend to die before the youngest child had reached his eighteenth birthday, and hence, in the course of its "natural history", the nuclear family would consist of a surviving widow and one or more children under 18.

For the most part, the probable Latin American picture resembles that of the United States prior to World War I. In recent years, a new pattern has developed in the latter area. This pattern includes a law age at marriage, a moderate level of fertility, and early completion of childbearing. As a result of these changes and the further extension of length of life, typically the couple has a number of years of joint married life after the youngest child has reached age 18 and has even married.

^{21/} These figures were derived by constructing a special life table in which the survivors of an original cohort of married women were divided into those who remained married and those who became widows. The basic life tables employed for this purpose which had a life expectancy of about 39 years for males at age 26 and of about 46 years for females at age 21 were the tables for "Other races, male" and "Other races, female" published in: United States Bureau of the Census, U.S. Life Tables and Actuarial Tables, 1939-41, by T. N. E. Greville, Washington, D.C., 1946. From one point of view, the figures tend to overstate the years of widowhood since mortality rates for all males, rather than for married males, were used and no allowance was made for divorce or remarriage. On the other hand, if account is taken of the shifting expectation of future life at each attained age for widows, the resulting mean period of widowhood would be still higher than given above, amounting to possibly 18 to 20 years. On this basis, average years of widowhood of males would be only a few years lower than for females. See Robert J. Myers, "Statistical Measures in the Marital Life Cycles of Men and Women", International Population Conference, Vienna, 1959, International Union for the Scientific Study of Population.

The life cycle of a household differs from that of a family in its date of inception and its date of demise. A typical household begins somewhat later than the corresponding family and terminates somewhat later also. Its period of life extends from its establishment by a married couple in a separate housing unit to either the death of the first (usually male) spouse and the transfer of the survivor (usually widow) to the home of relatives, or to the death of the surviving spouse (usually widow) in her own home.

The period of time between marriage and the establishment of a separate household is not known. The change may coincide with the arrival of the first child but more often it will come several years later. In addition to custom and personal preferences, the availability of suitable housing and the income level of the couple would have a strong influence on the decision to set up a separate household. Were it not for these limiting factors, it is hypothesized that the interval between marriage and the establishment of a household would be negligible. It should be possible to develop an estimate of this kind on the basis of data on marital status (married couples) and relationship (heads), by age, which would permit determination of the proportion of married couples at each age which do not have their own homes. Sample survey methods could throw direct light on this question. At the other end of its "natural" life, the original household may last another 13 years after the corresponding nuclear family has terminated if the surviving widow continues to maintain her own household after the departure or marriage of her children and subsequent death of her husband, or the household may last exactly as long as the nuclear family when an unmarried child remains in the household until the death of his widowed mother.

It should be possible to develop a direct estimate of the average length of life of a household by applying like table techniques to data on heads of households by age.^{22/} On the basis of the above analysis, however,

^{22/} Specifically, the per cent "heads" of the total population in each age group could be graduated to rates for single years and their differences taken. The "central" rates (m^i_x) so derived would be converted to "probabilities" (q^i_x) by any of several well known devices. Other factors, such as death, must be taken into account also. The average age of becoming a head could be computed from the " d^i " column and the " e^i " column would indicate average length of life of a household. Data in x the table could be combined with independent information to estimate the average interval between marriage and the establishment of a household.

a typical household in Latin America lasts 30 to 40 years, depending on the interval for establishing a home and whether the widow (or widower) goes to live with relatives at the death of her husband (his wife) or maintains her (his) household till her (his) death. On the other hand, the average length of useful life of a (conventional) dwelling, although not known, exceeds 60 years and may even exceed 80 years. Thus, considering the longevity factor only, on the average a dwelling tends to outlive the particular household which occupies it by a considerable number of years, perhaps from 25 to 50 years, or, apart from "turn-over", to be occupied by at least two households in its lifetime. Hence, over any considerable period of time, the total number of dwelling units needed will be substantially less than the number of households which ever existed during the period. One gap in our knowledge here relates to the longevity of dwelling units. In principle, the average "length of life" of a dwelling unit could be determined statistically by computing a "life table" for dwelling units, that is, by adapting the techniques of life table construction used in demographic studies to housing data. Average length of life would correspond to "expectation of life" in the conventional life table.^{23/}

h) Urbanization and internal migration

The discussion has to this point been confined to a consideration of the national situation as a whole. Housing needs have to be evaluated locally, however, i.e., in terms of specific geographic areas, and housing programs must be adapted to the needs of a specific local population. Housing needs vary from area to area on the basis of local differences in the numbers and characteristics of households, rates of household formation, and prospects for growth in the number of households, as well as on the basis of prevailing housing conditions, family income characteristics, and the nature of the local economy. These considerations are all the more

^{23/} Such a table could be developed on the basis of data on the total number of housing units in a given year and data on the number of units demolished or declared unfit for habitation in the year, each distributed by "year built" or "age". From these data would be computed the "age-specific death rates" corresponding to the conventional life table. At present, the kind of data required to prepare such a table is rarely available. Eventually, it would be desirable to refine such studies by preparing separate tables according to the type of dwelling and the basic material of construction.

pertinent in view of the fact that housing is essentially an immobile commodity and a housing supply of a particular kind no longer needed by or ill-adapted to, one community cannot simply be transferred to another community which has need for it.

The most outstanding demographic facts concerning the internal geographic distribution of the population of Latin America are that Latin America is still a predominantly rural continent, although urbanization has been proceeding rapidly.^{24/} With the exception of Argentina, Cuba, Chile, Uruguay, and Venezuela, every other country of Latin America has a majority in rural areas, although Colombia and Mexico are near the point of balance (see table 1).

Nearly 30 per cent of the population of Latin America lived in cities of 20 000 or more in 1960 as compared with about 25 per cent in 1950. As expected, there are wide variations from these regional averages, however. For example, 1 out of every 2 Argentinians live in cities of 20 000 or more, whereas only 1 in every 20 Haitians live in cities of this size.

Within the general framework of urbanization, growth has been greater for the larger cities than for the smaller ones. The general pattern has been for a single large city to dominate the urban population of each country and to contain an increasingly larger proportion of the total urban population.^{25/} Caracas Metropolitan District expanded from 5 per cent of the total population in 1920 to 16 per cent in 1955. Santiago about

^{24/} The discussion regarding urbanization which follows is based largely on the report of the United Nations: "Aspectos Demográficos de la Urbanización en América Latina", Seminario sobre problemas de urbanización en América Latina. Santiago de Chile, 6 al 18 de julio de 1959, E/CN.12/URB/18, 30 de septiembre de 1958, esp. pages 1-6.

^{25/} Harley L. Browning, "Recent Trends in Latin American Urbanization", Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, March 1958, pages 111-120, esp. pages 114-115.

doubled its proportion from 10 per cent to 22 per cent between 1907 and 1952 and is now nearly five times larger than the second metropolitan area in Chile. The Montevideo Metropolitan area contained 33 per cent of the national population in 1954 and was 17 times larger than the second metropolitan area. The suburban population of large cities has been growing rapidly too, so that for a number of cities a substantial proportion of the area's population lives outside the city limits (e.g., 37 per cent of the population of Buenos Aires).

The main factor accounting for the more rapid growth of cities is net migration from rural areas; the rates of natural increase in the urban areas and the rural areas are apparently quite similar. In several countries net migration contributed more than half of the recent growth of the urban population.

The rapid urban growth will undoubtedly continue in the foreseeable future in Latin America.^{26/} Moreover, the rapid momentum of recent decades may be maintained. In the current decade, the balance for Latin America as a whole will shift. In 1960, about 48 per cent of the population of Latin America was living in urban areas. If the assumptions in the projections shown in table 1 are realized, by 1970 the urban population is expected to rise to about 54 per cent. But even at this date the rural population will predominate in all countries (12) except Peru and those mentioned above as having, or about to have, an excess of urban population.

Cities differ significantly from rural areas in at least two basic demographic characteristics important in evaluating housing needs. The first is marital status; the second is age distribution. The urban population has a greater percentage of single persons, and rural areas have a greater proportion of married persons (including de facto unions). The cities also have a greater proportion of widowed, divorced, and separated persons. These differences can be attributed, at least partially, to the migration to the cities from the country of many single youths and to the tendency for persons in the city to marry at a later age.

^{26/} United Nations, Report on the World Social Situation, New York, 1957, p. 192.

With respect to de facto unions separately, the difference between the urban and rural populations is even more pronounced.

As a result of the relatively lower fertility of the cities and the larger proportion unmarried, the urban population has a smaller proportion of children and smaller families. At the same time, principally because of migration, cities have a larger proportion of young and older adults. The migrants from the country are mostly young adults (between the ages of 15 and 39), especially women.

Data on marital status for geographic subdivisions of countries were not called for in the recommendations of the United Nations or the Interamerican Statistical Institute; nevertheless, such data were compiled by 12 countries. It is important also to have information regarding the numbers of households, household characteristics, and changes in these series for geographic areas at various levels, for the principal administrative divisions as well as for the urban area and principal cities. Data on the number of private households by size are available for years around 1950 for the principal geographic divisions of 12 countries of Latin America. Nine countries provided data on relationship to head for members of private households for geographic divisions. Few provided data on households distributed by age of head, and none provided geographic data on the number of private households by structural type following the general lines suggested by the United Nations for countries as a whole.^{27/}

^{27/} The many types of data on households which were published for Panama are available also for the provinces of Panama, by urban and rural parts.

3. Some demographic aspects of the measurement of housing needs

(a) Estimation of the existing deficit

We come next to a consideration of the use of population data in connection with the specific methods of measuring the current deficit of housing and of projecting housing needs. Let us first accept the definition of a private household as an individual or group of individuals who occupy a housing unit or who habitually live together "under the same roof". Then it is evident that the number of housing units required at any date is equivalent to the number of private households. If all households did in fact currently occupy housing units, on the surface there would seem to be no existing quantitative housing deficit. In fact, however, a substantial number of persons do not occupy housing units. A small number of persons are homeless. These persons are probably omitted both from the housing and population censuses and it is impossible to arrive at even an approximate estimate of their number.

In addition, a substantial part of the population of Latin America lives neither in conventional dwellings nor in institutional households, but in makeshift (improvised, "rustic" non permanent) structures and converted units not originally intended for habitation. The makeshift structures are made of such materials as mud, old boards, straw, scrap metal, etc., and are variously known as rucas, ranchos, cités (shacks, huts, etc.) Most of the population of rural Latin America lives in such structures. These makeshift units and their occupants are supposed to be enumerated both in the housing and population censuses. Because of their particular character, however, they are extremely difficult to enumerate satisfactorily, and it is quite possible that many households and structures of this kind are omitted from the population census, the housing census, or both. A discrepancy between the count of private households and the count of occupied dwellings, taken from separate population and housing censuses, may result from the fact that some persons and households enumerated in the population census live in makeshift units which were not counted, or some of the makeshift dwelling units which were enumerated in the housing census are occupied by households which were not counted.

/This discrepancy

This discrepancy may represent a part of the total current deficit in the number of housing units. Data from the housing census on type of structure (house, apartment, room, hut, etc.) and material of construction may provide a basis for a direct estimate of the number of makeshift units and converted units not originally intended for habitation, but in view of the probable underenumeration, this figure must be considered minimal. Although information on the number of persons occupying these units may be available from the housing census, information on their demographic characteristics would not be available, and a collation of the population and housing censuses would be necessary.

In addition to the population living in improvised dwelling places, or lacking shelter of any kind, account must also be taken of the population living in conventional units which are in dilapidated condition (that is, needing major repairs) or which lack basic facilities (piped water, sanitary service, electricity, etc.) The existence of dilapidated units results from failure to maintain old buildings at satisfactory standards or to condemn and to demolish old buildings which are no longer fit for habitation. One may speak of this as a deficiency in quality as opposed to a deficiency in quantity, but it is virtually impossible to maintain this distinction if a large segment of the dwelling units are improvised or are in unfit condition. The housing census could provide information on state of repair or dilapidation, year of construction, and facilities available, but, once again, it cannot provide information on the demographic characteristics of the occupants.

Next, the demographic characteristics of some households may, in themselves, be the cogent factor in the need for different housing. A proportion of the households are living under housing conditions which do not provide sufficient space or a sufficient number of rooms for health, safety, and privacy, etc., in relation to the number, age, sex, marital status, and household status of the members, although there is no serious question about the condition of the physical structure itself. The need for housing depends also on the preference of individuals, affected by custom and tradition, to share their quarters or to live separately.

/These preferences

These preferences are subject to cyclical and secular variation, but a strong tradition may prevail supporting the practice of a separate dwelling for each nuclear family on the one hand, or of sharing of quarters by the joint family on the other. Fewer dwellings are needed in the latter case, of course. In Latin America, the practice seems to run closer to the former type. Accordingly, under more favorable conditions of housing supply and cost, and of family income, many families might be disposed to seek separate housing units rather than to live doubled up with other families, or would not offer housing space in their units to lodgers or boarders, who might then seek separate units. Finally, mention should be made of the need for additional units which would serve as a reserve of vacant units and which would make possible adjustment to the housing requirements just referred to. This element simply allows for the fact that it is impossible to plan precisely the number and types of units needed and that housing needs are in a state of continuous change.

As suggested, demographic data represent essential components of some of the most important formal measures used for evaluating current housing conditions.^{28/} These measures applied at various past dates may serve also as a basis for evaluating the future need to replace deteriorating units. The measures mentioned below are not equally useful for international comparisons, but they may be applicable in the case of particular countries. Those measures which are dependent solely on the physical condition of the structure are as follows:

1. Percent of the population or households living in "dwellings" (that is conventional permanent dwellings); the percent of the population or households living in housing units classified as "rustic", improvised, or not normally intended for habitation, or which is without regular shelter of any kind,

^{28/} A more detailed discussion of this subject is given in: United Nations Statistical Indicators of Housing Conditions, Statistical Papers, Series M, No. 37, New York, 1962.

2. Per cent of the population or households living in unconventional and dilapidated dwellings, including conventional housing units which are in need of major repairs, or no longer fit for occupancy, as well as "rustic" and improvised units, and units not originally intended for habitation.^{29/} The measures above are particularly appropriate for the countries of Latin America where, because of the acute inadequacies in the supply of housing, a substantial portion of the population does not live in conventional dwellings.

Measures which depend on the conditions of occupancy or the characteristics of the occupants are as follows:

1. Average number of persons per room (for occupied dwellings only); percent of occupied dwellings with three or more persons per room; or percent of persons or households living in units with three or more persons per room. These are measures of crowding in dwellings. The use of "three" is illustrative and more than one alternative may be used to indicate degrees of crowding. Similar measures, based on meters of floor space and cubic meters of living space are also possible in principle, but data are rarely available for computing them and they are, in effect, impracticable.

2. Ratio of families to dwelling units. This measures suggests the relative extent to which families are living doubled up. Families may be defined in terms of units of related persons, or in terms of units of married persons and their unmarried children. The latter definition gives a higher index of crowding, of course.

(b) Projections of households and household characteristics

If we employ the definition of a household as an individual or group of individuals which occupy a housing unit, projections of the number of actual or potential households represent, in effect, the number of units

^{29/} The difficulty of defining dilapidation on a comparable basis suggests the substitution of some specific indication of dilapidation or of some specific indication of the absence of a basic facility (e.g., lack of piped water or toilet). Persons living in institutional households which are in substandard condition could also be included in this measure, in principle, although information on the condition of such structures is not likely to be available.

needed to house the expected population. The number of units to be built to allow for future changes (necessary new construction), however, depends not only on the increase in the number of households, but also on the losses from the housing inventory resulting from demolition or deterioration of present housing units.

Further elements in the number of units to be built are current deficit in conventional (permanent) dwellings discussed earlier and the number of units so dilapidated as to be unfit for habitation. We are, however, concerned here with the relation of future population changes to future housing needs rather than with the projection of the needs for new construction per se. We shall largely confine ourselves, therefore, to the methodology of projection of actual and potential household characteristics.

Alternative basic procedures of projecting households vary in terms of whether the results are intended to represent essentially extensions of past trends which reproduce the basic features of past household composition and the associated tendencies toward doubling-up of families, or whether they incorporate the use of various norms relating to the size and composition of households under more favorable conditions of housing supply, housing cost, family income, and similar factors. When there is considerable doubling-up of families resulting from a housing shortage and the high cost of housing in relation to family income, the projected number of households obtained by extending past trends may be viewed as a type of "minimal" estimate of the household to be accommodated. On the other hand, an excessively high ("maximal") estimate is obtained by applying the norm that every nuclear family and every individual not living in a family group should have a separate dwelling unit. A practical and reasonable norm would appear to lie somewhat between these two approaches. The additional households to be accommodated under the first approach would be the excess of the projected number of households over the present number; under the second approach it would be the hypothetical increase in households resulting from the application of the norm stated, at both the current date and the future date. Even lower minimal estimates of future households to be accommodated would be obtained

/by positing

by positing the norm that, of the future households added, as indicated by the projection of past trends in the number of households, only a proportion equal to the proportion of current households occupying conventional dwellings needs to be furnished with dwellings.^{30/} This approach aims at maintaining at least the present level of the housing supply in relation to population size.

Several procedures have been developed for projecting the number and characteristics of households. The so-called crude methods are, of course, easier to apply, but they do not take as fully into account the various factors affecting the future growth of households, and do not provide any of several desirable types of by-products relating to the characteristics of households. Furthermore, the more refined procedures allow for the alternative possibilities resulting from possible variations in the crucial factors affecting changes in the number of households, and hence permit some evaluation of the results in terms of the components which make up the final totals.

The crude rate of future population growth would give a very rough indication of the percent increase in the number of households over a given future period. Although the average size of households, and the proportion of the population outside private households, change slowly over short periods of time, as we have seen the number of households tends to grow at a somewhat different rate than the total population. The similarity in the growth of population and households may be closer if the adult population (say, 18 years of age and over) is used rather than the total population, inasmuch as household heads fall almost wholly in this age range.

Over the longer run, the average size of household (and the average number of adults per household) is almost certain to change, and hence the future rate of growth of population and of households will differ, sometimes

^{30/} United Nations, Proposed Methods of Estimating Housing Needs, E/CN.3/274, 20 January 1960. See especially page 32, table 2, which illustrates the differences in housing requirements when the percentage of the population living in conventional dwellings varies from 70 to 100 per cent.

very sharply. The number of households should be estimated more directly, therefore. The more refined methods of projection take into account the composition of the population by age, sex, marital status, relationship to the head of the household, and other variables which have an important effect on changes in the number of households. The choice of variables used in making projections of households depends on two basic considerations: first, the value of the variable in improving the quality of the projections and, second, the need to include the variable because projections in the corresponding detail are sought. An illustration of each may be given: Statistics on age of head and computation of projections by age-of-head classes are desirable because they contribute to the quality of the final projections even though projections of households by age-of-head classes as such may not be needed. If specific information is sought as to the number of nuclear families with children who are living with other families, then variables such as relationship to head, marital status, or family type must be incorporated into the projection method.

A basic part of all the so-called refined procedures in the use of projections of population by age and sex. Highly reliable projections of adult population by age and sex are often already available or can be computed merely, in most cases, by use of census figures by age and sex and projected age-specific death rates. One does not have to begin projecting births for the present purpose until the projection period extends for 15 or 20 years ahead. Moreover, marital status and relationship status, and, hence, the number and size of households vary closely with age and sex; it is desirable in making household projections to take into account, at least, the effect of changing age-sex composition on the number and overall average size of households. The procedure for making population projections are well known and they have been described in a number of places.^{31/} In brief, a cohort-survival component method

^{31/} The United Nations has issued a manual describing in detail how such projections can be prepared even when some of the necessary vital statistics are lacking: Methods for Population Projections by Sex and Age, Manual III, ST/SOA/Series A, Population Studies, N° 25.

is employed. This method involves computation in terms of age-sex groups and in terms of the components of births, deaths, and net migration. More specifically, the base population, distributed in age-sex groups and possibly adjusted for age misreporting and underenumeration in the census, is carried forward by age cohorts, to various future dates by use of projected age-specific survival rates and birth rates.

The method of projecting households based on projections of population by age and sex, may simultaneously incorporate certain specific norms regarding the need for housing units. For example, Morales prepared a set of projections of "households" for Chile, for the period 1952 to 1982, which were based on rough assumptions regarding the types of persons in each marital status category which should have their own households.^{32/} Specifically, each married couple and each widowed and divorced person under age 60 were assumed to require a separate housing unit. The estimates of married couples, and of widowed and divorced persons, were derived by projecting current proportions of the population in each age-sex group which fell in each marital class on the basis of data for the four censuses from 1920 to 1952, and applying the projected proportions to projections of the male and female population by age (15 years and over) already available.^{33/} The normative assumptions employed here seem to set a rather demanding standard for housing utilization and supply. Morales, in fact, concluded that the number of housing units built between 1952 and 1957 in Chile was well below the number required merely to take care of population growth during the period.

^{32/} Julio Morales V., "Estimación de las necesidades de Viviendas en Chile, entre 1952 y 1982", prepared for the "Seminario de las Naciones Unidas sobre Evaluación y Utilización de Resultados de Censos de Población en América Latina", 30 de noviembre - 18 de diciembre de 1959, Santiago, Chile, limited distribution, E/CN.9/CONF.1/L.18, November 23, 1959.

^{33/} The proportion single at each age among women for 1957 and 1962 was obtained by fitting a second-degree polynomial by the method of least squares to the proportions for 1920, 1930, 1940, and 1952; after 1962 the proportions were held constant. The residual ever-married group was subdivided principally by use of ratios of widows to married women "Borrowed" from data for Belgium and Ireland. In general, for males, current proportions in each marital group were kept constant.

Other procedures employ additional data and other assumptions regarding the relation between the number in each marital status category and the number of households. One could proceed from projections of the population by age and sex to projections of marital status by age and sex, which are then combined by age and subdivided into relationship categories (principally the "head" category) on the basis of proportions prevailing at the last census or two. If the marital category, married-spouse present, is given separately in the census data,^{34/} projections can be readily made of the number and proportion of married couples who do have their own households. For this purpose, projections of the number in the married "head" category would be subtracted from projections of the total number of married couples.

Data by age of head of household may also be used effectively with population data by age in the form of so-called headship rates or ratios of heads to population in each age group. These may be employed apart from data on marital status: data on marital status by age and sex may be lacking, or it may be necessary to reduce the volume of work where both types of data are available. We have already noted that a general age-specific headship rate (heads per person) varies in the same way as the mean size of household (persons per head), by age of head. Use in household projections of the proportions which heads constitute of the total population in an age group permits allowing for (1) the effect of future changes in age composition on the general proportion of heads among adults in the population (or on the overall average size of households) and (2) for future changes in the proportion of heads in the population (or the average size of household) at each age.

In the absence of data on heads by age, a model or assumed schedule of age-sex-specific headship rates could be developed and applied. As was suggested earlier, schedules of age-specific headship rates do not appear

^{34/} As we have seen, "married" (legally or de facto) refers only to persons living with their spouses in the data for several countries of Latin America.

to vary widely enough from area to area to prejudice seriously their use in this way. The model schedule should first be tested on data from the census for the area under consideration and adjusted to yield the reported total of heads (or households) at the census date.

Where data on marital status and heads, by age and sex, are available in cross-tabulation, it would seem desirable to take account of all these data, by making the projections in terms of age-sex specific headship rates for each marital status category. Illustrative basic data for Panama are given in table 4. In the absence of age detail for heads in the specific marital classes, one could make use of sets of assumed schedules of age-sex specific headship rates. Again, each assumed schedule should first be tested on census data for the given area and adjusted to yield the reported total of heads in each marital status category for all ages combined and, if appropriate, the reported total of heads at each age for all marital status groups combined. This procedure could be applied in the case of Brazil and Venezuela, for which the relevant data are shown in tables 2, 3 and 4.

Pressat has applied a variation of this method in making projections of households for France.^{35/} Having data on marital status by age and sex for a series of dates and data on heads of households by age for two marital categories (married, other) at a single census, he projected the proportions married at each age for each sex by age cohorts, and to the resulting projections of the number of married males, other males, and married females by age he applied the appropriate age-specific headship rates. For this purpose, the pattern of change in the percent married from one age group to the next, for a given cohort, was determined from the changes between the same pair of ages, for the next two older cohorts. Where data on age of heads are available for a series of dates, the method employed by Pressat could be extended to include projecting the percent heads on a cohort basis also. This procedure is directly applicable to series which by their nature are cumulative.

^{35/} Roland Pressat, "Un essai de perspectives de ménages", International Population Conference, Vienna 1959. International Union for the Scientific Study of Population, pages 112-121.

In the most detailed methods, data on marital status by age and sex, and data on family and household structure, by age and sex of head, may be used in combination to provide projections of marital status groups by age and the number of households and families by type. Depending on the data available and the procedure employed, one could obtain the number of households which are headed by (primary) families by type of family (husband-wife families, other male-head families, and female-head families); the number of households which are headed by (primary) individuals, by sex; and the number of (secondary) families and individuals living with other (primary) families or individuals in the same households. One could obtain also the total number of married couples, the number of married couples which live in the households of others, the total number of nuclear families and the number of nuclear families which live in the households of others. The structural types for which estimates are prepared may follow the classification given earlier, which distinguishes households according to whether they consist merely of a married couple or include unmarried children, married children or married children with their children. It would be desirable to secure estimates also of the number of other types of households, particularly one-person households, households with "other relatives", and households which contain families or individuals which are not related to the primary family or individual.

In the practical application of these methods, as before, projections of the total population by age and sex, and then of the population in each marital status category by age and sex, are prepared. The proportion single at each age may be projected on an age basis (e.g., by use of the average annual change in the proportion at the same age between two past dates) or on a cohort basis (e.g., by use of the relation of the proportion in a given age group to the proportion in the preceding age group at an earlier date). The ever-married group, obtained as a difference between the total in an age group and the number single, may then be subdivided into the "married-spouse present" group and the "other ever-married" group on the basis of proportions from the previous census or censuses. The categories of families and households are then obtained by use of other relationship observed at the last census or

/censuses, held

censuses, held constant or projected, which are applied sequentially to the estimates of the various marital categories and household or family categories by age, computed in prior steps. For example, the number of households consisting of males who lived alone or who headed households in which there were no relatives of the head could be estimated as a proportion of the total number of males not "married, wife present". All the computations are carried forward by age and sex groups, and the process consists in subdividing the projected population into successively smaller groups until all the desired categories are obtained. This kind of projection has been prepared for the United States and reference should be made to the appropriate report for details.^{36/}

It should be evident that the detailed type of projection just described is hardly possible at this time for the countries of Latin America because of the lack of the necessary data. A principle problem is the failure to make a distinction between households, families, and nuclear families and to compile data for these categories. Hence, one of the simpler methods of making projections described earlier must be used.

Because of the uncertainty of future developments, it is customary and prudent to prepare several series of projections, rather than simply one, to illustrate the levels and range of figures which may result from alternative trends in population size, age and sex composition, and marital and family status. Possible variations in future fertility, in particular, may have a considerable effect on the population in the early ages of adulthood by 1980. Similarly, the future proportion of the population in various marital or family status categories, particularly the proportion of single persons, may be subject to considerable doubt and it may, therefore, be desirable to employ more than one assumption for projecting these categories.

^{36/} United States Bureau of the Census, "Illustrative Projections of the Number of Households and Families: 1960 to 1980", Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No 90, Washington 25, D.C., December 29, 1958.

In view of the importance of planning for the size of housing in any housing program, something should be said about the projection of households according to size. The simplest procedure is to distribute the projected totals by size, according to the size distribution observed at the last census (specific by type of household, age of head, or marital status of head, if possible). An alternative procedure is to project the size distribution, in order to take account of past trends inside and prospective changes in fertility.

Having current estimates and projections of population, households, and family in the detail described above, it is then possible to apply appropriate norms relating to the need for dwellings to accommodate the additional population. It would seem highly desirable, for use in the development of a housing program, to apply a series of norms rather than simply one, to assess the contribution of various components in the norms to total requirements.^{37/}

(c) Regional estimates and projections

Mention has already been made of the importance of assessing current and future housing requirements regionally and locally. As we have seen, regional and local population growth is importantly affected by migratory movements, especially the movement to cities. The redistribution of population and households is, of course, not accompanied by a corresponding redistribution of dwellings since dwellings are essentially immobile. Moreover, in Latin America, the need for rural dwellings is often satisfied by the construction of single dwellings by the rural people themselves; but when the family moves to the city, it generally depends on the availability of dwellings constructed industrially. Thus, in practice, migration to cities and the resulting growth of city population adds

^{37/} A more detailed discussion of the use of norms to take account of household structure and changes is given in: H.V. Muhsam, "Estimates and projections of numbers and characteristics of families and households in relation to housing requirements", prepared for United Nations Seminar on Evaluation and Utilization of Population Census Data in Latin America, Santiago, Chile, 30 Nov.-18 Dec. 1959, E/CN.9/CONF.1/L.15.

sharply to housing requirements.^{38/} It is important, therefore, to evaluate local housing requirements directly by use of current estimates and projections of the number of households and their characteristics for the principal administrative divisions of a country, its urban and rural parts, and principal cities.

Projections of the population of provinces and cities may be made by a number of methods. Mention may be made of mathematical extrapolation; correlation analysis, including use of economic series; projection of the ratio of the regional to the national total, and component methods, particularly the cohort-survival variation.^{39/} In the method of economic analysis, the total population may be projected on the basis of the past relation between population and certain economic series, or net migration may be projected separately on the basis of data on the relation between net migration and various economic series. As may be recalled, in the cohort-survival variation of the component method, computation of the components of births, deaths, and migration is carried out in terms of age-sex groups and the base population is carried forward by age and sex. Alternative assumptions regarding fertility and net internal migration are necessary in making projections of regions or cities by the component method in view of the volatility or possible variability of these components.

A quick procedure of projecting the population of geographical areas is to use the component method, not by age, developing projected series of births, deaths, and migration in terms of the past trends in birth, death, and migration rates. The number of households may then be assumed to have grown at the same rate as population between the base date and the projection date; i.e., the average size of household is assumed to remain

^{38/} In the case of economically developed countries, housing requirements may, from this point of view, be greater, because the same need for industrial construction of houses exists for rural and urban areas and a given family may require at one date a rural dwelling and at another an urban dwelling. Furthermore, if the rural population is declining, as is happening in some areas, many of the rural units may be abandoned instead of transferred to another family.

^{39/} A general outline and description of these methods is given in: J.S. Siegel, "Some aspects of the methodology of population forecasts for geographic subdivisions of countries", Proceedings of the United Nations World Population Conference, Rome, September 1954, Vol. __, United Nations, New York, 1958.

constant. Or, the ratio of population to households for the province or city may be projected on the basis of the observed ratios and applied to the population total for future years.

The more complex methods involve the use of the cohort-survival procedure for projecting population and the application of observed or projected headship rates at each age to the population by age and sex. If such rates are available only for the country as a whole, they may be "borrowed" for use in each province, after being adjusted to yield the total number of households at the census date for each province. If appropriate data are available, projections of the distribution of the population at each age by marital status may first be made, and then the marital groups may be subdivided into heads and non-heads.^{40/} In short, once population projections by age and sex are prepared, the possible procedures for projecting households for provinces or cities parallel those described for the country as a whole.

Projections for province, urban and rural zones, and specific cities are subject to considerable error, substantially greater error than projections for national areas because of the greater uncertainty relating to future population changes for small areas and the greater number of highly variable factors involved, particularly internal migration. Projections of this kind should be interpreted merely as rough guides illustrating the general magnitude of the changes which would result under the specific assumptions selected.

4. Basic Sources of Population Data for Housing Programs

The population data required for studying the influence of demographic factors on housing needs, and for measuring current and future housing requirements, can be obtained from censuses of population, censuses of housing in combination with censuses of population, regular sample surveys, and special sample surveys. In addition, population estimates and projections may be already available and can be adopted and extended for the present purpose.

^{40/} An illustration of this procedure is given in: A.H. Walkden, "The estimation of future numbers of private households in England and Wales", Population Studies, Vol. 15, No. 2, Nov. 1961, pages 174-185

From the housing census would come information regarding the existing stock of housing, the qualitative characteristics of this stock, and possibly limited information regarding the occupants. From the population census would come detailed information regarding the number and characteristics of persons and households occupying these units. From the periodic sample survey would come continuing, up-to-date information on the number and characteristics of households; and from the special sample survey or surveys would come information regarding attitudes and preferences of household members relating to their housing conditions and needs.

Specifically, the housing census would provide data on the number of housing units classified by type, size, number of rooms, number of occupants, condition (that is, dilapidated or not), year and material of construction, facilities provided (water, electricity, etc.); and the population census would provide data on the composition of the population by sex, age, marital status, and family and household status. The population census would also provide data on internal migration or the basis for making estimates of internal migration.

The United Nations and the Interamerican Statistical Institute (IASI) have developed and published recommendations regarding the subjects on which information should be obtained in national population censuses taken around 1960.^{41/} The tabulations recommended which would be of particular value in connection with studies of housing needs are as follows:

<u>Tabulation</u>	<u>United Nations</u>	<u>IASI</u>
1. Population by marital status, sex, and age	First priority, tab. No. 6	Minimum, tab. No. 5
2. Population by size and class of household	First priority, tab. No. 13	Minimum, tab. No. 16
3. Population in private households by structural type and size	Second priority, tab. No. 14	

^{41/} United Nations, Principles and Recommendations for National Censuses of Population, Statistical Reports, Series M, No. 27, New York 1958; and Interamerican Statistical Institute, Estadística, Report on the VI Session of the Committee on Improvement of National Statistics, Buenos Aires, Argentina, November 17-28, 1958, Vol. XVI Supplement 2 to No. 61, December 1958, pages 695-731, Washington, D.C.

<u>Tabulation</u>	<u>United Nations</u>	<u>IASI</u>
4. Population in private households by household relationship, marital status, and sex		Expanded, tab. No. 13
5. Heads of private households by major occupational groups and by branches of economic activity, by sex and age groups		Expanded, tabs. No. 14 and No. 15.
6. Families and numbers of family members by size of family		Expanded, tab. No. 16
7. Women by number of live-born children, by age of women	First priority, tab. No. 13	Expanded, tab. No. 17

Tabulations of the population by administrative divisions, principal places, and population size classes, were included in the United Nations and IASI recommendations, but specific proposals were not given regarding tabulations of households or families for these areas. For urban and rural areas, tabulations by marital status, sex, and age were recommended in the United Nations list at the second priority level.

A very important source of information is the combination of the housing census and population census so as to obtain information on the characteristics of the household in relation to those of the housing unit which it occupies. This is possible when the two censuses are taken concurrently or jointly. By coordinating the processing and tabulating of the two censuses, data on the type, size, and condition, etc., of the housing unit may be obtained in relation to the size and structural type of the household.

Inasmuch as the numbers and characteristics of persons and households change with the passage of time, it is useful periodically to obtain up-to-date information of this kind by means of a "continuing" national sample survey. Such a survey could also secure certain types of housing information.^{42/}

^{42/} United Nations, Handbook of Household Surveys, Chapter 4, "Demographic Characteristics (ACC/WPSSP/III/5/Add.4), prepared for the Administrative Committee on Coordination, Working Party on Statistics for Social Programmes, Third Session, Geneva, 16-20 October 1961.

Sociological investigation is needed to supplement the results of the censuses and the periodic demographic surveys, if answers are to be obtained to many of the important questions regarding the relation between demographic characteristics and housing requirements. A special sample survey could provide information on the preferences of individuals regarding their housing on the basis of alternative conditions of housing supply and characteristics, housing costs, family income, family composition, and other factors. Such a survey would thus aid in distinguishing the cases of doubling up which result from choice and those imposed by circumstances, and in evaluating the role of custom and taste in living arrangements, the choice of location, and the use of housing space. Ideally, the special sample survey should itself be linked to the population and housing censuses or to the periodic sample survey of households.

The usefulness of the data from the population and housing censuses and the sample surveys would be greatly enhanced for the purpose of housing studies, if in addition to national data, separate figures are available for regions, provinces, large cities, and urban-rural areas. Practical considerations, however, may dictate confining the sample surveys to selected areas, such as the larger cities.

/Selected List

Selected List of Publications Relating to the
Demographic Aspects of Housing Requirements

- Brown, S.P., "Analysis of a hypothetical stationary population by family units", Population Studies (London), Vol. 4, pages 380-394, 1951.
- Glass, Ruth, and Davidson, F.G., "Household structure and housing needs", Population Studies (London), Vol. 4, No 4, pages 395-420, March 1951.
- Glick, Paul C., American Families, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York (Chapman and Hall, Limited, London), 1957.
- Harmsen, H. (ed.), Haushalt und Familie, Ermittlung und Analysis ihrer Struktur, Deutsche Akademie für Bevölkerungswissenschaft, Veröffentlichung A 4, Hamburg 1959.
- Henry, Louis, "Structure de la population et besoins de logement", Population, (Paris), Vol. 4, No 3, pages 433-446, 1949.
- Henry, Louis, "Perspectives relatives aux besoins de logements", Population, (Paris), Vol. 5, No 3, pages 493-512, 1950.
- Muhsam, H.V., "Estimates and projections of numbers and characteristics of families and households in relation to housing requirements" (E/CN.9/CONF.1/L.15), paper prepared for the United Nations, Seminar on Evaluation and Utilization of Population Census Data in Latin America, Santiago, Chile, 30 November-18 December 1959.
- Musham, H.V., "Population Data and Analyses Needed in Assessing Present and Future Housing Requirements" (E/CN.9/CONF.2/L.10), paper prepared for the United Nations Seminar on Evaluation and Utilization of Population Census Data in Asia and the Far East, Bombay, India, 20 June-8 July 1960.
- Pressat, Roland, "Un essai de perspectives de ménages", International Population Conference, Vienna 1959, International Union for the Scientific Study of Population, pages 112-121.
- Sauvy, A., "Logement et Population", Population (Paris), Vol. 1, pages 441-452, 1946.
- Sonnabend, H., "Notes on the statistics of housing and town planning", Bulletin de l'Institut International de Statistique, tome XXXIV, 3eme livraison, pages 521-529.

- United Nations, Proposed Methods of Estimating Housing Needs (E/CN.3/274), item 11 of the provisional agenda of the eleventh session of the Statistical Commission, 20 January 1960, New York.
- United Nations, Seminar on Evaluation and Utilization of Population Census Data in Latin America (E/CN.9/CONF.1/1/Rev.1), Santiago Chile, 30 November-18 December 1959, New York, 1960, especially pages 14-18, 21-24 and 88-90.
- Walkden, A.H., "The Estimation of Future Numbers of Private Households in England and Wales", Population Studies (London), Vol. 15, No 2, pages 174-185, Nov. 1961.
- Winnick, Louis, "The Changing Household", Chapter 8 (pages 79-111) in American Housing and Its Use, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, (Chapman and Hall, Limited, London), 1957.

/LIST OF

LIST OF TABLES

Text Tables

- Table A. Estimated average annual rates of natural increase, birth rates, and death rates, for world total, Latin America, and North-western Europe: 1955-59.
- Table B. Average annual rates of natural increase, birth rates, and death rates: 1950-55.
- Table C. Percent of the population living in institutional (non-family) households: Around 1950.
- Table D. Mean size of household and related demographic measures: Around 1950.
- Table E. Percent distribution of private households and of the population in private households by number of members: Around 1950.
- Table F. Percent of persons 15 years of age and over in de facto unions: Around 1950.
- Table G. Percent distribution of the population in private households by relationship to head of household, by sex: Around 1950.
- Table H. Age-specific headship rates by sex for Brazil and Panama: 1950.
- Table I. Estimated median age at first marriage: Around 1950.
- Table J. Estimated percent of a population cohort which will ever marry, by sex.
- Table K. Average number of children ever born per 1 000 women 45 and over: Around 1950.

Appendix tables

- Table 1. Estimates and projections of the total, urban, and rural population of the countries of Latin America: 1950, 1960, and 1970.
- Table 2. Percent distribution of the population by marital status, by age and sex, for selected countries of Latin America: Around 1950.
- Table 3. Marital status of the population in private households by relationship to head of household, by sex, for Brazil and Venezuela: 1950.
- Table 4. Percent heads of total population by age, by marital status and sex, for Panama, urban and rural: 1950.

Annex

Table 1

LATIN AMERICA: ESTIMATES AND PROJECTIONS OF THE TOTAL, URBAN, AND RURAL POPULATION
BY COUNTRY: MIDYEAR 1950, 1960, AND 1970

Country	Number (in thousands)									Decennial percent change					
	Total			Urban			Rural			Total		Urban		Rural	
	1950	1960	1970	1950	1960	1970	1950	1960	1970	1950-1960	1960-1970	1950-1960	1960-1970	1950-1960	1960-1970
	1950	1960	1970	1950	1960	1970	1950	1960	1970	1950-1960	1960-1970	1950-1960	1960-1970	1950-1960	1960-1970
Total	155 570	199 235	257 040	65 469	95 870	138 300	90 101	103 365	118 740	28	29	46	44	15	15
Argentina	17 190	21 000	24 990	11 040	14 205	17 485	6 150	6 795	7 505	22	19	29	23	10	10
Bolivia	2 930	3 600	4 540	1 015	1 380	1 980	1 915	2 220	2 560	23	26	36	43	16	15
Brazil	51 975	65 860 ^a	84 440	18 815	27 380	39 780	33 160	38 480	44 660	27	28	46	45	16	16
Dominican Republic	2 130	2 845	3 895	505	855	1 480	1 625	1 980	2 415	34	37	71	71	22	22
Colombia	11 145	14 770	19 590	4 170	7 065	11 080	6 975	7 705	8 510	33	33	69	57	10	10
Costa Rica	800	1 145	1 560	265	460	685	595	685	875	43	36	74	49	28	28
Cuba	5 520	6 820	8 340	3 065	4 110	5 345	2 455	2 710	2 995	24	22	34	30	10	11
Chile	6 075	7 635	9 660	3 575	5 010	6 900	2 500	2 625	2 760	26	27	40	38	5	5
Ecuador	3 195	4 285	5 630	910	1 500	2 235	2 285	2 785	3 395	34	31	65	49	22	22
El Salvador	1 870	2 395	3 115	685	1 020	1 515	1 185	1 375	1 600	28	30	49	49	16	16
Guatemala	3 040	3 980	5 325	760	1 205	1 940	2 280	2 775	3 385	31	34	59	61	22	22
Haiti	3 110	3 725	4 620	380	710	1 290	2 730	3 015	3 330	20	24	87	82	10	10
Honduras	1 385	1 755	2 305	430	590	885	955	1 165	1 420	27	31	37	50	22	22
Mexico	26 435	35 115	47 330	11 265	17 510	26 900	15 170	17 605	20 430	33	35	55	54	16	16
Nicaragua	1 060	1 465	1 955	370	625	930	690	840	1 025	38	33	69	49	22	22
Panama	755	1 010	1 370	285	430	670	470	580	700	34	36	51	56	23	21
Paraguay	1 400	1 625	1 975	390	565	860	1 010	1 060	1 115	16	22	45	52	5	5
Peru	8 170	10 510	14 030	2 975	4 480	7 030	5 195	6 030	7 000	29	33	51	57	16	16
Uruguay	2 410	2 760	3 020	1 895	2 245	2 505	515	515	515	15	9	18	12	-	-
Venezuela	4 975	6 935	9 350	2 675	4 515	6 805	2 300	2 420	2 545	39	35	69	51	5	5

Source: United Nations, "Situación demográfica, económica social y educativa de América Latina", Conferencia sobre educación y desarrollo económico y social en América Latina, Santiago de Chile, 5 a 19 de Marzo de 1962, ST/ECLA/CONF.10/L.4; 10 de enero, 1962, table 1, p. 8.

a/ An estimate of Brazil's midyear population based on the provisional figure from the 1960 Census is 70.6 million, or 4.7 million greater than projected.

Table 2

PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF THE POPULATION 15 YEARS AND OVER BY MARITAL STATUS, BY AGE AND SEX,
FOR SELECTED COUNTRIES OF LATIN AMERICA, AROUND 1950^{a/}

Country and age	Male					Female					Percent of total mar- ried in de facto unions (both sexes)
	Total	Married	Widowed	Di- vorced	Single	Total	Married	Widowed	Di- vorced	Single	
<u>Latin America b/</u>											
Total	100.0	50.5	3.0	0.3	46.2	100.0	50.7	8.8	0.7	39.8	12.6
15-19 years	100.0	1.8	-	-	98.2	100.0	14.2	0.1	0.1	85.6	21.6
20-24	100.0	22.8	0.2	0.1	76.9	100.0	48.6	0.6	0.4	50.4	16.1
25-29	100.0	54.3	0.6	0.2	44.9	100.0	67.0	1.5	0.6	30.9	14.3
30-39	100.0	73.6	1.4	0.4	24.6	100.0	73.7	4.1	0.9	21.3	13.0
40-49	100.0	79.3	3.4	0.6	16.7	100.0	69.4	11.6	1.2	17.8	11.1
50-59	100.0	78.0	7.0	0.7	14.3	100.0	57.5	24.2	1.1	17.2	9.0
60-69	100.0	71.5	14.3	0.7	13.5	100.0	39.1	42.3	0.9	17.7	8.5
70 and over	100.0	61.7	25.7	0.8	11.8	100.0	21.2	58.4	0.8	19.6	12.1
<u>Argentina c/</u>											
Total	100.0	45.3	3.2	0.3	51.2	100.0	47.7	8.9	0.6	42.8	...
15-19 years d/	100.0	0.9	0.1	-	99.0	100.0	6.1	0.1	-	93.8	...
20-24	100.0	10.9	0.1	-	89.0	100.0	33.8	0.3	0.2	65.7	...
25-29	100.0	39.2	0.3	0.1	60.4	100.0	56.4	0.9	0.4	42.3	...
30-39	100.0	62.2	1.0	0.4	36.4	100.0	68.8	2.9	0.8	27.5	...
40-49	100.0	70.2	2.9	0.6	26.3	100.0	69.0	9.2	1.1	20.7	...
50-59	100.0	70.0	6.8	0.7	22.5	100.0	59.8	21.5	1.0	17.7	...
60 and over e/	100.0	62.2	17.8	0.6	19.4	100.0	36.9	46.0	0.6	16.5	...
<u>Bolivia</u>											
Total	100.0	58.1	4.7	0.2	37.0	100.0	52.2	11.3	0.4	36.1	17.2
15-19 years	100.0	4.2	-	-	95.8	100.0	14.0	0.1	-	85.9	42.1
20-24	100.0	39.0	0.4	0.1	60.5	100.0	53.1	0.7	0.3	45.9	27.1
25-29	100.0	69.3	1.1	0.2	29.4	100.0	72.1	2.0	0.5	25.4	21.0
30-39	100.0	83.0	2.5	0.3	14.2	100.0	77.6	6.3	0.7	15.4	16.4
40-49	100.0	85.9	5.2	0.4	8.5	100.0	70.9	16.4	0.7	12.0	13.6
50-59	100.0	83.2	9.3	0.5	7.0	100.0	60.5	28.3	0.5	10.7	10.8
60-69	100.0	77.3	16.1	0.3	6.3	100.0	47.3	41.7	0.3	10.7	9.8
70 and over	100.0	64.1	29.8	0.2	5.9	100.0	33.3	56.2	0.2	10.3	8.8
<u>Brazil b/</u>											
Total	100.0	54.3	3.2	0.1	42.4	100.0	54.2	9.9	0.2	35.7	...
15-19 years	100.0	1.5	-	-	98.5	100.0	14.8	0.1	-	85.1	...
20-24	100.0	25.4	0.2	-	74.4	100.0	51.9	0.7	0.1	47.3	...
25-29	100.0	59.8	0.7	-	39.5	100.0	70.4	1.8	0.1	27.7	...
30-39	100.0	78.3	1.7	0.1	19.9	100.0	76.3	5.1	0.2	18.4	...
40-49	100.0	83.1	4.3	0.2	12.4	100.0	71.2	14.1	0.3	14.4	...
50-59	100.0	82.2	8.0	0.3	9.5	100.0	58.5	28.4	0.3	12.8	...
60-69	100.0	76.6	14.4	0.3	8.7	100.0	39.6	47.2	0.2	13.0	...
70 and over	100.0	62.9	28.3	0.2	8.6	100.0	18.5	67.3	0.1	14.1	...

/Table 2 (continued)

Table 2 (continued 1)

Country and age	M a l e					F e m a l e					Percent of total mar- ried in de facto unions (both sexes)
	Total	Married	Widowed	Di- vorced	Single	Total	Married	Widowed	Di- vorced	Single	
<u>Chile</u>											
Total	100.0	52.2	3.9	0.9	43.0	100.0	50.2	10.7	1.8	37.3	6.7
15-19 years	100.0	1.5	-	-	98.5	100.0	8.7	0.1	0.2	91.0	11.3
20-24	100.0	20.6	0.2	0.3	78.9	100.0	40.5	0.4	0.9	58.2	8.2
25-29	100.0	52.8	0.7	0.7	45.8	100.0	62.5	1.3	1.6	34.6	7.2
30-39	100.0	73.2	1.5	1.1	24.2	100.0	72.8	3.9	2.5	20.8	7.0
40-49	100.0	79.4	3.9	1.3	15.4	100.0	69.6	11.1	3.0	16.3	6.5
50-59	100.0	77.9	8.3	1.4	12.4	100.0	56.9	24.1	3.0	16.0	5.3
60-69	100.0	71.2	15.3	1.4	12.1	100.0	39.3	42.4	2.2	16.1	5.2
70 and over	100.0	57.3	30.1	1.2	11.4	100.0	20.8	62.3	1.0	15.9	4.9
<u>Colombia</u>											
Total	100.0	40.1	2.4	0.9	56.6	100.0	40.3	7.7	1.9	50.1	19.0
15-19 years	100.0	2.1	-	-	97.9	100.0	15.6	0.2	0.5	83.7	30.2
20-24	100.0	20.9	0.2	0.4	78.5	100.0	48.6	0.9	1.6	48.9	24.9
25-29	100.0	49.7	0.6	0.8	48.8	100.0	63.4	1.9	2.3	32.4	22.1
30-39	100.0	70.0	1.5	1.2	27.3	100.0	67.3	1.8	2.8	25.1	20.0
40-49	100.0	77.3	3.4	1.8	17.5	100.0	61.3	12.3	3.4	23.0	16.4
50-59	100.0	77.1	6.6	2.3	14.0	100.0	50.0	23.4	3.4	23.2	13.0
60-69	100.0	72.2	12.4	2.7	12.7	100.0	34.7	38.6	2.9	23.8	11.4
70 and over	100.0	60.4	24.3	2.6	12.7	100.0	19.2	54.6	2.1	24.1	10.8
<u>Costa Rica f/</u>											
Total	100.0	53.1	2.9	0.2	43.8	100.0	53.0	8.0	0.4	38.6	14.2
15-19 years	100.0	1.6	-	-	98.4	100.0	14.8	0.1	-	85.1	20.7
20-24	100.0	25.4	0.1	-	74.5	100.0	50.0	0.4	0.2	49.4	17.7
25-29	100.0	58.4	0.4	0.2	41.0	100.0	68.0	1.0	0.4	30.6	16.4
30-39	100.0	77.2	1.1	0.3	21.4	100.0	75.1	3.3	0.6	21.0	15.0
40-49	100.0	83.4	2.8	0.3	13.5	100.0	70.8	10.0	0.6	18.6	12.6
50-59	100.0	81.0	6.6	0.4	12.0	100.0	57.5	23.1	0.7	18.7	10.1
60-69	100.0	73.9	13.5	0.3	12.3	100.0	40.2	39.7	0.4	19.7	9.2
70 and over	100.0	58.7	28.0	0.3	13.0	100.0	19.8	58.3	0.3	21.6	7.5
<u>Cuba</u>											
Total	100.0	52.7	2.4	0.6	44.3	100.0	54.4	7.0	1.5	37.1	34.5
15-19 years	100.0	2.1	0.1	-	97.8	100.0	20.2	0.1	0.2	79.5	57.9
20-24	100.0	21.5	0.1	0.2	78.2	100.0	53.9	0.3	0.8	45.0	49.9
25-29	100.0	51.9	0.2	0.5	47.4	100.0	71.0	0.6	1.6	26.8	42.0
30-39	100.0	73.4	0.5	0.8	25.3	100.0	79.4	1.8	2.4	16.4	37.2
40-49	100.0	79.8	1.4	1.0	17.8	100.0	78.3	6.5	2.7	12.5	30.6
50-59	100.0	75.3	3.9	1.4	19.4	100.0	67.0	18.6	2.5	11.9	22.8
60-69	100.0	72.0	10.2	1.0	16.1	100.0	51.0	36.2	1.7	11.1	19.3
70 and over	100.0	60.0	23.6	0.7	15.7	100.0	27.6	59.1	0.7	12.6	20.0
<u>Ecuador</u>											
Total	100.0	54.4	3.3	0.3	42.0	100.0	50.4	8.6	0.4	40.6	28.2
15-19 years	100.0	2.7	-	-	97.3	100.0	17.5	0.1	-	82.4	32.8
20-24	100.0	30.6	0.3	0.1	69.0	100.0	56.0	0.7	0.3	43.0	28.5
25-29	199.0	62.6	0.8	0.2	36.4	100.0	72.5	1.6	0.5	25.4	26.4
30-39	100.0	79.4	1.7	0.4	18.5	100.0	76.0	4.2	0.7	19.1	24.7
40-49	100.0	84.2	3.6	0.5	11.7	100.0	70.4	10.7	0.7	18.2	21.1
50-59	100.0	83.1	7.4	0.5	9.0	100.0	59.6	22.0	0.6	17.8	16.5
60-69	100.0	78.1	13.7	0.4	7.8	100.0	44.4	37.8	0.4	17.4	13.2
70 and over	100.0	66.6	26.2	0.2	7.0	100.0	27.4	56.1	0.1	16.4	10.6

/Table 2 (continued)

Table 2 (continued 2)

Country and age	Male					Female					Percent of total married in de facto unions (both sexes)
	Total	Married	Widowed	Divorced	Single	Total	Married	Widowed	Divorced	Single	
El Salvador											
Total	100.0	49.1	2.9	0.2	47.8	100.0	49.6	7.0	0.4	43.0	49.9
15-19 years	100.0	3.5	-	-	96.5	100.0	19.4	0.1	-	80.5	65.3
20-24	100.0	29.0	0.1	-	70.9	100.0	51.9	0.5	0.3	47.3	60.4
25-29	100.0	54.0	0.4	0.1	45.5	100.0	66.4	1.2	0.4	32.0	55.4
30-39	100.0	70.7	1.2	0.2	27.9	100.0	70.4	3.3	0.6	25.7	51.8
40-49	100.0	76.3	3.3	0.3	20.1	100.0	62.6	9.8	0.5	27.0	45.7
50-59	100.0	75.1	6.7	0.3	17.9	100.0	50.8	19.6	0.7	28.9	37.9
60-69	100.0	68.8	13.1	0.3	17.8	100.0	35.3	32.8	0.4	31.5	34.2
70 and over	100.0	55.6	26.2	0.3	17.9	100.0	21.4	46.0	0.4	32.2	32.3
Guatemala											
Total	100.0	56.9	2.5	0.1	40.5	100.0	58.9	7.6	0.4	33.1	68.1
15-19 years	100.0	7.5	-	-	92.5	100.0	31.5	0.2	0.1	68.2	79.3
20-24	100.0	42.2	0.2	0.1	57.5	100.0	66.7	0.6	0.3	32.4	73.9
25-29	100.0	69.4	0.5	0.1	30.0	100.0	77.8	1.3	0.4	20.5	72.3
30-39	100.0	81.5	1.3	0.2	17.0	100.0	78.9	3.7	0.6	16.8	68.9
40-49	100.0	84.5	3.2	0.2	12.1	100.0	70.5	11.7	0.6	17.2	63.3
50-59	100.0	82.7	6.3	0.2	10.8	100.0	57.5	22.4	0.6	18.5	58.2
60-69	100.0	76.3	12.1	0.2	11.4	100.0	39.5	37.1	0.4	23.0	58.6
70 and over	100.0	64.0	23.7	0.2	12.1	100.0	24.2	52.5	0.3	23.0	57.9
Haiti											
Total	100.0	51.5	0.9	0.7	46.9	100.0	52.9	3.3	1.8	42.0	74.8
15-19 years g/	100.0	0.5	-	-	99.5	100.0	5.1	-	0.1	94.8	86.2
20-24	100.0	10.6	-	0.1	89.3	100.0	36.7	0.1	0.6	62.6	80.8
25-29	100.0	41.6	0.1	0.4	57.9	100.0	64.8	0.3	1.1	33.8	80.0
30-39	100.0	73.9	0.4	0.7	25.0	100.0	77.7	1.1	1.7	19.5	77.7
40-49	100.0	84.8	0.9	1.0	13.3	100.0	74.0	3.5	2.7	19.8	73.6
50-59	100.0	83.9	1.9	1.3	12.9	100.0	62.4	7.9	3.5	26.2	67.2
60-69	100.0	79.9	3.6	1.6	14.9	100.0	47.0	14.1	4.2	34.7	65.5
70 and over	100.0	69.6	7.9	2.2	20.3	100.0	29.8	23.8	4.5	41.9	63.7
Nicaragua											
Total	100.0	48.5	2.5	0.3	48.7	100.0	48.2	6.9	0.5	44.4	42.5
15-19 years	100.0	4.1	0.1	-	95.8	100.0	18.8	0.1	0.1	81.0	54.2
20-24	100.0	28.9	0.1	0.1	70.9	100.0	49.9	0.6	0.3	49.2	52.5
25-29	100.0	54.7	0.6	0.2	44.5	100.0	64.3	1.2	0.4	34.1	50.0
30-39	100.0	71.2	1.3	0.3	27.2	100.0	69.2	3.4	0.6	26.8	45.0
40-49	100.0	78.3	3.3	0.4	18.0	100.0	63.2	9.7	0.7	26.4	37.1
50-59	100.0	77.8	6.2	0.4	15.6	100.0	50.4	19.0	0.8	29.8	29.8
60-69	100.0	71.2	11.7	0.7	16.4	100.0	34.0	32.6	1.1	32.3	25.8
70 and over	100.0	58.7	22.2	0.7	18.4	100.0	21.0	44.2	1.2	33.6	21.3
Panama											
Total	100.0	46.5	2.0	0.4	51.1	100.0	51.3	6.0	0.7	42.0	54.9
15-19 years	100.0	2.9	-	-	97.1	100.0	24.2	0.1	0.1	75.6	72.2
20-24	100.0	28.7	0.1	0.1	71.1	100.0	59.0	0.3	0.4	40.3	67.3
25-29	100.0	55.8	0.4	0.3	43.5	100.0	73.6	0.8	0.7	24.9	61.4
30-39	100.0	71.2	0.8	0.5	27.5	100.0	75.9	2.0	1.4	20.7	55.9
40-49	100.0	74.8	2.2	0.8	22.2	100.0	67.4	7.3	1.3	24.0	51.0
50-59	100.0	71.3	4.7	0.8	23.2	100.0	53.7	18.5	1.0	26.8	42.9
60-69	100.0	64.2	9.5	0.7	25.6	100.0	38.6	31.8	0.7	28.9	35.9
70 and over	100.0	53.7	18.9	0.5	26.9	100.0	22.0	45.3	0.4	32.3	31.8

/Table 2 (concluded)

Table 2 (concluded)

Country and age	Male					Female					Percent of total married in <u>de facto</u> unions (both sexes)
	Total	Married	Widowed	Divorced	Single	Total	Married	Widowed	Divorced	Single	
<u>Paraguay</u>											
Total	100.0	50.0	1.9	0.7	47.4	100.0	46.1	5.7	1.3	46.9	30.6
15-19 years	100.0	0.7	-	-	99.3	100.0	12.7	-	0.1	87.2	40.2
20-24	100.0	19.8	0.1	0.1	80.0	100.0	41.9	0.3	0.5	57.3	41.5
25-29	100.0	52.7	0.3	0.3	46.7	100.0	58.8	0.7	1.0	39.5	38.5
30-39	100.0	74.2	0.6	0.7	24.5	100.0	65.5	2.1	1.5	30.9	33.5
40-49	100.0	81.6	1.7	1.1	15.6	100.0	60.3	6.5	2.1	31.1	27.1
50-59	100.0	78.5	3.8	1.5	16.2	100.0	52.5	11.2	2.3	34.0	21.3
60-69	100.0	73.1	7.5	2.1	17.3	100.0	37.1	22.1	2.0	38.8	17.0
70 and over	100.0	61.8	17.8	2.5	17.9	100.0	18.5	40.0	1.6	39.9	13.3
<u>Venezuela</u>											
Total	100.0	45.8	2.0	0.3	51.9	100.0	44.1	6.6	0.5	48.8	40.1
15-19 years	100.0	2.3	-	-	97.7	100.0	21.1	0.1	0.1	78.7	47.1
20-24	100.0	22.0	0.1	0.1	77.8	100.0	52.2	0.6	0.4	46.8	46.2
25-29	100.0	48.2	0.3	0.3	51.2	100.0	64.8	1.2	0.8	33.2	44.2
30-39	100.0	67.0	0.9	0.5	31.6	100.0	66.7	3.3	0.9	29.1	42.3
40-49	100.0	73.3	2.5	0.6	23.6	100.0	57.6	9.9	0.8	31.7	37.2
50-59	100.0	78.5	3.8	1.5	16.2	100.0	52.5	11.2	2.3	34.0	21.3
60-69	100.0	66.7	11.1	0.4	21.8	100.0	27.7	31.6	0.4	40.3	27.3
70 and over	100.0	55.4	20.0	0.3	24.3	100.0	17.0	40.7	0.2	42.1	25.8

Sources: Instituto Interamericano de Estadística, La Estructura Demográfica de las Naciones Interamericanas, Vol. I, Características Generales de la Población, Tomo 2, "Estado Conyugal y Distribución de la Población por Hogares", Unión Panamericana, Washington, D.C., febrero 1960, Tables 5-10 to 5-29.

a/ "Married" includes persons in stable de facto unions. "Divorced" includes persons separated legally and de facto, and persons with annulled marriages. Persons whose age or marital status was not reported are excluded on the assumption that they are distributed in the same proportions as persons for which reports were given.

b/ Based on data for the 15 countries listed.

c/ Data on de facto unions are not available separately.

d/ Separate data for ages 15 to 19 not available.

e/ Separate data for ages 60 to 69 and 70 and over are not available.

f/ Separated persons are included with married persons, not with the divorced.

g/ For males, the minimum age is 18.

/Table 3

Table 3

BRAZIL AND VENEZUELA: MARITAL STATUS OF THE POPULATION IN PRIVATE HOUSEHOLDS BY RELATIONSHIP TO HEAD, BY SEX, 1950

Relationship to head and country	Both sexes						Male						Female					
	Total	Married a/	Widowed	Divorced b/	Single	Not reported	Total	Married a/	Widowed	Divorced b/	Single	Not reported	Total	Married a/	Widowed	Divorced b/	Single	Not reported
<u>Number</u>							<u>Brazil</u>											
Total	51 584 665	16 359 475	1 961 926	39 278	33 118 886	105 100	25 641 719	8 096 187	465 387	16 973	17 015 341	47 831	25 942 946	8 263 288	1 496 539	22 305	16 103 545	57 269
Head	10 046 199	7 666 513	1 081 093	21 369	1 248 010	29 214	8 827 218	7 493 760	331 560	11 937	965 954	23 957	1 218 981	172 753	749 533	9 382	282 053	5 257
Wife (mate)	7 909 833	7 355 132	57 060	3 585	468 031	26 025	7 025	4 594	235	41	2 042	113	7 702 808	7 350 538	56 825	3 544	465 989	25 912
Child a/	26 891 483	423 952	65 999	4 868	26 367 618	29 052	13 850 238	179 666	16 350	1 563	13 637 560	15 099	13 041 245	244 286	49 643	3 305	12 730 058	13 953
Grandchild	1 040 949	7 770	773	41	1 031 682	683	526 566	2 892	143	8	523 188	335	514 383	4 870	630	33	508 494	348
Parent d/	712 390	144 068	503 974	2 098	58 572	3 681	119 175	51 517	59 465	335	7 399	659	593 215	92 751	444 506	1 763	51 173	3 022
Grand parent	24 332	2 314	19 385	26	2 425	182	3 454	836	2 174	10	409	25	20 878	1 478	17 211	16	2 016	157
Other relative	2 417 547	433 556	94 259	2 997	1 880 694	6 041	1 143 006	208 528	21 148	1 185	909 303	2 842	1 274 541	225 028	73 111	1 812	971 391	3 199
Lodger e/	1 825 325	275 155	100 576	3 351	1 439 321	6 922	927 969	137 823	26 830	1 595	757 930	3 731	897 356	137 332	73 686	1 756	681 391	3 191
Servant	707 931	50 090	38 023	926	615 860	3 032	232 676	16 373	7 234	242	207 879	948	475 255	33 717	30 789	684	407 981	2 084
Not reported	8 676	925	793	17	6 673	268	4 392	398	186	7	3 677	122	4 284	527	605	10	2 926	116
<u>Percent</u>																		
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Head	19.5	46.9	55.1	54.4	3.8	27.8	34.4	92.6	71.2	70.6	5.7	50.1	4.7	2.1	50.1	42.1	1.8	9.2
Wife (mate)	15.3	45.0	2.9	9.1	1.4	24.8	f/	0.1	0.1	0.2		0.2	30.5	89.0	3.8	25.9	2.9	45.2
Child	52.1	2.6	3.4	12.4	12.4	27.6	54.0	2.2	3.5	9.2	80.1	31.6	50.3	3.0	3.3	14.8	79.1	24.4
Grandchild	2.0	f/	f/	0.1	3.1	0.6	2.0	f/	f/	f/	3.1	0.7	2.0	0.1	f/	0.1	3.2	0.6
Parent d/	1.4	0.9	25.7	5.3	0.2	3.5	0.5	0.6	12.8	2.0	f/	1.4	2.3	1.1	29.7	7.9	0.3	5.3
Grand parent		f/	1.0	0.1	f/	0.2	f/	f/	0.5	0.1	f/	0.1	0.1	f/	1.2	0.1	f/	0.3
Other relative	4.7	2.7	4.8	7.6	5.7	5.7	4.5	2.6	4.5	7.0	5.3	5.9	4.9	2.7	4.9	8.1	6.0	5.6
Lodger e/	3.5	1.7	5.1	8.5	4.3	6.6	3.6	1.7	5.8	9.4	4.5	7.8	3.4	1.7	4.9	7.9	4.2	5.6
Servant	1.4	0.3	1.9	2.4	1.9	2.9	0.9	0.2	1.6	1.4	1.2	2.0	1.8	0.4	2.1	3.1	2.5	3.6
Not reported	f/	f/	f/	f/	f/	0.3	f/	f/	f/	f/	f/	0.3	f/	f/	f/	f/	f/	0.3

Table 3 (concluded)

Relation- ship to head and country	Both sexes						Male						Female					
	Total	Married a/	Widowed	Divorced b/	Single	Not reported	Total	Married a/	Widowed	Di- vorced b/	Single	Not reported	Total	Married a/	Widowed	Di- vorced b/	Single	Not reported
Venezuela																		
Number																		
Total	2 643 595	1 307 940	127 381	11 398	1 176 162	20 734	1 269 879	630 268	27 522	3 811	598 626	9 652	1 373 716	677 672	99 859	7 567	577 536	11 082
Head	875 203	596 575	64 657	4 822	206 315	2 834	659 489	539 697	17 111	1 854	99 430	1 397	215 714	56 878	47 546	2 968	106 885	1 437
Wife	509 800	509 800	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	509 800	509 800	-	-	-	-
Child	487 277	52 875	5 600	2 142	421 675	4 985	-	19 796	798	473	226 908	2 536	236 766	33 079	4 802	1 669	194 767	2 449
Other relative	390 688	76 696	40 650	2 413	265 134	5 795	156 191	31 636	4 740	584	117 011	2 220	234 497	45 060	35 910	1 829	148 123	3 575
Lodger e/	324 778	66 693	14 517	1 709	235 602	6 257	195 796	38 140	4 755	882	148 686	3 333	128 982	28 553	9 762	827	86 916	2 924
Servant	53 762	4 827	1 874	281	46 100	680	6 589	668	99	15	5 721	86	47 173	4 159	1 775	266	40 379	594
Not reported	2 087	474	83	11	1 336	183	1 303	331	19	3	870	80	784	143	64	8	466	103
Percent																		
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Head	33.1	45.6	50.7	42.4	17.5	13.7	52.0	85.6	62.2	48.7	16.6	14.5	15.7	8.4	47.6	39.2	18.5	13.0
Wife	19.3	39.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	37.1	75.2	-	-	-	-
Child	18.4	4.0	4.4	18.8	35.9	24.0	19.7	3.1	2.9	12.4	37.9	26.3	17.2	4.9	4.8	22.1	33.7	22.1
Other relative	14.8	5.9	31.9	21.2	22.5	27.9	12.3	5.0	17.2	15.3	19.6	23.0	17.1	6.7	36.0	24.2	25.6	32.3
Lodger e/	12.3	5.1	11.4	15.0	20.0	30.2	15.4	6.1	17.3	23.1	23.8	34.5	9.4	4.2	9.8	10.9	15.0	26.4
Servant	2.0	0.4	1.5	2.5	3.9	3.3	0.5	0.1	0.3	0.4	1.0	0.9	3.4	0.6	1.8	3.5	7.0	5.4
Not reported	0.1	f/	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.9	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.8	0.1	f/	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.9

Source: Instituto Interamericano de Estadística, La estructura demográfica de las Naciones Americanas, Vol. I, Características generales de la población, tomo 2, "Estado conyugal y distribución de la población por hogares", Unión Panamericana, 1960, Washington, D.C. tables 7-12 and 7-29.

a/ Includes persons in stable "de facto" unions for Venezuela but not for Brazil.

b/ Includes persons separated (legally and de facto) and persons in annulled marriages for Brazil; for Venezuela, excludes persons in "de facto" separations.

c/ Includes stepchildren.

d/ Includes parents-in-law.

e/ Includes boarders and transients.

f/ Less than 0.05 percent.

Table 4

PANAMA: PERCENT HEADS OF TOTAL POPULATION BY AGE, BY MARITAL STATUS AND SEX,
URBAN AND RURAL, 1950 a/

Age (years) and area	Both sexes					Male					Female				
	Total	Single	Mar- ried b/	Divor- ced and wido- wed	Percent indivi- duals who li- ved alone of to- tal heads	Total	Single	Mar- ried b/	Divor- ced and wido- wed	Percent indivi- duals who li- ved alone of to- tal heads	Total	Single	Mar- ried	Divor- ced and wido- wed	Percent indivi- duals who li- ved alone of to- tal heads
Total															
Total, 15 and over c/	37.6	21.7	45.6	56.2	14.8	57.9	24.1	85.6	76.8	13.6	16.3	18.4	7.7	48.7	19.3
15 to 19	2.8	1.8	7.6	27.9	31.0	4.2	2.6	54.8	16.9	31.2	1.5	0.8	2.2	19.2	30.6
20 to 24	17.8	11.5	24.9	34.9	16.6	29.7	13.8	68.9	52.2	16.0	6.0	7.5	3.8	30.1	19.6
25 to 29	33.6	24.3	37.7	47.0	12.1	56.9	28.0	79.1	64.4	11.3	9.7	17.8	5.5	39.9	17.0
30 to 34	43.9	34.9	45.9	56.0	10.6	71.6	37.1	86.2	75.4	9.7	14.0	31.5	6.8	49.0	15.2
35 to 39	50.6	46.1	50.0	68.8	10.8	79.5	48.7	88.8	85.2	9.6	19.0	42.8	8.7	61.4	16.1
40 to 44	56.0	52.4	55.0	64.4	11.9	83.8	56.7	91.4	73.9	10.8	23.7	47.6	9.4	60.6	16.4
45 to 49	57.8	56.4	55.8	63.9	13.2	85.1	61.8	91.2	85.4	12.2	28.8	51.2	12.6	55.9	16.6
50 to 54	61.2	59.1	58.5	62.6	15.3	87.0	68.9	91.1	87.6	14.3	33.0	49.8	13.9	55.1	18.1
55 to 59	63.5	55.7	61.4	63.0	18.4	87.5	66.9	90.8	90.3	17.5	36.7	45.0	15.5	54.1	20.8
60 to 64	64.5	54.4	63.7	57.7	21.1	85.6	67.2	88.3	82.2	20.4	39.3	41.1	16.3	48.6	22.9
65 and over	60.1	43.2	63.8	47.3	25.4	81.4	58.8	85.7	66.6	24.5	38.6	29.6	16.8	39.7	27.3
Urban															
Total, 15 and over c/	37.3	20.8	46.1	51.1	18.9	56.5	21.6	84.1	65.9	17.2	19.8	20.0	10.8	46.7	23.3
15 to 19	2.1	1.3	6.7	5.6	44.7	2.7	1.9	40.8	-	48.5	1.6	0.8	3.8	6.2	39.6
20 to 24	15.6	9.5	23.7	37.5	21.3	25.1	10.9	66.9	57.1	20.0	7.6	7.9	5.0	35.1	24.9
25 to 29	32.3	21.5	37.6	39.1	16.1	52.6	22.7	77.7	46.7	14.0	13.3	19.9	7.6	36.7	23.7
30 to 34	42.9	33.3	45.1	50.3	14.1	68.3	32.6	84.3	65.1	12.3	18.2	34.2	8.9	46.2	20.6
35 to 39	49.7	42.5	49.7	57.5	15.0	75.9	40.9	87.6	66.5	12.8	24.3	44.2	12.3	54.5	21.6
40 to 44	55.1	49.5	54.3	63.5	16.5	79.6	48.7	88.6	60.9	14.5	29.3	50.3	12.9	54.4	22.5
45 to 49	56.3	51.3	55.5	65.2	18.4	80.8	50.1	90.0	69.1	16.6	34.5	52.1	17.9	49.8	22.2
50 to 54	59.3	54.2	56.7	58.7	24.9	83.1	57.9	88.0	82.1	18.8	37.4	51.5	16.4	53.2	21.9
55 to 59	62.3	51.7	61.3	56.0	23.4	84.5	56.9	89.1	76.1	23.3	40.6	47.1	20.9	50.5	23.7
60 to 64	63.5	49.4	62.5	55.4	25.8	83.9	57.0	86.3	73.6	26.3	41.5	41.9	19.3	49.5	24.7
65 and over	56.6	36.3	61.1	43.6	27.3	77.6	43.3	83.1	57.1	27.8	38.9	30.8	18.6	39.5	26.3
Rural															
Total, 15 and over c/	37.8	22.4	45.3	61.6	11.8	58.9	25.9	86.5	85.2	11.3	13.3	16.6	5.7	50.9	14.4
15 to 19	3.3	2.1	7.8	33.8	25.7	5.0	3.0	57.7	90.9	26.4	1.4	0.8	1.7	22.8	23.1
20 to 24	19.3	13.2	25.5	33.2	14.0	32.5	15.8	69.8	50.9	14.1	4.7	6.9	3.1	25.8	12.9
25 to 29	34.6	26.9	37.7	57.3	9.3	59.7	32.0	80.0	80.2	9.6	6.8	14.9	4.1	44.9	6.5
30 to 34	44.6	36.6	46.5	65.1	7.7	74.2	41.0	87.6	86.4	7.9	10.0	27.6	5.0	54.4	5.9
35 to 39	51.3	50.1	50.2	82.2	7.4	82.2	55.6	89.6	99.6	7.4	14.2	40.7	6.0	71.3	7.5
40 to 44	56.7	55.4	55.5	73.2	8.3	86.9	63.3	93.4	81.9	8.3	18.8	44.1	6.8	67.4	8.3
45 to 49	58.9	61.0	56.0	73.3	9.8	87.6	70.5	91.8	94.7	9.7	24.1	50.1	8.9	62.7	10.1
50 to 54	62.6	63.4	59.7	66.6	12.0	89.6	76.7	93.0	91.6	11.5	29.1	48.0	9.7	57.2	13.8
55 to 59	64.6	59.8	61.4	71.8	14.2	89.8	75.7	92.0	d/	13.3	32.7	42.6	11.2	58.9	17.2
60 to 64	65.3	58.4	64.5	60.0	17.6	86.9	75.3	89.7	89.2	16.3	37.5	40.4	14.1	47.7	21.2
65 and over	62.8	48.2	65.5	50.9	24.1	83.8	69.0	87.3	73.3	22.5	38.3	28.6	15.5	40.0	28.2

Sources: República de Panama, Censos Nacionales de 1950, Quinto Censo de Población, Vols. I, V, and VI. See particularly table 8 and 32 in Vol. V.

a/ Basic data have not generally been adjusted to include persons whose age or marital status was not reported. Rates for specific marital status groups for the total and urban population may be slightly low and for the rural population slightly high because non-employed individuals who lived alone are excluded from the number of heads (6 022 total: 1 734 urban males, 2 024 urban females, 567 rural males, and 1 697 rural females)

b/ Includes de facto unions.

c/ Includes persons whose age was not reported.

d/ Computed figure exceeds 100.0.

/Table A

Table A

ESTIMATED AVERAGE ANNUAL RATES OF NATURAL INCREASE, BIRTH RATES AND DEATH RATES FOR
WORLD TOTAL, LATIN AMERICA, AND NORTHWESTERN EUROPE, 1955-59

(Figures are per 1 000 population)

Area	Rate of increase	Birth rate	Death rate
World total	17	36	19
Latin America ^{a/}	24	43	19
Middle America	27	45	18
South America	23	42	19
Northwestern Europe	7	18	11

Source: United Nations, Demographic Yearbook, 1960, table 2.^{a/} Figures are not consistent with estimates shown in table B prepared independently.

/Table B

Table B

LATIN AMERICA: ESTIMATED AVERAGE ANNUAL RATES OF NATURAL INCREASE,
BIRTH RATES AND DEATH RATES, 1950-55

Country	Rate of natural increase	Birth rate	Death rate
Latin America ^{a/}	25	42	17
Argentina	16	25	9
Bolivia	25	45	20
Brazil	25	45	20
Chile	20	34	14
Colombia	25	45	20
Costa Rica	34	45	11
Cuba	20	35	15
Dominican Republic	30	50	20
Ecuador	26	46	20
El Salvador	25	50	25
Guatemala	30	51	21
Haiti
Honduras	21	41	20
Mexico	30	45	15
Nicaragua	30	50	20
Panama	25	45	20
Paraguay	30	45	15
Peru	25	45	20
Puerto Rico	28	36	8
Uruguay
Venezuela	25	45	20

Source: United Nations, Report on the World Social Situation, New York, 1957, p. 22, table 26.
Rates for total Latin America computed as the weighted average of rates for individual countries.

^{a/} Figures are not consistent with estimates shown in table A prepared independently.

/Table C

Table C

PERCENT OF THE POPULATION LIVING IN INSTITUTIONAL (NON-FAMILY)
HOUSEHOLDS, AROUND 1950

Country	Percent	Country	Percent
<u>Latin America</u>		<u>Northwestern Europe</u>	
Argentina	3.1	Austria	1.1
Colombia	3.4	Denmark	2.4
Costa Rica	1.3	Germany, Western	1.9
Cuba	0.8	France	4.2
Dominican Republic	1.0	Netherlands	2.1
Nicaragua	2.4	Norway	2.8
Panama	1.7	Sweden	1.7
Paraguay	1.9	England Wales	4.4
Puerto Rico	1.5		
Venezuela	6.4	United States	3.7

Source: Instituto Interamericano de Estadística, La Estructura Demográfica de las Naciones Americanas, Vol. I, Características Generales de la Población, Tomo 2, "Estado Conyugal y Distribución de la Población por Hogares", Febrero 1960, Unión Panamericana, Washington, D.C., table 6-05. United Nations, Demographic Yearbook, 1955, table 9.

Table D

MEAN SIZE OF HOUSEHOLD AND RELATED DEMOGRAPHIC MEASURES, AROUND 1950

Country	Census year	Private households	Population in private households	Mean size of household	General fertility rate a/	Percent of the population under age 15	Percent 25 to 29 ever-married b/
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
<u>Latin America</u>	-	26 444 065 g/	129 730 829 g/	4.91 g/	184 d/	40.2	62.6 g/
Argentina	1947	3 407 345	14 759 042	4.33	104	30.7	48.8
Bolivia	1950	f/	2 704 165 g/	f/	195	39.6	72.8
Brazil	1950	10 046 199	51 584 655	5.13	197	41.8	66.6
Chile	1952	...	5 932 995 g/	...	147	37.2	60.1
Colombia	1951	1 884 956	10 841 681	5.75	201	42.6	59.7
Costa Rica	1950	143 167	790 507	5.52	201	42.8	64.4
Cuba	1953	1 190 580	5 784 753	4.86	153	36.3	63.1
Dominican Rep.	1950	433 418	2 115 013	4.88	227	44.5	...
Ecuador	1950	621 645	3 180 933	5.12	211	42.5	69.4
El Salvador	1950	365 752	1 855 917 g/	5.07 g/	216	41.1	61.8
Guatemala	1950	...	2 790 868 g/	...	228	42.3	74.8
Haiti	1950	693 697	3 097 220 g/	4.46 g/	...	37.9	55.5
Honduras	1950	189	40.6	...
Mexico	1950	5 765 810 h/	25 791 017 g/	4.47 g/	200	41.7	...
Nicaragua	1950	175 462	1 031 392	5.88	220	43.3	61.0
Panama	1950	166 241	743 419	4.47	209	41.7	65.9
Paraguay	1950	244 789	1 303 017	5.32	207	43.8	57.1
Peru	-	...	8 521 000	44.0 i/	...
Puerto Rico	1950	429 300	2 177 921	5.07	170	43.2	75.1
Uruguay	-	...	2 407 000 j/	31.0 j/	...
Venezuela	1950	875 704	4 674 332	5.34	205	41.9	58.0
<u>Northwestern Europe</u>	-	55 439 084 j/	173 963 897 j/	3.14 j/	80.6	23.2	65.3
Austria	1951	2 205 159	6 856 756	3.11	67.5	22.9	59.1
Belgium	1947	2 836 979 k/	8 512 195 k/	3.00 k/	80.6	20.6	68.2
Denmark	1950	1 326 680	4 178 800	3.15	86.3	26.3	71.7
France	1946	12 644 190	38 755 000	3.07	93.9 l/	21.8	69.8
Germany, West.	1950	15 371 200	46 788 906	3.04	69.5	23.6	60.3
Ireland	1946	662 654	2 755 490	4.16	106.4 m/	28.9	34.5
Netherlands	1947	2 486 487	9 342 091	3.76	122.4	29.3	60.3
Norway	1950	966 804	3 143 776	3.25	87.4	24.4	55.8
Sweden	1950	2 385 138	6 921 015	2.90	76.7	23.4	62.4
Switzerland	1950	...	4 714 912 g/	...	80.4	23.6	54.6
United Kingdom	1951	14 553 793 n/	46 709 868 n/	3.21 n/	73.0	22.5	70.5
United States	1950	42 826 281	145 030 888	3.39	103.9	26.9	81.6

Source: Cols. (1), (2) and (3): Latin America, except Puerto Rico: Same as for table C, table 6-05. Population of Peru and Uruguay taken from: United Nations, Conferencia sobre Educación y Desarrollo Económico y Social en América Latina, "Situación Demográfica, Económica, Social y Educativa de América Latina", Santiago, Chile, 5 a 19 de marzo, 1962, ST/ECLA/CONF.10/L.4, January 10, 1962, table 11. Puerto Rico taken from: United States Census of Population, 1960, General Population Characteristics, "Puerto Rico", table 16. Europe: United Nations, Demographic Yearbook, 1955, table 9. Col. (4): Crude birth rates in table 2, adjusted by reported percent of women in ages 15 to 44. Col. (5): Instituto Interamericano de Estadística, La Estructura Demográfica de las Naciones Americanas, Vol. 1, Características Generales de la Población, Tomo I, "Población Censada y Estimada"; Agrupaciones Básicas de la Población Censada, Unión Panamericana, April 1960, Washington, D.C., table 1-05. Peru and Uruguay taken from United Nations, "Situación Demográfica, Económica, Social y Educativa de América Latina", Santiago, Chile, 5 a 19 de marzo, 1962, ST/ECLA/CONF.10/L.4, table 11. Puerto Rico: Same as above, table 14. Europe: United Nations, Demographic Yearbook, 1955, table 10. Col. (6): Latin America, except Puerto Rico: Same as for table C Puerto Rico: United States Census of Population, 1950, General Population Characteristics, "Puerto Rico". Europe: United Nations Demographic Yearbook, 1955, table 12.

Table D (concluded)

-
- a/ Births per 1 000 females population 15 to 44 years of age. Rates for Latin America based on estimated birth rates given in table B.
 - b/ Includes consensually married, widowed and divorced.
 - c/ Bolivia, Chile, Guatemala, Honduras, Peru and Uruguay are excluded.
 - d/ Data for Haiti, Honduras, Peru and Uruguay are excluded.
 - e/ Dominican Republic, Honduras, Mexico, Peru and Uruguay are excluded.
 - f/ Reported figure apparently defective.
 - g/ Total population including population in institutional households.
 - h/ Estimated on basis of total population and households of two or more persons.
 - i/ Total population and percent under age 15 are estimated for 1950.
 - j/ Switzerland and Northern Ireland are excluded.
 - k/ Total households, total population and corresponding mean size of household.
 - l/ Figure relates to 1954.
 - m/ Figure relates to 1951.
 - n/ Excludes Northern Ireland.

/Table E

Table E

PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF PRIVATE HOUSEHOLDS AND OF THE POPULATION IN PRIVATE HOUSEHOLDS
BY NUMBER OF MEMBERS; AROUND 1950

Country	Households						Population					
	Total	Under 3 mem- bers	3 to 6 mem- bers	7 to 9 mem- bers	10 or more mem- bers	Median num- ber	Total	Under 3 mem- bers	3 to 6 mem- bers	7 to 9 mem- bers	10 or more mem- bers	Median number
<u>Latin America a/</u>	100.0	17.4	54.6	20.5	7.5	4.56	100.0	6.5	46.3	30.6	16.6	6.21
Bolivia	100.0	31.1	52.3	11.9	4.7	4.05
Brazil	100.0	16.9	55.2	20.6	7.3	4.72	100.0	5.6	47.2	31.2	16.0	6.29
Colombia	100.0	15.4	38.2b/	28.9b/	17.5b/	5.23	100.0	4.2	26.7a/	69.1a/	...	7.18
Costa Rica	100.0	15.4	51.6	23.0	10.0	5.11	100.0	4.7	41.7	32.6	21.0	6.86
Cuba	100.0	21.6	54.8	16.7	6.9	4.28	100.0	7.1	48.5	26.7	17.7	6.04
Dominican Republic	100.0	23.4	50.5	18.9	7.2	4.38	100.0	7.5	45.1	30.1	17.3	6.39
Ecuador	100.0	17.9	55.9	19.7	6.5	4.69	100.0	5.6	48.5	23.8	16.1	6.22
El Salvador	100.0	18.5	56.1	19.6	5.8	4.61	100.0d/	6.0	48.8	29.9	15.3	6.16
Haiti	100.0	23.7	57.1	15.4	3.8	4.09	100.0d/	8.6	55.2	26.6	9.7	5.04
Mexico	100.0	26.1	53.1	16.8	4.0	4.11	100.0	9.1	51.8	28.9	10.2	5.73
Nicaragua	100.0	12.4	51.7	24.9	11.0	5.40	100.0	3.6	40.0	32.9	23.5	7.10
Panama	100.0	29.2	48.8	16.7	5.3	4.01	100.0	9.8	47.3	29.0	13.5	5.95
Paraguay	100.0	15.4	53.9	22.4	8.3	5.28	100.0	4.8	45.1	32.9	17.2	6.50
Puerto Rico	100.0	18.7	54.3	20.2	6.8	4.68	100.0	6.0	47.6	31.1	15.3	6.24
Venezuela	100.0	17.8	51.0	21.8	9.4	4.93	100.0	5.3	42.5	31.9	20.3	6.72
<u>Northwestern Europe</u>	100.0	41.6	53.5	3.8	1.1	2.86	100.0	22.0	66.7	9.1	2.2	3.77
Austria	100.0	44.7	50.0	4.4	0.9	2.74	100.0	23.1	62.8	10.9	3.2	3.78
Belgium e/	100.0	46.6	49.3	3.4	0.7	2.64	100.0	25.8	62.6	8.6	3.0	3.51
Denmark	100.0	40.8	55.4	3.4	0.4	2.90	100.0	21.5	68.8	8.2	1.5	3.78
England and Wales	100.0	38.3	58.7	3.2	0.3	3.36	100.0	20.7	70.8	7.4	1.1	3.73
France	100.0	45.3	49.8	4.2	0.7	2.72	100.0	23.5	63.6	10.5	2.4	3.77
Germany, Western	100.0	43.3	52.8	3.9f/	...	2.79	100.0	22.4	67.3	10.3f/	...	3.72
Netherlands	100.0	31.8	58.1	8.0	2.1	3.35	100.0	14.5	63.0	16.3	6.2	3.94
Norway	100.0	37.1	58.5	4.1	0.3	3.05	100.0	18.2	71.2	9.4	1.2	3.93
Sweden	100.0	45.5	51.9	2.4	0.2	2.57	100.0	24.2	68.6	6.3	0.9	3.38
United States	100.0	37.4	56.9	4.8	0.9	3.05	100.0	19.3	66.7	10.9	3.1	3.98

Source: Latin America: same as for table C. Europe and the United States; United Nations, Demographic Yearbook, 1955, table 9.

a/ Based on data for the countries shown, excluding Bolivia.

b/ Data are for following groups: 3 to 5, 6 to 8, and 9 and over.

c/ Data are for following groups: 3 to 5, and 6 and over.

d/ Total population including population in institutional households.

e/ Includes institutional households.

f/ Relates to group 7 and over.

/Table F

Table F

PERCENT OF PERSONS 15 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER REPORTED
IN STABLE DE FACTO UNIONS; AROUND 1950 a/

Country	As percent of total population	As percent of "married" population <u>b/</u>
<u>Latin America c/</u>		
Bolivia	10.0	17.2
Colombia	9.2	19.0
Costa Rica	7.5	14.2 <u>d/</u>
Cuba	19.7	34.5
Chile	3.4	6.7
Dominican Republic	14.5	49.8
Ecuador	12.0	22.8
El Salvador	25.2	49.9
Guatemala	40.9	68.1
Haiti	30.9	74.8
Honduras	22.3	49.6
Mexico	11.9	20.0
Nicaragua	21.4	42.5
Panama	29.5	54.9
Paraguay	14.7	30.6
Puerto Rico	13.9	23.9 <u>d/</u>
Venezuela	19.2	40.1

Source: Based on data compiled in: Instituto Interamericano de Estadística, La Estructura Demográfica de las Naciones Americanas.

Vol. I, Características Generales de la Población, Tomo 2, "Estado Conyugal y Distribución de la Población por Hogares", Febrero 1960, Unión Panamericana, Washington, D.C., tables 5-10 to 5-29. Puerto Rico: United States Census of Population, 1960, General Population Characteristics, "Puerto Rico", table 15.

- a/ The few persons reported under 15 in stable de facto unions, are included.
b/ "Married" population includes both married and stable de facto unions.
c/ The number of de facto unions is not available separately for Argentina and Brazil although data for marital classes are available; no census data are available for Peru and Uruguay.
d/ Married population specifically reported as including separated persons.

Table G

PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF THE POPULATION IN PRIVATE HOUSEHOLDS BY RELATIONSHIP TO
HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD, BY SEX, AROUND 1950 ^{a/}

Country	Total	Head	Wives (inc. top)	Chil- dren	Grand- children	Parents	Other relati- ves	Lodgers	Servants
Both sexes									
Brazil	100.0	19.5	15.3	52.1	2.0	1.4	6.6	1.7	1.4
Costa Rica	100.0	18.1	13.2	53.2	...	1.1	9.4 ^{b/}	3.4	1.6
Cuba	100.0	20.6	15.0	46.6	4.3	1.9	8.2	2.7	0.7
Dominican Republic	100.0	20.5	75.2 ^{c/}	4.3	...
El Salvador ^{b/}	100.0	19.9	12.2	46.9	...	0.9	14.0 ^{b/}	3.8	2.3
Guatemala	100.0	20.4	14.2	49.1	4.8	1.3	6.7	1.7	1.0
Honduras	100.0	16.4	12.1	54.7	13.0 ^{e/}	2.7	1.1
Mexico ^{f/}	100.0	19.8	15.9	51.7	8.8 ^{e/}	3.8 ^{d/}	...
Nicaragua	100.0	17.0	10.8	47.5	...	1.1	16.2 ^{b/}	4.4	3.0
Venezuela	100.0	33.1	19.3	18.4	14.8 ^{e/}	12.3	2.0
Male									
Brazil	100.0	34.4	^{g/}	54.0	2.1	0.5	6.3	1.8	0.9
Costa Rica	100.0	30.1	0.1	55.3	...	0.4	9.4 ^{b/}	4.4	0.3
Cuba	100.0	34.5	-	48.3	4.3	0.8	8.2	3.4	0.5
Dominican Republic	100.0	30.8	-	64.3 ^{c/}	4.9 ^{d/}	...
El Salvador ^{h/}	100.0	30.2	-	49.6	...	0.3	14.0 ^{b/}	4.9	1.0
Guatemala	100.0	33.8	-	52.6	4.9	0.3	5.5	2.1	0.8
Mexico ^{f/}	100.0	34.9	0.1	54.3	7.0 ^{e/}	3.7 ^{d/}	...
Nicaragua	100.0	25.9	-	50.6	...	0.4	16.1 ^{e/}	4.4	2.6
Venezuela	100.0	52.0	-	19.7	12.3	15.4	0.5
Female									
Brazil	100.0	4.7	30.5	50.3	2.0	2.3	6.9	1.5	1.8
Costa Rica	100.0	6.2	26.3	51.0	...	1.7	9.4 ^{b/}	2.5	2.9
Cuba	100.0	6.1	30.7	44.9	4.2	2.9	8.2	2.0	1.0
Dominican Republic	100.0	10.2	86.0 ^{e/}	3.8 ^{d/}	...
El Salvador	100.0	10.0	24.0	44.4	...	1.5	14.0 ^{b/}	2.6	3.5
Guatemala	100.0	6.9	28.6	45.5	4.7	2.3	8.0	1.3	2.7
Mexico	100.0	5.2	31.3	49.1	10.4 ^{e/}	4.0 ^{d/}	...
Nicaragua	100.0	8.6	21.0	44.5	...	1.8	16.3 ^{b/}	4.4	3.4
Venezuela	100.0	15.7	37.1	17.2	17.1 ^{e/}	9.4	3.4

Source: Instituto Interamericano de Estadística, La Estructura Demográfica de las Naciones Americanas, Vol. I, Características Generales de la Población, Tomo 2, "Estado Conyugal y Distribución de la Población por Hogares", Unión Panamericana, Febrero de 1960, Washington, D.C., tables 7-05 to 7-29.

^{a/} Similar data are not available for countries not listed, except Puerto Rico.

^{b/} Includes grandchildren.

^{c/} Includes all relatives of head.

^{d/} Includes lodgers and servants.

^{e/} Includes grandchildren and parents.

^{f/} Refers to total population, including persons in non-family households.

^{g/} Less than 0.05 per cent.

^{h/} Includes only persons 10 years old and over.

/Table H

Table II

BRAZIL AND PANAMA: AGE-SPECIFIC RATES OF HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS, BY SEX, 1950
(Percentages)

Age	B r a z i l			P a n a m a		
	Both sexes	Males	Females	Both sexes	Males	Females
Total, 15 and over <u>a/</u>	23.9	42.6	5.7	37.6	57.9	16.3
15 - 19 <u>b/</u>	1.7	3.1	0.4	2.8	4.2	1.5
20 - 29	22.3	43.7	2.2	25.3	42.8	7.7
30 - 39	44.6	82.5	6.7	47.1	75.4	16.4
40 - 49	53.5	90.9	13.9	56.8	26.1	27.1
50 - 59	57.6	92.0	21.3	62.1	87.2	34.5
60 and over	54.7	84.1	27.7	61.9	83.2	38.9
60 - 69 <u>c/</u>	57.8	88.1	27.2	64.5	85.6	39.3
70 and over <u>c/</u>	48.9	75.3	28.4	60.1	81.4	38.6

Source: VI Recenseamento do Brazil, 1950, Vol. I, Table 3, page 4, and Table 4, page 282. Panama, Censos Nacionales de 1950, Quinto Censo de Población, Vols. I and V, particularly tables 8 and 32 in Vol. V.

a/ Includes persons whose age was not reported.

b/ Includes the few heads of households under age 15.

c/ Figures for Panama refer to ages 60 to 64 and 65 and over.

Table I

ESTIMATED MEDIAN AGE AT FIRST MARRIAGE, AROUND 1950

Country	Male	Female
<u>Latin America a/</u>	25.6	21.3
Argentina	27.3	24.0
Bolivia	23.6	21.3
Brazil	25.3	21.3
Chile	25.9	22.5
Colombia	26.1	20.7
Costa Rica	25.3	21.1
Cuba	25.5	20.9
Ecuador	24.0	20.5
El Salvador	24.8	19.9
Guatemala	22.9	18.7
Haiti	27.7	22.4
Nicaragua	25.0	20.0
Panama	24.2	19.1
Paraguay	25.8	20.9
Puerto Rico	24.5	20.5
Venezuela	25.7	19.1
<u>Northwestern Europe a/</u>	26.0	23.0
Austria	26.6	23.9
Belgium	25.6	22.6
Denmark	25.6	21.7
France	25.6	22.8
Germany, Western	26.7	24.2
Ireland	30.1	26.1
Netherlands	26.6	24.2
Norway	27.1	23.3
Sweden	26.3	22.5
Switzerland	27.2	24.5
United Kingdom	25.2	21.9
United States	22.8	20.3

Source: Estimated. See text for description of method.

a/ Based on data for the countries shown.

/Table J