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## FOREWORD

The 2015 Labour Overview of Latin America and the Caribbean summarizes the economic situation of the countries of the region with the most recent available data. It analyzes the impact of this situation on labour markets, as well as the estimated effects for 2016.

This report also assesses the advances and challenges associated with efforts to formalize the domestic work sector in the region, which is made up of 18 million domestic workers (most of them women), accounting for $7 \%$ of the labour force.

For the past three years, the Latin American and Caribbean region has been experiencing an economic slowdown whose accumulated effects can be described as a "slow-motion crisis." The full impact on labour markets was felt in 2015 and is expected to continue in 2016, even if economic growth increases in 2016.

Regional unemployment, which had declined to a historic low of $6.2 \%$ in 2014, will increase to an estimated $6.7 \%$ by the end of 2015 , according to national data. This is still a moderate figure compared with the rates recorded over a decade ago. Nevertheless, it is the first significant increase in the regional open unemployment rate in five years. It also means an additional 1.7 million unemployed people, which raises the total number of unemployed in the region to nearly 19 million. A majority of the newly unemployed are women, with a high percentage of youth as well.
The effects of the slowdown vary across countries. Some nations more closely linked with the U.S. economy are growing at higher rates than those which are more affected by the so-called "China effect" on commodity demand and prices. In other countries, economies are contracting. In the same way, unemployment rates also vary across countries. Employment rates increased moderately in Central America (from $6.1 \%$ to $6.7 \%$ ) and the Caribbean (from $8.2 \%$ to $8.5 \%$ ), while Mexico recorded a reduction, from $5.0 \%$ to $4.4 \%$. The largest increases in the average unemployment rate for the first three quarters of 2015 were in South America (from $6.8 \%$ to $7.6 \%$ ), mainly due to the influence of Brazil.

The unemployment rate is just one indicator of the labour market situation and trends. The 2015 Labour Overview would not be complete without an analysis of other indicators associated with earnings and quality of employment. These indicators are also discouraging. Reversing a decade-long trend, the participation of paid employment in total employment has declined $(-0.35$ percentage points in 2015) and self-employment has increased. Registered employment fell in two of nine countries, a trend not observed in previous years. Average wages continued to grow, but at lower rates than in previous years ( $0.3 \%$ in 2014, less than the $1.1 \%$ recorded in 2013). Minimum wages grew by $2.0 \%$ in 2015 , with wide variations across countries. Although social protection coverage in health or pensions expanded in 2014, the reduction in the growth of paid employment will most likely affect these indicators in the short term.

All of the above are signs of rising informality, which had already affected 130 million workers at the end of 2013 .

The 2015 Labour Overview also estimates the regional unemployment rate for 2016: based on national data, this rate is expected to rise to $6.9 \%$ in 2016.

In summary, the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean need both short-term responses to mitigate the negative impact of the slowdown and return to the path of growth, as well as actions to address long-standing structural problems and to promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable growth with full and productive employment and decent work for all. In other words, these measures are needed to advance toward Goal 8 of the Sustainable Development Goals in the medium and long term.

Creativity and innovation will be needed in the short term to prevent the social, employment and income advances of recent years being sacrificed as a result of macroeconomic fears and the reduced fiscal spaces caused by the slowdown. In other words, we are faced with the question of how to respond to this "chronicle of an impact foretold," on labour markets that this edition of the Labour Overview documents for 2015 and foresees for 2016

In the medium and long term, the slowdown provides yet more evidence that the countries of the region are overly dependent on the dynamics of the global economy and that they need more
endogenous sources and engines of growth. The main long-term economic difficulties persist: low productivity; a lack of diversity in production; few incentives for innovation; limited added value; a predominance of micro and small enterprises and a dearth of medium-sized ones; and shortfalls in the quality and relevance of education and vocational training. The economic, social and labour context of the region indicates that it is time to act more ambitiously to address these issues, the associated social challenges and the lack of compliance with international labour standards.

All of this requires responses resulting from social dialogue and a broad shared vision. As a mechanism of democratic governance, social dialogue plays a complex yet pivotal role in the current context. Major efforts are required to re-establish trust among sectors and build institutional capacities to satisfy the various expectations and demands under a concerted, long-term vision.
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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The warning signs regarding the economic situation outlined in the 2014 Labour Overview have been confirmed: labour markets in Latin America and the Caribbean in 2015 reflect the effects of the economic slowdown and sluggish growth in the region. The most obvious indicator of this is the increase in the national unemployment rate, which will reach an estimated $6.7 \%$ in 2015 , as compared with $6.2 \%$ in 2014 . This means that at the end of 2015 , there will be 1.7 million newly unemployed people in the region. Some indicators of quality of employment remain positive, such as real wages and social protection coverage, largely as a result of recent institutional advances. In the near future, however, these may be affected by the decline in paid employment as a share of total employment.

## I The economic slowdown continues in emerging and developing countries, with negative growth rates for Latin America and the Caribbean

While the world's most advanced economies are experiencing a growth recovery trend, emerging and developing countries continue the downward path begun in 2010. This overall trend hides significant variation, however: whereas Asian countries have growth rates above $6 \%$, the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean are expected to record a contraction of $-0.3 \%$ in 2015.
The situation in the region varies across countries. A contraction in economic activity is particularly evident in the regional weighted average for South America, as it is affected by the situation of Brazil and Venezuela. By contrast, the countries of Central America, the Caribbean and Mexico recorded growth rates similar to or slightly higher than those of 2014, in part due to the vitality of the U.S. economy.

## | Discouraging short- and medium-term economic outlook for the region

Although economic growth in 2016 is expected to be slightly higher than in 2015, it is clear that in the short and medium term, the region will not surpass the growth rates of $4 \%$ of the past decade. Factors that facilitated that boom period, both internal (increased employment, expanded consumption and private credit, improved real wages, slightly better income distribution) and external (increased export growth and prices, availability of inexpensive financing) are deteriorating. This presents policy challenges for the region. Unfortunately, these challenges must be confronted in a context of shrinking fiscal space and rising inflation rates.

## | Volatile growth threatens social and labour advances and hinders progress toward Goal 8 of the Sustainable Development Goals

The slowdown confirms that the region can no longer escape the classic pattern of volatile growth with a negative impact on social and labour indicators. This pattern makes it more difficult for the countries of the region to reach Goal 8 of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: "Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all."

## I In some respects, the economic effects of the slowdown (2011-2015) are more severe and longer-lasting than those generated by the 2008-2009 global financial crisis

The effects of the economic slowdown period that began in 2011 are in some respects more severe than those generated by the 2008-2009 global financial crisis: the decline in key export commodities is more pronounced, as is the deterioration in the terms of trade. Additionally, while the recovery from the 2008-2009 crisis was largely facilitated by counter-cyclical public policies, this strategy is not as feasible in a context of increased fiscal restrictions or as effective in response to such an extreme, long-lasting deterioration in the terms of trade.

## | Unemployment rises in the region

In 2015, the first significant rise in the open unemployment rate in five years will increase this indicator to 2010 levels. The time lag between the onset of the economic slowdown and unemployment is partly explained by the reduction in the labour force participation rate, especially the temporary withdrawal of women and youth from the labour force in the period 2012-2014, as well as the reorganization in the structure of employment that favoured paid employment over selfemployment during that period. These trends of the first half of the decade appear to be shifting:
the labour force participation rate has ceased its decline and an increase in lower quality jobs has been observed.

The unemployment rate increased in six of 17 countries with available information. The total increase of the weighted average reflects the fact that one of those countries is Brazil, where unemployment rose by 1.5 percentage points. The reduction in the unemployment rate in the other countries was less than -0.5 percentage points, with the exception of Belize ( -1.0 percentage point), the Bahamas ( -1.8 percentage points) and Mexico ( -0.6 percentage points).

Labour market indicators suggest a negative outlook. Labour demand remains weak. The trend in the employment-to-population ratio, which began to record negative year-over-year changes in the second quarter of 2013, continues 10 quarters later. Accumulated data demonstrate that the negative change in the employment-to-population ratio in this slowdown period is -2.9 percentage points, considerably above the decline of -1.8 percentage points generated by the 2008-2009 global crisis.

## | Women return to the labour market but encounter difficulties in finding jobs

The trend of women's increased participation in the labour markets of the region, which was temporarily interrupted in 2014, began to recover in the second quarter of 2015. Unemployment among women also rose sharply, reaching $8.2 \%$ in the first three quarters (compared with $5.9 \%$ for men). In absolute terms, this means an additional 900,000 unemployed women in the region.

## | The crisis in youth employment continues

The youth population of the region benefitted only marginally from the economic boom years. Youth unemployment began to rise in 2013, reaching $14.5 \%$ in 2014 and $15.3 \%$ in the same period of 2015 (average of the first three quarters). Although rates varied across countries, the youth unemployment rate in the region is triple that of adults, on average.
The level of education of the labour force in the region did increase, however. The percentage of workers with a secondary school education rose from $43.2 \%$ to $48.5 \%$ between 2005 and 2014, and the percentage of those with a higher education increased from $14.5 \%$ to $20.5 \%$. Policies to expand educational supply as well as an increase in young people remaining in education during the global crisis explain this positive trend.

## I The protracted slowdown has also affected the composition and quality of employment and wages

Urban data for nine countries of the region indicate a decline in employment in the construction and trade sectors in the first nine months of 2015, compared with the same period of 2014, as well as an increase in the agriculture and manufacturing sectors. These data are in contrast to the trend observed during the period 2010-2014, during which employment in construction increased by 1.2 percentage points and trade rose 0.4 percentage points, while agriculture ( -0.2 percentage points) and manufacturing ( -2.1 percentage points) experienced declines.

In 2014, self-employment grew at a faster pace than paid employment, interrupting a trend that had consolidated in previous years. In 2015, paid employment declined. Although self-employment helps protect workers during crisis periods, it implies less favourable overall working conditions.

Rates of informal employment are higher in this sector. While registered employment - a concept similar to formal employment but applicable only to employees - has continued to grow in many countries of the region, it has fallen in two.
The growth of real average wages in $2014(0.3 \%)$ was less than the $1.1 \%$ recorded in 2013. There is no available data on average wages for 2015, although information on registered or formal sector wages points to a lower growth rate than that observed in 2013 in most of the countries. At the country level, with information for the first three quarters of 2015, declines were recorded in Brazil ( -2.3 percentage points), Peru ( -0.8 percentage points) and Costa Rica ( -0.1 percentage points), while the remainder of the countries with available information experienced moderate increases.

The average minimum wage of the first three quarters of 2015, both real and nominal, rose $2.0 \%$ compared to the same period of 2014. This increase was observed in most of the countries of the region. There is a correlation between increased earnings and poverty reduction given that employment income accounts for more than three-quarters of household income.

## I Social protection coverage continued to grow in 2014, although the decline in paid employment could affect advances in this area

Over the past decade, the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean have made significant advances in social protection coverage given the extension of contributory schemes (associated with the recovery of paid employment) but mainly as the result of the expansion of non-contributory schemes financed with tax revenues, in some cases with support from international cooperation agencies. Social protection and a strong labour market were key in reducing poverty and recovering from the 2008-2009 crisis.
Data from 2014 on the urban employed population with health or pension coverage demonstrate an overall increase in coverage, from $62.2 \%$ in 2013 to $62.8 \%$ in 2014 . The only exception occurred among private sector employees in firms with a maximum of five workers, where coverage rates remained stable. Although this information is not yet available for 2015 , it is likely that the reduction in the pace of paid employment creation has begun to affect social protection coverage as well.

## | Multidimensional strategies are needed to advance the formalization of the domestic work sector

This edition of the Labour Overview includes an in-depth analysis of efforts to formalize the domestic work sector in Latin America and the Caribbean. The people who perform domestic work in the region -who number nearly 18 million, accounting for almost $7 \%$ of the regional labour force and $37 \%$ of all domestic workers worldwide- are mostly women, and frequently migrants and members of indigenous or Afro-descendent populations.

The informal employment rate among this group of workers was $80.1 \%$ in 2009 and $77.5 \%$ in 2013. Despite this reduction in informal employment, which also occurred among employees and ownaccount workers, domestic work continues to be an activity with limited social security protection and deficits in terms of effective legal coverage in most of the countries. Beginning in the 2000s, however, countries of the region implemented a series of legal reforms to eliminate inequalities with respect to the labour rights of this sector. This was confirmed by the ratification in 12 countries of the ILO's Domestic Workers Convention of 2011 (Number 189).

The feature article on the formalization of domestic work in the region concluded that legal reforms should be accompanied by policies and incentives to promote compliance, social security enrolment, income security (minimum wages), oversight activities, campaigns to raise awareness and social dialogue.

## | Conclusions: policies to address this "slow-motion crisis"

This edition of the Labour Overview confirms that the economic and labour situation in the region has deteriorated since 2011. The slowdown has had a "slow-motion" impact, unlike the global financial crisis of 2008-2009, which had a strong but brief impact. The effects of the economic slowdown on the labour market will continue in the countries of the region for at least another year: the unemployment rate (regional average, using national data) is expected to reach $6.7 \%$ in 2015 and increase to $6.9 \%$ in 2016. Employment-to-population ratios will most likely begin to recover by the end of 2016. Job creation will be strongest in the Caribbean, Central America and Mexico as compared with the region's Southern Cone.

This future scenario is a cause for concern. In the short term, macroeconomic policy options seem limited given fiscal space restrictions and rising inflation in several countries. In this context, social and labour market policies will be needed to prevent the weight of the adjustment from falling on the most vulnerable. These policies will also stimulate recovery, especially in countries with inadequate effective demand. In the medium and longer term, productive development policies are urgently needed to diversify production structures and promote increased productivity and the growth of enterprises, in an effort to create more and better jobs. This will enable more inclusive economic
and social development and will reduce the vulnerability of the region's export commodities to price cycles. In both timeframes, the role of social dialogue as a democratic governance mechanism is a crucial yet complex component in a context of lower economic growth, increased fiscal restrictions, high expectations of various sectors of the population for improved standards of living, and the growing lack of confidence in the capacity of public policies to satisfy various expectations and demands in some countries.
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## LABOUR REPORT

## The global economic context

Although global economic performance continues to be uneven and uncertain, emerging countries are clearly experiencing an economic slowdown.
According to the latest forecasts of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), world economic growth in 2015 (3.1\%) will be slightly lower than that of 2014 (3.4\%), maintaining the decade-long trend of rates over $3 \%$ (Figure 1). Behind this apparent stability, however, is a major shift in the relative contribution of the different groups of countries.
On the one hand, advanced economies are experiencing a slight upward trend in economic growth, which is most evident in the United States. In the Euro Zone, recovery continues and the production declines observed in some countries in previous years are no longer occurring.
On the other hand, the economic growth rate of emerging and developing countries has been decreasing since 2010, although Asian countries are still recording high growth rates. Even with growth rates above $6 \%$, China is transitioning to lower growth rates than those recorded over the past decade. The economic scenario for Latin America and the Caribbean is clearly worsening. This year, the regional economy is expected to contract $-0.3 \%$, far below the $2.2 \%$ forecast in October 2014.1

FIGURE 1. World and Latin America and the Caribbean. GDP growth, 2010-2016 (Annual percentage change)


Source: IMF (2015). World Economic Outlook. Adjusting to Lower Prices for Commodities. October 2015. Washington D.C: IMF. Note: (*) Estimated for 2015 and 2016.

[^0]
## | The Economic and Labour Situation in the World's Leading Economies

Growth rates of advanced countries are slowly recovering. This trend is expected to continue in 2016. The U.S. economy grew $2.6 \%$ in 2015 , slightly more than the $2.4 \%$ recorded in 2014 . The Euro Zone is experiencing a more rapid recovery, with growth increasing from $0.9 \%$ in 2014 to $1.5 \%$ in 2015. Italy's economy will grow this year after three consecutive years of decline. In Spain, growth increased to $3.1 \%$ (Table 1).

In emerging and developing countries, the economic slowdown intensified. The Commonwealth of Independent States experienced negative growth this year, due largely to the recession in Russia, whose economy contracted $-3.8 \%$ in 2015 . The Asian region was affected by the economic slowdown in China, which grew $6.8 \%$ this year, the lowest rate in more than two decades. According to the latest IMF forecasts, China's growth rate will continue to fall over the next few years until it stabilizes at around 6\%. By contrast, India continues its growth trend, with a rate of $7.3 \%$.

| Region | Years |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015* | 2016* |
| World GDP | 5.4 | 4.2 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.1 | 3.6 |
| Advanced Economies | 3.1 | 1.7 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 2.2 |
| United States | 2.5 | 1.6 | 2.2 | 1.5 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 2.8 |
| Euro Zone | 2.0 | 1.6 | -0.8 | -0.3 | 0.9 | 1.5 | 1.6 |
| Germany | 3.9 | 3.7 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 1.6 |
| Italy | 1.7 | 0.6 | -2.8 | -1.7 | -0.4 | 0.8 | 1.3 |
| Spain | 0.0 | -0.6 | -2.1 | -1.2 | 1.4 | 3.1 | 2.5 |
| France | 2.0 | 2.1 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 1.2 | 1.5 |
| Japan | 4.7 | -0.5 | 1.7 | 1.6 | -0.1 | 0.6 | 1.0 |
| United Kingdom | 1.9 | 1.6 | 0.7 | 1.7 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 2.2 |
| Canada | 3.4 | 3.0 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 2.4 | 1.0 | 1.7 |
| Emerging and Developing Countries | 7.5 | 6.3 | 5.2 | 5.0 | 4.6 | 4.0 | 4.5 |
| Commonwealth of Independent States | 4.6 | 4.8 | 3.4 | 2.2 | 1.0 | -2.7 | 0.5 |
| Russia | 4.5 | 4.3 | 3.4 | 1.3 | 0.6 | -3.8 | -0.6 |
| Developing Countries of Asia | 9.6 | 7.9 | 6.8 | 7.0 | 6.8 | 6.5 | 6.4 |
| China | 10.6 | 9.5 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 7.3 | 6.8 | 6.3 |
| India | 10.3 | 6.6 | 5.1 | 6.9 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 7.5 |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | 6.1 | 4.9 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 1.3 | -0.3 | 0.8 |
| Brazil | 7.6 | 3.9 | 1.8 | 2.7 | 0.1 | -3.0 | -1.0 |
| Mexico | 5.1 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 1.4 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.8 |
| Sub-Saharan Africa | 6.6 | 5.0 | 4.3 | 5.2 | 5.0 | 3.8 | 4.3 |
| Middle East, North Africa, Afghanistan and Pakistan | 4.9 | 4.5 | 5.0 | 2.3 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 3.9 |

Source: IMF (2015). World Economic Outlook. Adjusting to Lower Prices for Commodities. October 2015. Washington D.C: IMF. Note: (*) Estimated for 2015 and 2016.

Unemployment rates worldwide also vary widely by region and country. Open unemployment rates in the United States continued to decline, to $5.1 \%$ in the third quarter of 2015 . This indicator is expected to decrease to $5.3 \%$ at the end of the year, after reaching $10 \%$ in 2010. In the Euro Zone, the growth rate peaked in 2013 and has declined ever since. In China, unemployment has remained stable at a rate of approximately $4 \%$ for more than a decade (Figure 2).


Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics (United States); Eurostat; National Statistics Office of China.

## | Economic situation of Latin America and the Caribbean in 2015: the slowdown intensifies

The economic situation of Latin America and the Caribbean has become increasingly complex. Growth forecasts are systematically downgraded. According to the latest figures of the IMF and the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC, the regional commission of the United Nations), regional growth will contract $-0.3 \%$ in 2015 (Table 2).

Nevertheless, the situation varies across countries. Whereas in Mexico, growth is expected to be slightly higher than in 2014, and growth will continue to be around $4 \%$ in Central America, the economic slowdown will be concentrated in South America, with a rate between $-1.3 \%$ (ECLAC) and $-1.5 \%$ (IMF). This sub-regional average is heavily influenced by Brazil, whose economy is expected to contract $-3.0 \%$ in 2015, and by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, with an estimated decline between $-6.7 \%$ and $-10 \%$. In the Caribbean, the ECLAC estimates a growth rate of $1.6 \%$ in 2015 , whereas the IMF estimates a rate of $3.8 \%$, depending of the group of countries considered. This sub-region, as well as Mexico, is strongly influenced by the growth of the U.S. economy.

TABLE 2. Latin America and the Caribbean: GDP growth forecasts, by country and sub-region 2014-2016 (Annual percentage change)

|  | IMF |  |  | ECLAC |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2014 | 2015* | 2016* | 2014 | 2015* | 2016* |
| Latin America and the Caribbean ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 1.3 | -0.3 | 0.8 | 1.1 | -0.3 | 0.7 |
| Latin America ${ }^{\text {b/ }}$ | ... | ... | ... | 1.1 | -0.3 | 0.7 |
| Argentina | 0.5 | 0.4 | -0.7 | 0.5 | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| Bolivia (Pluri. State of) | 5.5 | 4.1 | 3.5 | 5.4 | 4.4 | 4.4 |
| Brazil | 0.1 | -3.0 | -1.0 | 0.1 | -2.8 | -1.0 |
| Chile | 1.9 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 2.5 |
| Colombia | 4.6 | 2.5 | 2.8 | 4.6 | 2.9 | 3.1 |
| Costa Rica | 3.5 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 2.6 | 3.3 |
| Dominican Republic | 7.3 | 5.5 | 4.5 | 7.3 | 5.6 | 5.2 |
| Ecuador | 3.8 | -0.6 | 0.1 | 3.8 | 0.4 | 0.8 |
| El Salvador | 2.0 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 2.2 | 2.3 |
| Guatemala | 4.2 | 3.8 | 3.7 | 4.2 | 3.8 | 4.0 |
| Haiti | 2.8 | 2.5 | 3.2 | 2.8 | 2.0 | 2.5 |
| Honduras | 3.1 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.1 | 3.4 | 3.3 |


|  | IMF |  |  | ECLAC |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2014 | 2015* | 2016* | 2014 | 2015* | 2016* |
| Mexico | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.8 | 2.1 | 2.2 | 2.5 |
| Nicaragua | 4.7 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 4.7 | 4.3 | 4.5 |
| Panama | 6.2 | 6.0 | 6.3 | 6.2 | 5.8 | 6.0 |
| Paraguay | 4.4 | 3.0 | 3.8 | 4.4 | 3.3 | 3.6 |
| Peru | 2.4 | 2.4 | 3.3 | 2.4 | 2.7 | 3.4 |
| Uruguay | 3.5 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 3.5 | 2.4 | 2.6 |
| Venezuela (Boliv. Rep. of) | -4.0 | -10.0 | -6.0 | -4.0 | -6.7 | -7.0 |
| Caribbean ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 4.7 | 3.8 | 3.4 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 1.8 |
| Antigua and Barbuda | 4.2 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 3.2 | 2.0 | 3.4 |
| Bahamas | 1.0 | 1.2 | 2.2 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Barbados | 0.2 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 0.2 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Belize | 3.6 | 2.2 | 3.2 | 3.6 | 2.5 | 2.5 |
| Dominica | 3.9 | 2.8 | 3.3 | 2.4 | 1.9 | 2.2 |
| Granada | 5.7 | 3.4 | 2.4 | 3.8 | 1.3 | 0.9 |
| Guyana | 3.8 | 3.2 | 4.9 | 3.9 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Jamaica | 0.4 | 1.1 | 2.1 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 1.6 |
| Saint Kitts and Nevis | 6.1 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 6.3 | 4.4 | 5.3 |
| Saint Lucia | 0.5 | 1.8 | 1.4 | -1.6 | -0.2 | 0.5 |
| Saint Vincent and the Grenadines | -0.2 | 2.1 | 2.5 | -0.3 | 2.2 | 2.0 |
| Suriname | 1.8 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 0.8 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Central America ${ }^{\text {d/ }}$ | 4.1 | 3.9 | 4.2 | ... | 4.1 | 4.2 |
| South America ${ }^{\text {e/ }}$ | 0.7 | -1.5 | -0.3 | ... | -1.3 | -0.1 |

Source: IMF (2015). World Economic Outlook. Adjusting to Lower Prices for Commodities. October 2015. Washington D.C: IMF; and ECLAC (2015). Actualización de Proyecciones de América Latina y el Caribe, 2015-2016. October 2015. Santiago de Chile: ECLAC.
a/ The ECLAC estimate includes 33 countries whereas the IMF estimate includes 32.
b/ The ECLAC estimate is for the 20 countries mentioned in the table.
c/ The ECLAC estimate is for the 13 countries mentioned in the table. The IMF estimate excludes Belize, Guyana and Suriname and includes the Dominican Republic and Haiti (12 countries).
d/ The ECLAC estimate includes Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua and Panama (9 countries). The IMF estimate includes Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and Panama (7 countries).
e/ The ECLAC estimate includes 10 countries: Argentina, Bolivia (Pluri. State of), Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela (Boliv. Rep. of). The IMF estimate also includes Guyana and Suriname (12 countries).
(*) Estimated for 2015 and 2016.
Forecasts are discouraging and seem to confirm the end of the high-growth period that characterized the region over the past decade, during which the economy as a whole grew at rates above $4 \%$ annually. It is not clear how long this current slowdown will last. However, the latest projections indicate that regional GDP will not grow more than $3 \%$ annually for the remainder of the decade (Figure 3). The downgrading of forecasts has an impact not only on investment decisions, but also on the behaviour and well-being of individuals. The ILO (2014) estimates that for every tenth of a percentage point that the region fails to grow, 100,000 jobs will not be created. ${ }^{2}$

[^1]FIGURE 3. Latin America and the Caribbean: GDP growth and forecasts made between October 2011 and October 2015. 2010-2020 (Annual percentage change)


Source: Database of World Economic Outlook. Washington D.C: IMF.
Internal and external factors contributed to the vigorous growth of the past decade. Internal factors included the expansion of private consumption supported by the uptick in employment; the decline in the unemployment rate; the improvement in real wages; and the expansion of credit to the private sector (ECLAC 2011). ${ }^{3}$ External factors were the growth of exports; the rising prices of the main export commodities of the region; and the availability of liquidity, financing and even remittances. ${ }^{4}$ These factors seem to be deteriorating rapidly and largely explain the slowdown, although they affect the countries differently, depending on their global participation. ${ }^{5}$

In a context of reduced world trade volume, growth rates of the region's exports, particularly primary commodities -which rose sharply over the past decade- have been declining and even experienced negative growth in 2015. According to ECLAC (2015), ${ }^{6}$ during the 2009 crisis, the value of the region's exports declined by $-20.7 \%$ but recovered rapidly during the two subsequent years, increasing by $25 \%$ in 2010 and by $23 \%$ in 2011 . Since that year, export values increased $1.7 \%$ in 2012 , remained unchanged in 2013 and fell by $-2.5 \%$ in 2014. These figures are expected to decline to $-13.8 \%$ in 2015 (Figure 4). Export volumes also decreased, although more modestly.

[^2]FIGURE 4. Latin America and the Caribbean: Growth in value of exports of goods and services. 2007-2015 (Annual percentage change)


Source: ECLAC Database (ECLACSTAT).
Note: (*) Estimated for 2015.
Commodity prices-which increased by 15\% annually, on average, between 2003 and 2011 - have fallen rapidly in recent years. In the case of metals, a key export of several South American countries, current prices are approximately half of what they were in 2011, but they could still decline further, to levels recorded prior to the growth phase. The downward trend in the price of oil, an important commodity for countries such as the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela and Ecuador, was first recorded in the last quarter of 2014 and began to accelerate in the second half of 2015. Overall, the decline since 2011 approaches $60 \%$. Although prices of key agricultural exports for the region (soybean and coffee, among others) remained stable until 2014, they began to fall in 2015 (Figure 5).

FIGURE 5. Latin America and the Caribbean: International primary commodity price index. January 2003 - August 2015 (2005=100)


[^3]The availability of financing -another factor associated with growth over the past decade- also experienced a decline. Net private capital inflow to the region peaked in 2011 (US\$ 200.39 billion but then began to fall (US\$ 117.45 billion in 2013, a reduction of $-41 \%$ ). ${ }^{7}$ During the 2008-2009

[^4]global crisis, the decline was $-23 \%$. Additionally, investment in the region -which recovered after the 2008-2009 crisis- currently demonstrates a downward trend: $1.0 \%$ in $2012,2.5 \%$ in $2013,-0.4 \%$ in 2014 and, according to IMF estimates, $-6 \%$ in 2015 (Figure 6).

FIGURE 6. Latin America and the Caribbean: Growth of gross capital formation, 2007-2015 (Annual percentage change)


Source: Database of World Economic Outlook. Washington D.C.: IMF.
Note: (*) Estimate for 2015.
The monetary policies of the main trade partners of the region also influence the economic performance of the countries. The interest rates of the United States, Euro Zone, Japan and China are especially relevant for the region. They are currently decreasing. However, the U.S. Federal Reserve is expected to raise short-term interest rates soon, which also explains partially the capital flight from the region.
This external context poses some policy challenges for the countries of the region. The necessary fiscal spaces have been shrinking in recent years. According to ECLAC (2015), the region experienced on average a primary deficit of $1.1 \%$ of GDP in 2014, as compared with a deficit of $0.7 \%$ in 2013 (indicator of fiscal performance at the federal government level). Taking the global result into account (in other words, including the payment of interest on public debt), the deficit rose from $2.4 \%$ of GDP in 2013 to $2.8 \%$ of GDP in 2014. In 13 of the 19 Latin American countries analyzed, fiscal performance worsened in 2014. ${ }^{8}$ Data from IMF indicate an even greater deterioration of the economic situation in $2015 .{ }^{9}$

Currencies also devaluated significantly in most of the countries of the region, which poses a challenge for monetary policy. According to a recent study (IDB, 2015), between July 2014 and July 2015 , the U.S. dollar appreciated $-12.8 \%$, which had a greater impact in countries with a floating currency exchange system. ${ }^{10}$ It is uncertain whether the currencies have devalued to their lowest point and how much room is left for future devaluations. Neither are the effects of this devaluation clear. The benefits derived from the recovery of production resulting from this process will depend on the capacity to curtail imported inflationary pressures. ${ }^{11}$ It is more likely that a prolonged devaluation such as the current one will activate or intensify the transfer effect of the exchange rate on prices. In fact, inflation rates increases have been recorded in some countries that influence the regional average: $7.4 \%$ in $2013,8.2 \%$ in 2014 and an estimated $12 \%$ in $2015 .{ }^{12}$

## | Implications and outlook

The economic outlook in Latin America and the Caribbean deteriorated in 2015. Overall, since 2011, several indicators of the region point to a more severe external shock than that of the global crisis of 2008-2009 (Table 3).

[^5]TABLE 3. Latin America and the Caribbean: Comparison of the impact of the 2008-2009 global crisis and the 2011-2015 economic slowdown. 2008-2009 and 2011-2015 (Percentage change during the specified period)

|  | Global crisis <br> (2008-2009) | Economic slowdown <br> (2011-2015) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Export price index | $-24.4 \%$ | $-27.5 \%$ |
| Terms of trade | $-4.8 \%$ | $-12.4 \%$ |
| Price of total commodities | $-34.0 \%$ | $-38,3 \%$ |
| Commodity prices, without oil | $-68.0 \%$ | $-60,2 \%$ |
| Crude oil | $-47.5 \%$ | $-52.9 \%$ |
| Metals |  |  |

Source: Mendoza (2015). América Latina y el Caribe: Desaceleración con inflación. Working paper. Lima.
Unlike the 2008-2009 crisis, when commodities prices and capital inflows quickly recovered to reach levels higher than those of the period prior to the crisis, the current deterioration is sustained: it has been continuing for four years and it is not clear how long it will last.
Additionally, other factors could affect the economic performance of the region in the immediate future, especially those associated with internal governance in some countries and El Niño phenomenon, which has a more than $50 \%$ chance of being of a strong or severe magnitude.

Economic trends in Latin America and the Caribbean are worrying since they confirm that the region has failed to escape the volatile growth cycle. This has had a negative impact -which is already evident - on labour markets and social indicators. In the current context, countries of the region will find it difficult to meet the challenges of inclusive economic growth that is sustained and sustainable, both in terms of the integration of the poorest, most vulnerable segments of the population as well as with respect to the satisfaction of expectations for continued improvements in the standard of living of the growing middle classes.

## BOX 1. Latin America and the Caribbean: the long road to Sustainable Development Goal 8

The 2030 agenda adopted by consensus at the United Nations General Assembly in September 2015 is probably the most ambitious and comprehensive world development programme in recent history. Its goals and targets will guide nations in their efforts to advance toward a world that is more just, equitable and sustainable, taking into account the interconnectedness of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of development (or, as stated in the declaration, between prosperity, people and the planet).
At the core of the agenda is a goal that directly involves the ILO: "Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all." This goal, Number 8 of the 17 on the agenda, has 10 targets that can be summarized as follows:
8.1) Sustain per capita economic growth of at least 7 per cent gross domestic product growth per annum in the least developed countries; 8.2) Achieve higher levels of economic productivity through diversification, technological upgrading and innovation, including through a focus on high-value added and labour-intensive sectors;
8.3) Promote policies that support productive activities and decent job creation and entrepreneurship, and encourage the formalization and growth of micro-, small- and medium-sized enterprises;
8.4) Improve global resource efficiency in consumption and production and endeavour to decouple economic growth from environmental degradation;
8.5) Achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all women and men, including for young people and persons with disabilities, and equal pay for work of equal value;
8.6) Reduce the proportion of youth not in employment, education or training;
8.7) Take immediate measures to eradicate forced labour, end modern slavery, human trafficking and child labour;
8.8) Protect labour rights and promote safe and secure working environments for all workers, including migrant workers, in particular women migrants, and those in precarious employment;
8.9) Devise and implement policies to promote sustainable tourism that creates jobs; and
8.10) Strengthen the capacity of domestic financial institutions to encourage and expand access to banking, insurance and financial services.

As complementary targets, Goal 8 calls for supporting the aid-for-trade initiative for developing countries and implementing the ILO's Global Jobs Pact and a global strategy for youth employment.
If the mountain that this goal represents is in and of itself difficult to climb, the economic slowdown in Latin America and the Caribbean between 2011 and 2015 places the region -overall- at a disadvantage at the base camp. While some countries should focus on raising their growth, productivity and employment (quantity and quality) rates, others should concentrate on reversing negative trends in an unfavourable global context, with a view to achieving targets 8.1 and 8.2.
The region's social achievements -poverty reduction, increased social protection coverage- as well as labour market gains - unemployment reduction, increased employment - during the boom years were possible thanks to an average GDP growth rate of $4 \%$. It will be difficult to reach this level again, at least during the remaining years of this decade. Progress has been less evident in the quality of employment, productivity and the capacity of economies to provide formal employment options for youth, women and the most vulnerable segments of the population.

Nearly $47 \%$ of employment in the region is informal, productivity growth is slow compared with other emerging regions and the youth unemployment rate triples that of adults.

Measures to formalize small and medium-sized enterprises (part of Target 8.3) and own-account workers, which account for $75 \%$ of total employment in the region -over 200 million people - must decisively address the deficit in productivity and decent work in those segments. To provide alternatives to the nearly 22 million youth who neither study nor work (Target 8.6), the majority of whom are women, will require innovative policies to improve employability, the school-to-work transition and the promotion of entrepreneurship. The precarious employment situation of youth has consequences in terms of child labour since it acts as a disincentive to education. The strides made by countries of the region
to reduce this phenomenon stagnated during the first half of this decade, for which reason there are currently more than 12 million child labourers (Target 8.7) in Latin America and the Caribbean. This is especially true of adolescents engaged in the worst forms of child labour, many of whom are in situations of forced labour. In response, the countries of the region are launching a regional initiative to accelerate progress toward the goal of eliminating child labour by 2025.

Finally, to achieve Target 8.8, the region should also work to protect labour rights and promote safe workplaces, considering the special situation of the growing migrant population both within and outside of the region, among other groups. This will require updating legislation in several countries, as well as linking migration policies to those of employment, with a gender focus and one that takes into account situations of irregular migration, among other solutions.

Clearly, the region must overcome daunting interrelated challenges to advance toward achieving the targets of Goal 8. The region should take advantage of its demographic advantage, which is expected to last until 2025. It should also focus on productive development policies, including the promotion of manufacturing, to generate more and better jobs, with an emphasis on youth. This structural change should be accompanied by labour market policies to ensure adequate training and the elimination of skills gaps.
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## Labour market performance in Latin America and the Caribbean in 2015

In 2015, the negative effects of the economic slowdown on the labour market intensified, causing an increase in the unemployment rate of the region. Until 2014, labour markets still did not fully reflect the impact of the lower growth rate in the region. Nevertheless, there were warning signs, including the rise in the unemployment rate among youth and women in some countries of the region and the fact that the increase in self-employment outpaced that of paid employment. There is considerable variation among the countries of the region, however. In 2015, for example, Brazil experienced a steep rise in the unemployment rate while this rate declined in Mexico and other countries with significant weight in the regional labour force.

This section describes how the slowdown has begun to affect different labour market indicators in the region. For the first time, the Labour Overview is including national information on countries, which is found in Annex 1. Until 2014, the indicators published in the Labour Overview referred exclusively to urban areas (mainly cities) given data availability. These urban statistics are still relevant for some sections of this analysis, for which reason they are included in Annex 2. ${ }^{13}$

## | Key annual indicators with national data: unemployment rises

National coverage information for the first three quarters of 2015 (which includes both urban and rural areas) clearly demonstrates that the open unemployment rate reached 6.9\%, higher than the $6.4 \%$ observed in the same period of 2014 (Table 4). At the end of 2015 , the unemployment rate will reach an estimated $6.7 \%$, as compared with the $6.2 \%$ recorded in 2014 . This will mean an additional 1.7 million unemployed workers in the region.

TABLE 4. Latin America and the Caribbean ( 22 countries): Key national labour market indicators. 2005 and 2010-2015 (Percentages)

|  | Labour force participation rate | Employment-to-population ratio | Unemployment rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Annual data ${ }^{\text {a/ }}$ |  |  |  |
| 2005 | 61.6 | 56.8 | 7.8 |
| 2010 | 61.7 | 57.5 | 6.9 |
| 2011 | 61.6 | 57.7 | 6.4 |
| 2012 | 62.3 | 58.3 | 6.5 |
| 2013 | 61.9 | 58.0 | 6.3 |
| 2014 | 61.7 | 57.9 | 6.2 |
| $2015{ }^{\text {b/ }}$ | 61.8 | 57.6 | 6.7 |
| Average of the first three quarters ${ }^{\text {c/ }}$ |  |  |  |
| 2014 III | 61.2 | 57.3 | 6.4 |
| 2015 III | 61.3 | 57.2 | 6.9 |

Source: ILO, based on official information from household surveys of the countries.

## Notes:

a/ 22 countries were included in the calculation of the unemployment rate and 21 countries were included in the calculation of the labour force participation rate and the employment-to-population ratio.
b/ Estimated.
c/ 17 countries were included in the calculation of the unemployment rate and 16 countries were included in the calculation of the labour force participation rate and the employment-to-population ratio.

The unemployment rate declined in the region until 2014, although the pace of this decrease slowed beginning in 2011 . Both the intensification of the economic slowdown and its persistence over time have contributed to this new trend observed in 2015.

From 2003 to 2012, both labour participation rates and employment-to-population ratios were on the rise, except in 2009, the year of the global financial crisis. The declines in both indicators in 2013 and 2014 did not increase unemployment given that the labour force participation rate decreased more so than did the employment-to-population ratio. This was explained by the

[^6]temporary withdrawal of women from the labour force and by changes in the creation of paid and self-employment. ${ }^{14}$

Based on information for the first three quarters of 2015, these trends have shifted. The labour force participation rate is no longer declining (which was expected given that this rate could not continue to decrease indefinitely). It increased by a tenth of a percentage point, to $61.3 \%$. For its part, the employment-to-population ratio continued to fall, although more slowly than last year, to reach $57.2 \%$. The main effect of this trend is the growth of the unemployment rate. Additionally, as will be discussed later in this report, the smaller reduction of the employment-to-population ratio reflected a change in the composition of employment toward own-account employment.

## Analysis by sub-region and country

Table 5 demonstrates the diverse performance of labour market indicators among and even within sub-regions. Although several countries had poor indicator results in 2015, Brazil played a pivotal role in the weighted regional average. In fact, the remainder of the region (without Brazil) recorded an increase in the employment-to-population ratio (from $57.6 \%$ to $57.9 \%$ ) and a decline in the unemployment rate (from $6.1 \%$ to $5.8 \%$ ) during the first three quarters of 2015 compared with the same period of 2014.
Given the weight of Brazil in the regional average, the effects of the slowdown were concentrated in South America. The unemployment rate rose from $6.8 \%$ to $7.6 \%$ in a comparison of the first three quarters of 2014 and 2015. Excluding Brazil from this sub-regional average, the unemployment rate fell slightly. This occurred in the remaining Southern Cone countries and the Andean countries alike. Unemployment also increased in the Caribbean, from a rate of $8.2 \%$ to $8.5 \%$, as well as in the Central American countries, from $6.1 \%$ to $6.7 \%$. By contrast, the national unemployment rate in Mexico fell from $5.0 \%$ to $4.4 \%$.

The employment-to-population ratio declined in the Caribbean and the Southern Cone countries and rose in the Andean countries, Mexico and Central America. The labour force participation rate increased sharply in the Andean countries but fell in Mexico and the Southern Cone countries, despite the increase in this indicator in Brazil.

TABLE 5. Latin America and the Caribbean (17 countries): Key national labour market indicators. January-September, 2014 and 2015 (Percentages)

| Country | Labour force participation rate |  | Employment-to-population ratio |  | Unemployment rate |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2014 III | 2015 III | 2014 III | 2015 III | 2014 III | 2015 III |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | 61.2 | 61.3 | 57.3 | 57.2 | 6.4 | 6.9 |
| Caribbean countries ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 61.9 | 61.9 | 56.9 | 56.7 | 8.2 | 8.5 |
| Central America y Mexico ${ }^{\text {b/ }}$ | 59.3 | 59.3 | 56.2 | 56.4 | 5.2 | 4.8 |
| Mexico | 59.9 | 59.6 | 56.9 | 57.0 | 5.0 | 4.4 |
| Central America | 56.9 | 57.8 | 53.4 | 53.9 | 6.1 | 6.7 |
| South America ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 62.0 | 62.1 | 57.7 | 57.5 | 6.8 | 7.6 |
| Andean countries ${ }^{\text {d/ }}$ | 66.0 | 66.7 | 61.8 | 62.5 | 6.5 | 6.4 |
| Southern Cone (including Brazil) ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | 60.6 | 60.6 | 56.4 | 55.7 | 7.0 | 8.0 |
| Southern Cone (without Brazil) | 59.0 | 58.5 | 54.8 | 54.6 | 7.0 | 6.7 |
| Brazil | 61.1 | 61.2 | 56.8 | 56.1 | 6.9 | 8.4 |

[^7]Between the first three quarters of 2014 and the same period of 2015, the national unemployment rate, in other words, the percentage of unemployed workers in the labour force (people who are working or seeking employment) increased in six of the 17 countries analyzed: Honduras ( +2.0 percentage points), Brazil ( +1.5 pp ), Uruguay ( +0.9 pp ), Trinidad and Tobago $(+0.6 \mathrm{pp})$, Barbados $(+0.3 \mathrm{pp})$ and Panama ( +0.3 pp ). Rates in Peru and Costa Rica remained stable. The unemployment rate fell in the Dominican Republic, Jamaica and Chile ( -0.1 pp ), Colombia ( -0.2 pp ), Ecuador ( -0.3 pp ), Argentina ( -0.4 pp ), Mexico ( -0.6 pp ), Belize ( -1.0 pp ) and the Bahamas ( -1.8 pp ).

FIGURE 7. Latin America and the Caribbean (17 countries): National unemployment rate. January-September, 2014 and 2015 (Percentages)


Source: ILO, based on official information from household surveys of the countries.
The national labour force participation rate, in other words, the percentage of individuals in the working age population (ages 15 and up) who are working or seeking employment increased in nine of 16 countries: Ecuador $(+3.6 \mathrm{pp})$, Barbados $(+2.4 \mathrm{pp})$, Honduras $(+2.2 \mathrm{pp})$, the Dominican Republic ( +1.1 pp ), Colombia ( +0.5 pp ), Panama ( +0.2 pp ), Jamaica ( +0.2 pp ), Brazil $(+0.1 \mathrm{pp}$ ) and the Bahamas $(+0.1 \mathrm{pp})$. This indicator declined in Chile ( -0.1 pp ), Mexico ( -0.3 pp ), Argentina $(-0.7 \mathrm{pp})$, Peru ( -0.8 pp ), Uruguay ( -1.0 pp ), Costa Rica ( -1.0 pp ) and Trinidad and Tobago ( -1.8 pp ). When this rate increases, it exerts supply pressure on the labour market in addition to the pressure of demographic growth of the working age population. The increase in the labour force participation rate is not in and of itself a negative trend, however. In the medium term, it is strongly linked to the growing inclusion of women in the labour market.

FIGURE 8. Latin America and the Caribbean ( 16 countries): National labour force participation rate. January-September, 2014 and 2015 (Percentages)


[^8]In eight of 16 countries, the national employment-to-population ratio, in other words, the percentage of employed individuals among the working age population, increased: Ecuador ( +3.6 pp ), Barbados $(+1.9 \mathrm{pp})$, Bahamas $(+1.5 \mathrm{pp})$, Dominican Republic $(+1.1 \mathrm{pp})$, Honduras $(+0.9 \mathrm{pp})$, Colombia $(+0.6 \mathrm{pp})$, Jamaica $(+0.2 \mathrm{pp})$ and Mexico $(+0.1 \mathrm{pp})$. This ratio remained unchanged in Chile and Panama. Argentina ( -0.3 pp ), Brazil ( -0.6 pp ), Peru ( -0.8 pp ), Costa Rica ( -0.9 pp ), Uruguay ( -1.4 pp ) and Trinidad and Tobago ( -2.0 pp ) experienced declines in this indicator. An increase in this indicator puts downward pressure on the unemployment rate while its reduction implies a negative trend and upward pressure on the unemployment rate

FIGURE 9. Latin America and the Caribbean ( 16 countries):
National employment-to-population ratio. January-September, 2014 and 2015 (Percentages)


Source: ILO, based on official information from household surveys of the countries.
To summarize, the changes in the unemployment rate are associated with the fluctuations of the other two indicators analyzed: the "labour force participation rate effect" is direct (a reduction in the labour force participation rate places downward pressure on the unemployment rate and vice versa) whereas the "employment-to-population ratio effect" is inverse (a reduction in this ratio generates upward pressure on the unemployment rate and vice versa). ${ }^{15}$ Figure 10 shows that between 2014 and 2015, both effects simultaneously exerted an upward pressure on the unemployment rate although the "employment-to-population ratio effect" was stronger. In other words, the reduction in the employment-to-population ratio contributed to the higher unemployment rate more so than did the rise in the labour force participation rate.

[^9]FIGURE 10. Latin America and the Caribbean (16 countries): Effect of change in the employment-to-population ratio and the labour participation rate on the national unemployment rate. January-September 2014 and 2015 (Percentages)


Source: ILO, based on official information from household surveys of the countries.
The only country that performed similarly to the regional average was Brazil, which experienced a sharp rise in the unemployment rate, strongly influencing the average. In that country, the employment-to-population ratio effect was much stronger than the labour force participation rate effect. The opposite occurred in Panama, where both effects exerted upward pressure on unemployment but where the labour force participation rate effect was stronger.

In Honduras and Barbados, the labour force participation rate effect generated upward pressure on the unemployment rate that was not offset by the employment-to-population ratio effect. By contrast, in Uruguay and Trinidad and Tobago, the employment-to-population ratio effect caused upward pressure on unemployment that was not compensated by the labour force participation rate effect.
In Peru, the employment-to-population ratio and labour force participation rate effects were equally strong in opposite directions, which kept the unemployment rate stable.

In several countries where unemployment rates fell -the Bahamas, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador and Jamaica- the employment-to-population ratio effect predominated.
In Costa Rica, Chile and Argentina, the unemployment rate also declined, but as a result of a more significant reduction in the labour force participation rate than in the employment-to-population ratio. Finally, both effects exerted downward pressure on the unemployment rate in Mexico, although the labour force participation rate effect was stronger.

## Women return to the labour market

The decline in the total unemployment rate recorded in the region proportionately favoured women. The unemployment rate among women decreased from $10.0 \%$ in 2005 to $7.3 \%$ in 2014. Information for the first three quarters of the year indicates that the unemployment rate among women rose from $7.7 \%$ in 2014 to $8.2 \%$ in 2015 although the ratio between male and female unemployment remained unchanged ( 1.4 times). If data are annualized and expanded to the regional level, it is possible to conclude that more than half of the 1.7 million unemployed workers in the region are women.

TABLE 6. Latin America and the Caribbean ( 20 countries): Key national labour market indicators, by sex. 2005 and 2010-2015 (Percentages)


Source: ILO, based on official information from household surveys of the countries.
In the case of men, the opposite occurred: the smaller increase in the unemployment rate was due both to the reduction in the employment-to-population ratio and to a decline in the labour force participation rate. ${ }^{16}$

This is largely explained by the fact that in 2015, women returned to the labour market: between the first three quarters of 2014 and the same period of 2015, the labour force participation rate rose from $49.0 \%$ to $49.4 \%$. The larger number of unemployed workers was due to the increased incorporation of women into the labour market. This had been a long-term trend in the region, which was temporarily interrupted in 2013 and 2014, when the labour force participation rate among women declined more than it did among men. ${ }^{17}$

The unemployment rate among men also increased by a similar level ( +0.4 percentage points) but this reflected a decline in the employment-to-population ratio that was not compensated by the reduction in the labour force participation rate.

FIGURE 11. Latin America ( 15 countries): Year-over-year change in key national labour market indicators, by sex. January-September, 2014 and 2015 (Percentage points)


Source: ILO, based on official information from household surveys of the countries.

[^10]
## Youth are also affected by the economic slowdown

The economic slowdown has also affected the youth population. During the phase of strong economic growth, youth unemployment declined, ${ }^{18}$ which was associated with a downward trend in the labour force participation rate of youth, both men and women, reflecting their tendency to remain in education. ${ }^{19}$ The decline in the labour force participation rate among youth and the increase in school enrolment levels continued even during the 2009 global financial crisis. ${ }^{20}$

This phenomenon had a dual effect on the youth labour supply: besides reducing the labour force participation rate of this group, youth who did enter the labour market were better educated (Box 2). Consequently, there was less pressure on the youth labour supply and first-time young workers were better qualified.

This trend has shifted, however. Youth unemployment has begun to rise. Based on information for the first three quarters of 2015, the youth unemployment rate reached $15.3 \%$, above the $14.5 \%$ recorded during the same period of 2014. Figure 12 shows that this increase is due to the significant reduction in the employment-to-population ratio among youth ( -0.8 percentage points), which was not offset by the decline in the labour force participation rate ( -0.5 percentage points). The ongoing reduction of the labour force participation rate distinguishes youth from adults, whose labour force participation rate rose in 2015 , which combined with a slight decline in the employment-topopulation ratio to drive an increase in the unemployment rate.

FIGURE 12. Latin America (13 countries): Year-over-year change in national key labour market indicators, by age. January-September, 2014 and 2015 (Percentage points)


Source: ILO, based on official information from household surveys of the countries.
The youth unemployment rate tripled that of adults (3.1 times), a proportion similar to that of 2014 ( 3.2 times) but slightly higher than the 2005 rate ( 2.9 times).

In seven of 13 countries studied, reductions in the youth unemployment rate ranged from $-2.7 \%$ to $-0.6 \%$. This rate increased up to 4.8 percentage points in Brazil, Uruguay and Honduras, which had a strong influence on the regional average youth unemployment rate.

[^11]FIGURE 13. Latin America and the Caribbean (13 countries): Urban open unemployment rate among youth aged 15-24 years. January-September, 2014 and 2015 (Percentages)


Source: ILO, based on official information from household surveys of the countries
The economic slowdown in the region is limiting opportunities for youth to access the labour market and decent work. If policies are not implemented to promote the quantity and quality of youth employment, the economic scenario expected over the next few years could further aggravate this situation.

## BOX 2. Educational level of the labour force: medium-term trends

The development of the region requires a labour force with basic skills acquired through education. In most Latin American and Caribbean countries, low educational levels and absolute or functional illiteracy have contributed to a level of labour productivity that is inadequate for meeting the challenges of a productive transformation that generates inclusive growth with more and better jobs.

In this context, it is interesting to explore the data on educational attainment (measured by years of education) of the labour force and how it has changed in recent years in the region.

The increase in educational level is clearly reflected in the distribution of the labour supply. For the region as a whole ( 16 countries), between 2005 and 2014, the percentage of workers without a formal education fell from $8.4 \%$ to $5.7 \%$ while the percentage of those with between 1 and 6 years of education - the equivalent of complete or incomplete primary school - declined from a third (33.5\%) to a fourth (25.1\%) of the total in the same period.

The percentage of workers who have completed between 7 and 12 years of education -corresponding to complete or incomplete secondary school- increased from $43.2 \%$ to $48.5 \%$. The largest increase, in both relative and absolute terms, corresponds to workers with a higher education ( 13 or more years of education), whose participation rose from $14.5 \%$ to $20.5 \%$ (Table 6 of the National Annex). Reflecting the gradual effect of increased secondary and higher education coverage, the number of workers with fewer than seven years of education also declined, by more than 10 million, between 2005 and 2014 in the group of countries analyzed. The number of workers with a secondary education increased by more than 27 million and those with a higher education, by more than 18 million (Table B2.1).

TABLE B2.1. Latin America ( $\mathbf{1 6}$ countries): Workers by years of education and status in employment. 2005 and 2014 (Percentages and difference in percentage points)

| Year and years of education |  | Total | Status in Employment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Employees | Non-employees |  |  | Domestic workers | Contributing family workers | Otros |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Own- |
| 2005 | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
|  | No education |  | 8.4 | 4.6 | 2.0 | 5.3 | 13.6 | 4.9 | 15.0 | 10.1 | 11.9 | 12.6 |
|  | 1 to 6 | 33.5 | 24.5 | 10.9 | 27.8 | 42.3 | 28.2 | 44.6 | 49.7 | 47.0 | 31.6 |
|  | 7 to 12 | 43.2 | 50.3 | 42.3 | 52.2 | 33.8 | 41.3 | 32.6 | 38.6 | 36.4 | 48.0 |
|  | 13 and over | 14.5 | 20.2 | 44.5 | 14.2 | 10.0 | 25.5 | 7.5 | 0.8 | 4.5 | 7.7 |
| 2014 | Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
|  | No education | 5.7 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 3.5 | 10.0 | 3.4 | 10.9 | 8.1 | 8.4 | 0.8 |
|  | 1 to 6 | 25.1 | 17.4 | 6.6 | 20.0 | 35.5 | 21.9 | 37.5 | 41.0 | 36.2 | 23.9 |
|  | 7 to 12 | 48.5 | 52.8 | 37.0 | 56.6 | 40.8 | 44.3 | 40.3 | 48.0 | 46.5 | 62.7 |
|  | 13 and over | 20.5 | 26.7 | 55.2 | 19.8 | 13.6 | 30.4 | 11.1 | 2.5 | 8.8 | 12.7 |
| Percentage point difference, 2005-2014 | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | No education | -2.7 | -1.6 | -0.9 | -1.8 | -3.6 | -1.5 | -4.1 | -2.0 | -3.5 | -11.8 |
|  | 1 to 6 | -8.4 | -7.2 | -4.3 | -7.9 | -6.8 | -6.3 | -7.1 | -8.8 | -10.9 | -7.7 |
|  | 7 to 12 | 5.3 | 2.5 | -5.3 | 4.4 | 7.0 | 3.0 | 7.7 | 9.4 | 10.2 | 14.6 |
|  | 13 and over | 6.0 | 6.5 | 10.7 | 5.5 | 3.6 | 4.8 | 3.7 | 1.7 | 4.3 | 4.9 |

Source: ILO, based on information from household surveys of the countries.
The decline in the percentage of workers with a primary education, as well as the increase in the percentage of workers with a secondary and tertiary education, was observed for all types of workers. Despite these global trends, there are differences among types of workers. For example, the percentage of workers with a higher education among the group of domestic workers tripled, although absolute levels remain low. Levels of educational attainment above the average were also observed for public ( +10.7 pp ) and private $(+5.5 \mathrm{pp})$ employees, indicating that the dynamics of firms has generated a demand for higher skills, which has managed to absorb the growing numbers of workers with a higher education.

This positive trend has been attributed to aspects of the educational supply as well as to the gradual increase in the coverage of institutions of secondary and higher education. It has also been attributed to the fact that during the 2009 global economic crisis, the temporary decline in employment opportunities led a larger share of youth to remain in the education system for longer as compared with the number of youth who neither studied nor worked (ECLAC and ILO 2012).

An analysis by economic sectors complements information on demand for higher skills and qualifications. Tabulations by economic sub-sectors for the years 2004 and 2014 ( 10 countries) reveal that sectors of advanced manufacturing, such as the automotive, electronics and aeronautics industries, recorded a more marked increase in the educational level of workers compared with workers of other, more labour-intensive sectors, such as mining. This is reflected in both the decline in the percentage of workers with a primary or no education, as well as in the increase in the percentage of workers with a higher education (Figure B2.1).

FIGURE B2.1. Latin America ( 10 countries): Workers by years of education according to selected economic sub-sectors. 2004-2014 (Percentages)


Source: ILO, based on information from household surveys of the countries.
The educational challenge of the region goes beyond educational levels measured in terms of years of education completed, however. There have been repeated calls for a quality education that is capable of teaching the basic skills workers need. This need is evident in the results of international tests such as the PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment) of the OECD. In the three subjects tested (math, reading and sciences), the average score of students from Asian countries was more than $20 \%$ higher than that of students in the region. Even more troubling, between 2006 and 2012, this gap widened rather than narrowed. In comparison with OECD countries, the gap is almost as large and improved only slightly between 2006 and 2012. Within these statistics, problems of segmentation emerge, which associate poorer results with populations living in poverty and schools with more needs. Although educational coverage and attainment levels have improved, the quality of education also must be improved to ensure the development of skills that help raise productivity and transform production, as well as to guarantee the generation of civic values that contribute to the sustainability of development.
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## | Short-term (quarterly) trends in urban areas: weak labour demand continues and gains in employment quality have ceased

## Continued weakness of labour demand

A more detailed short-term analysis with urban data found that changes in the employment-topopulation ratio have been negative since the second quarter of 2013. This trend has intensified with the decline in GDP growth during the same period.

FIGURE 14. Latin America and the Caribbean (12 countries):
Year-over-year change in GDP and urban employment-to-population ratio.
1st quarter 2010 through 3rd quarter 2015 (Year-over-year in percentage points)

$\simeq$ Change in GDP Change in the urban employment-to-population ratio

Source: ILO, based on official information from household surveys of the countries and ECLAC.
Note: Preliminary data for 2015.
As mentioned, the lower decreases in the employment-to-population ratio observed in 2015 with respect to 2014 are also associated with the return of the labour force to the labour market, especially through self-generated employment (own-account employment). In 2013 and 2014, the labour force participation rate fell (Figure 15). This process cannot continue indefinitely, however, and the rate is expected to increase again in 2016. ${ }^{21}$

FIGURE 15. Latin America ( 12 countries): Quarterly rate of urban unemployment, labour force participation and the employment-to-population ratio. 1st quarter 2008-3rd quarter 2015 (Percentages)


Source: ILO, based on official information from household surveys of the countries.
In 2015, the quarterly trend in the unemployment rate was unusual given that it normally demonstrates a markedly seasonal behaviour (higher in the first quarter and lower in subsequent quarters). In 2015, unemployment rates increased continually through the third quarter. During the 2009 global crisis, rates remained constant during the first three quarters and then fell in the fourth quarter. In 2014, the rate remained stable in the second and third quarters. The behaviour of this rate in 2015 clearly deviates from trends observed in recent years (Figure 16).

[^12]FIGURE 16. Latin America and the Caribbean (12 countries): Quarterly changes in the urban unemployment rate. 2009 I-2015 III (Percentages)


Source: ILO, based on official information from household surveys of the countries.
The quarterly analysis enables a comparison between the 2008-2009 crisis and the current economic slowdown. The crisis had a direct impact on job creation, generating a negative change in the employment-to-population ratio beginning in the first quarter of 2009 (compared with the same quarter the previous year). This crisis lasted for four quarters, until the end of that year, but by early 2010, the change in the employment-to-population ratio again became positive. The current slowdown, which began in 2011, has been more complex. The negative effect on the employment-to-population ratio became evident rather late, during the second quarter of 2013 (compared with the same quarter the previous year). The problem is that the rate continues to be negative; in other words, 10 quarters later (Figure 17). The accumulated negative change during the global crisis was $1.8 \%$, while the current slowdown has already reached a level of $2.9 \%$.

FIGURE 17. Latin America (12 countries): Percentage point difference in the quarterly urban employment-to-population ratio between the global crisis period and the current slowdown. 2008 IV - 2011 II and 2013 I - 2015 IV (year-over-year change)


Source: ILO, based on official information from household surveys of the countries.
Note: The zero period refers to the 1st quarter during which a decline in the employment-to-population ratio was recorded (4th quarter 2008 for the 2008-2009 global crisis and 1st quarter 2013 for the 2011-2015 slowdown).

## Signs of a reordering of employment sectors

The sectoral organization of urban employment has changed over the past decade. Since 2005, an upward trend in employment in construction and the tertiary sector has been consolidated, to the detriment of participation of the primary sector and manufacturing

Agriculture, fishing and mining experienced a continuous decline in participation in urban employment until 2012, when it stagnated at approximately 5\%. Employment in manufacturing decreased to $13.8 \%$. By contrast, the construction sector has increased its share -thanks to the
expansion of public infrastructure and private investment works- although the pace is slowing. That sector accounts for $9.3 \%$ of employment.

The growth of the financial service sector, characterized by pro-cyclical growth, has remained at approximately $4 \%$ since 2011 . The transportation, storage and communication sector has remained practically unchanged since 2011 at $6.3 \%$, following a continual expansion throughout the past decade. The trade sector experienced a slight increase and has maintained a participation of nearly $26 \%$ for the past 10 years. The service sector had similar results, which since 2010 has represented approximately $34.8 \%$ of employment. The electricity, gas and water sector has remained largely unchanged at less than $1 \%$. No sectors experienced significant growth in employment between 2013 and 2014 (Table 7).

TABLE 7. Latin America ( 18 countries): Composition of urban employment by economic sector. 2005 and 2010-2014 (Percentages)

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Economic activity | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| Agriculture, fishing and mining | 7.0 | 5.6 | 5.4 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 5.0 |
| Electricity, gas and water supply | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 |
| Manufacturing | 15.9 | 14.7 | 14.1 | 14.5 | 14.0 | 13.8 |
| Construction | 7.3 | 8.3 | 8.7 | 8.8 | 9.2 | 9.3 |
| Trade | 25.8 | 26.0 | 26.3 | 26.1 | 26.0 | 26.2 |
| Transportation, storage and communications | 5.7 | 6.1 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.5 | 6.3 |
| Financial services | 3.5 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 3.9 |
| Community, social and personal services | 33.9 | 34.8 | 34.6 | 34.8 | 34.8 | 34.8 |
| Not classifiable by economic activity | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |

Source: ILO, based on official information from household surveys of the countries.
Note: Several countries have made changes to their International Standard Industrial Classification of all Economic Activities (ISIC) and their International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO)

Only nine countries have urban data for the first three quarters of 2015 (Figure 18). Compared to 2014, some trends differing from those occurring between 2013 and 2014 have been observed: a slight increase in the participation of manufacturing in employment (although this participation declined in five of the nine countries); a reduction in employment in construction, heavily influenced by the situation in Brazil; and a larger decrease in the trade sector. As was the case in the analysis of year-over-year data, the participation of agriculture in employment rose slightly.

FIGURE 18. Latin America (9 countries): Year-over-year change in participation of economic sectors in urban employment. January-September, 2014 and 2015 (Percentage points)


Source: ILO, based on official information from household surveys of the countries.
Note: Selected countries are Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Mexico, Panama, Peru and Uruguay.

## The slowdown begins to affect the quality of employment

The slowdown has also begun to affect indicators associated with the quality of employment. The economic growth period of the past decade, together with a sharp decline in the unemployment rate, had enabled the expansion of paid employment and a reduction in self-employment in the
region. ${ }^{22}$ This trend was reversed in 2014 given that self-employment grew at a faster pace than paid employment as compared with 2013, increasing its participation in total urban employment from $25.6 \%$ to $26 \%$. For its part, paid employment fell from $65.7 \%$ to $65.1 \%$. Many countries in the region experienced an increase in own-account work. While this form of employment helps to mitigate the effects of the downturn in the labour market given that it acts as a sort of "adjustment cushion" in response to unemployment, its increase is generally associated with less favourable working conditions. Indicators such as informal employment are higher in that sector, for example. ${ }^{23}$

Another notable characteristic of the growth phase was the restructuring of private employment by firm size. Until 2012, paid employment has been decreasing in firms with a maximum of five workers (ILO 2014a, World Bank 2015). Since that date, the trend has been less obvious. Beginning in 2012, public sector employment has reduced its participation in employment.

TABLE 8. Latin America ( 18 countries): Composition of urban employment by status in employment. 2005 and 2010-2014 (Percentages)

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total workers | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| Employees | 61.1 | 64.0 | 65.1 | 65.4 | 65.7 | 65.1 |
| Public | 12.5 | 12.9 | 13.1 | 13.1 | 13.0 | 12.7 |
| Private | 48.6 | 51.0 | 52.0 | 52.4 | 52.7 | 52.4 |
| $\quad$ Establishments with a maximum | 13.1 | 12.8 | 12.8 | 12.1 | 12.5 | 12.0 |
| of five workers | 35.5 | 38.2 | 39.2 | 40.3 | 40.2 | 40.4 |
| $\quad$ Establishments with six or more workers | 27.6 | 26.1 | 25.6 | 25.6 | 25.6 | 26.0 |
| Non-employees | 4.8 | 4.3 | 3.9 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.1 |
| $\quad$ Employers | 3.4 | 3.1 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 2.9 |
| $\quad$ Establishments with a maximum | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.2 |
| of five workers | 22.9 | 21.8 | 21.7 | 21.3 | 21.4 | 21.9 |
| $\quad$ Establishments with six or more workers | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 3.4 |
| Own-account workers | 21.2 | 19.9 | 19.7 | 19.2 | 19.3 | 18.5 |
| $\quad$ Professional, technical or administrative | 7.9 | 7.4 | 7.1 | 6.7 | 6.6 | 6.5 |
| $\quad$ Non professional, technical or administrative | 3.1 | 2.1 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 1.8 |
| Domestic workers | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| Unpaid family workers |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Others |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: ILO, based on official information from household surveys of the countries.
Among non-employees, own-account workers account for the largest share of them. Within this group, non-professionals have the most weight, followed by own-account professionals, who have increased their participation in total employment. In general, the percentage of own-account workers is similar to that observed in 2010 following the global crisis.

For 2015, with urban information for eight countries, the trend observed in 2014 appears to be continuing (Figure 19). In other words, own-account workers expanded while the proportion of employees declined sharply ( -0.35 percentage points).

[^13]FIGURE 19. Latin America (8 countries): Year-over-year change in the participation of different types of status in employment in urban employment. January-September, 2014 and 2015 (Percentage points)


Source: ILO, based on official information from household surveys of the countries.
Note: The selected countries are Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Mexico, Panama, Peru and Venezuela (Boliv. Rep. of).

During the high-growth phase of the past decade, the expansion of paid employment was associated with positive changes in indicators related to employment quality, such as the expansion of social security and the reduction of informal employment. These advances are now being affected by the slowdown.

This is the case of registered employment, a concept similar to the formal employment of employees (jobs that firms report to the government through social security registers or other payroll mechanisms). This indicator rose sharply over the past decade. Currently, its growth has been more moderate. Despite the economic slowdown, this indicator remains positive in most of the countries in the region. Nevertheless, available data through the first semester of 2015 demonstrate a reduction in this indicator in some countries, such as Brazil and Uruguay. This would imply a shifting trend in an indicator with steady growth to date.

TABLE 9. Latin America and the Caribbean (11 countries): Registered employment index. 2000, 2005 and 2010-2015 (2010=100)

|  |  |  |  |  |  | First semester |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ |
| Argentina | 66 | 78 | 100 | 105 | 107 | 109 | 109 | 109.0 | 111.5 |
| Brazil | 68 | 79 | 100 | 105 | 109 | 111 | 112 | 111.6 | 110.8 |
| Chile | 63 | 75 | 100 | 106 | 112 | 116 | 118 | 118.5 | 121.0 |
| Costa Rica | 68 | 79 | 100 | 103 | 107 | 109 | 111 | 110.9 | 111.7 |
| El Salvador | 82 | 89 | 100 | 103 | 106 | 111 | 114 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Guatemala | 82 | 91 | 100 | 104 | 107 | 110 | 112 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Mexico | 87 | 89 | 100 | 104 | 109 | 113 | 117 | 116.2 | 120.4 |
| Nicaragua | 58 | 71 | 100 | 108 | 117 | 126 | 133 | 130.7 | 139.6 |
| Panama | 63 | 69 | 100 | 110 | 118 | 123 | 125 | 123.4 | 126.5 |
| Peru | 70 | 75 | 100 | 105 | 110 | 113 | 115 | 110.8 | 112.0 |
| Uruguay | 65 | 72 | 100 | 105 | 109 | 111 | 112 | 112.1 | 111.7 |

Source: ECLAC (2015). Economic Survey of Latin America and the Caribbean 2015. Challenges in boosting the investment cycle to reinvigorate growth. Santiago de Chile: ECLAC.

With respect to social protection coverage, the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean made significant strides over the past decade given the expansion of contributory schemes (associated with the recovery of paid employment), but especially in response to the increase in non-contributory programmes financed by tax revenues, in some cases with support from international cooperation agencies. Social protection and the favourable labour market performance were pivotal in poverty reduction efforts and the recovery from the 2008-2009 financial crisis. Available data on the urban employed population with health or pension coverage still shows an increase in coverage, from $62.2 \%$ in 2013 to $62.8 \%$ in 2014. The only exception occurred among private sector employees of
firms with a maximum of five workers, where coverage remained stable. Although information is not yet available for 2015, it is likely that the reduction observed in the creation of paid employment has also begun to affect social protection coverage. This hypothesis will be verified with data presented in the 2016 Labour Overview.

TABLE 10. Latin America: Urban employed population with health or pension coverage, by status in employment. 2010-2014 (Percentages)

|  | Health |  |  |  |  | Pensions |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
| Total employed population | 57.5 | 59.5 | 59.7 | 60.7 | 61.3 | 58.5 | 60.1 | 60.9 | 62.2 | 62.8 |
| Employees | 75.4 | 76.7 | 76.9 | 77.3 | 78.1 | 76.6 | 77.7 | 78.0 | 78.6 | 79.4 |
| Public | 93.4 | 93.6 | 92.8 | 93.1 | 93.5 | 93.1 | 93.4 | 92.9 | 93.6 | 93.8 |
| Private |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Establishments with a maximum of five workers | 38.1 | 39.5 | 39.0 | 40.1 | 39.9 | 41.0 | 42.5 | 42.0 | 43.9 | 43.9 |
| Establishments with six or more workers | 82.9 | 84.2 | 84.5 | 85.0 | 85.8 | 83.9 | 84.8 | 85.1 | 85.6 | 86.2 |
| Non-employees | 25.7 | 27.3 | 27.6 | 28.6 | 29.2 | 33.0 | 33.7 | 35.1 | 32.6 | 33.9 |
| Employers | 47.3 | 49.9 | 49.3 | 50.3 | 51.1 | 59.9 | 61.9 | 61.8 | 56.7 | 57.9 |
| Own-account workers and contributing family workers | 21.7 | 23.5 | 23.5 | 24.6 | 25.4 | 28.2 | 29.1 | 30.2 | 28.2 | 29.8 |
| Domestic workers | 29.5 | 32.1 | 32.4 | 34.4 | 35.2 | 32.7 | 33.9 | 35.4 | 38.9 | 40.1 |

Source: ILO, based on official information from household surveys of the countries.
Time-related underemployment has also been declining for more than a decade. This indicator reflects the underutilization of workers and their willingness to work more hours than those reported. Beginning in 2011, however, this positive trend began to stagnate in some countries (Uruguay). Underemployment even increased in others, such as Argentina, Costa Rica and Ecuador (Table 11).

TABLE 11. Latin America ( 13 countries): Percentage of workers
with time-related underemployment. 2003, 2007, 2011-2014 (Percentages)

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Argentina | 20.7 | 10.4 | 9.1 | 9.3 | 9.2 | 9.6 |
| Brazil | 5.0 | 3.6 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 1.8 | 1.5 |
| Chile | 6.5 | 8.0 | 11.9 | 11.5 | 11.6 | 11.3 |
| Colombia | 15.3 | 10.0 | 11.1 | 11.7 | 11.9 | 10.6 |
| Costa Rica | 15.2 | 11.5 | 13.4 | 11.3 | 12.5 | 12.8 |
| Ecuador | 9.8 | 11.3 | 9.8 | 8.2 | 8.9 | 9.3 |
| El Salvador | 4.8 | 5.3 | 3.4 | 5.8 | 5.8 | $\ldots$ |
| Honduras | 5.9 | 4.3 | 10.6 | 10.1 | 11.6 | 10.4 |
| Mexico | $\ldots$ | 7.2 | 8.6 | 8.5 | 8.3 | 8.1 |
| Panama | $\ldots$ | 2.7 | 1.3 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 1.8 |
| Paraguay | 8.8 | 5.8 | 6.3 | 5.4 | 5.1 | 4.9 |
| Peru | 19.0 | 16.5 | 12.4 | 12.0 | 11.6 | 11.3 |
| Uruguay | 19.3 | 12.9 | 7.6 | 7.4 | 6.9 | 6.9 |

Source: ECLAC (2015). Economic Survey of Latin America and the Caribbean 2015. Challenges in boosting the investment cycle to reinvigorate growth. Santiago de Chile: ECLAC and ECLAC (2013). Economic Survey of Latin America and the Caribbean 2013. Three decades of uneven and unstable growth. Santiago de Chile: ECLAC.

## | Wage trends

The economic slowdown has begun to affect wages (Figure 20). During the economic boom, average wages of all employees rose sharply. The Global Wage Report ${ }^{24}$ reported growth rates of $3.9 \%$ and $2.9 \%$ in 2006 and 2007, respectively. Even during the 2008-2009 crisis, wages grew rather than declined, although at rates below $1 \%$, recovering to $2.3 \%$ in 2012. In 2014, average wages grew only slightly $(0.3 \%)$, similar to the rate observed during the 2009 global crisis $(0.2 \%)$.

FIGURE 20. Latin America and the Caribbean (29 countries):
Change in average real wages. 2006-2014 (Annual percentage change)


Source: ILO, based on information from the ILO's Global Wage Database.
Note: Regional growth of wages is calculated as the weighted average of year-over-year growth of the real monthly wage. The methodology used, as well as the list of 29 countries included, is found in Annex I of ILO (2014), Global Wage Report 2014/15. Geneva: ILO.

No information is yet available on average wages for 2015, a year in which the effects of the economic slowdown have intensified. Some countries do have information on wages of the registered or formal sector. In the 2014 Labour Overview, data on changes in wages between 2013 and 2014 indicated a slowdown in the growth of wages in this sector as a result of the sluggish performance of economies of the region and a slight increase in inflation. ${ }^{25}$
A comparison of information for the first three quarters of 2014 and 2015 (Figure 21) still demonstrates some increases - although moderate - in this indicator in Chile, Colombia, Mexico, Nicaragua, Paraguay and Uruguay. By contrast, reductions were recorded in Brazil ( -2.3 pp ), Peru ( -0.8 pp ) and Costa Rica ( -0.1 pp ). ${ }^{26}$

FIGURE 21. Latin America (9 countries): Year-over-year change in average real wages in the formal sector. January-September, 2014 and 2015 (Percentage points)


Source: ILO, based on official information from household surveys of the countries.

[^14] declined due to a significant reduction in the nominal wage in early 2015.

Minimum wages have continued to rise in the region during the period December 2014 to September 2015. Nevertheless, in nine of 16 countries, these increases were lower than those observed in the same period of the previous year (December 2013 to September 2014). In other countries, such as Panama, Paraguay and Peru, no nominal adjustments of the minimum wage were recorded in the period, for which reason decreases were registered in real terms. Panama and Paraguay use a bi-annual adjustment scheme whereas in Peru, adjustment periods are variable. In Colombia, where the adjustment is annual, the increase was practically offset by rising prices. In Costa Rica and El Salvador, prices have fallen (negative inflation or deflation), for which reason the real change in the minimum wage was greater than the nominal change (Figure 22).

FIGURE 22. Latin America (16 countries): Changes in nominal minimum wage and real minimum wage. December 2014 to September 2015 (Annual percentage change)


Source: ILO, based on official information of the countries.
Sustained wage increases contributed to improvements in key social indicators for the region over the past decade, such as the reduction of poverty and inequality. Figure 23 reflects this trend, which shows the correlation between percentage variations in labour income and changes in poverty rates during the growth period (2003-2011). With respect to labour income, improvements were observed in nearly every country. In the case of poverty rates, all of the countries experienced declines. Although this is not a causal analysis, the trend in this correlation is that improvements in labour income have been accompanied by falling poverty rates. This is consistent with findings of studies that indicate that improvements in labour markets of the region were crucial for reducing poverty (World Bank, 2012). ${ }^{27}$ This is expected given that labour income accounts for more than three-quarters of household income.

[^15]FIGURE 23. Latin America ( 15 countries): Difference in real monthly labour income and poverty rate. 2003-2011 (Percentages)


Source: ECLAC database (ECLACSTAT) and SEDLAC - Socio-Economic Database for Latin America and the Caribbean (CEDLAS and World Bank)
Note: Includes monthly labour earnings of employees and non-employees.

## | Rural and urban employment trends

Overall, the open unemployment rate is lower in rural areas than in urban ones: employment difficulties in rural areas tend to be reflected in underemployment, informality and low earnings rather than in unemployment. Of the 13 countries with available data for 2013 and 2014, only in two, Costa Rica and El Salvador, did rural unemployment equal or surpass urban unemployment, whereas in the remaining 11 countries, urban unemployment was considerably higher than rural unemployment. In the context of the economic slowdown, between 2013 and 2014, the gap between urban and rural unemployment rose in nine of the 13 countries (Brazil, Ecuador, Honduras, Guatemala, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Peru and Uruguay) and declined in four (Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic and El Salvador).

FIGURE 24. Latin America (13 countries): Difference in urban and rural
unemployment rates. 2013 and 2014 (Percentage points)


Source: ILO, based on official information from household surveys of the countries.
With respect to the employment-to-population ratio by geographic area, no clear trends emerge. In seven of the 13 countries considered, the employment-to-population ratio was higher in urban than in rural areas in 2014. In terms of the gap in the employment-to-population ratio between urban and rural zones, in five of the 13 countries with available information, the gap narrowed (the change in the employment-to-population ratio was more favourable in rural areas than in urban ones) whereas it widened in the eight remaining countries (Figure 25).

FIGURE 25. Latin America (13 countries): Difference in urban and rural employment-to-population ratios. 2013 and 2014 (Percentage points)


Source: ILO, based on official information from household surveys of the countries.
In summary, the annual data available until 2014 indicates that urban unemployment rates tended to be higher than those of rural areas and that the gap increased slightly between 2013 and 2014.

## | Employment outlook

The uncertainty of the economic scenario has rapidly made an impact on the world of work in the region. Some stylized relationships enable projections for key variables, such as the change in employment and unemployment rates.
Employment is the most direct transmission mechanism between output and the labour market. By calculating static elasticities, it is possible to estimate the expected behaviour of employment (volume) according to the most recent economic forecasts. Figure 24 shows the changes in employment from 2005 through 2015 and includes an estimate of the performance of this variable until 2020. ${ }^{28}$ The figure clearly demonstrates how the economic slowdown affects job creation. At least in 2016, the volume of employment will remain weak; recovery is not expected to begin until 2017. The reduction in the pace of job creation will be more evident in Southern Cone countries. Employment trends in Central America and Mexico are more favourable than in other sub-regions.

FIGURE 26. Latin America and the Caribbean: Rate of growth
in employment, by sub-region. 2014-2020 (Percentages)


Source: ILO, based on IMF (2015). World Economic Outlook. Adjusting to Lower Commodity Prices. October 2015 Washington D.C.: IMF; and ILO (2015). Trends Econometric Models. January 2015. Geneva, ILO.
Note: (*) Estimated.

[^16]Lower labour demand may result in higher unemployment or a higher share of own-account workers. The regional unemployment rate for 2015 is expected to be $6.7 \%$ (national data). In light of the expected low GDP growth rate, employment-to-population ratios could continue to be weak in 2016. The labour force participation rate is expected to increase again. This points to an increased unemployment rate in 2016, which will reach approximately $6.9 \%$ (Figure 27).

FIGURE 27. Latin America and the Caribbean: Change in GDP growth and the unemployment rate. 2010-2016 (Percentages)


Source: ILO, based on official information of the countries, and IMF (2015), World Economic Outlook. Adjusting to Lower Commodity Prices. October 2015. Washington D.C.: IMF
Note: (*) Estimated
In summary, due both to the economic performance of the region and to the delayed effects it usually has on the labour market, the unemployment rate will most likely rise again in 2016. This situation calls for increased policy efforts in this area.
This future scenario is a cause for concern. In the short term, macroeconomic policy options seem limited given fiscal space restrictions and rising inflation in several countries. In this context, social and labour market policies will be needed to prevent the weight of the adjustment from falling on the most vulnerable. These policies will also stimulate recovery, especially in countries with inadequate effective demand. In the medium and short term, productive development policies are urgently needed to diversify production structures, promote increased productivity and the growth of enterprises in an effort to create more and better jobs. This will enable more inclusive economic and social development and will reduce vulnerability to price cycles of the region's export commodities. In both timeframes, the role of social dialogue as a democratic governance mechanism is a crucial yet complex component in a context of lower economic growth, increased fiscal restrictions, high expectations of different population sectors for improved standards of living, and the growing lack of confidence in the capacity of public policies to satisfy different expectations and demands in some countries.
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## Experiences of formalization of domestic work in Latin America and the Caribbean

## | 1. Introduction

Domestic work is one of the occupations most affected by informality. The ILO estimates there are some 18 million domestic workers, representing $7 \%$ of all workers in the region. In 2013, the informal employment rate among domestic workers in Latin America was $77.5 \%$. In other words, nearly eight out of 10 domestic workers had an informal job (ILO, 2014a: 11). However, like in other sectors, this rate declined in the domestic work sector between 2009 and 2013, by 2.6 percentage points (Figure 1).

FIGURE 1. Latin America ( 14 countries): Rate of non-agricultural informal employment by status in employment, 2009-2013, (percentages)


Source: ILO (2014a).
Note: Employed population, 15 years and over.
This reduction owes to several factors, including measures adopted by the countries to formalize this activity. This article briefly reviews the main characteristics of this occupation and examines the different initiatives to reduce informality in diverse areas such as social security, minimum wages, labour inspection, union membership and collective bargaining.

## | 2. Domestic work in Latin America: characteristics and working conditions

The ILO's Domestic Workers Convention (2011, No. 189) defines this occupation as "work performed in or for a household or households." The ILO estimates that the domestic workers in Latin America represent $37 \%$ of the world's domestic workers. Latin America and Asia have the largest share of domestic workers and these regions have also experienced the highest increase in domestic workers in recent decades (ILO, 2013).

Ninety-three per cent of domestic workers in Latin America are women. Although the importance of domestic work as a share of female employment in the region has diminished in recent years, from $18.6 \%$ in 2000 to $14.3 \%$ in 2013 (ILO, 2014b), this activity continues to be a significant source of employment for women (Figure 2). In some countries, many domestic workers are migrants. In countries with indigenous or African-descendant populations, both tend to be overrepresented in the group of domestic workers.

[^17]FIGURE 2. Latin America (18 countries): Proportion of domestic workers in relation to total employed persons, by sex, 2013 (percentages)


Source: ILO (2014b).
Notes: Data for Bolivia correspond to 2011; data for Nicaragua correspond to 2012.
Domestic workers' educational level has been improving. In 2013, $63 \%$ had not completed any schooling or had finished only primary school, as compared with $76.3 \%$ in 2003. Likewise, the percentage of domestic workers with a secondary school education has risen nearly 12 percentage points over the past decade, from $21.8 \%$ in 2003 to $33.3 \%$ in 2013 (ILO 2015a).
Domestic work has scant value in terms of wages. Currently, in Argentina, Brazil, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Panama and Uruguay, domestic workers' labour income are equal to or less than half of the average of all employed individuals (ILO 2015a). The gap has narrowed over the past decade, however, since these workers received $51.1 \%$ of average income in 2013 as compared with $45.1 \%$ in 2003. The differences in income in this sector persist even when compared with the average income of unskilled occupations.

Domestic work continues to be an activity with limited social security coverage and with legal and effective coverage gaps in practically all countries. At the regional level, no comparable information exists on coverage of the domestic work sector, ${ }^{2}$ although information from the ILO's Labour Information and Analysis System for Latin America and the Caribbean (SIALC) demonstrates that pension coverage in 2013, measured in terms of the proportion of domestic workers actively contributing to a pension system, was $28 \%$, far below the $47 \%$ for the total of employed persons (ILO 2015a).
The information collected through institutional records and household surveys for a group of countries of the region reveal large gaps in the levels of contributory coverage of social security in the domestic work sector (Figure 3).

[^18]FIGURE 3. Latin America (13 countries): Contributory coverage of social security systems, circa 2013 (percentages)


Source: ILO, 2015b.
Coverage rates vary significantly. While some countries have achieved rates of over $40 \%$, others have not surpassed $10 \%$ of the total. Several elements contribute to the differences in effective coverage rates, such as the mandatory or voluntary nature of coverage. For the group of countries included in Figure 3, Mexico and El Salvador are the only ones where coverage is voluntary, and at the same time have the lowest coverage rates. Voluntary coverage is a practice that hinders efforts to extend social security coverage.

Mandatory coverage is a necessary but insufficient condition, however. Some countries with mandatory legal coverage of social security also have low levels of effective coverage, which indicates that there are national determinants and practices that affect these levels, including the contributory capacity of employers and workers of the sector, the legal and institutional framework related to the capacity to exercise contributory and evasion controls, the capacity of inspection services, and the level of complexity of enrollment and contribution payment procedures (ILO, 2015b).

The design of social security systems frequently does not respond to the specific characteristics of the domestic work sector, particularly with respect to the low contributory capacity and the widespread practice of working partial days for one or several employers at the same time. The countries of the region with higher contributory coverage rates, such as Uruguay or Chile, have managed to modify social security schemes to address the unique characteristics of the sector.

Despite limited contributory coverage, a large percentage of domestic workers have access to social security through enrollment schemes not associated with their status as employees. This situation is largely explained by the inadequacy of social security strategies and mechanisms to guarantee contributory participation. The inclusion of domestic work in social security systems through a category separate from that of paid employment impedes domestic workers from accessing all benefits normally included in social security. Coverage is frequently limited to medical assistance only. For example, in Costa Rica, contributory coverage of domestic work is estimated at $15.5 \%$, but an additional $60 \%$ of domestic workers have medical coverage through social security categories not related to their employment status, such as family insurance (spouses of a direct policyholder) or a voluntary insurance scheme. Clearly this coverage is insufficient since it excludes the economic benefits (for illness, maternity and unemployment, among others) granted to individuals who are directly covered.

In summary, the data show that the design of the social protection system and its institutional capacity are relevant but not decisive factors for achieving high levels of social protection of domestic workers. Policies and strategies to extend social security coverage should be viewed as part of a set of policies designed to promote labour formalization (ILO, 2015b).

## | 3. Legislation to regulate domestic work

Legislation regulating the domestic work sector in Latin America and the Caribbean has passed through different phases. The first laws established differentiated schemes that granted fewer rights and guarantees to domestic workers. In 1972, Brazil was the first country to modify its legal
framework to eliminate inequalities. It was not until the early 2000s, however, that these changes became a trend, which was further strengthened by the adoption in 2011 of the ILO's Domestic Workers Convention (No. 189). To October 2015, 12 countries of the region had ratified this Convention: Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guyana, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay and Uruguay. Some of these nations have not adapted their legislation to the Convention, for which reason the acknowledgment and exercise of the rights established in the Convention vary across countries (Table 1).

In legal terms, serious contradictions exist between the legislation regulating domestic workers and that of migrant workers. For example, most of the countries still recognize verbal employment contracts. Nevertheless, migration laws demand a written contract to enable migrants to request a work permit and formalize their migratory status (Milano-Mijangos et al. 2012: 32). Additionally, domestic workers often work for several employers at the same time and have high job turnover rates, yet migration laws in the countries demand some permanence with the same employer (Milano-Mijangos et al. 2012: 33).

One important advance is the 1997 signing, in the context of MERCOSUR, of the Multilateral Social Security Agreement of the Southern Common Market and the Administrative Regulations for its due application. Through this agreement, MERCOSUR member states recognize the same rights and responsibilities of social security for migrant and national workers.

TABLE 1. Latin America ( $\mathbf{2 1}$ countries): Formal recognition of the rights of domestic workers, 2015

| Right | Conditions | Countries |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Working hours | Equal to that of other workers (between 40 and 48 hours weekly) | Argentina, Bolivia ${ }^{\text {a/, }}$, Colombia ${ }^{\mathrm{b} /}$, Costa Rica, Peru, Guyana, Paraguay ${ }^{\text {c/ }}$, Chile ${ }^{\mathrm{d} /}$, Brazil, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Ecuador, Jamaica and Venezuela. |
|  | Not established. Rest periods are defined for workdays between 9 and 12 hours | Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua and Panama. |
|  | Workdays are longer for workers who live in the household where they work | Bolivia, Chile and Colombia |
| Contract | Mandatory written contract | Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Mexico, Paraguay and Bolivia ${ }^{e l}$ |
|  | Verbal contract permitted | Colombia, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Jamaica, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela |
| Minimum wage | Minimum wage for domestic workers or domestic workers included in general minimum wage | Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Guyana, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela |
|  | No minimum wage established for domestic workers | Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Honduras and Peru |
|  | Part of salary can be paid in-kind | Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama and Uruguay |
| Social security | Mandatory enrollment | Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Guyana, Jamaica, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela |
|  | Voluntary enrollment | El Salvador, Honduras and Mexico |
|  | Special scheme with more limited coverage | El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Mexico |

Source: ILO, based on legislation of the countries.
a/ Forty-eight hour work weeks, eight hours daily is recognized for live-out workers. Work weeks for live-in workers is 10 hours daily, for a work week of 60 hours (Law 2.450, Art. 11).
b/ Eight-hour days are recognized for live-out workers. For live-in workers it is 10 hours daily (Constitutional Court Ruling C-372, 1998)
c/ Forty-eight hour work weeks are established for live-out workers (Law No. 5.407/2015, Art. 13).
d/ Forty-five hour work weeks are recognized only for live-out workers. Live-in workers do not have a defined workday although they are entitled to 12 hours of rest daily (Law 20786, Art. 149).
e/ Mandatory only when the labour relationship exceeds one year (Law 2.450, Art. 3).

## | 4. Strategies for the formalization of domestic work beyond legal reforms

Legal reforms alone cannot guarantee the formalization of domestic workers if they are not accompanied by policies that promote their compliance. The countries with the most positive
results in this area (Argentina, Chile, Ecuador and Uruguay) have implemented a multidimensional strategy that combines activities in different areas.

The multidimensional approaches include, first, legal reforms to give domestic workers the same rights as those of workers covered in general labour law. Other actions seek to guarantee compliance with these rights and reduce gaps in the working conditions of domestic workers compared with those of other workers. To this end, strategies are implemented to promote social security enrollment and to guarantee income security, as well as to establish minimum wages that are equal to those of occupations of similar skill levels. Other measures include control activities; economic incentives for compliance with the law; promotion of social dialogue; and information and awareness-raising campaigns (Table 2).

TABLE 2. Multidimensional approaches implemented in the region to promote the formalization of domestic workers

|  | Legislation | Social Security | Income Security | Inspection | Incentives | Collective Bargaining |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 즏 } \\ & \text { 를 } \\ & \frac{\text { but }}{} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Law } 18.065 \\ & (2006) \\ & \text { domestic } \\ & \text { workers. } \end{aligned}$ | Legal recognition of right to social security applying to private activity in general | Creation of wage group no. 21 - domestic workers in the Wage Council beginning in 2008 | Inspection without entering household | Inclusion of insurance premium payment of the BSE in the BPS invoice. Payment discounts | Collective bargaining with Single Domestic Workers' Union (SUTD) and the League of Homemakers, Consumers and Users |
|  | Information and dissemination campaigns implemented by different government agencies and civil society organizations |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{\text { U }}{\stackrel{=}{ढ}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Law } 20786 \\ & (2014) \end{aligned}$ | Covered by the general scheme that applies to other workers | Progressive equalization of wages with general minimum wage through Law 20.279 (2008) | Mandatory labour inspection. Inspection without entering household |  |  |
|  | Household workers' union provides legal advisory services |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 흐둘 } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{4} \end{aligned}$ | Recognition of equal rights in the Labour Code (2005) | Non-enrollment of workers by employers is punishable by jail time. Penal Code reform (2014) | Progressive alignment of wages with general minimum wage between 2007 and 2010. | Increased control in the framework of the Dignified Domestic Work Programme (2010). |  |  |
|  | In the framework of the Dignified Domestic Work Programme, television, radio and printed media campaigns were carried out, accompanied by information brigades stationed on main streets of large cities. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Law N ${ }^{\circ} 26.844$ of the Special Scheme of Employment Contracts for Household Workers (2013) | Reform to permit enrollment of part-time workers. Incentives | Establishment of Commission to set wages. | Mandatory registration of the employment certificate | Discount on social security payments. Tax incentives | Collective bargaining with several union organizations and two employers' organizations |
|  | Advisory service for workers and employers through the Employment Tribunal for Household Workers. Campaigns to raise awareness |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: ILO, based on legislation of the countries

### 4.1 Actions to guarantee domestic workers' right to social protection

Access to social security is crucial for the transition to formality since it indirectly promotes access to other rights: it enables monitoring of compliance with established minimum wages and working hours; helps prove the existence of a labour relationship when no written contract exists; and facilitates labour inspection. This is especially relevant in countries where registration of the employment contract with Ministries of Labour is not mandatory.

As mentioned, this is one area with the largest gaps with respect to other workers. While current social security legislation in most countries includes domestic workers, social protection schemes do not respond to the unique characteristics of this activity. This means that the real possibilities for accessing social security are quite limited.

Countries of the region have implemented a variety of actions to promote the social protection of the sector. The most basic measure is to guarantee domestic workers all social security benefits. In Uruguay and Argentina, this provision was included in the new legislation regulating the domestic work sector. ${ }^{3}$ In 2013, Colombia expanded benefits to workers of this sector, recognizing their right to participate in the Family Compensation Fund, which enables access to several social benefits. ${ }^{4}$

Another set of measures seeks to make enrollment schemes more flexible to allow workers who are employed part-time or who have more than one employer to make social security contributions. In Uruguay, social security coverage is extended to workers who work at least 13 days per month, for a minimum of 104 hours, and who earn a monthly salary of at least 1.25 Contributory Base Wages (BPC). These requisites can be met by combining workdays and earnings from workers' different jobs. This is quite relevant in Uruguay as $63.6 \%$ of domestic workers in the country are employed part-time (MTSS, 2014: 29).

Similarly, in Argentina, the 2013 legislative reform established the coverage of this sector under the Special Social Security Scheme and extended it to all categories of domestic work, regardless of the hours worked (Messina, 2015:33). Social security contributions are established in groups classified according to the number of hours worked per week (Messina, 2015: 56).

Colombia developed a similar strategy, but which combines the contributory scheme with a subsidized one. In 2013, a social protection scheme for part-time workers was created (Decree 2616, 20/11/13). The new scheme includes government subsidies given that workers must be enrolled in a subsidized healthcare scheme and do not make contributions for this coverage. Contributions are proportional to the number of hours worked and it is possible to accumulate contributions made by different employers. Both employers and workers must make contributions to the pension fund. Additionally, employers are responsible for the full amount of contributions to the Family Compensation Fund and the Occupational Risk Administration.

An approach that differs from the aforementioned ones uses penalty mechanisms. Ecuador has opted for this strategy. The New Penal Code adopted in 2014 establishes that employers who do not enroll their workers in social security are subject to incarceration for a period of three to seven days (Art. 244).

Finally, social security enrollment is also promoted through the establishment of fiscal incentives and discounts on payment of quotas and fines. This mechanism, which will be discussed in the section on incentives in this report (Section 4.4), has been included in reforms in Argentina, Uruguay and Brazil.

Some countries have already observed results from the implementation of these measures. In Uruguay, a strategy based on the recognition of all rights and the creation of flexible social security schemes has led to an increase in the social protection coverage among domestic workers: between 2006 and 2013, enrollment rose by nearly 15 percentage points, from $33.1 \%$ to $47.2 \%$ (MTSS, 2014: 26). A total of 21,109 domestic workers have been enrolled in the Social Protection Bank (BPS) since the adoption of the legislation in 2006 until 2012, for an estimated increase of more than $7 \%$ (MTSS, 2013: 3).

Although a gap still exists between domestic workers and workers in general (in 2013, 47.2\%, of domestic workers contributed to social security versus $74.4 \%$ for all workers), progress during this period was significant.
Argentina opted to combine three of the aforementioned measures: recognition of all rights, adoption of flexible schemes and creation of incentives. That country has also had positive results. During the 1990s, non-enrollment among domestic workers never fell below 90\%; it is now 78\% (MTEySS, 2014:

[^19]1). Between 2012 and 2014, 108,000 additional workers were enrolled, for an increase of $35.5 \%$. This growth is especially significant considering that during the same period, enrollment in the private sector increased by only $0.9 \%$ (MTEySS, cited in Mazamorra et al., 2015: 11).

In Ecuador, more time is needed to assess the impact of measures to promote the social protection of domestic workers. However, enrollment of workers of this sector has markedly increased, from $11 \%$ in 2003 to $42 \%$ in 2013 (ILO, 2015b).

### 4.2 Income security: minimum wage

Domestic work, which is associated with tasks long assigned to women for no pay, is still undervalued. For this reason, reforms have focused on aligning domestic workers' wages with wages established for other activities. Countries such as Ecuador and Chile have general minimum wages and strategies in place to gradually increase the minimum wage for domestic work until it is matches the general wage. Ecuador implemented this process between 2007 and 2010, while Chile did so between 2000 and 2011. This meant a wage increase of $120 \%$ and $71 \%$, respectively, for domestic workers of those countries. In Chile, however, non-compliance with the minimum wage for domestic workers rose from $8.1 \%$ in 2000 to $13.6 \%$ in 2011. This situation also occurred in a context in which overall compliance with the minimum wage law improved for the economy as a whole (Velázquez and Loyo, 2013: 24).

Other countries with minimum wages differentiated by occupation have opted to create tripartite entities to set and gradually increase the minimum wage of domestic workers.

This occurred in Uruguay, where the Wage Committee established the minimum wage for domestic workers through a 2006 Law. In 2008, the Committee convened Wage Group No. 21 - Domestic Work with representatives of employers and workers of the sector to establish a national minimum wage and semester adjustments until July 2010.

Since that date, the Wage Committee has regularly adjusted the minimum wage for this sector, as well as wages above the minimum. The provisions adopted in this period have led to a real increase (considering the Consumer Price Index) of 97\% in the minimum wage for the domestic work sector between 2008 and 2014 (MTSS, 2014: 35).

Statistics on the impact of these measures are particularly encouraging. In 2012, more than 73.1\% of domestic workers in Uruguay earned wages above the minimum (MTSS, 2013: 24). Wage policy has also contributed to narrowing the employment income gap between the domestic work sector and other sectors. This trend has had a greater impact on those who work by the hour, whose remuneration increased from $55.5 \%$ of the average for all employed workers in 2006 to the equivalent of $70.1 \%$ of that average in 2012 (MTSS, 2013: 25).

### 4.3 Labour inspection in private households

Labour inspection of domestic work faces two specific challenges that some countries of the region are trying to address. Because domestic work is performed in private households, there is a conflict between protecting workers' rights through inspections and upholding the right to the inviolability of private spaces. This means that performing inspections in households requires a court order, which automatically rules out routine inspections since a court order must be based on a wellfounded suspicion.

In this context, countries of the region have implemented two main lines of action to guarantee oversight of the domestic work sector: registration mechanisms and initiatives to monitor workers' working conditions.

In an effort to develop tools to control and monitor the working conditions of domestic workers, countries such as Argentina (Work Record), Bolivia (Individual Employment Contract and the Wage and Occupational Safety and Health Record), Brazil (eSocial), Chile (Mandatory Employment Contract Registry) and Peru (Household Workers' Registry) have created mandatory registration systems. Registry characteristics differ but are generally administered by Ministries of Labour and collect information on conditions of the labour relationship.

In addition to registration systems, initiatives are being implemented to guarantee labour inspections without the need to enter homes. Inspectors may ask to review the documentation that provides information on the conditions of the labour relationship. For example, they may request
information from the mandatory registries or on social security enrollment. These documents are verified without entering the home, unless authorized by the employer.

In Chile, employers can choose to allow inspectors into their homes or agree to take the required documentation to a labour inspectorate office on a specified date (Labour Code, 2002, Art. 146).

Uruguay has made important strides in developing this strategy in recent years. Inspectors request an interview with the worker and the employer at the front door of the home. They also require employers to show documentation confirming that they are up-to-date with their obligations (ILO, 2013: 67).

Informational activities were also identified in the region. These seek to question potential employers with respect to compliance with their obligations. In Argentina, the Federal Public Income Administration (AFIP) promotes the registration and formalization of domestic workers based on the likelihood that contributors with the highest income hire domestic workers. On that premise, the administration sends letters to contributors whose income exceeds the amount estimated by the AFIP and which have not declared any domestic worker. In 2006, 200,000 contributors received these letters (Persia, 2014:7)

Finally, another strategy is the creation of specific programmes to increase inspections. This is the case of Ecuador's Dignified Domestic Work Programme.

The implementation of these strategies is guaranteeing oversight of a sector where it was previously thought to be impossible. For example, between 2010 and 2013 in Uruguay, the General Labour and Social Security Inspectorate (IGTSS) carried out more than 10,000 inspections, most of which were routine (MTSS, 2013: 6). The number of complaints filed has increased significantly since 2013 (MTSS, 2013: 6).

In Ecuador, inspections have risen sharply. In 2010, 16,854 inspections were carried out nationwide. In $46 \%$ of those cases, violations of current law were observed (MRL, 2010: 17). Since that year, approximately 25,000 inspections have been performed annually (Ministry of Labour, 2014).

### 4.4 Incentives for social security contributions and other employment-related contributions

Some countries of the region have implemented incentive policies with the aim of promoting social security enrollment and payment of other employment-related contributions.

The most basic actions attempt to simplify paperwork and payment procedures through the use of new technologies. An increasing number of countries are exploring the possibility of making enrollment and contribution procedures available online and through mobile phone apps. These countries include Colombia, Peru, Chile, Brazil, Costa Rica and Uruguay. Colombia and Brazil have platforms such as the Integrated Contribution Liquidation List (PILA) or eSocial, which combine payments to different systems.

Other actions focus on creating fiscal incentives for those who comply with their employer obligations. For example, in 2005, Argentina established that employers could deduct the full amount of remunerations and social security contributions from their gross taxable income (Persia, 2014: 7).

Other proposals offer discounts on payments of quotas to employers who formalize their workers through their social security enrollment. Since 2008, Argentina has offered a $50 \%$ discount on the employers' contribution for new employees hired during the first 12 months and of $25 \%$ during the subsequent 12 months.

In Uruguay, an agreement signed between the Social Protection Bank and the Government Insurance Bank in 2013 simplified contribution procedures for domestic workers and reduced the amount of insurance payments for $85 \%$ of employers (President's Office, 2013).

Finally, countries such as Argentina and Brazil have implemented initiatives to reduce fines. In Brazil, employers fined for violations associated with non-compliance with employment conditions can receive a $50 \%$ discount if they pay the fine within 10 days of notification of the violation and if they agree not to file an administrative appeal (ILO, 2015c: 13).

### 4.5 Organization of domestic workers and collective bargaining

As ILO Recommendation No. 204 states, freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining are crucial for enabling those employed in the informal economy to engage in social dialogue in the framework of the transition to the formal economy. Although domestic workers are formally protected by these principles, current law in many countries is not adapted to the specific characteristics of the sector and does not provide the necessary legal protection to make them a reality (Bastidas, 2014: 10).

In this context, the organization of domestic workers has assumed different legal configurations (Bastidas, 2014: 10): unions (Argentina, Bolivia and Chile), associations (Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala and Nicaragua) and associations and unions (Peru, Chile and the Dominican Republic). The adoption of Convention No. 189 and the campaigns for its ratification have helped promote this organization and prioritized the rights of domestic workers on the agenda of union organizations.

Still, workers face significant limitations for meeting and organizing. Among the countries in the region, only Uruguay and Argentina offer the necessary conditions for collective bargaining. In Uruguay, the Single Domestic Workers' Union (SUTD) and the League of Homemakers, Consumers and Users participate in this process (Bastidas, 2014: 10). In that country, collective bargaining may be implemented in the framework of the Wage Council, such as in the case of domestic workers. In the 2008 meetings of the Wage Council, in addition to wage issues, members agreed to jointly raise public awareness; create a bonus for time of service; establish measures to ensure dignified working conditions, free of psychological and sexual harassment; and establish severance pay for partial dismissal when workers' workdays are reduced. ${ }^{5}$ At the 2013 meetings, a bonus for perfect work attendance was established ${ }^{6}$ and the Wage Council agreed to advance in the definition of categories and employment contracts of the sector.
In Argentina, on 29 September 2015, the National Commission on Employment in Private Households was established (as per Article $N^{\circ} 62$ of Law 26.844). Several domestic workers' unions, employers' organizations and the Ministry of Labour serve on this commission. The first order of business of this entity was to raise wages of the sector in 2015, through Resolution 1/2015, of the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Security.

Bolivia is also promoting social dialogue and collective bargaining. Since 2013, representatives of the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Security, the Bolivian League of Household Workers and the National Federation of Household Employees of Bolivia (FENATRAHOB) have been participating on tripartite committees. These committees developed the Individual Employment Contract and the Wage, Occupational Health and Safety Record. The tripartite committee is also carrying out an assessment on freedom of association and collective bargaining to obtain input for the development of a tripartite plan of action (ILO, 2015d: 26).

### 4.6 Campaigns to raise awareness and employment advisory services

Increasingly, countries are launching campaigns to promote the rights of domestic workers and disseminate current law. Practically all countries of the region that have implemented legal reforms in recent years have produced some printed informational materials for workers, employers or both. These initiatives are led by government agencies, organizations of workers or by both.
In countries that have not yet ratified Convention No. 189, unions focus on promoting its ratification. In Trinidad and Tobago, the National Union of Domestic Employees (NUDE) has prepared informational materials and is collecting signatures to this end.

Campaigns have also been organized in the region to raise awareness about the importance of domestic work. One such campaign is "Trabajo como ningún otro, derechos como cualquier otro," developed by the Trade Union Confederation of the Americas, with support from the ILO in Central America and the Dominican Republic.

[^20]Additionally, several countries provide some type of advisory service for workers, most of which are offered through organizations of domestic workers, in some cases with support from government agencies.

## | 5. Conclusions

This feature article examined the measures taken by Latin American and Caribbean countries to formalize domestic work. Informal employment in this occupation was rooted in legislation that established differentiated working conditions, which recognizes fewer rights for domestic workers than for other workers. This legal discrimination was in turn supported by some social norms that legitimized the undervaluing and invisibility of this occupation.
In light of this historical context, the transition to formal employment begins with the adoption of legal reforms to guarantee that domestic workers enjoy the same rights as other workers. The adoption of ILO Convention No. 189 and the campaigns for its ratification have encouraged the implementation of these reforms in many countries. The rights-based focus is therefore the foundation on which to advance toward formalization.

Modifying legislation is insufficient, however. The countries with the most positive results are those that accompanied legal reforms with medium- and long-term strategies to guarantee the full exercise of the rights recognized by law. These strategies have included actions to facilitate a cultural and symbolic change that recognizes the value of domestic work. Advances in other areas, such as wages, social security and union membership, are only possible once this recognition has been established. The rights-based focus and the progressive implementation of those legal changes have been pivotal for achieving advances (Chart 1).

CHART 1. Multidimensional approach implemented in Latin America and the Caribbean to promote the formalization of domestic workers

## Multidimensional Approach



Campaigns to provide information and raise awareness/legal advisory services

Source: ILO.
Multidimensional strategies have focused on the effective access to social security. To achieve significant coverage of social security requires enrolling workers in general social security schemes for all employees, and also attending to the specific characteristics of the sector, such as enrollment of part-time workers who work for several employers. In all the cases analyzed, the legal recognition
of that right has been accompanied by activities to disseminate the laws, promote enrollment and improve monitoring of compliance.

Given that domestic workers earn very low wages, the countries with the highest rates of formalization have implemented gradual processes to guarantee a minimum wage for domestic work equal to that of occupations of a similar skill level. This in turn has helped increase the purchasing power of domestic workers, which has had a positive effect on social security enrollment.

In the current context of recent legal reforms, another key element has been to inform workers of these changes to enable them to demand their compliance, promote worker organizations to defend those rights and strengthen controls. It is no coincidence that countries with the greatest advances are those where domestic workers have organized and can collectively demand their rights. Since the adoption of Convention No. 189, the number of domestic workers' unions has risen, as has the involvement of the union sector in defending these workers' rights. This improves possibilities for increasing social dialogue in the sector.
Finally, it should be mentioned that there is still limited information on the impact of the measures implemented. Countries should allocate resources for the systematization and evaluation of the initiatives taken. This would enable adjustments to be made to improve the effectiveness of the actions and to share good practices with other countries. There are no magic formulas. Only coordinated measures to guarantee equal pay and compliance with rights, implemented progressively and sustained over time, will have lasting effects on reducing informality in the domestic work sector.
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## EXPLANATORY NOTE

The tables in the Statistical Annexes are prepared by the ILO using information from different official sources of statistics of Latin America and the Caribbean. These tables are one of the main inputs for the analysis of the labour report of the Labour Overview.

When the first edition of the Labour Overview was published in 1994, household surveys in most of the countries of the region had geographic coverage limited to urban areas, many of which were restricted to the country's leading cities or urban centres. Accordingly, in an effort to collect the largest amount of information possible and to place it in a comparative framework, the Labour Overview opted to generate a statistical series that referred to urban areas. Up until the 2014 edition, the Labour Overview maintained this urban series, although the report also addressed issues associated with national and rural labour markets.

For the first time, the 2015 Labour Overview includes a series with national data as a primary source for the regional labour market analysis, complemented by the traditional urban series. In addition, while the content of the Labour Overview always considered a gender perspective, all key indicators contained in the Statistical Annex have now been disaggregated by sex.
Below is a glossary of the concepts and definitions used, information sources, international comparability of the data, reliability of the estimates and overall considerations of the estimates published in the Statistical Annexes. The statistical information presented refers to national areas unless otherwise indicated.

## I 1. Concepts and Definitions

The national definitions of several concepts appearing in the Labour Overview are generally based on the standards of the International Conferences of Labour Statisticians (ICLS), although some are defined according to standards developed for this publication to the extent that the processes following national criteria imply a partial adherence to international standards. In 2013, the ICLS adopted the "Resolution concerning statistics of work, employment and labour underutilization," through which it revises and expands on the "Resolution concerning statistics of the economically active population, employment, unemployment and underemployment" adopted by the 13th ICLS (1982). Nevertheless, taking into consideration that the countries of the region have not yet fully incorporated the provisions of the new resolution in effect into the conceptual framework of their surveys, the concepts and definitions detailed below largely maintain the conceptual framework of the 13th ICLS, although they do include elements of the new provisions.
Employed persons are those individuals above a certain specified age who, during the brief reference period of the survey, were employed for at least one hour in: (1) paid employment, in other words, they worked during the reference period for a wage or salary, or who were employed but without work due to temporary absence during the reference period, during which time they maintained a formal tie with their job, or (2) self-employment, working for profit or family gain (includes unpaid family workers), or not working independently due to a temporary absence during the reference period. It should be noted that not all countries require verification of formal ties with the establishments that employ those temporarily absent, nor do they necessarily follow the same criteria. Furthermore, some countries do not explicitly include the hour criterion but rather establish it as an instruction in the interviewers' handbook. In the case of unpaid family workers, these countries may establish a minimum number of hours to classify them as employed.

Unemployed persons include individuals over a specified age that, during the reference period, (1) are not employed, (2) are actively seeking employment, and (3) are currently available for a job. It should be noted that not all countries of the region apply these three criteria to estimate the number of unemployed persons. Some countries include in the unemployed population individuals who did not actively seek employment during the established job-search period.

The economically active population (EAP) or labour force includes all individuals who, being of at least a specified minimum age, fulfill the requirements to be included in the category of employed or unemployed individuals. In other words, it is the sum of the group of both categories.

The employment-to-population ratio is the number of employed individuals divided by the working-age population multiplied by 100 and denotes the level of exploitation of the working-age population

The unemployment rate is the number of unemployed persons divided by the labour force multiplied by 100 and represents the proportion of the labour force that does not have work.

The labour force participation rate is the labour force divided by the working-age population multiplied by 100 and represents the proportion of the working-age population or labour force that actively participates in the labour market

Wages and salaries refer to payment in cash and/or in kind (for example foodstuffs or other articles) that wage and salaried workers receive, usually at regular intervals, for the hours worked or the work performed, along with pay for periods not worked, such as annual vacations or holidays.

Real average wages are the average wages paid to wage and salaried workers in the formal sector, deflated using the consumer price index (CPI) of each country. In other words, the nominal wage values published by official sources in local currency figures or as an index are deflated using the CPI for the national level or metropolitan area. Diverse data sources are used, including establishment survey sources, social security systems and household surveys. Worker coverage varies by country; in some cases, all wage and salaried workers are included whereas in others, data refer only to regular remunerations of wage and salaried workers in the private sector, workers covered by social and labour legislation, workers covered by the social security system or workers in the manufacturing sector, as indicated in the notes of the corresponding table. The real average wage index was constructed using 2000 as the base year ( $2000=100$ ).

Real minimum wages are defined in the Labour Overview as the value of the average nominal minimum wage deflated using the CPI of each country. In other words, official data on nominal minimum wages (monthly, daily or hourly) paid to workers covered by minimum wage legislation are deflated using the CPI of each country. The majority of the countries have a single minimum wage. Nonetheless, in some countries, the minimum wage is differentiated according to industry and/ or occupation, in which case the minimum wage of the industry is used as the reference. The real minimum wage index was constructed using 2000 as the base year ( $2000=100$ ).

The urban employed population with health and/or pension coverage refers to the employed population that is covered by health insurance and/or a pension, whether it is through social security or through private insurance, as the primary beneficiary, direct insured, contributing member or beneficiary. In other words, this term refers to the urban employed population with social security coverage.

## | 2. International Comparability

Progress toward harmonizing concepts and methodologies of statistical data that facilitate international comparisons is directly related to the particular situation and development of the statistical system in each country of the region. This largely depends on institutional efforts and commitments for implementing resolutions adopted in the ICLS and regional integration agreements on statistical issues. Efforts should focus on information needs, infrastructure and level of development of the data collection system (based primarily on labour force sample surveys), as well as on guaranteeing the availability of human and financial resources to this end. The comparability of labour market statistics in Latin America and the Caribbean is mainly hampered by the lack of conceptual and methodological standardization of key labour market indicators. This is also true of related variables, since countries may have different concepts for geographic coverage and minimum working-age thresholds, different reference periods and may use different versions of international classification manuals, among others. Nevertheless, in recent years, statistics institutes of the countries of the region have made significant efforts to adjust the conceptual framework of employment surveys to comply with international standards, which has led to advances in standardization and international comparability at the regional level.

## | 3. Information Sources

Most of the information on employment indicators, real wages, productivity and GDP growth (expressed in constant monetary units) for the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean
presented in the Labour Overview originate from household surveys, establishment surveys or administrative records. These are available on the websites of the following institutions:

## Argentina

Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas y Censos -INDEC- (www.indec.mecon.ar) Ministerio de Trabajo, Empleo y Seguridad Social (www.trabajo.gov.ar)

## Bahamas

Department of Statistics (www.statistics.bahamas.gov.bs)

## Barbados

Ministry of Labour (https://labour.gov.bb)
The Central Bank of Barbados (www.centralbank.org.bb)

## Belize

Statistical Institute of Belize (www.sib.org.bz)

## Bolivia (Plurinational State of)

Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas -INE- (www.ine.gov.bo)

## Brazil

Instituto Brasileño de Geografía y Estadísticas -IBGE- (www.ibge.gov.br)
Ministerio do Trabalho e Emprego (www.mte.gov.br)

## Chile

Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas -INE- (www.ine.cl)
Banco Central de Chile (www.bcentral.cl)
Ministerio de Planificación y Cooperación (www.mideplan.cl)
Ministerio de Trabajo y Previsión Social (www.mintrab.gob.cl)
Dirección de Trabajo del Ministerio de Trabajo y Previsión Social (www.dt.gob.cl)

## Colombia

Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadísticas -DANE- (www.dane.gov.co)
Banco de la República de Colombia (www.banrep.gov.co)
Ministerio de Trabajo (www.mintrabajo.gov.co/)
Costa Rica
Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas y Censos -INEC- (www.inec.go.cr)
Banco Central de Costa Rica (www.bccr.fi.cr)
Ministerio de Trabajo y Seguridad Social (www.mtss.go.cr)

## Dominican Republic

Banco Central de la República Dominicana (www.bancentral.gov.do)
Secretaría de Estado de Trabajo (www.ministeriodetrabajo.gov.do)

## Ecuador

Banco Central del Ecuador -BCE- (www.bce.fin.ec)
Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censo (www.ecuadorencifras.gov.ec)
Ministerio de Relaciones Laborales (www.relacioneslaborales.gov.ec)

## El Salvador

Ministerio de Economía -MINEC- (www.minec.gob.sv)
Dirección General de Estadística y Censo (www.digestyc.gob.sv)
Ministerio de Trabajo y Previsión Social (www.mtps.gob.sv)

## Guatemala

Instituto Nacional de Estadística (www.ine.gob.gt)
Ministerio de Trabajo y Previsión Social (www.mintrabajo.gob.gt)

## Honduras

Instituto Nacional de Estadística -INE- (www.ine.gob.hn)
Banco Central (www.bch.hn)
Secretaría de Trabajo y Seguridad Social (www.trabajo.gob.hn)

## Jamaica

Statistical Institute of Jamaica (www.statinja.gov.jm)
Bank of Jamaica (www.boj.org.jm)

## Mexico

Instituto Nacional de Estadística, Geografía e Informática -INEGI- (www.inegi.org.mx)
Secretaría de Trabajo y Previsión Social (www.stps.gob.mx)

## Nicaragua

Instituto Nacional de Información de Desarrollo -INIDE- (www.inide.gob.ni)
Ministerio de Trabajo (www.mitrab.gob.ni)

## Panama

Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censo -INEC- (www.contraloria.gob.pa/inec)
Ministerio de Trabajo y Desarrollo Laboral (www.mitradel.gob.pa)

## Paraguay

Banco Central del Paraguay -BCP- (www.bcp.gov.py
Dirección General de Estadística, Encuesta y Censo (www.dgeec.gov.py)

## Peru

Instituto Nacional de Estadística e Informática -INEI- (www.inei.gob.pe)
Banco Central de Reserva del Perú (www.bcrp.gob.pe)
Ministerio de Trabajo y Promoción del Empleo (www.mintra.gob.pe)

## Trinidad and Tobago

Central Bank of Trinidad and Tobago (www.central-bank.org.tt)
Central Statistical Office (www.cso.planning.gov.tt)

## Uruguay

Instituto Nacional de Estadística - INE- (www.ine.gub.uy)
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
Instituto Nacional de Estadística -INE- (www.ine.gov.ve)
Banco Central de Venezuela (www.bcv.gov.ve)

## | 4. General Considerations

The information on labour indicators of the countries not previously mentioned, along with data on the employment structure indicators for Latin American and Caribbean countries presented in the Labour Overview, are obtained from household surveys that include information on the situation of the labour market, as well as from administrative records. These sources are processed by the ILO/ SIALC team (Labour Information and Analysis System for Latin America and the Caribbean).

Several of the household surveys have undergone methodological changes or adjustments, for which reason the contents of the series changed household surveys, which may affect the comparability of information across years. The most marked changes occurred in Mexico (2005, 2010, 2014), Argentina (2003), Brazil (2002, 2012), Colombia (2007), Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Chile, Guatemala and Paraguay (2010) and Ecuador, El Salvador and Uruguay (2014). In some cases, the notes of the tables provide additional information following accepted international usage to prevent mistaken conclusions of comparisons with respect to the corresponding years

Moreover, while the Labour Overview uses official unemployment rates and labour force participation rates of Colombia, Ecuador, Jamaica and Panama to calculate the respective regional series of averages, these were estimated excluding hidden unemployment given that official information of these countries considers hidden unemployment within the labour force. The weighted averages in the tables of the Statistical Annexes were also revised based on updated weighted statistics

Recent editions of the Labour Overview have incorporated statistical data disaggregated by geographic region (urban-rural), whose source are national surveys with year-end estimates. Consequently, these data do not necessarily coincide with those presented in the labour report section, which uses estimates of the average for the first three quarters of the year or the last reference available in September of each year. Additionally, the urban data on the situation of some countries come from specifically-determined surveys and/or areas of urban coverage. Thus, for example, the information
on Brazil corresponds to six metropolitan regions; that of Colombia, to 13 metropolitan areas; that of Mexico, to 32 urban areas; that of Paraguay, to Asuncion ad the urban Central Department; and that of Peru, to Metropolitan Lima. For more information, see the footnotes of the respective tables.

## | 5. Reliability of Estimates

The data in the Statistical Annexes originating from household or establishment surveys of the countries are subject to sampling and non-sampling errors. Sampling errors occur, for example, when a survey is conducted based on a sample of the population instead of a census, for which reason there is the possibility that these estimates will differ from the real values of the target population. The difference, called the sampling error, varies depending on the sample selected. Its variability is measured through the standard error of the estimate. Estimates of the key labour market indicators in most countries of Latin America and the Caribbean presented in the Labour Overview are obtained through a probability sample considering a specific sampling error and a 95\% confidence level.
Non-sampling errors may also affect estimates derived from household or establishment surveys. These may occur for a variety of reasons, including incomplete geographic coverage, the inability to obtain information for all people in the sample, the lack of cooperation on the part of some respondents to provide accurate, timely information, errors in the responses of survey respondents, and errors occurring during data collection and processing.
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table 1. LATIN AMERICA AND the CARIBBEAN: NATIONAL UNEMPLOYMENT
RATE BY COUNTRY. 2005, 2010-2015 (Annual Average Rates)

| Country | 2005 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2014 | 2015 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average through 3rd quarter |  |
| Latin America |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Argentina ${ }^{\text {a/ }}$ | 11.6 | 7.7 | 7.2 | 7.2 | 7.1 | 7.3 | $7.3{ }^{\text {\% }}$ | $6.9{ }^{\text {r }}$ |
| Bolivia (Pluri. State of) | 5.4 | ... | 2.7 | 2.3 | 2.8 | ... | $\ldots$ | ... |
| Brazil ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 9.3 | 7.5 | 6.7 | 7.3 | 7.1 | 6.8 | 6.9 | 8.4 |
| Chile ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 8.0 | 8.2 | 7.1 | 6.4 | 5.9 | 6.4 | 6.5 | 6.4 |
| Colombia ${ }^{\text {d/ }}$ | 11.8 | 11.8 | 10.8 | 10.4 | 9.6 | 9.1 | 9.4 | 9.2 |
| Costa Rica ${ }^{\text {e/ }}$ | 6.6 | 8.9 | 10.3 | 10.2 | 9.4 | 9.6 | 9.6 | 9.6 |
| Cuba | 1.9 | 2.5 | 3.2 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 2.7 | $\ldots$ | ... |
| Dominican Republic | 6.4 | 5.0 | 5.8 | 6.5 | 7.0 | 6.4 | 6.0 m/ | 5.9 m/ |
| Ecuador ${ }^{\text {// }}$ | 6.7 | 5.6 | 4.6 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 4.2 |
| El Salvador ${ }^{\text {8/ }}$ | 7.2 | 7.0 | 6.6 | 6.1 | 5.9 | 7.0 | ... | ... |
| Guatemala | 3.3 | 3.7 | 4.1 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 2.9 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Honduras | 4.8 | 3.9 | 4.3 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 5.3 | $5.3{ }^{\text {k }}$ | $7.3{ }^{\text {k }}$ |
| Mexico | 3.6 | 5.3 | 5.2 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 4.8 | 5.0 | 4.4 |
| Nicaragua ${ }^{\text {h/ }}$ | 6.2 | 7.8 | 5.3 | 5.9 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Panama ${ }^{\text {d/ }}$ | 9.8 | 6.5 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 4.8 | $4.8{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 5.1 " |
| Paraguay | 5.8 | 5.7 | 5.6 | 4.9 | 5.0 | 6.0 | ... | $\ldots$ |
| Peru | 5.4 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 3.7 | $4.2{ }^{\text {I }}$ | $4.2{ }^{\text {i }}$ |
| Uruguay | 10.8 | 7.2 | 6.3 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.6 | 6.5 | 7.4 |
| Venezuela (Boliv. Rep. of) | 12.3 | 8.7 | 8.3 | 8.1 | 7.8 | 7.1 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| The Caribbean |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bahamas | 10.2 | $\ldots$ | 15.9 | 14.4 | 15.8 | 14.6 | $13.8{ }^{\text {n/ }}$ | 12.0 n |
| Barbados | 9.7 | 10.7 | 11.2 | 11.6 | 11.6 | 12.3 | $11.5{ }^{\text {o }}$ | $11.8{ }^{\text {o }}$ |
| Belize | 11.0 | 12.5 | $\ldots$ | 15.3 | 14.3 | 11.6 | $11.1{ }^{\text {p/ }}$ | $10.1{ }^{\text {p }}$ |
| Jamaica ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 11.2 | 12.4 | 12.7 | 13.9 | 15.2 | 13.7 | $13.6{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $13.5{ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 8.0 | 5.9 | 5.1 | 5.0 | 3.7 | 3.3 | 3.1 | 3.7 |
| Latin America and the Caribbean ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ | 7.8 | 6.9 | 6.4 | 6.5 | 6.3 | 6.2 | 6.4 | 6.9 |

Source: ILO, based on information from household surveys of the countries.
a/ 31 urban areas.
b/ Through 2011, data correspond to PNAD survey. Beginning in 2012, data correspond to continuous PNAD survey data. 2010 data are the average of 2009 and 2011 data given that the PNAD was not carried out in 2010.
c/ New measurement beginning in 2010; data not comparable with previous years.
d/ Includes hidden unemployment.
e/ 2005 data correspond to July. Beginning in 2010, ECE data not comparable with previous years (2010 is the average of the third and fourth quarters).
f/ 2005 data correspond to the fourth quarter. Beginning in 2010, data correspond to minimum working age of 15 years. Includes hidden unemployment.
g/ Beginning in 2010, data correspond to minimum working age of 16 years.
h/ New measurement beginning in 2010, data not comparable with 2005.
i/ Weighted average. Excludes hidden unemployment in Colombia,
Ecuador, Jamaica and Panama.
j/ Average through first semester.
k/ June data.
I/ August data.
$\mathrm{m} /$ October data.
n/ May data.
o/ Data through first quarter
p/ April data.
q/ March data.

TABLE 2. LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN: NATIONAL UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, BY COUNTRY AND SEX. 2005 AND 2010-2015 (Annual Average Rates)

| Country | 2005 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2014 | 2015 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average through 3rd quarter |  |
| Latin America |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Argentina ${ }^{\text {a/ }}$ | 11.6 | 7.7 | 7.2 | 7.2 | 7.1 | 7.3 | $7.3{ }^{1 /}$ | $6.9{ }^{\text {/ }}$ |
| Men | 10.0 | 6.7 | 6.3 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.1 |
| Women | 13.6 | 9.2 | 8.5 | 8.8 | 8.5 | 8.4 | 8.6 | 8.0 |
| Bolivia (Pluri. State of) | 5.4 | ... | 2.7 | 2.3 | 2.8 | ... | ... | $\ldots$ |
| Men | 4.5 | $\ldots$ | 2.2 | 1.6 | 2.3 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 6.5 | ... | 3.2 | 3.1 | 3.5 | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Brazil ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 9.3 | 7.5 | 6.7 | 7.3 | 7.1 | 6.8 | 6.9 | 8.4 |
| Men | 7.1 | 5.5 | 4.9 | 6.0 | 5.8 | 5.7 | 5.8 | 7.2 |
| Women | 12.2 | 10.1 | 9.1 | 9.2 | 8.9 | 8.2 | 8.4 | 9.9 |
| Chile ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 8.0 | 8.2 | 7.1 | 6.4 | 5.9 | 6.4 | 6.5 | 6.4 |
| Men | 7.0 | 7.2 | 6.1 | 5.4 | 5.3 | 6.0 | 6.2 | 5.8 |
| Women | 9.8 | 9.6 | 8.7 | 7.9 | 6.9 | 6.9 | 7.0 | 7.2 |
| Colombia ${ }^{\text {d/ }}$ | 11.8 | 11.8 | 10.8 | 10.4 | 9.6 | 9.1 | 9.4 | 9.2 |
| Men | 9.1 | 9.0 | 8.2 | 7.8 | 7.4 | 7.0 | 7.3 | 7.0 |
| Women | 15.8 | 15.6 | 14.4 | 13.7 | 12.7 | 11.9 | 12.3 | 12.1 |
| Costa Rica ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 6.6 | 8.9 | 10.3 | 10.2 | 9.4 | 9.6 | 9.6 | 9.6 |
| Men | 5.0 | 7.6 | 8.7 | 8.9 | 8.3 | 8.1 | 8.1 | 8.0 |
| Women | 9.6 | 11.0 | 13.0 | 12.2 | 11.1 | 11.9 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Cuba | 1.9 | 2.5 | 3.2 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 2.7 | ... | ... |
| Men | 1.8 | 2.4 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 3.1 | 2.4 | ... | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 2.2 | 2.7 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.1 | ... | $\ldots$ |
| Dominican Republic | 6.4 | 5.0 | 5.8 | 6.5 | 7.0 | 6.4 | 6.0 m/ | 5.9 m/ |
| Men | 4.7 | 3.9 | 4.4 | 4.9 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 3.9 | 3.6 |
| Women | 9.6 | 6.9 | 8.2 | 9.1 | 10.4 | 9.5 | 9.4 | 9.5 |
| Ecuador ${ }^{\text {// }}$ | 6.7 | 5.6 | 4.6 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 4.2 |
| Men | 4.7 | 4.5 | 3.8 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 3.4 |
| Women | 9.7 | 7.2 | 5.8 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 5.2 | 5.3 | 5.4 |
| El Salvador ${ }^{\text {8 }}$ | 7.2 | 7.0 | 6.6 | 6.1 | 5.9 | 7.0 | ... | ... |
| Men | 8.9 | 8.4 | 8.2 | 7.3 | 6.8 | 8.6 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 4.8 | 5.1 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 4.7 | 4.7 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Guatemala | 3.3 | 3.7 | 4.1 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 2.9 | ... | $\ldots$ |
| Men | 3.0 | 3.5 | 2.9 | 2.4 | 2.7 | 2.6 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 3.9 | 4.2 | 6.6 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.5 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Honduras | 4.8 | 3.9 | 4.3 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 5.3 | $5.3{ }^{\text {k }}$ | $7.3{ }^{\text {k }}$ |
| Men | 3.9 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 2.9 | 3.4 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.4 |
| Women | 6.4 | 5.2 | 6.2 | 5.1 | 5.1 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 11.7 |
| Mexico | 3.6 | 5.3 | 5.2 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 4.8 | 5.0 | 4.4 |
| Men | 3.4 | 5.4 | 5.2 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 4.8 | 5.0 | 4.3 |
| Women | 3.9 | 5.2 | 5.2 | 4.9 | 5.0 | 4.9 | 5.0 | 4.5 |
| Nicaragua ${ }^{n /}$ | 6.2 | 7.8 | 5.3 | 5.9 | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Men | 6.0 | 7.2 | 4.7 | 5.4 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 6.5 | 8.6 | 6.0 | 6.5 | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Panama ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 9.8 | 6.5 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 4.8 | 4.8 " | 5.1 " |
| Men | 7.6 | 5.3 | 4.2 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.2 |
| Women | 13.3 | 8.5 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 5.3 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.2 |
| Paraguay | 5.8 | 5.7 | 5.6 | 4.9 | 5.0 | 6.0 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Men | 4.9 | 4.7 | 4.4 | 3.9 | 4.5 | 4.7 | ... | ... |
| Women | 7.3 | 7.2 | 7.4 | 6.1 | 5.7 | 8.0 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Peru | 5.4 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 3.7 | $4.2{ }^{\text {j }}$ | $4.2{ }^{\text {\% }}$ |
| Men | 5.0 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 4.0 | 4.2 |
| Women | 5.8 | 4.7 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 4.7 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.3 |
| Uruguay | 10.8 | 7.2 | 6.3 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.6 | 6.5 | 7.4 |
| Men | 8.1 | 5.3 | 4.8 | 4.9 | 5.0 | 5.1 | 5.1 | 6.2 |
| Women | 14.0 | 9.4 | 8.1 | 8.3 | 8.2 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 8.8 |
| Venezuela (Boliv. Rep. of) | 12.3 | 8.7 | 8.3 | 8.1 | 7.8 | 7.1 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Men | 11.3 | 8.5 | 7.7 | 7.4 | 7.1 | 6.5 | ... | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 14.0 | 9.0 | 9.2 | 9.0 | 8.8 | 8.0 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |


| Country | 2005 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2014 | 2015 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average through 3rd quarter |  |
| The Caribbean |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bahamas | 10.2 | $\ldots$ | 15.9 | 14.4 | 15.8 | 14.6 | 13.8 n/ | $12.0{ }^{\text {n/ }}$ |
| Men | 9.2 | $\ldots$ | ... | 15.0 | 15.6 | 13.5 | 13.0 | 11.0 |
| Women | 11.2 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | 13.7 | 16.0 | 15.8 | 14.6 | 12.9 |
| Barbados | 9.7 | 10.7 | 11.2 | 11.6 | 11.6 | 12.3 | 11.5 \% | $11.8{ }^{\circ}$ |
| Men | 8.0 | 10.9 | 9.8 | 10.9 | 11.7 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 12.1 |
| Women | 11.4 | 10.6 | 12.6 | 12.3 | 11.6 | 12.8 | 11.1 | 11.6 |
| Belize | 11.0 | 12.5 | ... | 15.3 | 14.3 | 11.6 | $11.1{ }^{\text {p/ }}$ | 10.1 p/ |
| Men | 7.4 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | 10.5 | 11.7 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... |
| Women | 17.2 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | 22.3 | 18.6 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Jamaica ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 11.2 | 12.4 | 12.7 | 13.9 | 15.2 | 13.7 | 13.6 | 13.5 |
| Men | 7.6 | 9.2 | 9.3 | 10.5 | 11.2 | 10.1 | 10.2 | 10.1 |
| Women | 15.8 | 16.2 | 16.7 | 18.1 | 20.1 | 18.1 | 17.7 | 17.6 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 8.0 | 5.9 | 5.1 | 5.0 | 3.7 | 3.3 | $3.1{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $3.7{ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| Men | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Women |  |  | .. |  | $\ldots$ | .. | . | .. |
| Latin America and The Caribbean ${ }^{\text {// }}$ | 7.8 | 6.9 | 6.4 | 6.5 | 6.3 | 6.2 | 6.4 | 6.9 |
| Latin America and The Caribbean - Men | 6.4 | 5.8 | 5.2 | 5.5 | 5.4 | 5.4 | 5.5 | 5.9 |
| Latin America and The Caribbean - Women | 10.0 | 8.6 | 8.0 | 7.9 | 7.7 | 7.3 | 7.7 | 8.2 |

Source: ILO, based on information from household surveys of the countries.
a/ 31 urban areas.
b/ Until 2011, data correspond to PNAD. Beginning in 2012, data correspond to the Continuous PNAD. 2010 data is the average of 2009 and 2011 data given that the PNAD was not carried out in 2010.
c/ New measurement beginning in 2010; data not comparable with previous years.
d/ Includes hidden unemployment.
e/ 2005 data correspond to July. Beginning in 2010, ECE data not comparable with previous years ( 2010 is the average of the 3rd and 4th quarters).
f/ 2005 data correspond to the 4th quarter. Beginning in 2010, data correspond to working age population of 15 years. Includes hidden unemployment.
g/ Beginning in 2010, working age population is 16 years.
h/ New measurement beginning in 2010; data not comparable with 2005.
i/ Weighted average. Excludes hidden unemployment in Colombia,
Ecuador, Jamaica and Panama.
j/ Average of 1st semester.
$\mathrm{k} /$ June data.
// August data.
$\mathrm{m} /$ October data.
$\mathrm{n} /$ May data.
o/ 1st quarter data.
$\mathrm{p} /$ April data.
q/ March data.
table 3. Latin america and the caribbean: national youth unemployment RATE BY COUNTRY. 2005, 2010-2015 (Annual Average Rates)

| Country | 2005 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2014 | 2015 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average through 3rd quarter |  |
| Latin America |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Argentina ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 26.0 | 19.4 | 18.7 | 18.3 | 19.4 | 18.8 | $18.7{ }^{\text {i }}$ | 18.9 " |
| Bolivia (Pluri. State of) ${ }^{\text {b/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 10.1 | $\ldots$ | 6.2 | 4.3 | 6.9 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Brazil ${ }^{\text {b/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 19.4 | 16.6 | 15.3 | 16.3 | 16.1 | 16.0 | 16.4 | 19.8 |
| Chile ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 19.7 | 18.5 | 17.5 | 16.3 | 16.0 | 16.4 | 16.5 | 15.5 |
| Colombia ${ }^{\text {d/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 20.5 | 22.1 | 20.8 | 19.6 | 18.2 | 17.7 | 16.4 | 15.7 |
| Costa Rica ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 15.0 | 21.5 | 22.4 | 23.1 | 22.5 | 25.1 | 25.3 | 22.6 |
| Dominican Republic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 13.4 | 10.5 | 13.4 | 14.6 | 16.8 | 12.8 | 12.3 " | 12.6 " |
| Ecuador ${ }^{\text {// }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 11.9 | 10.7 | 10.9 | 11.3 | 11.8 | 9.9 |
| El Salvador ${ }^{\text {8/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 14.3 | 13.7 | 12.4 | 12.4 | 12.4 | 15.0 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Guatemala |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 6.0 | 5.8 | 7.5 | 4.9 | 5.7 | 6.1 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Honduras |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 8.8 | 7.5 | 8.0 | 6.9 | 7.1 | 9.4 | $9.4{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | $14.2{ }^{\text {j }}$ |
| Mexico |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 6.9 | 9.8 | 9.8 | 9.4 | 9.5 | 9.5 | 9.7 | 8.8 |
| Nicaragua ${ }^{\text {h/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 10.2 | 11.9 | 7.8 | 9.0 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Panama ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 20.8 | 15.0 | 12.4 | 10.3 | 10.8 | 12.6 | 12.6 k | $13.1{ }^{\text {k }}$ |
| Paraguay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 12.3 | 12.6 | 13.0 | 11.2 | 10.5 | 13.0 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Peru |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 10.8 | 9.5 | 9.5 | 9.1 | 9.0 | 9.9 | $11.1{ }^{\text {d }}$ | 9.9 " |
| Uruguay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 27.9 | 20.7 | 18.1 | 18.5 | 19.3 | 19.4 | 19.5 | 22.1 |
| Venezuela (Boliv. Rep. of) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 21.0 | 17.5 | 17.3 | 17.2 | 16.4 | 14.8 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| The Caribbean |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jamaica ${ }^{\text {d/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 25.5 | 30.8 | 30.1 | 33.5 | 37.8 | 34.3 | 33.7 | 32.9 |

Source: ILO, based on information from household surveys of the countries.
a/ 31 urban areas.
b/ Through 2011, data correspond to PNAD survey. Beginning in 2012
data correspond to continuous PNAD survey data. 2010 data are the
average of 2009 and 2011 data given that the PNAD was not carried out in 2010.
c/ New measurement beginning in 2010; data not comparable with previous years.
d/ Includes hidden unemployment.
e/ 2005 data correspond to July. Beginning in 2010, ECE data not comparable with previous years (2010 is the average of the third and fourth quarters).
f/ 2005 data correspond to the fourth quarter. Beginning in 2010, data correspond to minimum working age of 15 years. Includes hidden unemployment.
g/ Beginning in 2010, data correspond to minimum working age of 16 years.
h/ New measurement beginning in 2010, data not comparable with 2005.
i/ Average through first semester.
j/ June data.
k/ August data.
I/ October data.

TABLE 4. LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN: NATIONAL LABOUR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATE, BY COUNTRY AND SEX. 2005, 2010-2015 (Average Annual Rates)

| Country | 2005 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2014 | 2015 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average through 3rd quarter |  |
| Latin America |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Argentina ${ }^{\text {a/ }}$ | 59.9 | 58.9 | 59.5 | 59.3 | 58.9 | 58.3 | 58.3 | $57.6{ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Men | 73.1 | 72.3 | 72.9 | 72.2 | 72.0 | 70.9 | 71.2 | 70.1 |
| Women | 48.3 | 47.0 | 47.4 | 47.6 | 47.1 | 46.9 | 46.5 | 46.2 |
| Bolivia (Pluri. State of) | 62.8 | $\ldots$ | 65.8 | 61.2 | 63.4 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Men | 71.5 | .. | 74.7 | 70.4 | 72.7 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 54.8 | $\ldots$ | 57.4 | 52.6 | 54.8 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Brazil ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 62.9 | 61.1 | 60.0 | 61.4 | 61.3 | 61.0 | 61.1 | 61.2 |
| Men | 73.6 | 71.5 | 70.8 | 73.1 | 72.9 | 72.5 | 72.6 | 72.3 |
| Women | 52.9 | 51.3 | 50.1 | 50.8 | 50.7 | 50.6 | 50.6 | 51.2 |
| Chile ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 55.6 | 58.5 | 59.8 | 59.5 | 59.6 | 59.8 | 59.7 | 59.6 |
| Men | 70.4 | 72.1 | 72.7 | 71.9 | 71.8 | 71.6 | 71.5 | 71.5 |
| Women | 37.2 | 45.3 | 47.3 | 47.6 | 47.7 | 48.4 | 48.3 | 48.1 |
| Colombia ${ }^{\text {d/ }}$ | 60.5 | 62.7 | 63.7 | 64.5 | 64.2 | 64.2 | 63.8 | 64.3 |
| Men | 73.6 | 74.2 | 75.1 | 75.4 | 74.9 | 74.9 | 74.4 | 74.7 |
| Women | 48.1 | 51.8 | 52.8 | 54.1 | 53.9 | 54.0 | 53.7 | 54.4 |
| Costa Rica ${ }^{\text {e/ }}$ | 56.8 | 60.7 | 59.0 | 62.8 | 62.3 | 62.5 | 62.7 | 61.7 |
| Men | 73.9 | 75.4 | 73.6 | 75.9 | 75.1 | 75.9 | 76.0 | 74.6 |
| Women | 40.4 | 45.9 | 44.2 | 49.5 | 49.3 | 49.0 | 49.2 | 48.6 |
| Cuba | 72.1 | 74.9 | 76.1 | 74.2 | 72.9 | 71.9 | ... | ... |
| Men | 87.0 | 87.7 | 90.0 | 89.5 | 87.1 | 86.2 | ... | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 55.6 | 60.5 | 60.5 | 57.4 | 57.3 | 56.3 |  |  |
| Dominican Republic | 49.0 | 49.6 | 51.0 | 51.6 | 51.3 | 52.3 | 52.1 m/ | 53.2 m/ |
| Men | 64.2 | 63.6 | 64.4 | 64.6 | 64.6 | 65.6 | 65.4 | 66.3 |
| Women | 34.0 | 35.8 | 37.6 | 38.6 | 38.2 | 39.2 | 38.9 | 40.4 |
| Ecuador ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ | 61.1 | 63.7 | 62.5 | 63.0 | 62.9 | 63.1 | 62.7 | 66.3 |
| Men | 73.5 | 78.9 | 77.9 | 78.1 | 77.6 | 78.8 | 78.5 | 80.5 |
| Women | 48.9 | 49.4 | 48.1 | 48.8 | 48.9 | 48.5 | 47.9 | 52.9 |
| El Salvador ${ }^{\text {s/ }}$ | 52.4 | 62.5 | 62.7 | 63.2 | 63.6 | 62.8 | $\ldots$ | ... |
| Men | 67.4 | 80.9 | 81.2 | 81.4 | 80.7 | 80.7 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 39.5 | 47.3 | 47.0 | 47.9 | 49.3 | 47.8 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Guatemala | 63.3 | 62.5 | 61.8 | 65.4 | 60.6 | 60.9 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Men | 86.1 | 84.7 | 84.6 | 87.6 | 83.4 | 83.8 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 42.7 | 42.9 | 40.4 | 45.7 | 40.6 | 40.6 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Honduras | 52.0 | 53.6 | 51.9 | 50.8 | 53.7 | 56.1 | $56.1{ }^{\text {k }}$ | 58.3 k |
| Men | 70.3 | 71.0 | 71.1 | 70.5 | 74.3 | 73.6 | 73.6 | 74.4 |
| Women | 35.5 | 37.4 | 35.3 | 34.5 | 38.3 | 40.5 | 40.5 | 44.1 |
| Mexico | 59.3 | 59.7 | 59.8 | 60.4 | 60.3 | 59.8 | 59.9 | 59.6 |
| Men | 80.4 | 78.8 | 78.6 | 78.9 | 78.6 | 78.3 | 78.3 | 77.9 |
| Women | 40.8 | 42.4 | 42.6 | 43.7 | 43.9 | 43.1 | 43.1 | 43.0 |
| Nicaragua ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ | 51.8 | 71.4 | 75.7 | 76.8 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... |
| Men | 67.4 | 85.4 | 88.1 | 87.7 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 37.3 | 58.1 | 63.9 | 66.6 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | .. |
| Panama ${ }^{\text {d/ }}$ | 63.5 | 63.5 | 61.8 | 63.5 | 64.1 | 64.0 | 64.0" | 64.2" |
| Men | 80.3 | 80.4 | 79.2 | 80.1 | 79.7 | 79.4 | 79.4 | 78.4 |
| Women | 47.3 | 47.5 | 45.8 | 48.2 | 49.4 | 49.8 | 49.8 | 50.8 |
| Paraguay | 61.8 | 60.5 | 60.7 | 64.3 | 62.6 | 61.6 | ... | ... |
| Men | 75.1 | 73.5 | 72.8 | 74.7 | 73.8 | 74.1 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 48.6 | 47.3 | 48.9 | 53.8 | 51.9 | 49.6 | $\ldots$ | ... |
| Peru | 71.1 | 74.1 | 73.9 | 73.6 | 73.2 | 72.2 | $72.3{ }^{17}$ | $71.5{ }^{\text { }}$ |
| Men | 81.1 | 82.7 | 82.7 | 82.4 | 82.0 | 81.3 | 80.9 | 80.2 |
| Women | 61.2 | 65.7 | 65.2 | 64.8 | 64.5 | 63.2 | 63.9 | 62.9 |
| Uruguay | 60.7 | 62.9 | 64.8 | 64.0 | 63.6 | 64.7 | 64.6 | 63.6 |
| Men | 72.2 | 73.1 | 74.7 | 73.5 | 73.9 | 74.3 | 74.1 | 72.8 |
| Women | 50.8 | 54.0 | 55.8 | 55.6 | 54.4 | 55.9 | 55.9 | 55.2 |
| Venezuela (Boliv. Rep. of) | 66.2 | 64.5 | 64.4 | 63.9 | 64.3 | 65.0 | ... | ... |
| Men | 81.1 | 79.0 | 78.6 | 77.8 | 78.1 | 79.0 | ... | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 51.7 | 50.1 | 50.3 | 50.1 | 50.6 | 51.3 | $\ldots$ | ... |


| Country | 2005 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2014 | 2015 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average through 3rd quarter |  |
| The Caribbean |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bahamas | 76.3 | $\ldots$ | 72.1 | 72.5 | 73.2 | 73.7 | $72.9{ }^{\text {n/ }}$ | 73.0 n |
| Men | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | 75.8 | 76.9 | 77.8 | 77.4 | 78.5 |
| Women | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | 69.5 | 70.1 | 70.1 | 69.1 | 71.5 |
| Barbados | 69.6 | 66.6 | 67.6 | 66.2 | 66.7 | 63.9 | $62.8{ }^{\circ}$ | $65.2{ }^{\text {o }}$ |
| Men | 75.2 | 71.8 | 72.7 | 71.9 | 72.0 | 67.7 | 66.4 | 69.5 |
| Women | 64.5 | 62.0 | 63.0 | 61.1 | 62.0 | 60.4 | 59.5 | 61.3 |
| Belize | 59.4 | ... | ... | 65.8 | 64.7 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Men | 76.4 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | 79.2 | 78.3 | .. | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 42.9 | ... | $\ldots$ | 52.6 | 50.9 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Jamaica ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 64.2 | 62.4 | 62.3 | 61.9 | 63.0 | 62.8 | 62.8 | 63.0 |
| Men | 73.3 | 70.4 | 70.1 | 69.2 | 70.0 | 70.0 | 70.0 | 70.1 |
| Women | 55.5 | 54.8 | 55.0 | 54.9 | 56.3 | 55.9 | 55.9 | 56.1 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 63.7 | 62.1 | 61.3 | 61.9 | 61.4 | 61.9 | $62.6{ }^{\text {p/ }}$ | $60.8{ }^{\text {p/ }}$ |
| Men | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Women | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | .. | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | . |
| Latin America and The Caribbean ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ | 61.6 | 61.7 | 61.6 | 62.3 | 61.9 | 61.7 | 61.2 | 61.3 |
| Latin America and The Caribbean - Men | 75.7 | 75.1 | 75.0 | 75.8 | 75.4 | 75.2 | 74.4 | 74.2 |
| Latin America and The Caribbean - Women | 48.3 | 49.1 | 48.9 | 49.7 | 49.4 | 49.1 | 49.0 | 49.4 |

Source: ILO, based on information from household surveys of the countries.
a/ 31 urban areas.
b/ Until 2011, data correspond to PNAD. Beginning in 2012, data correspond to the Continuous PNAD. 2010 data is the average of 2009 and 2011 data given that the PNAD was not carried out in 2010.
c/ New measurement beginning in 2010; data not comparable with previous years.
d/ Includes hidden unemployment.
e/ 2005 data correspond to July. Beginning in 2010, ECE data not comparable with previous years ( 2010 is the average of the 3rd and 4th quarters).
f/ 2005 data correspond to the 4th quarter. Beginning in 2010, data correspond to working age population of 15 years. Includes hidden unemployment.
g/ Beginning in 2010, working age population is 16 years.
h/ New measurement beginning in 2010; data not comparable with 2005.
i/ Weighted average. Excludes hidden unemployment in Colombia,
Ecuador, Jamaica and Panama.
j/ Average of 1st semester.
k/ June data.
// August data.
$\mathrm{m} /$ October data.
$\mathrm{n} /$ May data
o/ 1st quarter data.
$\mathrm{p} /$ March data.

TABLE 5. LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN: NATIONAL EMPLOYMENT-TO-POPULATION RATIO, BY COUNTRY AND SEX. 2005, 2010-2015 (Average Annual Rates)

| Country | 2005 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2014 | 2015 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average through 3rd quarter |  |
| Latin America |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Argentina ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 53.0 | 54.4 | 55.2 | 55.0 | 54.7 | 54.0 | $54.0{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | $53.7{ }^{\text {² }}$ |
| Men | 65.8 | 67.5 | 68.3 | 67.9 | 67.6 | 66.3 | 66.7 | 65.9 |
| Women | 41.7 | 42.7 | 43.4 | 43.4 | 43.1 | 42.9 | 42.5 | 42.6 |
| Bolivia (Pluri. State of) | 59.4 | ... | 64.1 | 59.8 | 61.6 | ... | ... | ... |
| Men | 68.2 | ... | 73.0 | 69.3 | 71.0 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | .. |
| Women | 51.2 | ... | 55.5 | 51.0 | 52.9 | ... | ... | $\ldots$ |
| Brazil ${ }^{\text {b/ }}$ | 57.0 | 56.5 | 56.0 | 56.9 | 56.9 | 56.8 | 56.8 | 56.1 |
| Men | 68.4 | 67.5 | 67.3 | 68.7 | 68.7 | 68.3 | 68.4 | 67.1 |
| Women | 46.4 | 46.2 | 45.5 | 46.1 | 46.2 | 46.4 | 46.3 | 46.1 |
| Chile ${ }^{\text {c/ }}$ | 49.2 | 53.7 | 55.5 | 55.7 | 56.0 | 56.0 | 55.8 | 55.8 |
| Men | 65.5 | 66.9 | 68.3 | 68.0 | 68.0 | 67.3 | 67.1 | 67.4 |
| Women | 33.5 | 41.0 | 43.2 | 43.8 | 44.4 | 45.1 | 44.9 | 44.6 |
| Colombia | 53.4 | 55.3 | 56.8 | 57.8 | 58.0 | 58.4 | 57.8 | 58.4 |
| Men | 66.9 | 67.6 | 69.0 | 69.5 | 69.4 | 69.7 | 69.0 | 69.5 |
| Women | 40.5 | 43.7 | 45.2 | 46.7 | 47.1 | 47.6 | 47.1 | 47.8 |
| Costa Rica ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 53.0 | 55.3 | 52.9 | 56.4 | 56.4 | 56.5 | 56.7 | 55.7 |
| Men | 70.2 | 69.6 | 67.2 | 69.2 | 68.9 | 69.7 | 69.9 | 68.6 |
| Women | 36.5 | 40.8 | 38.5 | 43.5 | 43.8 | 43.2 | 43.3 | 42.8 |
| Cuba | 70.7 | 73.0 | 73.6 | 71.6 | 70.5 | 70.0 | ... | ... |
| Men | 85.5 | 85.6 | 87.3 | 86.4 | 84.4 | 84.2 | ... | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 54.4 | 58.9 | 58.4 | 55.3 | 55.3 | 54.6 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Dominican Republic | 45.9 | 47.1 | 48.0 | 48.2 | 47.7 | 49.0 | 49.0 " | 50.1 " |
| Men | 61.2 | 61.1 | 61.6 | 61.5 | 61.3 | 62.7 | 62.8 | 63.9 |
| Women | 30.7 | 33.3 | 34.6 | 35.0 | 34.2 | 35.4 | 35.3 | 36.6 |
| Ecuador ${ }^{\text {e/ }}$ | 57.0 | 60.1 | 59.6 | 60.4 | 60.3 | 60.4 | 59.9 | 63.5 |
| Men | 70.1 | 75.3 | 75.0 | 75.3 | 74.9 | 75.9 | 75.4 | 77.8 |
| Women | 44.1 | 45.9 | 45.3 | 46.5 | 46.6 | 46.0 | 45.3 | 50.1 |
| El Salvador ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ | 48.6 | 58.1 | 58.6 | 59.4 | 59.9 | 58.4 | ... | ... |
| Men | 61.4 | 74.1 | 74.6 | 75.4 | 75.1 | 73.7 | ... | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 37.6 | 44.8 | 45.0 | 45.8 | 47.0 | 45.5 | ... | $\ldots$ |
| Guatemala | 61.2 | 60.2 | 59.2 | 63.5 | 58.7 | 59.2 | ... | $\ldots$ |
| Men | 83.5 | 81.7 | 82.2 | 85.5 | 81.1 | 81.6 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 41.0 | 41.1 | 37.7 | 44.1 | 39.1 | 39.2 | $\ldots$ | .. |
| Honduras | 49.5 | 51.5 | 49.7 | 48.9 | 51.6 | 53.1 | 53.1 " | 54.0 \% |
| Men | 67.5 | 68.7 | 68.8 | 68.5 | 71.8 | 70.3 | 70.3 | 71.2 |
| Women | 33.2 | 35.4 | 33.1 | 32.8 | 36.4 | 37.8 | 37.8 | 38.9 |
| Mexico | 57.2 | 56.5 | 56.7 | 57.5 | 57.3 | 56.9 | 56.9 | 57.0 |
| Men | 77.6 | 74.5 | 74.4 | 74.9 | 74.6 | 74.4 | 74.4 | 74.6 |
| Women | 39.3 | 40.3 | 40.6 | 41.7 | 41.7 | 41.0 | 41.0 | 41.1 |
| Nicaragua ${ }^{\text {8 }}$ | 48.6 | 65.8 | 71.7 | 72.3 | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Men | 63.4 | 79.2 | 83.9 | 83.0 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | .. |
| Women | 34.9 | 53.1 | 60.1 | 62.2 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Panama | 57.3 | 59.4 | 59.1 | 61.0 | 61.5 | 60.9 | $60.9{ }^{\text {k }}$ | 60.9 k |
| Men | 74.2 | 76.1 | 75.8 | 77.4 | 77.1 | 76.2 | 76.2 | 75.0 |
| Women | 41.0 | 43.5 | 43.5 | 45.8 | 46.8 | 46.8 | 46.8 | 47.6 |
| Paraguay | 58.2 | 57.1 | 57.3 | 61.2 | 59.5 | 57.9 | ... | ... |
| Men | 71.5 | 70.1 | 69.6 | 71.7 | 70.5 | 70.6 | ... | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 45.1 | 43.9 | 45.3 | 50.5 | 48.9 | 45.6 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Peru | 67.3 | 71.1 | 70.9 | 70.8 | 70.3 | 69.6 | 69.3 " | $68.5{ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| Men | 77.0 | 79.7 | 79.6 | 79.8 | 79.2 | 78.5 | 77.6 | 76.9 |
| Women | 57.7 | 62.6 | 62.4 | 61.9 | 61.5 | 60.7 | 61.0 | 60.2 |
| Uruguay | 54.1 | 58.4 | 60.7 | 59.9 | 59.5 | 60.4 | 60.3 | 58.9 |
| Men | 66.3 | 69.3 | 71.0 | 69.8 | 70.2 | 70.5 | 70.4 | 68.3 |
| Women | 43.7 | 48.9 | 51.3 | 51.1 | 50.0 | 51.3 | 51.2 | 50.3 |
| Venezuela (Boliv. Rep. of) | 58.2 | 58.9 | 59.0 | 58.7 | 59.3 | 60.4 | $\ldots$ | .. |
| Men | 71.9 | 72.3 | 72.6 | 72.1 | 72.6 | 73.8 | ... | ... |
| Women | 44.5 | 45.6 | 45.6 | 45.6 | 46.1 | 47.3 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |


| Country | 2005 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2014 | 2015 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average through 3rd quarter |  |
| The Caribbean |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bahamas | 68.5 | $\ldots$ | 60.6 | 62.0 | 61.6 | 62.9 | 62.8 m/ | 64.3 m/ |
| Men | ... | $\ldots$ | ... | 64.4 | 64.9 | 67.2 | 67.3 | 69.9 |
| Women | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | 59.9 | 58.8 | 59.0 | 59.0 | 62.2 |
| Barbados | 62.8 | 59.5 | 60.1 | 58.5 | 58.9 | 56.0 | 55.6 n/ | 57.5 n/ |
| Men | 69.1 | 64.0 | 65.6 | 64.0 | 63.6 | 59.8 | 58.6 | 61.1 |
| Women | 57.2 | 55.4 | 55.1 | 53.5 | 54.8 | 52.6 | 52.9 | 54.2 |
| Belize | 52.8 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | 55.7 | 56.4 | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ |
| Men | 70.7 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | 71.4 | 73.5 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 35.5 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | 40.4 | 40.6 | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ |
| Jamaica | 57.0 | 54.7 | 54.3 | 53.3 | 53.4 | 54.2 | 54.3 | 54.5 |
| Men | 67.7 | 63.9 | 63.6 | 61.9 | 62.1 | 62.9 | 62.9 | 63.1 |
| Women | 46.7 | 45.9 | 45.8 | 45.0 | 45.0 | 45.8 | 46.0 | 46.2 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 58.6 | 58.4 | 58.2 | 58.8 | 59.1 | 59.9 | $60.6{ }^{\circ}$ | 58.6 \% |
| Men | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ |
| Women | .. | $\ldots$ | . | $\ldots$ | .. | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... |
| Latin America and The Caribbean ${ }^{\text {// }}$ | 56.8 | 57.5 | 57.7 | 58.3 | 58.0 | 57.9 | 57.3 | 57.2 |
| Latin America and The Caribbean - Men | 70.9 | 70.8 | 71.1 | 71.7 | 71.4 | 71.2 | 70.3 | 69.8 |
| Latin America and The Caribbean - Women | 43.6 | 44.9 | 45.1 | 45.9 | 45.7 | 45.5 | 45.3 | 45.4 |

Source: ILO, based on information from household surveys of the countries.
a/ 31 urban areas.
b/ Until 2011, data correspond to PNAD. Beginning in 2012, data correspond to the Continuous PNAD. 2010 data is the average of 2009 and 2011 data given that the PNAD was not carried out in 2010. c/ New measurement beginning in 2010; data not comparable with previous years.
d/ 2005 data correspond to July. Beginning in 2010, ECE data not comparable with previous years (2010 is the average of the 3rd and 4th quarters).
e/ 2005 data correspond to the 4th quarter. Beginning in 2010, data
correspond to working age population of 15 years.
f/ Beginning in 2010, working age population is 16 years.
g/ New measurement beginning in 2010; data not comparable with 2005. h/ Weighted average.
i/ Average of 1st semester.
j/ June data.
k/ August data.
I/ October data.
m/ May data.
$\mathrm{n} / 1$ st quarter data.
o/ March data.

TABLE 6. LATIN AMERICA: NATIONAL EMPLOYED POPULATION BY STATUS IN EMPLOYMENT,
Year and years of Education. 2005, 2011, 2013 AND 2014al (Percentages)

| Year and years of education |  | TOTAL | Status in Employment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Employees | Non-employees |  |  | Domestic workers | Contributing family workers | Others |
|  |  | Total | Public | Private | Total |  |  |  | Employers | Own-account workers |
| 2005 | Total |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
|  | No education |  | 8.4 | 4.6 | 2.0 | 5.3 | 13.6 | 4.9 | 15.0 | 10.1 | 11.9 | 12.6 |
|  | 1 to 6 | 33.5 | 24.5 | 10.9 | 27.8 | 42.3 | 28.2 | 44.6 | 49.7 | 47.0 | 31.6 |
|  | 7 to 12 | 43.2 | 50.3 | 42.3 | 52.2 | 33.8 | 41.3 | 32.6 | 38.6 | 36.4 | 48.0 |
|  | 13 or more | 14.5 | 20.2 | 44.5 | 14.2 | 10.0 | 25.5 | 7.5 | 0.8 | 4.5 | 7.7 |
| 2011 | Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
|  | No education | 7.3 | 4.2 | 1.6 | 4.8 | 11.9 | 4.0 | 13.1 | 10.8 | 9.9 | 4.7 |
|  | 1 to 6 | 26.1 | 18.3 | 7.0 | 21.1 | 35.9 | 23.4 | 37.7 | 40.3 | 39.2 | 44.4 |
|  | 7 to 12 | 47.7 | 52.6 | 39.4 | 55.9 | 39.5 | 43.6 | 38.9 | 46.2 | 43.9 | 32.7 |
|  | 13 or more | 18.7 | 24.8 | 51.9 | 18.0 | 12.5 | 29.0 | 10.1 | 2.2 | 6.9 | 18.2 |
| 2013 | Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
|  | No education | 6.1 | 3.3 | 1.1 | 3.8 | 10.5 | 3.3 | 11.5 | 8.4 | 8.9 | 0.2 |
|  | 1 to 6 | 25.3 | 17.4 | 6.8 | 20.0 | 35.9 | 22.0 | 38.0 | 40.8 | 36.9 | 21.4 |
|  | 7 to 12 | 48.2 | 52.7 | 37.5 | 56.4 | 40.2 | 44.2 | 39.6 | 47.8 | 45.9 | 63.5 |
|  | 13 or more | 20.3 | 26.5 | 54.5 | 19.6 | 13.3 | 30.4 | 10.8 | 2.6 | 8.3 | 15.0 |
| 2014 | Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
|  | No education | 5.7 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 3.5 | 10.0 | 3.4 | 10.9 | 8.1 | 8.4 | 0.8 |
|  | 1 to 6 | 25.1 | 17.4 | 6.6 | 20.0 | 35.5 | 21.9 | 37.5 | 41.0 | 36.2 | 23.9 |
|  | 7 to 12 | 48.5 | 52.8 | 37.0 | 56.6 | 40.8 | 44.3 | 40.3 | 48.0 | 46.5 | 62.7 |
|  | 13 or more | 20.5 | 26.7 | 55.2 | 19.8 | 13.6 | 30.4 | 11.1 | 2.5 | 8.8 | 12.7 |

Source: ILO, based on information from household surveys of the countries.
a/ Selected countries: Bolivia (Pluri. State of), Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela (Boliv. Rep. of).
Data correspond to official working age population of each country.
2005 data for Guatemala correspond to the 2004 survey. 2014 data for Bolivia (Pluri. State of), Nicaragua and Venezuela (Boliv. Rep. of) correspond to 2013.

## URBAN Statistical annex

TABLE 1. LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN: URBAN UNEMPLOYMENT RATE BY COUNTRY. 2005-2015 (Annual Average Rates)

| Country | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2014 | 2015 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average through 3rd quarter |  |
| Latin America |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Argentina ${ }^{\text {a/ }}$ | 11.6 | 10.2 | 8.5 | 7.9 | 8.7 | 7.7 | 7.2 | 7.2 | 7.1 | 7.3 | 7.3 p | $6.9{ }^{\text {p/ }}$ |
| Bolivia (Pluri. State of) ${ }^{\text {b/ }}$ | 8.1 | 8.0 | 7.7 | 4.4 | 4.9 | 6.0 | 3.8 | 3.2 | 4.0 | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Brazil a | 9.9 | 10.0 | 9.3 | 7.9 | 8.1 | 6.7 | 6.0 | 5.5 | 5.4 | 4.8 | 4.9 | 6.7 |
| Chile ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 8.0 | 7.7 | 7.1 | 7.8 | 9.7 | 8.2 | 7.1 | 6.4 | 5.9 | 6.4 | 6.5 | 6.4 |
| Colombia e/ | 13.9 | 12.9 | 11.4 | 11.5 | 13.0 | 12.4 | 11.5 | 11.2 | 10.6 | 9.9 | 10.3 | 10.0 |
| Costa Rica ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ | 6.9 | 6.0 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 7.6 | 8.5 | 10.1 | 10.0 | 9.2 | 9.6 | 9.6 | 9.7 |
| Cuba ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 2.5 | 3.2 | 3.5 | 3.3 | ... | ... | $\ldots$ |
| Dominican Republic | 7.3 | 6.2 | 5.4 | 5.3 | 5.8 | 5.7 | 6.7 | 7.2 | 7.9 | 7.2 | $6.4{ }^{\text {s/ }}$ | $6.4{ }^{\text {s/ }}$ |
| Ecuador ${ }^{\text {// }}$ | 8.5 | 8.1 | 7.3 | 6.9 | 8.5 | 7.6 | 6.0 | 4.9 | 4.7 | 5.1 | 5.3 | 5.3 |
| El Salvador " | 7.3 | 5.7 | 5.8 | 5.5 | 7.1 | 6.8 | 6.6 | 6.2 | 5.6 | 6.7 | $\ldots$ | ... |
| Guatemala | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | 4.8 | 3.1 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 4.0 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Honduras | 6.9 | 5.2 | 4.1 | 3.9 | 4.9 | 6.4 | 6.8 | 5.6 | 6.0 | 7.5 | $7.5{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $8.8{ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| Mexico ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ | 4.7 | 4.6 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 6.6 | 6.4 | 5.9 | 5.8 | 5.7 | 5.8 | 6.0 | 5.2 |
| Nicaragua ${ }^{\text {k }}$ | 7.9 | 7.6 | 7.3 | 8.0 | 10.5 | 10.1 | 6.5 | 7.6 | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Panama " | 12.1 | 10.4 | 7.8 | 6.5 | 7.9 | 7.7 | 5.4 | 4.8 | 4.7 | 5.4 | 5.4 " | 5.8 " |
| Paraguay ${ }^{\text {m/ }}$ | 7.6 | 8.9 | 7.2 | 7.4 | 8.2 | 7.2 | 7.1 | 8.1 | 8.1 | 8.0 | 8.5 | 7.2 |
| Peru ${ }^{\text {n/ }}$ | 9.6 | 8.5 | 8.5 | 8.4 | 8.4 | 7.9 | 7.7 | 6.8 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.1 | 6.7 |
| Uruguay | 12.2 | 11.3 | 9.8 | 8.3 | 8.2 | 7.5 | 6.6 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 6.9 | 6.9 | 7.7 |
| Venezuela (Boliv. Rep. of) ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 12.3 | 10.0 | 8.4 | 7.3 | 7.9 | 8.7 | 8.3 | 8.1 | 7.8 | 7.1 | ... | $\ldots$ |
| The Caribbean |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bahamas ${ }^{8 /}$ | 10.2 | 7.6 | 7.9 | 8.7 | 15.3 |  | 15.9 | 14.4 | 15.8 | 14.6 | 13.8 | 12.0 " |
| Barbados ${ }^{8 /}$ | 9.7 | 8.7 | 7.4 | 8.1 | 10.0 | 10.7 | 11.2 | 11.6 | 11.6 | 12.3 | 11.5 ${ }^{\text {w }}$ | 11.8* |
| Belize ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 11.0 | 9.4 | 10.3 | 8.2 | 13.1 | 12.5 | $\ldots$ | 15.3 | 14.3 | 11.6 | 11.1 v | 10.1 v |
| Jamaica ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 11.2 | 10.3 | 9.9 | 10.6 | 11.4 | 12.4 | 12.7 | 13.9 | 15.2 | 13.7 | 13.6 | 13.5 |
| Trinidad and Tobago ${ }^{\text {d/ }}$ | 8.0 | 6.2 | 5.6 | 4.6 | 5.3 | 5.9 | 5.1 | 5.0 | 3.7 | 3.3 | 3.1 w/ | 3.7 w |
| Latin America and The Caribbean ${ }^{\text {o/ }}$ | 9.0 | 8.6 | 7.9 | 7.2 | 8.0 | 7.3 | 6.7 | 6.4 | 6.2 | 6.0 | 6.1 | 6.7 |

Source: ILO, based on information from household surveys of the countries.
a/ 31 urban areas.
b/ 2010 data correspond to capital cities and El Alto, not comparable with the rest of the series.
c/ Six metropolitan regions.
d/ National total. New measurement beginning in 2010; data not comparable with previous years.
e/ Thirteen metropolitan areas. Includes hidden unemployment.
f/ 2005-2009 data from July of each year. Beginning in 2010, ECE survey
data not comparable with previous years (2010 is the average of the 3rd and 4th quarters).
$\mathrm{g} /$ National total.
$\mathrm{h} /$ Beginning in 2008, the minimum working age is 15 years, not comparable with previous years. Includes hidden unemployment. i/ Beginning in 2007, working age increases from 10 years to 16 years and over. Includes hidden unemployment.
j/ Corresponds to aggregate of 32 cities.
k/ New measurement beginning in 2010; data not comparable with previous years.

I/ Includes hidden unemployment.
m/ Urban national until 2009; beginning in 2010, Asunción and Central Urban Department, data not comparable with previous years, ECE survey. n/ Metropolitan Lima.
o/ Weighted average. Includes data adjustment for methodological changes of Argentina (2003) and Brazil (2002); as well as for the exclusion of hidden unemployment in Colombia, Ecuador, Jamaica and Panama.
p/ Average of first semester
$q / J u n e ~ d a t a$.
r/ August data.
s/ October data.
t/ May data.
u/ First quarter.
v/ April preliminary data.
w/ March data.

TABLE 2. LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN: URBAN UNEMPLOYMENT RATE BY COUNTRY AND SEX. 2005-2015 (Annual Average Rates)

| Country | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2014 | 2015 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average through 3rd quarter |  |
| Latin America |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Argentina ${ }^{\text {a/ }}$ | 11.6 | 10.2 | 8.5 | 7.9 | 8.7 | 7.7 | 7.2 | 7.2 | 7.1 | 7.3 | 7.3 p | 6.9 p/ |
| Men | 10.0 | 8.4 | 6.7 | 6.6 | 7.8 | 6.7 | 6.3 | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.1 |
| Women | 13.6 | 12.5 | 10.8 | 9.7 | 9.9 | 9.2 | 8.5 | 8.8 | 8.5 | 8.4 | 8.6 | 8.0 |
| Bolivia (Pluri. State of) ${ }^{\text {b/ }}$ | 8.1 | 8.0 | 7.7 | 4.4 | 4.9 | 6.0 | 3.8 | 3.2 | 4.0 | ... | ... | $\ldots$ |
| Men | 6.8 | 7.1 | 6.3 | 3.3 | 3.7 | 5.0 | 3.1 | 2.2 | 3.2 | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 9.9 | 9.1 | 9.4 | 5.7 | 6.4 | 7.2 | 4.7 | 4.4 | 5.1 | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ |
| Brazil ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 9.9 | 10.0 | 9.3 | 7.9 | 8.1 | 6.7 | 6.0 | 5.5 | 5.4 | 4.8 | 4.9 | 6.7 |
| Men | 7.8 | 8.2 | 7.4 | 6.1 | 6.5 | 5.2 | 4.7 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.8 |
| Women | 12.4 | 12.2 | 11.6 | 10.0 | 9.9 | 8.5 | 7.5 | 6.8 | 6.5 | 5.8 | 6.0 | 7.6 |
| Chile ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 8.0 | 7.7 | 7.1 | 7.8 | 9.7 | 8.2 | 7.1 | 6.4 | 5.9 | 6.4 | 6.5 | 6.4 |
| Men | 7.0 | 6.7 | 6.3 | 6.8 | 9.1 | 7.2 | 6.1 | 5.4 | 5.3 | 6.0 | 6.2 | 5.8 |
| Women | 9.8 | 9.4 | 8.6 | 9.5 | 10.7 | 9.6 | 8.7 | 7.9 | 6.9 | 6.9 | 7.0 | 7.2 |
| Colombia ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | 13.9 | 12.9 | 11.4 | 11.5 | 13.0 | 12.4 | 11.5 | 11.2 | 10.6 | 9.9 | 10.3 | 10.0 |
| Men | 11.6 | 10.7 | 9.7 | 9.9 | 11.3 | 10.7 | 9.5 | 9.4 | 8.9 | 8.3 | 8.6 | 8.4 |
| Women | 16.7 | 15.6 | 13.4 | 13.5 | 15.0 | 14.4 | 13.6 | 13.2 | 12.5 | 11.8 | 12.2 | 11.8 |
| Costa Rica ${ }^{\text {// }}$ | 6.9 | 6.0 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 7.6 | 8.5 | 10.1 | 10.0 | 9.2 | 9.6 | 9.6 | 9.7 |
| Men | 5.6 | 4.5 | 3.4 | 4.3 | 6.5 | 7.5 | 8.6 | 8.9 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 8.4 |
| Women | 8.8 | 8.2 | 6.8 | 5.6 | 9.2 | 10.1 | 12.4 | 11.5 | 10.5 | 11.3 | 11.4 | 11.6 |
| Cuba ${ }^{8 /}$ | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 2.5 | 3.2 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 2.7 | ... | ... |
| Men | 1.8 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 2.4 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 3.1 | 2.4 | ... | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 2.2 | 2.2 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.7 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.1 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Dominican Republic | 7.3 | 6.2 | 5.4 | 5.3 | 5.8 | 5.7 | 6.7 | 7.2 | 7.9 | 7.2 | $6.4{ }^{\text {s }}$ | $6.4{ }^{\text {s/ }}$ |
| Men | 5.5 | 4.4 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 4.5 | 4.8 | 5.4 | 5.8 | 5.9 | 5.4 | 4.0 | 4.1 |
| Women | 10.0 | 9.0 | 7.8 | 7.6 | 7.8 | 7.1 | 8.5 | 9.3 | 10.7 | 9.8 | 9.6 | 9.7 |
| Ecuador ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ | 8.5 | 8.1 | 7.3 | 6.9 | 8.5 | 7.6 | 6.0 | 4.9 | 4.7 | 5.1 | 5.3 | 5.3 |
| Men | 6.8 | 6.2 | 6.0 | 5.5 | 7.1 | 6.3 | 5.1 | 4.5 | 4.2 | 4.5 | 4.7 | 4.3 |
| Women | 10.9 | 10.6 | 9.2 | 8.8 | 10.4 | 9.3 | 7.2 | 5.5 | 5.4 | 6.0 | 6.2 | 6.7 |
| El Salvador ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ | 7.3 | 5.7 | 5.8 | 5.5 | 7.1 | 6.8 | 6.6 | 6.2 | 5.6 | 6.7 | ... | ... |
| Men | 9.4 | 7.6 | 7.9 | 7.2 | 9.0 | 8.3 | 8.7 | 8.0 | 6.8 | 8.5 | $\ldots$ | ... |
| Women | 4.8 | 3.6 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 4.9 | 5.1 | 4.1 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.6 | ... | ... |
| Guatemala | ... | ... | ... | ... | $\ldots$ | 4.8 | 3.1 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 4.0 | ... | $\ldots$ |
| Men | ... | ... | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ | 4.4 | 2.8 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 3.9 | $\ldots$ | ... |
| Women | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 5.2 | 3.7 | 4.5 | 3.7 | 4.2 | ... | $\ldots$ |
| Honduras | 6.9 | 5.2 | 4.1 | 3.9 | 4.9 | 6.4 | 6.8 | 5.6 | 6.0 | 7.5 | 7.5 | $8.8{ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| Men | 6.7 | 5.2 | 3.8 | 4.2 | 4.6 | 5.9 | 6.2 | 5.3 | 5.7 | 6.9 | 6.9 | 7.0 |
| Women | 7.2 | 5.3 | 4.4 | 4.2 | 5.2 | 7.1 | 7.6 | 6.1 | 6.3 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 10.9 |
| Mexico ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ | 4.7 | 4.6 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 6.6 | 6.4 | 5.9 | 5.8 | 5.7 | 5.8 | 6.0 | 5.2 |
| Men | 4.5 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 4.8 | 6.7 | 6.5 | 6.0 | 5.9 | 5.7 | 6.0 | 6.3 | 5.2 |
| Women | 5.0 | 4.9 | 5.2 | 4.8 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 5.8 | 5.7 | 5.7 | 5.6 | 5.7 | 5.1 |
| Nicaragua ${ }^{\text {k/ }}$ | 7.9 | 7.6 | 7.3 | 8.0 | 10.5 | 10.1 | 6.5 | 7.6 | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Men | 8.8 | 8.8 | 8.0 | 8.4 |  | 10.4 | 6.7 | 7.7 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... |
| Women | 6.8 | 6.1 | 6.3 | 7.6 | ... | 9.6 | 6.3 | 7.5 | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Panama " | 12.1 | 10.4 | 7.8 | 6.5 | 7.9 | 7.7 | 5.4 | 4.8 | 4.7 | 5.4 | $5.4{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 5.8 |
| Men | 10.0 | 8.6 | 6.5 | 5.4 | 6.3 | 6.5 | 5.3 | 4.2 | 3.9 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 5.1 |
| Women | 15.0 | 12.9 | 9.6 | 7.9 | 9.9 | 9.3 | 5.4 | 5.5 | 5.7 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 6.7 |
| Paraguay ${ }^{m /}$ | 7.6 | 8.9 | 7.2 | 7.4 | 8.2 | 7.2 | 7.1 | 8.1 | 8.1 | 8.0 | 8.5 | 7.2 |
| Men | 7.1 | 7.7 | 6.2 | 6.6 | 7.9 | 6.6 | 6.3 | 6.7 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.6 | 6.1 |
| Women | 8.3 | 10.4 | 8.4 | 8.5 | 8.7 | 8.1 | 8.2 | 9.9 | 9.9 | 9.9 | 10.8 | 8.5 |
| Peru ${ }^{n /}$ | 9.6 | 8.5 | 8.5 | 8.4 | 8.4 | 7.9 | 7.7 | 6.8 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.1 | 6.7 |
| Men | 8.3 | 7.2 | 7.3 | 6.5 | 6.7 | 6.5 | 5.8 | 5.4 | 4.9 | 5.2 | 5.3 | 5.5 |
| Women | 11.2 | 10.1 | 9.9 | 10.6 | 10.4 | 9.6 | 10.1 | 8.5 | 7.2 | 7.0 | 7.2 | 8.3 |
| Uruguay | 12.2 | 11.3 | 9.8 | 8.3 | 8.2 | 7.5 | 6.6 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 6.9 | 6.9 | 7.7 |
| Men | 9.6 | 8.7 | 7.2 | 6.0 | 6.1 | 5.7 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 5.4 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 6.6 |
| Women | 15.3 | 14.2 | 12.7 | 10.7 | 10.5 | 9.5 | 8.1 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 8.5 | 8.4 | 9.0 |
| Venezuela (Boliv. Rep. of) ${ }^{\text {g/ }}$ | 12.3 | 10.0 | 8.4 | 7.3 | 7.9 | 8.7 | 8.3 | 8.1 | 7.8 | 7.1 | ... | ... |
| Men | 11.3 | 9.2 | 7.9 | 7.0 | 7.4 | 8.5 | 7.7 | 7.4 | 7.1 | 6.5 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 14.0 | 11.3 | 9.3 | 7.8 | 8.3 | 9.0 | 9.2 | 9.0 | 8.8 | 8.0 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |


| Country | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2014 | 2015 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average through 3rd quarter |  |
| The Caribbean |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bahamas ${ }^{\text {8/ }}$ | 10.2 | 7.6 | 7.9 | 8.7 | 15.3 | $\ldots$ | 15.9 | 14.4 | 15.8 | 14.6 | 13.8 * | 12.0 * |
| Men | 9.2 | 6.9 | 6.7 | ... | 14.0 | $\ldots$ | ... | 15.0 | 15.6 | 13.5 | 13.0 | 11.0 |
| Women | 11.2 | 8.4 | 9.1 | ... | 14.4 | $\ldots$ | ... | 13.7 | 16.0 | 15.8 | 14.6 | 12.9 |
| Barbados ${ }^{\text {s/ }}$ | 9.7 | 8.7 | 7.4 | 8.1 | 10.0 | 10.7 | 11.2 | 11.6 | 11.6 | 12.3 | 11.5 " | $11.8{ }^{\text {w }}$ |
| Men | 8.0 | 7.7 | 6.4 | 6.9 | 10.1 | 10.9 | 9.8 | 10.9 | 11.7 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 12.1 |
| Women | 11.4 | 9.8 | 8.5 | 9.5 | 9.8 | 10.6 | 12.6 | 12.3 | 11.6 | 12.8 | 11.1 | 11.6 |
| Belize ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 11.0 | 9.4 | 10.3 | 8.2 | 13.1 | 12.5 | ... | 15.3 | 14.3 | 11.6 | 11.1 v | 10.1 w |
| Men | 7.4 | 6.2 | 7.2 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | 10.5 | 11.7 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... |
| Women | 17.2 | 15.0 | 15.8 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | 22.3 | 18.6 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Jamaica ${ }^{\text {d/ }}$ | 11.2 | 10.3 | 9.9 | 10.6 | 11.4 | 12.4 | 12.7 | 13.9 | 15.2 | 13.7 | 13.6 | 13.5 |
| Men | 7.6 | 7.0 | 6.2 | 7.3 | 8.5 | 9.2 | 9.3 | 10.5 | 11.2 | 10.1 | 10.2 | 10.1 |
| Women | 15.8 | 14.4 | 14.5 | 14.6 | 14.8 | 16.2 | 16.7 | 18.1 | 20.1 | 18.1 | 17.7 | 17.6 |
| Trinidad and Tobago ${ }^{\text {8/ }}$ | 8.0 | 6.2 | 5.6 | 4.6 | 5.3 | 5.9 | 5.1 | 5.0 | 3.7 | 3.3 | 3.1 w/ | 3.7 w |
| Men | ... | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ |
| Women | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | ... | $\ldots$ | ... | ... |
| Latin America and The Caribbean | 9.0 | 8.6 | 7.9 | 7.2 | 8.0 | 7.3 | 6.7 | 6.4 | 6.2 | 6.0 | 6.1 | 6.7 |
| Latin America and The Caribbean - Men | 7.6 | 7.2 | 6.6 | 6.0 | 7.0 | 6.3 | 5.7 | 5.5 | 5.4 | 5.3 | 5.4 | 5.8 |
| Latin America and The Caribbean - Women | 10.7 | 10.1 | 9.4 | 8.6 | 9.2 | 8.4 | 7.7 | 7.4 | 7.1 | 6.8 | 7.0 | 7.7 |

Source: ILO, based on official information from household surveys of the countries.
a/ 31 urban areas.
b/ 2010 data correspond to capital cities and El Alto, not comparable with the rest of the series.
c/ Six metropolitan regions.
d/ National total. New measurement beginning in 2010; data not comparable with previous years.
e/ Thirteen metropolitan areas. Includes hidden unemployment.
f/ 2005-2009 data from July of each year. Beginning in 2010, ECE survey
data not comparable with previous years (2010 is the average of the 3rd and 4th quarters).
g/ National total.
$\mathrm{h} /$ Beginning in 2008, the minimum working age is 15 years, not comparable with previous years. Includes hidden unemployment.
i/ Beginning in 2007, working age increases from 10 years to 16 years and over Includes hidden unemployment.
j/ Corresponds to aggregate of 32 cities.
k/ New measurement beginning in 2010; data not comparable with previous years.
// Includes hidden unemployment.
m/ Urban national until 2009; beginning in 2010, Asunción and Central
Urban Department, data not comparable with previous years, ECE survey. n/ Metropolitan Lima.
o/ Weighted average. Includes data adjustment for methodological
changes of Argentina (2003) and Brazil (2002); as well as for the
exclusion of hidden unemployment in Colombia, Ecuador, Jamaica and Panama.
$\mathrm{p} /$ Average of first semester.
q/ June data.
r/ August data.
s/ October data.
t/ May data.
u/ First quarter.
v/ April preliminary data.
w/ March data.

TABLE 3. LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN: URBAN YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT RATE BY COUNTRY. 2005-2015 (Annual Average Rates)

| Country | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2014 | 2015 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average through 3rd quarter |  |
| Latin America |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Argentina ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 26.0 | 23.7 | 20.3 | 18.8 | 21.2 | 19.4 | 18.7 | 18.3 | 19.4 | 18.8 | 18.7 nt | 18.9 n/ |
| Bolivia (Pluri. State of) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 14.0 | 14.4 | 19.2 | 10.1 | 8.8 | ... | 8.8 | 6.1 | 9.6 | $\ldots$ | ... | ... |
| Brazil ${ }^{\text {b/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 22.1 | 22.4 | 21.1 | 18.0 | 18.5 | 16.0 | 14.5 | 13.5 | 14.0 | 13.4 | 13.9 | 17.8 |
| Chile ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 19.7 | 18.3 | 17.8 | 19.7 | 22.6 | 18.5 | 17.5 | 16.3 | 16.0 | 16.4 | 16.5 | 15.5 |
| Colombia ${ }^{\text {d/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 25.3 | 21.2 | 18.8 | 23.0 | 25.3 | 24.9 | 23.2 | 22.3 | 20.7 | 20.2 | 17.7 | 16.8 |
| Costa Rica ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 15.9 | 15.3 | 11.9 | 11.2 | 17.9 | 21.4 | 22.1 | 23.0 | 23.3 | 26.0 | 26.5 | 23.0 |
| Dominican Republic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 15.2 | 11.9 | 13.2 | 12.1 | 13.7 | 11.7 | 15.3 | 15.9 | 18.5 | 14.4 | 12.3 \% | $13.9{ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| Ecuador ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 17.9 | 18.2 | 16.7 | 16.3 | 18.6 | 18.6 | 15.6 | 13.6 | 13.4 | 13.9 | 14.3 | 13.7 |
| El Salvador ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 15.0 | 13.2 | 11.5 | 12.4 | 15.5 | 15.4 | 14.3 | 14.4 | 13.8 | 16.7 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Guatemala |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | 7.9 | 8.2 | 9.3 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Honduras |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 12.8 | 8.9 | 7.4 | 8.2 | 9.8 | 12.7 | 14.0 | 11.6 | 11.2 | 13.7 | 13.7 * | $19.3{ }^{\circ}$ |
| Mexico ${ }^{\mathrm{h} /}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 9.5 | 9.6 | 9.8 | 9.7 | 12.9 | 12.5 | 11.9 | 11.8 | 11.5 | 12.1 | 12.6 | 11.3 |
| Nicaragua ${ }^{\text {// }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 10.2 | 9.6 | 7.4 | 9.6 | $\ldots$ | 11.9 | 7.8 | 9.0 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... |
| Panama ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 26.3 | 23.4 | 18.9 | 16.6 | 18.8 | 18.0 | 15.6 | 12.6 | 12.6 | 15.3 | 15.3 p/ | $15.8{ }^{\text {p/ }}$ |
| Paraguay ${ }^{\text {k }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 16.2 | 16.9 | 15.9 | 15.1 | 17.1 | 15.8 | 15.8 | 13.8 | 18.3 | 19.0 | 20.6 | 16.1 |
| Peru ${ }^{\text {m/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 16.3 | 15.1 | 14.2 | 16.0 | 16.8 | 15.7 | 16.1 | 13.7 | 13.6 | 14.0 | 13.5 | 15.3 |
| Uruguay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 29.3 | 29.0 | 25.9 | 23.2 | 22.1 | 21.6 | 18.8 | 19.3 | 20.2 | 20.4 | 20.5 | 23.3 |
| Venezuela (Boliv. Rep. of) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 | 21.0 | 17.8 | 15.5 | 14.1 | 15.6 | 17.5 | 17.3 | 17.2 | 16.4 | 14.8 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| The Caribbean |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jamaica ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14-24 | 25.5 | 23.6 | 23.7 | 26.5 | ... | 30.8 | 30.1 | 33.5 | 37.8 | 34.3 | 33.7 | 32.9 |

Source: ILO, based on official information from household surveys of the countries.
a/ 31 urban areas.
b/ Six metropolitan regions.
c/ National total. New measurement beginning in 2010; data not comparable with previous years.
d/ Thirteen metropolitan areas. Includes hidden unemployment. e/ 2005-2009 data from July of each year. Beginning in 2010, ECE data not comparable with previous years (2010 is the average of the 3rd and 4th quarters).
f/ Beginning in 2008, working age is 15 years, not comparable with previous years. Includes hidden unemployment.
g/ Beginning in 2007, working age population increases from 10 years to
16 years and over. Includes hidden unemployment.
h/ Corresponds to the aggregate of 32 cities.
i/ New measurement in 2010, not comparable with previous years.
j/ Includes hidden unemployment.
k Urban national until 2012, with EPH as source. Beginning in 2013, coverage is Asunción and Central Department, with ECE as source. Data not comparable.
$\mathrm{m} /$ Metropolitan Lima.
$\mathrm{n} /$ Average of 1st semester.
o/ June data.
p/ August data.
q/ October data.
table 4. latin america and the caribbean: urban labour force participation RATE, BY COUNTRY AND SEX. 2005-2015 (Average Annual Rates)

| Country | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2014 | 2015 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average through 3rd quarter |  |
| Latin America |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Argentina ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 59.9 | 60.3 | 59.5 | 58.8 | 59.3 | 58.9 | 59.5 | 59.3 | 58.9 | 58.3 | $58.3{ }^{\text {p/ }}$ | 57.6 |
| Men | 73.1 | 73.3 | 73.0 | 72.0 | 72.1 | 72.3 | 72.9 | 72.2 | 72.0 | 70.9 | 71.2 | 70.1 |
| Women | 48.3 | 49.0 | 47.7 | 47.2 | 48.0 | 47.0 | 47.4 | 47.6 | 47.1 | 46.9 | 46.5 | 46.2 |
| Bolivia (Pluri. State of) ${ }^{\text {b/ }}$ | 55.7 | 58.7 | 57.1 | 58.8 | 60.5 | 57.0 | 59.7 | 57.0 | 58.4 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Men | 64.8 | 67.0 | 67.0 | 67.5 | 68.6 | 64.1 | 69.1 | 65.9 | 68.0 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 47.4 | 51.0 | 48.0 | 50.8 | 52.7 | 50.4 | 50.9 | 49.0 | 49.7 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Brazil ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 56.6 | 56.9 | 56.9 | 57.0 | 56.7 | 57.1 | 57.1 | 57.3 | 57.1 | 56.0 | 56.0 | 55.8 |
| Men | 66.7 | 66.8 | 66.5 | 66.6 | 66.0 | 66.5 | 66.5 | 66.6 | 66.2 | 65.2 | 65.3 | 64.9 |
| Women | 47.7 | 48.2 | 48.5 | 48.6 | 48.6 | 49.0 | 49.0 | 49.3 | 49.3 | 48.2 | 48.0 | 48.1 |
| Chile ${ }^{\text {d/ }}$ | 55.6 | 54.8 | 54.9 | 56.0 | 55.9 | 58.5 | 59.8 | 59.5 | 59.6 | 59.8 | 59.7 | 59.6 |
| Men | 70.4 | 71.4 | 71.4 | 71.8 | 71.0 | 72.1 | 72.7 | 71.9 | 71.8 | 71.6 | 71.5 | 71.5 |
| Women | 37.2 | 38.3 | 39.1 | 40.9 | 41.3 | 45.3 | 47.3 | 47.6 | 47.7 | 48.4 | 48.3 | 48.1 |
| Colombia ${ }^{\text {e/ }}$ | 63.3 | 62.0 | 61.8 | 62.6 | 64.6 | 65.7 | 66.7 | 67.6 | 67.5 | 67.9 | 67.7 | 67.9 |
| Men | 72.8 | 71.6 | 71.2 | 72.1 | 73.5 | 74.0 | 74.8 | 75.9 | 75.3 | 76.0 | 75.6 | 75.9 |
| Women | 54.9 | 53.5 | 53.5 | 54.0 | 56.6 | 58.3 | 59.4 | 60.3 | 60.4 | 60.7 | 60.5 | 60.8 |
| Costa Rica ${ }^{\text {t/ }}$ | 58.2 | 58.2 | 58.5 | 58.6 | 58.1 | 62.1 | 60.3 | 64.1 | 63.0 | 63.9 | 64.0 | 63.2 |
| Men | 72.8 | 72.5 | 72.5 | 71.1 | 70.4 | 75.4 | 73.6 | 75.9 | 75.1 | 75.9 | 76.1 | 74.3 |
| Women | 44.7 | 45.3 | 45.7 | 47.2 | 46.7 | 45.9 | 44.2 | 49.5 | 49.3 | 49.0 | 52.3 | 52.3 |
| Cuba ${ }^{8 /}$ | 72.1 | 72.1 | 73.7 | 74.7 | 75.4 | 74.9 | 76.1 | 74.2 | 72.9 | ... | $\ldots$ | ... |
| Men | 87.0 | 86.0 | 86.7 | 87.8 | 88.4 | 87.7 | 90.0 | 89.5 | 87.1 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 55.6 | 56.7 | 59.3 | 60.2 | 61.0 | 60.5 | 60.5 | 57.4 | 57.3 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Dominican Republic | 50.4 | 50.6 | 50.5 | 51.0 | 49.2 | 50.5 | 51.8 | 52.6 | 52.8 | 53.4 | $53.5{ }^{\text {s/ }}$ | 54.5 |
| Men | 64.4 | 63.9 | 64.2 | 63.5 | 62.6 | 62.5 | 62.8 | 63.3 | 63.9 | 64.4 | 64.7 | 65.7 |
| Women | 37.4 | 38.3 | 37.6 | 39.4 | 36.8 | 39.3 | 41.4 | 42.5 | 42.3 | 43.0 | 43.1 | 44.2 |
| Ecuador ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ | 59.5 | 59.1 | 61.3 | 67.7 | 66.3 | 64.2 | 62.2 | 62.8 | 61.8 | 62.2 | 61.9 | 63.9 |
| Men | 70.9 | 71.2 | 72.5 | 80.9 | 79.5 | 77.4 | 75.9 | 76.8 | 76.0 | 76.9 | 76.6 | 78.0 |
| Women | 48.7 | 47.7 | 50.9 | 55.5 | 54.2 | 52.3 | 49.9 | 50.1 | 48.9 | 48.7 | 48.3 | 51.0 |
| El Salvador ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ | 54.3 | 53.9 | 63.6 | 64.1 | 64.3 | 64.4 | 63.7 | 64.6 | 65.1 | 64.6 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Men | 64.4 | 63.6 | 78.4 | 78.6 | 77.7 | 77.9 | 77.9 | 78.2 | 77.6 | 77.8 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 45.8 | 46.0 | 52.2 | 52.6 | 53.6 | 53.7 | 52.1 | 53.7 | 55.1 | 54.1 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Guatemala | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | 56.6 | 61.0 | 65.5 | 61.9 | 62.7 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Men | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ | 69.9 | 80.1 | 83.2 | 79.8 | 79.0 | $\ldots$ |  |
| Women | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ | 45.0 | 44.3 | 50.0 | 46.3 | 48.5 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Honduras | 54.9 | 52.1 | 51.0 | 52.7 | 53.1 | 53.7 | 52.5 | 51.2 | 54.3 | 55.7 | $55.7{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 57.1 |
| Men | 66.3 | 64.9 | 64.4 | 64.8 | 65.5 | 64.3 | 64.5 | 62.5 | 66.1 | 68.5 | 68.5 | 68.3 |
| Women | 45.5 | 41.6 | 40.0 | 42.7 | 42.9 | 44.8 | 42.6 | 41.7 | 44.7 | 45.2 | 45.2 | 48.1 |
| Mexico ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ | 60.9 | 62.0 | 62.0 | 61.7 | 61.5 | 61.3 | 61.4 | 62.1 | 61.7 | 60.9 | 61.0 | 61.0 |
| Men | 78.8 | 79.4 | 79.0 | 78.4 | 77.5 | 77.3 | 77.1 | 77.7 | 77.1 | 76.4 | 76.5 | 76.1 |
| Women | 45.0 | 46.8 | 47.1 | 46.9 | 47.3 | 47.0 | 47.3 | 48.4 | 48.1 | 47.0 | 47.2 | 47.5 |
| Nicaragua ${ }^{\text {k }}$ | 52.1 | 53.1 | 50.7 | 53.8 | 52.1 | 71.6 | 74.2 | 75.2 | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | $\ldots$ |
| Men | 62.5 | 63.5 | 61.1 | 64.0 | $\ldots$ | 81.5 | 83.9 | 83.7 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 43.0 | 44.1 | 41.8 | 45.0 | $\ldots$ | 62.8 | 65.7 | 67.7 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Panama ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ | 63.7 | 62.8 | 62.6 | 64.4 | 64.4 | 64.0 | 63.2 | 63.6 | 64.1 | 64.3 | 64.3 " | 64.5 |
| Men | 77.7 | 76.8 | 76.0 | 78.9 | 78.6 | 78.3 | 77.8 | 77.9 | 77.6 | 77.7 | 77.7 | 76.6 |
| Women | 51.2 | 49.9 | 50.4 | 51.4 | 51.7 | 51.1 | 50.3 | 51.1 | 51.9 | 52.6 | 52.6 | 53.5 |
| Paraguay ${ }^{m /}$ | 60.4 | 57.9 | 59.6 | 61.5 | 62.3 | 62.5 | 62.4 | 62.9 | 65.2 | 64.9 | 65.1 | 65.3 |
| Men | 70.5 | 70.0 | 70.5 | 73.7 | 73.4 | 72.0 | 72.1 | 72.1 | 73.0 | 74.4 | 74.6 | 74.8 |
| Women | 51.5 | 47.0 | 49.6 | 50.2 | 51.6 | 53.6 | 53.3 | 54.3 | 57.7 | 56.0 | 56.2 | 56.7 |
| Peru ${ }^{\text {// }}$ | 67.1 | 67.5 | 68.9 | 68.1 | 68.4 | 70.0 | 70.0 | 69.1 | 68.9 | 68.4 | 68.4 | 68.0 |
| Men | 77.2 | 76.9 | 78.7 | 77.9 | 77.2 | 79.0 | 79.0 | 78.2 | 77.9 | 77.3 | 77.6 | 76.4 |
| Women | 57.6 | 58.6 | 59.6 | 59.1 | 60.2 | 61.7 | 61.5 | 60.7 | 60.6 | 60.1 | 59.8 | 58.7 |
| Uruguay | 58.5 | 60.8 | 62.9 | 62.8 | 63.6 | 63.5 | 65.0 | 64.0 | 63.8 | 64.9 | 64.9 | 63.8 |
| Men | 69.3 | 71.6 | 73.7 | 72.8 | 73.4 | 73.0 | 74.1 | 73.0 | 73.4 | 73.9 | 73.8 | 72.4 |
| Women | 49.5 | 51.7 | 53.8 | 54.5 | 55.4 | 55.5 | 57.0 | 56.2 | 55.3 | 56.9 | 56.9 | 56.1 |
| Venezuela (Boliv. Rep. of) ${ }^{\text {g }}$ | 66.2 | 65.5 | 64.9 | 64.9 | 65.1 | 64.5 | 64.4 | 63.9 | 64.3 | 65.0 | ... | ... |
| Men | 81.1 | 80.4 | 79.8 | 79.9 | 79.4 | 79.0 | 78.6 | 77.8 | 78.1 | 79.0 | ... | ... |
| Women | 51.7 | 50.7 | 50.0 | 50.1 | 50.9 | 50.1 | 50.3 | 50.1 | 50.6 | 51.3 | ... | $\ldots$ |


| Country | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2014 | 2015 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average through 3rd quarter |  |
| The Caribbean |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bahamas ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 76.3 | 75.1 | 76.2 | 76.3 | 73.4 |  | 72.1 | 72.5 | 73.2 | 73.7 | 72.9 ${ }^{\text {* }}$ | 73.0 |
| Men | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | 82.8 | 83.0 | ... | $\ldots$ | ... | 75.8 | 76.9 | 77.8 | 77.4 | 78.5 |
| Women | ... | $\ldots$ | 70.6 | 70.8 | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ | 69.5 | 70.1 | 70.1 | 69.1 | 71.5 |
| Barbados ${ }^{\text {8/ }}$ | 69.6 | 67.9 | 67.8 | 67.6 | 67.0 | 66.6 | 67.6 | 66.2 | 66.7 | 63.9 | $62.8{ }^{\text {w }}$ | 65.2 |
| Men | 75.2 | 73.4 | 74.3 | 73.3 | 72.3 | 71.8 | 72.7 | 71.9 | 72.0 | 67.7 | 66.4 | 69.5 |
| Women | 64.5 | 62.8 | 61.9 | 62.5 | 62.2 | 62.0 | 63.0 | 61.1 | 62.0 | 60.4 | 59.5 | 61.3 |
| Belize ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | 59.4 | 57.6 | 61.2 | 59.2 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | 65.8 | 64.7 | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Men | 76.4 | 75.6 | 77.8 | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | 79.2 | 78.3 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 42.9 | 40.4 | 45.0 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | 52.6 | 50.9 | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Jamaica ${ }^{\text {g, }} \mathrm{V}$ | 64.2 | 64.7 | 64.9 | 65.5 | 63.5 | 62.4 | 62.1 | 61.9 | 63.0 | 62.8 | 62.8 | 63.0 |
| Men | 73.3 | 73.5 | 73.5 | 73.9 | 71.8 | 70.4 | 70.1 | 69.2 | 70.0 | 70.0 | 70.0 | 70.1 |
| Women | 55.5 | 56.3 | 56.5 | 57.5 | 55.7 | 54.8 | 55.0 | 54.9 | 56.3 | 55.9 | 55.9 | 56.1 |
| Trinidad and Tobago ${ }^{\text {s/ }}$ | 63.7 | 63.9 | 63.5 | 63.5 | 62.7 | 62.1 | 61.3 | 61.9 | 61.4 | 61.9 | 62.6 " | 60.8 |
| Men | ... | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Women | ... | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | 59.5 | 59.8 | 59.9 | 60.1 | 60.1 | 60.4 | 60.7 | 61.0 | 60.7 | 60.2 | 59.5 | 59.4 |
| Latin America and the Caribbean - Men | 72.1 | 72.2 | 72.2 | 72.3 | 71.9 | 72.1 | 72.4 | 72.5 | 72.1 | 71.6 | 70.7 | 70.3 |
| Latin America and the Caribbean - Women | 48.1 | 48.6 | 48.9 | 49.2 | 49.7 | 50.0 | 50.2 | 50.7 | 50.4 | 49.9 | 49.6 | 49.7 |

Source: ILO, based on information from household surveys of the countries.
a/ 31 urban areas.
b/ 2010 data correspond to capital cities and El Alto, not comparable with the rest of the series.
c/ Six metropolitan regions.
d/National total. New measurement beginning in 2010; data not comparable with previous years.
e/ Thirteen metropolitan areas. Includes hidden unemployment.
f/ 2005-2009 data from July of each year. Beginning in 2010, ECE data
not comparable with previous years (2010 is the average of the 3rd and 4th quarters).
g/ National total.
h/ Beginning in 2008, working age is 15 years, not comparable with previous years. Includes hidden unemployment.
i/ Beginning in 2007, working age population increases from 10 years to 16 years and over. Includes hidden unemployment.
j/ Corresponds to the aggregate of 32 cities
k/ New measurement in 2010, not comparable with previous years.
I/ Includes hidden unemployment.
m/ Urban national until 2009, beginning in 2010, Asunción and Central Urban Department, data not comparable with previous years. ECE Survey.
n/ Metropolitan Lima
o/ Weighted average. Includes data adjustments for methodological
changes in Argentina (2003) and Brazil (2002); as well as due to the exclusion of hidden unemployment in Colombia, Ecuador, Jamaica and Panama.
p/ Average, first semester.
q/ June data.
r/ August data.
s/ October data.
t/ May data.
u/ First quarter.
v/ March data.

TABLE 5. LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN: URBAN EMPLOYMENT-TO-POPULATION RATIO, BY COUNTRY AND SEX. 2005-2015 (Average Annual Rates)

| Country | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2014 | 2015 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average through 3rd quarter |  |
| Latin America |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Argentina ${ }^{\text {a/ }}$ | 53.0 | 54.1 | 54.5 | 54.2 | 54.2 | 54.4 | 55.2 | 55.0 | 54.7 | 54.0 | $54.0{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $53.7{ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| Men | 65.8 | 67.1 | 68.1 | 67.3 | 66.5 | 67.5 | 68.3 | 67.9 | 67.6 | 66.3 | 66.7 | 65.9 |
| Women | 41.7 | 42.8 | 42.5 | 42.6 | 43.3 | 42.7 | 43.4 | 43.4 | 43.1 | 42.9 | 42.5 | 42.6 |
| Bolivia (Pluri. State of) ${ }^{\text {b/ }}$ | 51.2 | 54.0 | 52.7 | 56.2 | 57.5 | 53.6 | 57.4 | 55.2 | 56.1 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... |
| Men | 60.4 | 62.2 | 62.8 | 65.3 | 66.1 | 60.9 | 66.9 | 64.4 | 65.9 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 42.7 | 46.4 | 43.5 | 47.9 | 49.3 | 46.8 | 48.5 | 46.8 | 47.2 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Brazil ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 51.0 | 51.2 | 51.6 | 52.5 | 52.1 | 53.2 | 53.7 | 54.2 | 54.0 | 53.3 | 53.2 | 52.1 |
| Men | 61.5 | 61.3 | 61.6 | 62.5 | 61.7 | 63.0 | 63.4 | 63.7 | 63.3 | 62.6 | 62.6 | 61.2 |
| Women | 41.8 | 42.3 | 42.8 | 43.8 | 43.8 | 44.9 | 45.3 | 46.0 | 46.0 | 45.4 | 45.2 | 44.5 |
| Chile ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 49.2 | 50.3 | 51.0 | 51.7 | 50.5 | 53.7 | 55.5 | 55.7 | 56.0 | 56.0 | 55.8 | 55.8 |
| Men | 65.5 | 66.6 | 66.9 | 66.9 | 64.5 | 66.9 | 68.3 | 68.0 | 68.0 | 67.3 | 67.1 | 67.4 |
| Women | 33.5 | 34.7 | 35.7 | 37.0 | 36.9 | 41.0 | 43.2 | 43.8 | 44.4 | 45.1 | 44.9 | 44.6 |
| Colombia ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | 54.5 | 54.0 | 54.8 | 55.3 | 56.2 | 57.6 | 59.1 | 60.1 | 60.3 | 61.2 | 60.7 | 61.1 |
| Men | 64.4 | 63.9 | 64.3 | 65.0 | 65.2 | 66.1 | 67.7 | 68.8 | 68.7 | 69.7 | 69.1 | 69.5 |
| Women | 45.8 | 45.2 | 46.3 | 46.7 | 48.2 | 49.9 | 51.3 | 52.3 | 52.8 | 53.5 | 53.1 | 53.6 |
| Costa Rica ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ | 54.2 | 54.7 | 55.7 | 55.7 | 53.6 | 56.8 | 54.2 | 57.7 | 57.2 | 57.8 | 57.9 | 57.0 |
| Men | 68.8 | 69.2 | 70.0 | 68.0 | 65.8 | 69.6 | 67.2 | 69.2 | 68.9 | 69.7 | 69.7 | 68.1 |
| Women | 40.7 | 41.6 | 42.6 | 44.6 | 42.4 | 40.8 | 38.5 | 43.5 | 43.8 | 43.2 | 46.3 | 46.2 |
| Cuba ${ }^{\text {8 }}$ | 70.7 | 70.7 | 72.4 | 73.6 | 74.2 | 73.0 | 73.6 | 71.6 | 70.5 | 70.0 | ... | ... |
| Men | 85.5 | 84.5 | 85.2 | 86.6 | 87.1 | 85.6 | 87.3 | 86.4 | 84.4 | 84.2 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 54.4 | 55.5 | 58.2 | 59.0 | 59.8 | 58.9 | 58.4 | 55.3 | 55.3 | 54.6 | $\ldots$ |  |
| Dominican Republic | 46.8 | 47.5 | 47.8 | 48.3 | 46.4 | 47.6 | 48.3 | 48.8 | 48.6 | 49.5 | 50.1 / | 51.0 " |
| Men | 60.8 | 61.1 | 61.7 | 61.1 | 59.8 | 59.5 | 59.4 | 59.6 | 60.1 | 60.9 | 62.1 | 63.0 |
| Women | 33.7 | 34.9 | 34.7 | 36.4 | 33.9 | 36.5 | 37.9 | 38.5 | 37.8 | 38.8 | 39.0 | 39.9 |
| Ecuador ${ }^{\text {// }}$ | 54.4 | 54.3 | 56.8 | 63.1 | 60.7 | 59.3 | 58.5 | 59.7 | 58.9 | 59.0 | 58.6 | 60.5 |
| Men | 66.1 | 66.8 | 68.2 | 76.5 | 73.8 | 72.5 | 72.0 | 73.3 | 72.8 | 73.4 | 73.0 | 74.7 |
| Women | 43.4 | 42.6 | 46.2 | 50.7 | 48.6 | 47.4 | 46.3 | 47.3 | 46.3 | 45.7 | 45.4 | 47.6 |
| El Salvador ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ | 50.3 | 50.8 | 59.9 | 60.6 | 59.7 | 60.0 | 59.5 | 60.6 | 61.5 | 60.3 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Men | 58.4 | 58.7 | 72.2 | 72.9 | 70.7 | 71.5 | 71.2 | 71.9 | 72.3 | 71.2 | $\ldots$ |  |
| Women | 43.6 | 44.3 | 50.4 | 50.8 | 51.0 | 51.0 | 50.0 | 51.4 | 52.8 | 51.6 | ... | $\cdots$ |
| Guatemala | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | 53.9 | 59.0 | 62.8 | 59.6 | 61.5 | $\ldots$ | ... |
| Men | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | 66.8 | 77.9 | 80.1 | 76.7 | 75.9 | $\ldots$ | ... |
| Women | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | 42.6 | 42.7 | 47.7 | 44.6 | 46.5 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Honduras | 51.1 | 49.4 | 49.0 | 50.5 | 50.5 | 50.3 | 48.9 | 48.3 | 51.1 | 51.5 | $51.5{ }^{\text {p }}$ | $52.1{ }^{\text {p/ }}$ |
| Men | 61.9 | 61.5 | 61.9 | 62.1 | 62.5 | 60.5 | 60.5 | 59.2 | 62.3 | 63.7 | 63.7 | 63.5 |
| Women | 42.3 | 39.4 | 38.2 | 40.9 | 40.7 | 41.6 | 39.4 | 39.1 | 41.9 | 41.5 | 41.5 | 42.8 |
| Mexico ${ }^{\text {l }}$ | 58.0 | 59.2 | 59.1 | 58.7 | 57.4 | 57.4 | 57.8 | 58.5 | 58.2 | 57.3 | 57.3 | 57.8 |
| Men | 75.3 | 76.0 | 75.6 | 74.7 | 72.3 | 72.3 | 72.5 | 73.2 | 72.7 | 71.8 | 71.7 | 72.2 |
| Women | 42.8 | 44.5 | 44.7 | 44.7 | 44.2 | 44.1 | 44.6 | 45.6 | 45.3 | 44.4 | 44.5 | 45.0 |
| Nicaragua ${ }^{k /}$ | 47.9 | 49.1 | 47.1 | 49.5 | 46.6 | 64.4 | 69.4 | 69.5 | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... |
| Men | 57.0 | 58.0 | 56.2 | 58.7 | $\ldots$ | 73.0 | 78.2 | 77.3 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 40.0 | 41.4 | 39.2 | 41.6 | $\ldots$ | 56.7 | 61.6 | 62.6 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Panama | 56.0 | 56.3 | 57.7 | 60.2 | 59.3 | 59.1 | 59.8 | 60.6 | 61.1 | 60.9 | 60.9 व | $60.7{ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| Men | 69.9 | 70.2 | 71.0 | 74.7 | 73.6 | 73.2 | 73.7 | 74.6 | 74.5 | 74.0 | 74.0 | 72.7 |
| Women | 43.5 | 43.5 | 45.6 | 47.3 | 46.6 | 46.3 | 47.6 | 48.3 | 49.0 | 49.3 | 49.3 | 49.9 |
| Paraguay ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ | 55.8 | 52.7 | 55.3 | 57.0 | 57.1 | 58.0 | 58.0 | 57.8 | 59.9 | 59.7 | 59.5 | 60.6 |
| Men | 65.5 | 64.6 | 66.1 | 68.8 | 67.6 | 67.2 | 67.6 | 67.3 | 68.2 | 69.6 | 69.7 | 70.2 |
| Women | 47.2 | 42.1 | 45.4 | 46.0 | 47.1 | 49.2 | 48.9 | 49.0 | 52.0 | 50.5 | 50.1 | 51.9 |
| Peru ${ }^{\text {m/ }}$ | 60.7 | 61.8 | 63.0 | 62.4 | 62.7 | 64.5 | 64.5 | 64.4 | 64.8 | 64.3 | 64.2 | 63.4 |
| Men | 70.8 | 71.4 | 73.0 | 72.8 | 72.0 | 73.9 | 74.4 | 74.0 | 74.0 | 73.4 | 73.6 | 72.2 |
| Women | 51.2 | 52.8 | 53.8 | 52.6 | 54.0 | 55.8 | 55.3 | 55.5 | 56.2 | 55.9 | 55.5 | 55.2 |
| Uruguay | 51.4 | 53.9 | 56.7 | 57.6 | 58.4 | 58.8 | 60.7 | 59.6 | 59.5 | 60.4 | 60.4 | 58.9 |
| Men | 62.7 | 65.4 | 68.4 | 68.3 | 68.9 | 68.8 | 70.2 | 69.1 | 69.4 | 69.8 | 69.7 | 67.6 |
| Women | 41.9 | 44.4 | 47.0 | 48.6 | 49.5 | 50.2 | 52.4 | 51.5 | 50.8 | 52.0 | 52.1 | 51.1 |
| Venezuela (Boliv. Rep. of) ${ }^{\text {d/ }}$ | 58.2 | 58.9 | 59.4 | 60.2 | 60.0 | 58.9 | 59.0 | 58.7 | 59.3 | 60.4 | $\ldots$ | ... |
| Men | 71.9 | 73.0 | 73.5 | 74.3 | 73.5 | 72.3 | 72.6 | 72.1 | 72.6 | 73.8 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 44.5 | 44.9 | 45.4 | 46.2 | 46.6 | 45.6 | 45.6 | 45.6 | 46.1 | 47.3 | $\ldots$ | ... |


| Country | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2014 | 2015 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average through 3rd quarter |  |
| The Caribbean |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bahamas ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 68.5 | 69.4 | 70.2 | 69.7 | 62.1 | $\ldots$ | 60.6 | 62.0 | 61.6 | 62.9 | $62.8{ }^{\text {s }}$ | $64.3{ }^{\text {s }}$ |
| Men | ... | ... | 82.8 | 83.0 | ... | ... | ... | 64.4 | 64.9 | 67.2 | 67.3 | 69.9 |
| Women | ... | $\ldots$ | 70.6 | 70.8 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | .. | 59.9 | 58.8 | 59.0 | 59.0 | 62.2 |
| Barbados ${ }^{\text {s/ }}$ | 62.8 | 61.9 | 62.8 | 62.1 | 60.3 | 59.5 | 60.1 | 58.5 | 58.9 | 56.0 | $55.6{ }^{\text {\# }}$ | 57.5 t |
| Men | 69.1 | 67.7 | 69.5 | 68.3 | 65.0 | 64.0 | 65.6 | 64.0 | 63.6 | 59.8 | 58.6 | 61.1 |
| Women | 57.2 | 56.7 | 56.7 | 56.6 | 56.1 | 55.4 | 55.1 | 53.5 | 54.8 | 52.6 | 52.9 | 54.2 |
| Belize ${ }^{\text {d/ }}$ | 52.8 | 52.2 | 56.0 | 54.3 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | 55.7 | 56.7 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Men | 70.7 | 70.9 | 72.1 | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | 71.4 | 73.5 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Women | 35.5 | 34.4 | 36.5 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | 40.4 | 40.6 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Jamaica ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 57.0 | 58.0 | 58.6 | 58.5 | 56.3 | 54.7 | 54.3 | 53.3 | 53.4 | 54.2 | 54.3 | 54.5 |
| Men | 67.7 | 68.4 | 69.0 | 68.5 | 65.7 | 63.9 | 63.6 | 61.9 | 62.1 | 62.9 | 62.9 | 63.1 |
| Women | 46.7 | 48.1 | 48.3 | 49.1 | 47.4 | 45.9 | 45.8 | 45.0 | 45.0 | 45.8 | 46.0 | 46.2 |
| Trinidad and Tobago ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 58.6 | 59.9 | 59.9 | 60.6 | 59.4 | 58.4 | 58.2 | 58.8 | 59.1 | 59.9 | 60.6 w | $58.6{ }^{\text {w }}$ |
| Men | ... | ... | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | $\ldots$ |
| Women | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Latin America and the Caribbean ${ }^{n}$ | 54.2 | 54.7 | 55.3 | 55.8 | 55.3 | 56.0 | 56.7 | 57.1 | 56.9 | 56.6 | 55.8 | 55.5 |
| Latin America and the Caribbean - Men | 66.7 | 67.0 | 67.5 | 67.9 | 66.9 | 67.5 | 68.3 | 68.5 | 68.2 | 67.4 | 66.8 | 66.2 |
| Latin America and the Caribbean - Women | 42.9 | 43.6 | 44.3 | 45.0 | 45.1 | 45.7 | 46.2 | 46.8 | 46.8 | 46.3 | 46.1 | 46.0 |

Source: ILO, based on information from household surveys of the countries.
a/ 31 urban areas.
b/ 2010 data correspond to capital cities and El Alto, not comparable with the rest of the series.
c/ Six metropolitan regions.
d/National total. New measurement beginning in 2010; data not comparable with previous years.
e/ Thirteen metropolitan areas.
f/ 2005-2009 data from July of each year. Beginning in 2010, ECE data
not comparable with previous years (2010 is the average of the 3rd and 4th quarters).
g/ National total.
h/ Beginning in 2008, working age is 15 years, not comparable with previous years.
i/ Beginning in 2007, working age population increases from 10 years to
16 years and over.
j/ Corresponds to the aggregate of 32 cities.
k/ New measurement in 2010, not comparable with previous years.
// Urban national until 2009, beginning in 2010, Asunción and Central
Urban Department data not comparable with previous years.
$\mathrm{m} /$ Metropolitan Lima.
$\mathrm{n} /$ Weighted average. Includes data adjustments for methodological changes in Argentina (2003) and Brazil (2002).
o/ First semester data.
$\mathrm{p} /$ June data.
q/ August data.
r/ October data.
s/ May data.
t/ First quarter data.
u/ March data.
| TABLE 6. LATIN AMERICA: URBAN EMPLOYED POPULATION BY STATUS IN EMPLOYMENT AND SEX. 2005, 2010-2014 (Percentages)

| Country, Year and Sex | Status in Employment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Employees |  |  |  | Non-employees |  |  |  |  | Domestic Workers | ContributingFamily Workers | Others |
|  | Total | Public | Private |  | Total | Employers |  | Own-Account |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Establishments with a maximum of five workers | Establishments with six or more workers |  | Establishments with a maximum of five workers | Establishments with six or more workers | Professional, technical or administrative | Nonprofessional, technical or administrative |  |  |  |
| Latin America ${ }^{\text {a/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2005 \begin{array}{ll}\text { Total } \\ & \text { Men } \\ & \text { Women }\end{array}$ | 61.1 | 12.5 | 13.1 | 35.5 | 27.6 | 3.4 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 21.2 | 7.9 | 3.1 | 0.3 |
|  | 66.0 | 9.9 | 15.9 | 40.3 | 30.8 | 4.3 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 23.1 | 0.7 | 2.1 | 0.3 |
|  | 54.6 | 16.0 | 9.4 | 29.2 | 23.5 | 2.2 | 0.8 | 1.8 | 18.7 | 17.3 | 4.4 | 0.2 |
| 2010 Total | 64.0 | 12.9 | 12.8 | 38.2 | 26.1 | 3.1 | 1.2 | 1.9 | 19.9 | 7.4 | 2.1 | 0.0 |
| Men | 68.0 | 10.2 | 15.0 | 42.8 | 29.4 | 4.0 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 22.0 | 0.8 | 1.4 | 0.5 |
| Women | 58.8 | 16.5 | 10.0 | 32.4 | 21.9 | 2.0 | 0.7 | 2.0 | 17.2 | 15.9 | 3.1 | 0.2 |
| $2011{ }^{\text {b/ Total }}$ | 65.1 | 13.1 | 12.8 | 39.2 | 25.6 | 2.7 | 1.2 | 2.0 | 19.7 | 7.1 | 1.8 | 0.4 |
| Men | 68.4 | 10.2 | 14.8 | 43.5 | 29.1 | 3.4 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 22.1 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 0.5 |
| Women | 60.7 | 16.9 | 10.1 | 33.7 | 21.1 | 1.8 | 0.7 | 2.1 | 16.5 | 15.3 | 2.7 | 0.3 |
| 2012 Total | 65.4 | 13.1 | 12.1 | 40.3 | 25.6 | 3.0 | 1.2 | 2.1 | 19.2 | 6.7 | 1.8 | 0.5 |
| Men | 68.6 | 10.2 | 14.0 | 44.4 | 29.0 | 3.7 | 1.6 | 2.0 | 21.7 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 0.6 |
| Women | 61.5 | 16.7 | 9.6 | 35.2 | 21.2 | 2.1 | 0.7 | 2.3 | 16.1 | 14.3 | 2.7 | 0.3 |
| 2013 Total | 65.7 | 13.0 | 12.5 | 40.2 | 25.6 | 2.9 | 1.3 | 2.1 | 19.3 | 6.6 | 1.5 | 0.5 |
| Men | 68.7 | 10.0 | 14.4 | 44.3 | 29.0 | 3.7 | 1.7 | 2.0 | 21.7 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.7 |
| Women | 61.9 | 16.8 | 10.2 | 35.0 | 21.3 | 2.0 | 0.8 | 2.3 | 16.3 | 14.1 | 2.3 | 0.4 |
| 2014 Total | 65.1 | 12.7 | 12.0 | 40.4 | 26.1 | 2.9 | 1.2 | 3.4 | 18.5 | 6.5 | 1.8 | 0.5 |
| Men | 67.9 | 9.7 | 13.8 | 44.5 | 29.6 | 3.7 | 1.6 | 3.6 | 20.7 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 0.7 |
| Women | 61.7 | 16.5 | 9.8 | 35.3 | 21.6 | 1.9 | 0.7 | 3.3 | 15.7 | 13.7 | 2.6 | 0.4 |
| Argentina ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 Total | 62.9 | 16.4 | 14.2 | 32.3 | 24.0 | 2.8 | 1.2 | 4.4 | 15.7 | 7.3 | 1.2 | 4.7 |
| Men | 65.6 | 12.5 | 17.2 | 35.9 | 28.0 | 3.5 | 1.7 | 4.1 | 18.7 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 5.3 |
| Women | 59.1 | 21.6 | 10.1 | 27.3 | 18.5 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 4.7 | 11.5 | 16.7 | 2.0 | 3.8 |
| 2010 Total | 66.6 | 16.1 | 14.1 | 36.4 | 22.1 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 4.6 | 13.4 | 6.9 | 0.7 | 3.7 |
| Men | 69.3 | 12.5 | 16.0 | 40.9 | 25.3 | 3.7 | 1.5 | 4.2 | 15.9 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 4.8 |
| Women | 62.7 | 21.4 | 11.3 | 30.1 | 17.5 | 1.9 | 0.5 | 5.2 | 9.9 | 16.4 | 1.2 | 2.1 |
| 2011 Total | 66.0 | 16.8 | 13.5 | 35.7 | 21.9 | 3.0 | 1.2 | 4.2 | 13.5 | 7.2 | 0.6 | 4.2 |
| Men | 68.7 | 12.8 | 15.6 | 40.3 | 25.5 | 3.6 | 1.8 | 4.4 | 15.8 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 5.2 |
| Women | 62.2 | 22.5 | 10.6 | 29.2 | 16.7 | 2.1 | 0.4 | 4.0 | 10.2 | 17.1 | 1.2 | 2.8 |
| 2012 Total | 65.0 | 17.3 | 13.9 | 33.8 | 22.6 | 3.2 | 1.0 | 4.2 | 14.1 | 7.1 | 0.5 | 4.9 |


| Country, Year and Sex |  | Status in Employment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Employees |  |  |  | Non-employees |  |  |  |  | Domestic Workers | Contributing Family Workers | Others |
|  |  | Total | Public | Private |  | Total | Employers |  | Own-Account |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Establishments with a maximum of five workers |  | Establishments with six or more workers | Establishments with a maximum of five workers |  | Establishments with six or more workers | Professional, technical or administrative | Nonprofessional, technical or administrative |  |  |  |
|  | Men |  | 67.8 | 13.6 | 16.5 | 37.7 | 25.6 | 3.8 | 1.3 | 3.9 | 16.6 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 6.1 |
|  | Women | 60.9 | 22.7 | 10.1 | 28.2 | 18.2 | 2.4 | 0.7 | 4.5 | 10.5 | 17.0 | 0.7 | 3.2 |
| 2013 | Total | 63.2 | 16.7 | 13.7 | 32.8 | 22.8 | 2.6 | 0.9 | 4.1 | 15.1 | 7.2 | 0.5 | 6.4 |
|  | Men | 66.6 | 13.6 | 15.8 | 37.1 | 26.0 | 3.3 | 1.2 | 4.0 | 17.5 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 6.9 |
|  | Women | 58.4 | 21.0 | 10.6 | 26.8 | 18.3 | 1.8 | 0.4 | 4.3 | 11.8 | 17.0 | 0.7 | 5.6 |
| 2014 | Total | 64.8 | 16.8 | 14.0 | 34.1 | 23.0 | 2.6 | 0.9 | 4.8 | 14.7 | 7.0 | 0.6 | 4.7 |
|  | Men | 68.1 | 12.9 | 16.2 | 38.9 | 26.0 | 3.1 | 1.3 | 4.6 | 17.0 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 5.4 |
|  | Women | 60.3 | 21.9 | 10.9 | 27.5 | 18.9 | 1.8 | 0.4 | 5.1 | 11.6 | 16.2 | 0.9 | 3.7 |
| Bolivia (Pluri. State of) ${ }^{\text {d/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Total | 47.6 | 9.8 | 12.4 | 25.4 | 40.1 | 4.5 | 1.9 | 2.7 | 31.1 | 3.8 | 8.5 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 58.4 | 9.0 | 16.4 | 33.0 | 35.6 | 5.8 | 2.4 | 3.1 | 24.3 | 0.1 | 5.8 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 33.7 | 10.9 | 7.3 | 15.5 | 45.8 | 2.7 | 1.1 | 2.1 | 39.8 | 8.5 | 12.0 | 0.0 |
| 2010 | Total | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | $\cdots$ | ... |
|  | Men | ... | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | ... | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | $\ldots$ | ... |
|  | Women | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | $\ldots$ |
| 2011 | Total | 48.3 | 12.3 | 11.8 | 24.2 | 38.9 | 4.9 | 1.8 | 3.5 | 28.7 | 2.9 | 9.7 | 0.3 |
|  | Men | 55.9 | 11.8 | 14.8 | 29.3 | 37.8 | 6.3 | 2.6 | 4.2 | 24.6 | 0.2 | 5.7 | 0.5 |
|  | Women | 38.3 | 12.9 | 7.9 | 17.5 | 40.4 | 3.0 | 0.8 | 2.6 | 34.0 | 6.4 | 14.8 | 0.1 |
| 2012 | Total | 48.2 | 12.6 | 12.3 | 23.4 | 41.2 | 5.5 | 1.8 | 3.0 | 30.9 | 3.4 | 6.6 | 0.6 |
|  | Men | 54.7 | 12.0 | 14.1 | 28.6 | 40.3 | 6.8 | 2.5 | 3.7 | 27.4 | 0.2 | 4.2 | 0.6 |
|  | Women | 40.2 | 13.2 | 10.1 | 16.9 | 42.4 | 3.9 | 0.9 | 2.2 | 35.4 | 7.4 | 9.6 | 0.5 |
| 2013 | Total | 49.4 | 14.3 | 10.1 | 24.9 | 40.0 | 4.7 | 1.8 | 4.1 | 29.5 | 2.9 | 7.5 | 0.2 |
|  | Men | 55.4 | 13.7 | 11.7 | 30.0 | 40.0 | 5.6 | 2.7 | 4.8 | 26.9 | 0.1 | 4.3 | 0.2 |
|  | Women | 41.7 | 15.1 | 8.1 | 18.5 | 40.1 | 3.4 | 0.8 | 3.1 | 32.8 | 6.5 | 11.6 | 0.1 |
| 2014 | Total | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
|  | Men | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
|  | Women | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... |
| Brazil ${ }^{\text {e/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Total | 61.1 | 12.4 | 13.1 | 35.6 | 27.5 | 3.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 21.3 | 8.5 | 2.9 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 66.3 | 9.6 | 16.0 | 40.7 | 30.9 | 4.1 | 1.8 | 1.3 | 23.7 | 0.8 | 2.1 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 54.3 | 16.1 | 9.4 | 28.9 | 22.9 | 2.2 | 0.9 | 1.7 | 18.1 | 18.7 | 4.1 | 0.0 |
| 2010 | Total | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |



| Country, Year and Sex |  | Status in Employment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Employees |  |  |  | Non-employees |  |  |  |  | Domestic Workers | Contributing Family Workers | Others |
|  |  | Total | Public | Private |  | Total | Employers |  | Own-Account |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Establishments with a maximum of five workers |  | Establishments with six or more workers | Establishments with a maximum of five workers |  | Establishments with six or more workers | Professional, technical or administrative | Nonprofessional, technical or administrative |  |  |  |
| Colombia ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Total |  | 48.8 | 7.5 | 11.9 | 29.4 | 42.7 | 4.5 | 1.1 | 3.2 | 33.9 | 5.0 | 3.4 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 51.3 | 6.8 | 13.7 | 30.8 | 46.6 | 5.8 | 1.5 | 3.3 | 35.9 | 0.3 | 1.8 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 45.7 | 8.3 | 9.7 | 27.7 | 37.8 | 2.9 | 0.5 | 3.1 | 31.4 | 11.1 | 5.4 | 0.0 |
| 2010 | Total | 45.5 | 5.0 | 10.5 | 30.0 | 46.7 | 4.0 | 0.8 | 4.6 | 37.2 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 0.1 |
|  | Men | 47.7 | 4.6 | 11.3 | 31.8 | 49.5 | 5.3 | 1.0 | 5.1 | 38.1 | 0.2 | 2.5 | 0.1 |
|  | Women | 42.9 | 5.6 | 9.5 | 27.8 | 43.1 | 2.4 | 0.5 | 4.0 | 36.2 | 8.7 | 5.2 | 0.1 |
| 2011 | Total | 45.5 | 4.9 | 10.6 | 30.1 | 47.1 | 4.1 | 0.9 | 4.3 | 37.8 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 0.1 |
|  | Men | 48.3 | 4.7 | 11.4 | 32.2 | 49.1 | 5.3 | 1.3 | 4.8 | 37.8 | 0.3 | 2.2 | 0.1 |
|  | Women | 42.1 | 5.1 | 9.6 | 27.4 | 44.6 | 2.6 | 0.5 | 3.8 | 37.8 | 8.1 | 5.0 | 0.2 |
| 2012 | Total | 46.3 | 5.1 | 10.7 | 30.5 | 45.7 | 4.1 | 0.7 | 4.5 | 36.4 | 4.1 | 3.9 | 0.1 |
|  | Men | 49.6 | 5.0 | 12.0 | 32.6 | 47.7 | 5.2 | 1.1 | 4.8 | 36.5 | 0.3 | 2.3 | 0.1 |
|  | Women | 42.1 | 5.3 | 9.0 | 27.8 | 43.3 | 2.7 | 0.3 | 4.0 | 36.3 | 8.7 | 5.7 | 0.2 |
| 2013 | Total | 47.0 | 5.0 | 10.6 | 31.4 | 45.3 | 3.8 | 0.9 | 4.9 | 35.8 | 4.0 | 3.4 | 0.2 |
|  | Men | 49.7 | 4.6 | 11.7 | 33.5 | 47.7 | 4.9 | 1.2 | 5.6 | 36.0 | 0.4 | 2.1 | 0.1 |
|  | Women | 43.8 | 5.6 | 9.2 | 29.0 | 42.5 | 2.5 | 0.5 | 4.0 | 35.5 | 8.4 | 5.0 | 0.2 |
| 2014 | Total | 48.1 | 4.8 | 10.0 | 33.4 | 44.9 | 3.7 | 0.8 | 4.8 | 35.6 | 3.7 | 3.2 | 0.1 |
|  | Men | 50.5 | 4.5 | 10.6 | 35.3 | 47.3 | 4.5 | 1.2 | 5.3 | 36.3 | 0.3 | 1.9 | 0.1 |
|  | Women | 45.2 | 5.0 | 9.2 | 31.0 | 42.1 | 2.8 | 0.4 | 4.2 | 34.7 | 7.8 | 4.8 | 0.1 |
| Costa Rica ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Total | 68.7 | 17.2 | 13.0 | 38.5 | 25.2 | 5.9 | 1.4 | 3.0 | 14.9 | 4.9 | 1.2 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 72.1 | 13.8 | 13.9 | 44.3 | 26.8 | 7.3 | 1.9 | 3.4 | 14.3 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 63.3 | 22.4 | 11.4 | 29.5 | 22.7 | 3.7 | 0.6 | 2.4 | 16.0 | 12.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 |
| 2010 | Total | 71.3 | 17.4 | 11.8 | 42.1 | 20.8 | 2.4 | 1.1 | 3.7 | 13.6 | 7.1 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 75.5 | 14.8 | 12.7 | 48.0 | 23.0 | 3.1 | 1.5 | 4.3 | 14.1 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 65.3 | 21.1 | 10.5 | 33.8 | 17.8 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 3.0 | 13.0 | 16.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 |
| 2011 | Total | 71.7 | 18.0 | 12.5 | 41.1 | 19.3 | 2.6 | 1.0 | 3.9 | 11.8 | 5.8 | 1.3 | 1.8 |
|  | Men | 74.0 | 15.1 | 12.5 | 46.4 | 22.3 | 3.4 | 1.3 | 4.5 | 13.1 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 1.9 |
|  | Women | 68.0 | 22.5 | 12.6 | 32.9 | 14.7 | 1.3 | 0.6 | 2.9 | 9.9 | 13.2 | 2.4 | 1.7 |
| 2012 | Total | 71.3 | 16.8 | 14.1 | 40.3 | 20.3 | 2.1 | 0.8 | 3.9 | 13.3 | 7.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 74.7 | 14.2 | 14.5 | 46.0 | 23.4 | 2.9 | 1.1 | 4.5 | 14.9 | 1.4 | 0.5 | 0.1 |
|  | Women | 66.4 | 20.5 | 13.7 | 32.2 | 15.8 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 3.1 | 11.2 | 15.0 | 2.8 | 0.0 |



| Country, Year and Sex |  | Status in Employment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Employees |  |  |  | Non-employees |  |  |  |  | Domestic Workers | Contributing Family Workers | Others |
|  |  | Total | Public | Private |  | Total | Employers |  | Own-Account |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Establishments with a maximum of five workers |  | Establishments with six or more workers | Establishments with a maximum of five workers |  | Establishments with six or more workers | Professional, technical or administrative | Nonprofessional, technical or administrative |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Total |  | 56.2 | 12.2 | 14.6 | 29.4 | 34.9 | 3.4 | 0.8 | 2.0 | 28.7 | 3.5 | 5.4 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 62.4 | 11.2 | 17.9 | 33.2 | 34.5 | 4.1 | 1.1 | 2.3 | 27.0 | 0.4 | 2.7 | 0.1 |
|  | Women | 47.5 | 13.5 | 10.1 | 24.0 | 35.4 | 2.4 | 0.3 | 1.6 | 31.1 | 7.8 | 9.2 | 0.0 |
| 2012 | Total | 55.6 | 11.2 | 14.0 | 30.4 | 35.4 | 3.9 | 0.6 | 2.2 | 28.6 | 3.1 | 5.9 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 61.6 | 10.4 | 17.2 | 34.0 | 35.2 | 4.9 | 0.9 | 2.5 | 26.8 | 0.4 | 2.9 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 47.2 | 12.4 | 9.5 | 25.3 | 35.6 | 2.6 | 0.2 | 1.8 | 31.0 | 6.9 | 10.3 | 0.0 |
| 2013 | Total | 56.5 | 11.3 | 14.2 | 31.0 | 35.0 | 3.2 | 0.9 | 2.0 | 28.9 | 3.1 | 5.4 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 62.4 | 10.6 | 17.1 | 34.7 | 34.3 | 4.0 | 1.2 | 2.4 | 26.7 | 0.4 | 2.9 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 48.0 | 12.3 | 10.1 | 25.7 | 35.9 | 2.0 | 0.4 | 1.5 | 32.0 | 7.0 | 9.0 | 0.0 |
| 2014 | Total | 58.5 | 11.9 | 15.7 | 30.9 | 33.3 | 3.1 | 0.7 | 1.9 | 27.6 | 3.4 | 4.9 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 64.8 | 10.8 | 19.1 | 34.9 | 32.4 | 3.9 | 0.9 | 2.3 | 25.3 | 0.4 | 2.4 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 49.2 | 13.5 | 10.7 | 24.9 | 34.5 | 2.0 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 31.1 | 7.8 | 8.5 | 0.0 |
| El Salvador ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Total | 51.9 | 10.8 | 13.5 | 27.7 | 32.9 | 4.6 | 0.5 | 1.1 | 26.6 | 3.8 | 7.3 | 4.0 |
|  | Men | 60.6 | 10.5 | 18.3 | 31.9 | 27.7 | 5.9 | 0.8 | 1.5 | 19.5 | 0.7 | 5.9 | 5.1 |
|  | Women | 42.2 | 11.1 | 8.1 | 23.0 | 38.8 | 3.2 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 34.6 | 7.2 | 9.0 | 2.8 |
| 2010 | Total | 57.6 | 10.2 | 14.7 | 32.6 | 33.2 | 4.0 | 0.5 | 1.7 | 27.1 | 3.8 | 5.2 | 0.2 |
|  | Men | 68.1 | 10.1 | 19.5 | 38.5 | 27.6 | 4.7 | 0.8 | 2.1 | 20.0 | 0.4 | 3.6 | 0.3 |
|  | Women | 45.9 | 10.4 | 9.4 | 26.1 | 39.4 | 3.1 | 0.1 | 1.4 | 34.8 | 7.6 | 6.9 | 0.1 |
| 2011 | Total | 58.4 | 9.9 | 14.9 | 33.5 | 32.5 | 3.6 | 0.4 | 1.8 | 26.8 | 3.7 | 5.4 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 68.1 | 9.7 | 19.5 | 39.0 | 27.6 | 4.4 | 0.6 | 2.6 | 20.0 | 0.6 | 3.8 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 47.2 | 10.3 | 9.7 | 27.3 | 38.2 | 2.8 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 34.5 | 7.3 | 7.2 | 0.0 |
| 2012 | Total | 57.9 | 10.1 | 15.5 | 32.4 | 32.2 | 3.8 | 0.6 | 1.3 | 26.4 | 4.1 | 5.8 | 0.1 |
|  | Men | 67.9 | 10.0 | 19.9 | 38.1 | 26.6 | 4.4 | 0.9 | 1.8 | 19.6 | 0.8 | 4.7 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 46.5 | 10.1 | 10.5 | 25.9 | 38.5 | 3.2 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 34.2 | 7.8 | 7.1 | 0.1 |
| 2013 | Total | 57.8 | 10.2 | 14.4 | 33.1 | 31.9 | 4.0 | 0.4 | 1.7 | 25.7 | 4.3 | 5.9 | 0.1 |
|  | Men | 68.6 | 10.2 | 18.3 | 40.0 | 26.3 | 5.0 | 0.7 | 2.4 | 18.2 | 0.7 | 4.3 | 0.1 |
|  | Women | 45.8 | 10.2 | 10.1 | 25.5 | 38.0 | 3.0 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 34.1 | 8.4 | 7.6 | 0.1 |
| 2014 | Total | 60.0 | 10.3 | 15.2 | 34.4 | 29.8 | 3.9 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 24.3 | 4.3 | 5.7 | 0.1 |
|  | Men | 70.0 | 10.2 | 19.0 | 40.8 | 24.7 | 4.5 | 0.6 | 1.8 | 17.8 | 0.6 | 4.6 | 0.2 |
|  | Women | 48.9 | 10.5 | 11.1 | 27.3 | 35.5 | 3.2 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 31.4 | 8.5 | 6.9 | 0.1 |


| Country, Year and Sex |  | Status in Employment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Employees |  |  |  | Non-employees |  |  |  |  | Domestic Workers | Contributing Family Workers | Others |
|  |  | Total | Public | Private |  | Total | Employers |  | Own-Account |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Establishments with a maximum of five workers |  | Establishments with six or more workers | Establishments with a maximum of five workers |  | Establishments with six or more workers | Professional, technical or administrative | Nonprofessional, technical or administrative |  |  |  |
| Guatemala ${ }^{\mathrm{k}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Total |  | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
|  | Men | $\ldots$ | .. | ... | ... | ... | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | ... |
|  | Women | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | $\ldots$ |
| 2010 | Total | 56.6 | 8.5 | 17.3 | 30.9 | 31.9 | 3.8 | 0.7 | 4.1 | 23.3 | 3.7 | 7.8 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 66.3 | 7.5 | 22.1 | 36.7 | 28.3 | 4.6 | 1.2 | 3.0 | 19.5 | 0.4 | 5.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 43.3 | 9.8 | 10.6 | 22.9 | 37.0 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 5.7 | 28.4 | 8.1 | 11.6 | 0.0 |
| 2011 | Total | 63.7 | 8.7 | 21.2 | 33.8 | 27.5 | 3.0 | 0.5 | 10.0 | 13.9 | 3.4 | 5.5 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 70.2 | 6.8 | 24.6 | 38.8 | 25.1 | 3.5 | 0.8 | 7.2 | 13.6 | 0.1 | 4.6 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 53.5 | 11.8 | 15.8 | 25.9 | 31.1 | 2.1 | 0.1 | 14.6 | 14.4 | 8.5 | 6.9 | 0.0 |
| 2012 | Total | 54.7 | 7.7 | 19.7 | 27.2 | 31.1 | 3.1 | 0.4 | 1.7 | 26.0 | 4.0 | 10.2 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 65.0 | 6.9 | 25.6 | 32.5 | 27.1 | 3.3 | 0.6 | 2.1 | 21.1 | 0.3 | 7.7 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 39.6 | 8.9 | 11.1 | 19.6 | 37.1 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 33.2 | 9.5 | 13.8 | 0.0 |
| 2013 | Total | 57.9 | 9.0 | 18.8 | 30.1 | 31.2 | 3.1 | 0.5 | 1.8 | 25.7 | 4.3 | 6.6 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 65.9 | 7.4 | 23.6 | 34.8 | 28.6 | 3.6 | 0.7 | 2.1 | 22.1 | 0.3 | 5.2 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 46.0 | 11.3 | 11.6 | 23.1 | 35.1 | 2.4 | 0.2 | 1.4 | 31.1 | 10.1 | 8.8 | 0.0 |
| 2014 | Total | 62.7 | 9.5 | 17.9 | 35.3 | 28.1 | 3.3 | 0.4 | 1.4 | 22.9 | 3.1 | 6.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 70.5 | 8.2 | 20.7 | 41.7 | 25.0 | 3.7 | 0.6 | 1.7 | 18.9 | 0.3 | 4.1 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 51.7 | 11.5 | 14.0 | 26.2 | 32.6 | 2.8 | 0.1 | 1.0 | 28.6 | 7.1 | 8.6 | 0.0 |
| Honduras |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Total | 59.7 | 10.8 | 10.2 | 38.7 | 31.9 | 2.2 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 27.1 | 4.0 | 4.4 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 63.2 | 8.5 | 13.0 | 41.7 | 32.5 | 2.8 | 1.4 | 1.8 | 26.4 | 0.5 | 3.7 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 54.8 | 14.1 | 6.3 | 34.4 | 30.9 | 1.4 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 27.9 | 9.0 | 5.3 | 0.0 |
| 2010 | Total | 51.9 | 10.3 | 13.8 | 27.8 | 36.4 | 3.2 | 0.6 | 2.2 | 30.5 | 4.0 | 7.7 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 57.7 | 8.2 | 18.5 | 31.1 | 35.8 | 3.9 | 0.9 | 2.3 | 28.8 | 0.5 | 5.9 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 44.7 | 12.9 | 8.1 | 23.8 | 37.2 | 2.2 | 0.3 | 2.1 | 32.6 | 8.3 | 9.8 | 0.0 |
| 2011 | Total | 53.9 | 11.0 | 14.0 | 28.9 | 34.8 | 2.8 | 0.4 | 2.6 | 28.9 | 3.4 | 7.9 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 59.0 | 9.0 | 17.2 | 32.7 | 34.7 | 3.6 | 0.7 | 3.4 | 27.0 | 0.2 | 6.1 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 47.6 | 13.5 | 10.0 | 24.1 | 34.8 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 31.4 | 7.3 | 10.2 | 0.1 |
| 2012 | Total | 51.6 | 11.0 | 13.2 | 27.4 | 37.9 | 3.3 | 0.8 | 2.4 | 31.4 | 2.7 | 7.9 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 56.5 | 9.2 | 16.7 | 30.6 | 36.9 | 3.7 | 1.2 | 2.6 | 29.4 | 0.2 | 6.5 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 45.3 | 13.3 | 8.8 | 23.2 | 39.1 | 2.7 | 0.3 | 2.2 | 33.9 | 5.9 | 9.6 | 0.0 |


| Country, Year and Sex |  | Status in Employment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Employees |  |  |  | Non-employees |  |  |  |  | Domestic Workers | Contributing Family Workers | Others |
|  |  | Total | Public | Private |  | Total | Employers |  | Own-Account |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Establishments with a maximum of five workers |  | Establishments with six or more workers | Establishments with a maximum of five workers |  | Establishments with six or more workers | Professional, technical or administrative | Nonprofessional, technical or administrative |  |  |  |
| 2013 | Total |  | 49.4 | 8.6 | 13.1 | 27.7 | 38.6 | 3.8 | 0.4 | 2.5 | 31.8 | 3.7 | 8.3 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 56.1 | 6.9 | 17.5 | 31.7 | 37.4 | 4.7 | 0.6 | 3.0 | 29.1 | 0.3 | 6.3 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 41.4 | 10.8 | 7.7 | 22.9 | 40.0 | 2.8 | 0.1 | 1.9 | 35.1 | 7.8 | 10.8 | 0.0 |
| 2014 | Total | 53.4 | 9.3 | 12.6 | 31.5 | 35.3 | 4.0 | 0.5 | 1.9 | 29.0 | 3.7 | 7.6 | 0.1 |
|  | Men | 59.2 | 6.7 | 17.3 | 35.2 | 34.2 | 4.7 | 0.6 | 2.1 | 26.8 | 0.6 | 6.0 | 0.1 |
|  | Women | 46.1 | 12.6 | 6.7 | 26.8 | 36.7 | 3.1 | 0.3 | 1.6 | 31.7 | 7.6 | 9.6 | 0.1 |
| Mexico ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Total | 67.2 | 13.7 | 13.8 | 39.8 | 23.1 | 3.8 | 1.3 | 2.1 | 15.9 | 4.5 | 3.7 | 1.4 |
|  | Men | 70.4 | 11.8 | 16.2 | 42.4 | 25.2 | 5.1 | 1.8 | 2.6 | 15.6 | 0.7 | 2.1 | 1.7 |
|  | Women | 62.4 | 16.6 | 10.0 | 35.8 | 20.1 | 1.7 | 0.5 | 1.5 | 16.4 | 10.3 | 6.2 | 1.1 |
| 2010 | Total | 65.8 | 12.9 | 14.3 | 38.6 | 23.9 | 3.9 | 1.0 | 2.5 | 16.4 | 4.3 | 3.6 | 2.4 |
|  | Men | 69.4 | 11.4 | 16.7 | 41.4 | 25.0 | 5.2 | 1.5 | 2.9 | 15.4 | 0.8 | 2.0 | 2.8 |
|  | Women | 60.6 | 15.0 | 11.0 | 34.7 | 22.3 | 2.1 | 0.4 | 1.9 | 17.9 | 9.4 | 5.9 | 1.8 |
| 2011 | Total | 66.6 | 13.1 | 14.5 | 39.0 | 22.9 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 2.4 | 15.5 | 4.4 | 3.4 | 2.7 |
|  | Men | 70.1 | 11.4 | 17.0 | 41.8 | 24.2 | 5.3 | 1.4 | 3.0 | 14.7 | 0.7 | 1.8 | 3.2 |
|  | Women | 61.6 | 15.7 | 11.0 | 34.9 | 20.9 | 2.1 | 0.3 | 1.6 | 16.8 | 9.9 | 5.7 | 1.9 |
| 2012 | Total | 66.4 | 12.8 | 14.2 | 39.5 | 22.8 | 3.9 | 0.9 | 2.3 | 15.7 | 4.4 | 3.3 | 3.0 |
|  | Men | 70.1 | 11.3 | 16.5 | 42.4 | 24.1 | 5.0 | 1.4 | 2.8 | 14.8 | 0.6 | 1.8 | 3.5 |
|  | Women | 61.4 | 14.8 | 11.0 | 35.5 | 21.0 | 2.3 | 0.3 | 1.5 | 16.9 | 9.8 | 5.5 | 2.3 |
| 2013 | Total | 66.5 | 12.5 | 14.1 | 39.9 | 22.6 | 3.6 | 0.9 | 2.5 | 15.6 | 4.3 | 3.2 | 3.3 |
|  | Men | 70.1 | 10.8 | 16.4 | 42.9 | 23.6 | 4.9 | 1.3 | 2.9 | 14.5 | 0.7 | 1.8 | 3.8 |
|  | Women | 61.6 | 15.0 | 10.7 | 35.9 | 21.3 | 1.9 | 0.4 | 2.0 | 17.0 | 9.3 | 5.2 | 2.7 |
| 2014 | Total | 67.2 | 12.4 | 13.7 | 41.1 | 21.8 | 3.2 | 0.8 | 2.4 | 15.3 | 4.4 | 3.0 | 3.7 |
|  | Men | 70.7 | 10.8 | 15.8 | 44.1 | 22.9 | 4.1 | 1.1 | 2.8 | 14.8 | 0.6 | 1.6 | 4.2 |
|  | Women | 62.4 | 14.7 | 10.8 | 36.8 | 20.2 | 1.9 | 0.3 | 1.9 | 16.1 | 9.7 | 4.9 | 2.9 |
| Nicaragua ${ }^{\text {m/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Total | 57.2 | 11.7 | 19.2 | 26.4 | 35.9 | 3.9 | 1.0 | 2.1 | 28.9 | 0.0 | 6.9 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 59.7 | 10.3 | 18.3 | 31.1 | 34.5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | 2.7 | 25.3 | 0.0 | 5.7 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 54.2 | 13.4 | 20.2 | 20.5 | 37.5 | 2.5 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 33.2 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 0.0 |
| 2010 | Total | 47.0 | 10.4 | 12.4 | 24.2 | 35.5 | 4.9 | 0.7 | 1.9 | 28.0 | 6.0 | 11.5 | 0.1 |
|  | Men | 56.3 | 9.5 | 17.5 | 29.3 | 32.0 | 6.9 | 1.1 | 2.3 | 21.7 | 1.6 | 10.1 | 0.1 |
|  | Women | 36.3 | 11.5 | 6.6 | 18.2 | 39.5 | 2.6 | 0.1 | 1.5 | 35.2 | 11.1 | 13.1 | 0.1 |


| Country, Year and Sex |  | Status in Employment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Employees |  |  |  | Non-employees |  |  |  |  | Domestic Workers | Contributing Family Workers | Others |
|  |  | Total | Public | Private |  | Total | Employers |  | Own-Account |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Establishments with a maximum of five workers |  | Establishments with six or more workers | Establishments with a maximum of five workers |  | Establishments with six or more workers | Professional, technical or administrative | Nonprofessional, technical or administrative |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Total |  | 44.9 | 9.5 | 12.1 | 23.3 | 36.2 | 4.8 | 0.5 | 1.9 | 29.0 | 5.3 | 13.6 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 54.8 | 8.5 | 17.3 | 29.0 | 32.3 | 6.9 | 0.8 | 2.2 | 22.3 | 0.9 | 11.9 | 0.1 |
|  | Women | 34.0 | 10.7 | 6.3 | 16.9 | 40.5 | 2.4 | 0.2 | 1.5 | 36.4 | 10.0 | 15.5 | 0.0 |
| 2012 | Total | 45.6 | 9.4 | 12.2 | 24.0 | 36.3 | 4.5 | 0.7 | 1.9 | 29.2 | 4.8 | 13.4 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 55.5 | 8.4 | 16.5 | 30.5 | 32.0 | 6.5 | 1.0 | 2.4 | 22.0 | 0.9 | 11.6 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 34.9 | 10.4 | 7.4 | 17.0 | 40.8 | 2.2 | 0.3 | 1.3 | 37.0 | 8.9 | 15.4 | 0.0 |
| 2013 | Total | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
|  | Men | ... | ... | .. | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | $\ldots$ |
|  | Women | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| 2014 | Total | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | .. | ... | ... |
|  | Men | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
|  | Women | ... | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Panama ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Total | 66.6 | 18.4 | 7.4 | 40.8 | 25.1 | 2.4 | 1.2 | 2.0 | 19.5 | 6.8 | 1.6 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 68.3 | 15.2 | 8.5 | 44.6 | 29.8 | 3.1 | 1.8 | 2.4 | 22.5 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 64.1 | 23.0 | 5.7 | 35.3 | 18.3 | 1.4 | 0.3 | 1.4 | 15.1 | 14.9 | 2.8 | 0.0 |
| 2010 | Total | 70.8 | 19.3 | 6.7 | 44.9 | 23.1 | 2.2 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 17.6 | 5.1 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 72.4 | 15.5 | 7.9 | 49.1 | 26.1 | 2.8 | 1.7 | 2.0 | 19.5 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 68.5 | 24.7 | 4.9 | 38.8 | 18.8 | 1.4 | 0.6 | 1.9 | 14.9 | 11.3 | 1.5 | 0.0 |
| 2011 | Total | 73.0 | 19.4 | 5.8 | 47.9 | 21.4 | 2.3 | 1.2 | 1.8 | 16.1 | 5.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 73.0 | 15.6 | 6.3 | 51.1 | 25.6 | 2.8 | 1.6 | 2.0 | 19.2 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 73.0 | 24.5 | 5.0 | 43.5 | 15.7 | 1.7 | 0.7 | 1.4 | 11.9 | 10.5 | 0.8 | 0.0 |
| 2012 | Total | 72.5 | 18.4 | 6.4 | 47.7 | 21.4 | 2.1 | 1.1 | 2.1 | 16.1 | 5.3 | 0.8 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 74.1 | 14.6 | 7.4 | 52.1 | 24.7 | 2.5 | 1.6 | 2.4 | 18.1 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 70.4 | 23.6 | 5.0 | 41.8 | 17.1 | 1.4 | 0.6 | 1.6 | 13.5 | 11.2 | 1.3 | 0.0 |
| 2013 | Total | 72.7 | 18.1 | 6.5 | 48.1 | 21.7 | 1.7 | 1.0 | 2.1 | 16.9 | 4.9 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 73.7 | 14.3 | 8.0 | 51.3 | 25.0 | 2.3 | 1.5 | 2.4 | 18.9 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 71.3 | 23.2 | 4.4 | 43.7 | 17.1 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 1.7 | 14.1 | 10.3 | 1.2 | 0.1 |
| 2014 | Total | 71.9 | 18.1 | 6.4 | 47.4 | 22.5 | 2.0 | 1.1 | 2.4 | 16.9 | 5.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 73.0 | 13.8 | 8.1 | 51.1 | 25.7 | 2.7 | 1.5 | 2.4 | 19.0 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 70.4 | 23.8 | 4.1 | 42.6 | 18.2 | 1.1 | 0.5 | 2.2 | 14.3 | 10.4 | 1.0 | 0.0 |


| Country, Year and Sex |  | Status in Employment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Employees |  |  |  | Non-employees |  |  |  |  | Domestic Workers | Contributing Family Workers | Others |
|  |  | Total | Public | Private |  | Total | Employers |  | Own-Account |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Establishments with a maximum of five workers |  | Establishments with six or more workers | Establishments with a maximum of five workers |  | Establishments with six or more workers | Professional, technical or administrative | Nonprofessional, technical or administrative |  |  |  |
| Paraguay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Total |  | 50.2 | 12.7 | 16.1 | 21.5 | 33.9 | 4.6 | 1.4 | 2.9 | 25.0 | 11.1 | 4.2 | 0.6 |
|  | Men | 60.3 | 11.6 | 22.7 | 26.1 | 34.6 | 6.4 | 1.8 | 3.5 | 22.8 | 1.5 | 2.9 | 0.6 |
|  | Women | 37.7 | 14.1 | 7.9 | 15.8 | 33.0 | 2.4 | 0.9 | 2.1 | 27.6 | 23.0 | 5.7 | 0.6 |
| 2010 | Total | 54.5 | 13.1 | 15.0 | 26.3 | 29.7 | 4.8 | 1.2 | 2.6 | 21.2 | 9.6 | 3.4 | 2.9 |
|  | Men | 64.4 | 12.5 | 20.1 | 31.8 | 28.0 | 6.0 | 1.6 | 1.9 | 18.4 | 0.9 | 2.8 | 3.9 |
|  | Women | 40.9 | 13.9 | 8.1 | 18.9 | 32.1 | 3.1 | 0.6 | 3.5 | 25.0 | 21.4 | 4.1 | 1.5 |
| 2011 | Total | 57.6 | 13.4 | 16.5 | 27.8 | 30.4 | 5.0 | 1.1 | 2.8 | 21.5 | 7.5 | 3.2 | 1.2 |
|  | Men | 65.2 | 11.7 | 20.5 | 32.9 | 30.1 | 6.6 | 1.6 | 2.8 | 19.1 | 1.1 | 2.1 | 1.6 |
|  | Women | 47.8 | 15.5 | 11.2 | 21.1 | 30.8 | 3.0 | 0.4 | 3.0 | 24.5 | 15.8 | 4.7 | 0.8 |
| 2012 | Total | 55.5 | 13.0 | 14.7 | 27.7 | 31.0 | 5.1 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 21.9 | 7.8 | 3.8 | 2.0 |
|  | Men | 63.1 | 11.8 | 18.0 | 33.4 | 29.8 | 6.3 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 18.5 | 1.1 | 3.2 | 2.9 |
|  | Women | 45.8 | 14.6 | 10.6 | 20.6 | 32.5 | 3.6 | 1.1 | 1.5 | 26.3 | 16.3 | 4.5 | 1.0 |
| 2013 | Total | 53.7 | 15.0 | 13.3 | 25.3 | 29.7 | 6.5 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 19.8 | 8.3 | 3.6 | 4.7 |
|  | Men | 60.5 | 13.0 | 17.3 | 30.2 | 30.0 | 8.6 | 1.2 | 2.2 | 18.0 | 0.8 | 2.5 | 6.3 |
|  | Women | 45.9 | 17.5 | 8.6 | 19.7 | 29.3 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 2.5 | 21.9 | 17.1 | 4.9 | 2.8 |
| 2014 | Total | 56.1 | 13.0 | 15.0 | 28.2 | 29.4 | 5.7 | 1.4 | 2.6 | 19.8 | 8.2 | 2.4 | 3.9 |
|  | Men | 63.7 | 11.3 | 19.2 | 33.2 | 28.5 | 6.7 | 1.9 | 2.5 | 17.4 | 0.6 | 2.2 | 5.0 |
|  | Women | 46.6 | 15.2 | 9.6 | 21.8 | 30.5 | 4.4 | 0.7 | 2.7 | 22.8 | 17.7 | 2.7 | 2.5 |
| Peru |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Total | 48.3 | 10.3 | 13.3 | 24.7 | 38.4 | 4.8 | 1.0 | 2.2 | 30.5 | 4.9 | 8.3 | 0.1 |
|  | Men | 56.8 | 10.1 | 16.6 | 30.0 | 37.0 | 6.0 | 1.4 | 2.8 | 26.8 | 0.5 | 5.6 | 0.1 |
|  | Women | 37.1 | 10.5 | 9.0 | 17.7 | 40.3 | 3.1 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 35.4 | 10.7 | 11.9 | 0.0 |
| 2010 | Total | 50.7 | 10.9 | 12.7 | 27.1 | 38.6 | 5.1 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 30.2 | 4.0 | 6.5 | 0.2 |
|  | Men | 58.2 | 10.9 | 14.6 | 32.7 | 36.8 | 6.5 | 1.6 | 3.1 | 25.7 | 0.3 | 4.3 | 0.3 |
|  | Women | 41.4 | 10.8 | 10.4 | 20.2 | 40.9 | 3.3 | 0.3 | 1.4 | 35.8 | 8.5 | 9.1 | 0.1 |
| 2011 | Total | 52.0 | 11.2 | 13.0 | 27.7 | 37.8 | 4.6 | 0.9 | 2.0 | 30.3 | 3.4 | 6.5 | 0.4 |
|  | Men | 58.2 | 10.9 | 14.6 | 32.7 | 36.5 | 6.1 | 1.3 | 2.5 | 26.6 | 0.3 | 4.5 | 0.5 |
|  | Women | 44.2 | 11.7 | 11.0 | 21.6 | 39.3 | 2.8 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 34.8 | 7.3 | 8.9 | 0.3 |
| 2012 | Total | 52.9 | 11.3 | 12.8 | 28.8 | 37.4 | 4.7 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 29.4 | 3.2 | 6.2 | 0.4 |
|  | Men | 59.2 | 11.1 | 14.5 | 33.5 | 36.1 | 6.0 | 1.5 | 2.9 | 25.6 | 0.3 | 4.0 | 0.4 |
|  | Women | 45.0 | 11.4 | 10.6 | 23.0 | 39.0 | 3.0 | 0.3 | 1.4 | 34.2 | 6.7 | 8.9 | 0.5 |



| Country, Year and Sex |  | Status in Employment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Employees |  |  |  | Non-employees |  |  |  |  | Domestic Workers | Contributing Family Workers | Others |
|  |  | Total | Public | Private |  | Total | Employers |  | Own-Account |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Establishments with a maximum of five workers |  | Establishments with six or more workers | Establishments with a maximum of five workers |  | Establishments with six or more workers | Professional, technical or administrative | Nonprofessional, technical or administrative |  |  |  |
| 2011 | Total |  | 57.7 | 19.8 | 8.9 | 28.9 | 40.4 | 2.7 | 0.8 | 2.2 | 34.6 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 57.1 | 14.4 | 11.0 | 31.7 | 42.3 | 3.7 | 1.1 | 2.0 | 35.6 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 58.6 | 28.4 | 5.6 | 24.6 | 37.3 | 1.3 | 0.3 | 2.6 | 33.1 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 |
| 2012 | Total | 58.7 | 20.5 | 8.9 | 29.4 | 39.1 | 2.6 | 0.7 | 2.4 | 33.4 | 1.3 | 0.9 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 58.2 | 15.1 | 10.8 | 32.3 | 41.1 | 3.4 | 1.0 | 2.2 | 34.5 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 59.6 | 28.9 | 5.8 | 24.9 | 36.0 | 1.3 | 0.3 | 2.7 | 31.7 | 3.1 | 1.3 | 0.0 |
| 2013 | Total | 59.0 | 20.4 | 8.9 | 29.8 | 38.8 | 2.6 | 0.9 | 2.6 | 32.6 | 1.5 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 58.2 | 15.1 | 10.8 | 32.3 | 41.1 | 3.5 | 1.2 | 2.3 | 34.1 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 60.3 | 28.6 | 5.9 | 25.8 | 35.1 | 1.3 | 0.4 | 3.1 | 30.3 | 3.6 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| 2014 | Total | ... | ... | $\ldots$ | ... | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | ... | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\ldots$ |
|  | Men | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
|  | Women | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | ... |

Source: ILO estimate based on information from the household surveys of the countries.
 of 2014 does not include Venezuela (Boliv. Rep. of).
b/ For the calculation of the 2010 regional weighted average, Brazil was estimated based on the average of 2009 and 2011, given that the IBGE did not carry out the PNAD in 2010.
c/ 31 urban areas. Data correspond to working age population of 14 years and above, with temporary coverage reported through the 4th quarter of each year.
d/ Microenterprises: establishments with less than five workers.
f/ National total. 2005 data source is the National Employment Survey (ENE); Source of data beginning in 2010 is the New National Employment Survey. Not comparable with previous years.
/ Source of 2005 data is the Multi-purpose Household Survey; beginning in 2010, source of data is the Continuous Household Survey. Not comparable with previous years. 2005 data was for working age population of 10 years. Beginning in 2010, data is based on working age population of 16 years.
k/ 2013 and 2014 data correspond to the average of the two ENEI surveys of those years.
I/ Data of the National Occupation and Employment Survey (ENOE). More urbanized areas. Working age population of 15 years. In 2013, the occupation classifier was modified.
$\mathrm{m} /$ Source of 2005 data is the Household Survey to Measure Urban Employment. Beginning in 2010, the data source is the Continuous Household Survey. Data not comparable with previous years. 2011 data correspond to 3rd quarter only; 2012 data correspond to annual average.

[^21]| TABLE 7. latin america and the caribbean. urban employed population by type of economic activity and sex. 2005 and $2010-2014$ (Percentages)

| Year | Sex | Total | Agriculture, fishing and mining | Electricity, gas and waterworks | Manufacturing industry | Construction | Trade | Transportation, storage and communications | $\underset{\text { Financial }}{\text { establishments }}$ | Community, social and personas services | Unspecified activities |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Latin America ${ }^{\text {a/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Total | 100.0 | 7.0 | 0.5 | 15.9 | 7.3 | 25.8 | 5.7 | 3.5 | 33.9 | 0.3 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 9.1 | 0.7 | 17.6 | 12.4 | 26.3 | 8.6 | 3.8 | 21.0 | 0.5 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 4.4 | 0.2 | 13.8 | 0.5 | 25.2 | 1.8 | 3.1 | 50.8 | 0.1 |
| 2010 | Total | 100.0 | 5.6 | 0.5 | 14.7 | 8.3 | 26.0 | 6.1 | 3.8 | 34.8 | 0.3 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 7.7 | 0.7 | 16.3 | 14.3 | 25.4 | 9.3 | 4.1 | 21.9 | 0.4 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 3.0 | 0.2 | 12.5 | 0.6 | 26.8 | 2.0 | 3.5 | 51.2 | 0.1 |
| 2011 | Total | 100.0 | 5.4 | 0.4 | 14.1 | 8.7 | 26.3 | 6.4 | 3.8 | 34.6 | 0.2 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 7.4 | 0.6 | 15.8 | 14.9 | 25.1 | 9.8 | 4.0 | 22.0 | 0.3 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 2.9 | 0.2 | 11.9 | 0.6 | 27.7 | 2.1 | 3.6 | 50.9 | 0.2 |
| 2012 | Total | 100.0 | 4.9 | 0.4 | 14.5 | 8.8 | 26.1 | 6.4 | 3.9 | 34.8 | 0.2 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 6.8 | 0.6 | 16.2 | 15.3 | 24.9 | 9.9 | 4.2 | 22.0 | 0.2 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 2.5 | 0.2 | 12.3 | 0.7 | 27.6 | 2.0 | 3.6 | 51.0 | 0.1 |
| 2013 | Total | 100.0 | 4.9 | 0.5 | 14.0 | 9.2 | 26.0 | 6.5 | 4.0 | 34.8 | 0.2 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 6.7 | 0.7 | 15.7 | 15.9 | 24.7 | 10.0 | 4.2 | 21.9 | 0.2 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 2.6 | 0.2 | 11.7 | 0.8 | 27.5 | 2.1 | 3.7 | 51.2 | 0.1 |
| 2014 | Total | 100.0 | 5.0 | 0.5 | 13.8 | 9.3 | 26.2 | 6.3 | 3.9 | 34.8 | 0.2 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 6.7 | 0.7 | 15.5 | 16.1 | 25.2 | 9.7 | 4.1 | 21.8 | 0.2 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 2.9 | 0.2 | 11.7 | 0.8 | 27.5 | 2.1 | 3.7 | 51.1 | 0.1 |
| Argentina ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Total | 100.0 | 1.6 | 0.5 | 14.1 | 8.6 | 23.3 | 6.7 | 9.3 | 35.6 | 0.3 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 2.1 | 0.8 | 17.2 | 14.5 | 24.8 | 9.9 | 9.7 | 20.7 | 0.2 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 9.9 | 0.6 | 21.1 | 2.4 | 8.8 | 55.8 | 0.3 |
| 2010 | Total | 100.0 | 1.6 | 0.5 | 14.2 | 8.5 | 22.8 | 6.8 | 10.6 | 34.2 | 0.7 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 2.3 | 0.7 | 17.9 | 14.1 | 24.2 | 10.1 | 10.2 | 19.8 | 0.7 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 9.0 | 0.6 | 20.9 | 2.1 | 11.2 | 54.8 | 0.6 |
| 2011 | Total | 100.0 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 13.7 | 9.1 | 21.9 | 8.1 | 10.4 | 34.1 | 0.6 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 16.8 | 15.2 | 22.5 | 11.9 | 10.9 | 19.1 | 0.5 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 9.2 | 0.5 | 21.0 | 2.5 | 9.6 | 55.7 | 0.7 |
| 2012 | Total | 100.0 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 12.9 | 9.0 | 22.4 | 8.5 | 10.4 | 34.1 | 0.6 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 1.5 | 1.3 | 16.1 | 15.0 | 23.3 | 12.3 | 10.9 | 18.8 | 0.8 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 8.4 | 0.4 | 21.2 | 3.0 | 9.7 | 56.1 | 0.4 |
| 2013 | Total | 100.0 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 13.0 | 8.8 | 21.4 | 8.4 | 9.6 | 35.4 | 1.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 1.6 | 2.0 | 17.5 | 14.7 | 21.7 | 12.2 | 9.3 | 20.0 | 1.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 6.7 | 0.5 | 21.0 | 3.0 | 10.0 | 56.9 | 1.1 |
| 2014 | Total | 100.0 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 13.2 | 9.3 | 21.3 | 7.8 | 9.8 | 35.6 | 0.7 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 17.1 | 15.7 | 21.7 | 11.6 | 9.7 | 20.2 | 0.7 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 7.9 | 0.6 | 20.8 | 2.7 | 9.9 | 56.6 | 0.6 |


| Year | Sex | Total | Agriculture, fishing and mining | Electricity, gas and waterworks | Manufacturing industry | Construction | Trade | Transportation, storage and communications | Financial establishments | Community, social and personal services | Unspecified activities |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bolivia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Total | 100.0 | 8.5 | 0.6 | 16.7 | 9.1 | 29.6 | 9.3 | 4.7 | 21.6 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 10.8 | 0.8 | 19.6 | 14.9 | 18.9 | 14.7 | 4.9 | 15.4 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 5.5 | 0.3 | 13.1 | 1.6 | 43.3 | 2.2 | 4.5 | 29.6 | 0.0 |
| 2010 | Total | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
|  | Men | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
|  | Women | ... | ... | ... | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | ... | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| 2011 | Total | 100.0 | 6.8 | 0.4 | 14.7 | 9.5 | 30.7 | 9.8 | 1.4 | 26.6 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 8.7 | 0.6 | 16.2 | 16.2 | 20.2 | 15.3 | 1.1 | 21.6 | 0.1 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 4.3 | 0.1 | 12.7 | 0.9 | 44.4 | 2.7 | 1.8 | 33.1 | 0.0 |
| 2012 | Total | 100.0 | 6.9 | 0.8 | 13.2 | 9.0 | 31.5 | 9.8 | 1.5 | 26.9 | 0.3 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 9.2 | 1.1 | 14.4 | 15.5 | 20.5 | 15.9 | 1.4 | 21.8 | 0.3 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 4.0 | 0.5 | 11.7 | 1.0 | 45.2 | 2.3 | 1.6 | 33.4 | 0.2 |
| 2013 | Total | 100.0 | 6.3 | 0.4 | 13.9 | 8.3 | 30.1 | 9.7 | 2.0 | 29.2 | 0.1 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 8.6 | 0.7 | 16.0 | 14.4 | 18.9 | 15.4 | 1.8 | 24.1 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 3.3 | 0.2 | 11.1 | 0.6 | 44.3 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 35.7 | 0.1 |
| 2014 | Total | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
|  | Men | ... | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
|  | Women | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ | ... | ... |
| Brazil ${ }^{\text {d/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Total | 100.0 | 7.9 | 0.5 | 15.9 | 7.5 | 25.4 | 5.4 | 3.3 | 34.0 | 0.3 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 10.0 | 0.7 | 17.5 | 12.7 | 26.7 | 8.2 | 3.6 | 20.1 | 0.4 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 5.0 | 0.2 | 13.7 | 0.5 | 23.7 | 1.7 | 2.8 | 52.4 | 0.0 |
| 2010 | Total | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | $\ldots$ |
|  | Men | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
|  | Women | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| 2011 | Total | 100.0 | 6.0 | 0.4 | 13.9 | 9.2 | 25.7 | 6.2 | 3.5 | 35.0 | 0.1 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 8.1 | 0.6 | 15.5 | 15.7 | 25.3 | 9.4 | 3.8 | 21.3 | 0.2 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 3.2 | 0.2 | 11.7 | 0.6 | 26.3 | 1.9 | 3.2 | 52.9 | 0.1 |
| 2012 | Total | 100.0 | 5.4 | 0.4 | 14.4 | 9.5 | 25.4 | 6.2 | 3.5 | 35.1 | 0.1 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 7.4 | 0.6 | 16.1 | 16.3 | 24.9 | 9.6 | 3.9 | 21.2 | 0.1 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 2.8 | 0.2 | 12.3 | 0.6 | 26.0 | 1.9 | 3.1 | 53.1 | 0.0 |
| 2013 | Total | 100.0 | 5.4 | 0.4 | 13.7 | 10.0 | 25.2 | 6.3 | 3.7 | 35.2 | 0.1 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 7.3 | 0.6 | 15.4 | 17.1 | 24.7 | 9.6 | 4.0 | 21.1 | 0.1 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 2.9 | 0.2 | 11.6 | 0.8 | 25.9 | 1.9 | 3.2 | 53.4 | 0.0 |
| 2014 | Total | 100.0 | 5.6 | 0.4 | 13.4 | 9.9 | 25.6 | 6.1 | 3.6 | 35.2 | 0.1 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 7.5 | 0.6 | 14.9 | 17.2 | 25.3 | 9.4 | 3.9 | 21.1 | 0.1 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 3.2 | 0.2 | 11.5 | 0.8 | 26.0 | 1.9 | 3.2 | 53.2 | 0.0 |


| Year | Sex | Total | Agriculture, fishing and mining | Electricity, gas and waterworks | Manufacturing industry | Construction | Trade | Transportation, storage and communications | Financial establishments | Community, social and personal services | Unspecified activities |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chile ${ }^{\text {e/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Total | 100.0 | 13.9 | 0.6 | 13.3 | 8.0 | 19.2 | 8.2 | 8.7 | 28.2 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 18.7 | 0.7 | 15.1 | 11.7 | 15.5 | 10.4 | 8.4 | 19.5 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 4.8 | 0.3 | 10.0 | 0.9 | 26.0 | 4.1 | 9.3 | 44.5 | 0.0 |
| 2010 | Total | 100.0 | 13.4 | 0.8 | 11.3 | 8.0 | 24.5 | 7.3 | 8.0 | 26.5 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 18.4 | 1.2 | 13.0 | 12.5 | 21.1 | 10.1 | 7.7 | 16.1 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 5.6 | 0.3 | 8.6 | 0.9 | 30.0 | 3.0 | 8.6 | 43.0 | 0.0 |
| 2011 | Total | 100.0 | 13.2 | 0.8 | 11.5 | 8.1 | 24.3 | 7.2 | 8.2 | 26.6 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 18.2 | 1.1 | 13.4 | 12.8 | 20.5 | 10.2 | 7.9 | 15.9 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 5.6 | 0.3 | 8.6 | 1.0 | 30.0 | 2.8 | 8.8 | 42.9 | 0.0 |
| 2012 | Total | 100.0 | 13.3 | 0.7 | 11.6 | 8.3 | 23.4 | 7.3 | 8.1 | 27.4 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 18.4 | 1.0 | 13.5 | 13.0 | 19.5 | 10.4 | 7.9 | 16.4 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 5.6 | 0.3 | 8.7 | 1.2 | 29.2 | 2.8 | 8.4 | 44.0 | 0.0 |
| 2013 | Total | 100.0 | 12.7 | 0.7 | 11.3 | 8.7 | 23.9 | 7.4 | 8.5 | 26.9 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 17.7 | 0.9 | 13.3 | 13.6 | 20.1 | 10.2 | 8.0 | 16.2 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 5.2 | 0.3 | 8.4 | 1.4 | 29.5 | 3.2 | 9.2 | 42.8 | 0.0 |
| 2014 | Total | 100.0 | 12.4 | 0.7 | 11.4 | 8.4 | 20.1 | 7.3 | 11.9 | 27.8 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 17.5 | 1.0 | 13.3 | 13.4 | 17.5 | 10.1 | 10.4 | 16.8 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 5.0 | 0.4 | 8.6 | 1.2 | 23.8 | 3.2 | 14.0 | 43.7 | 0.0 |
| Colombia ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Total | 100.0 | 7.1 | 0.6 | 16.5 | 5.2 | 28.4 | 8.5 | 7.8 | 25.9 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 11.5 | 0.8 | 16.1 | 8.9 | 27.8 | 12.8 | 8.0 | 14.1 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 1.5 | 0.4 | 16.9 | 0.4 | 29.2 | 2.9 | 7.7 | 41.0 | 0.0 |
| 2010 | Total | 100.0 | 5.3 | 0.6 | 14.9 | 5.9 | 30.6 | 9.7 | 9.6 | 23.3 | 0.1 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 8.3 | 0.8 | 14.6 | 10.3 | 29.6 | 14.0 | 8.8 | 13.6 | 0.1 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 1.6 | 0.3 | 15.3 | 0.5 | 32.0 | 4.3 | 10.6 | 35.5 | 0.1 |
| 2011 | Total | 100.0 | 5.4 | 0.6 | 15.3 | 6.2 | 31.0 | 9.7 | 9.7 | 22.1 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 8.3 | 0.8 | 15.4 | 10.7 | 28.7 | 14.1 | 9.2 | 12.9 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 1.9 | 0.3 | 15.1 | 0.6 | 33.8 | 4.3 | 10.4 | 33.7 | 0.0 |
| 2012 | Total | 100.0 | 4.9 | 0.5 | 14.7 | 6.8 | 31.1 | 9.6 | 9.4 | 22.9 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 7.5 | 0.7 | 14.5 | 11.8 | 28.8 | 14.4 | 8.9 | 13.4 | 0.1 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 1.8 | 0.3 | 14.9 | 0.7 | 33.9 | 3.7 | 9.9 | 34.7 | 0.0 |
| 2013 | Total | 100.0 | 4.3 | 0.5 | 14.2 | 6.2 | 31.0 | 10.0 | 10.2 | 23.5 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 6.7 | 0.7 | 14.4 | 10.8 | 28.6 | 15.0 | 9.9 | 13.8 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 1.5 | 0.3 | 14.0 | 0.6 | 33.8 | 3.9 | 10.6 | 35.2 | 0.0 |
| 2014 | Total | 100.0 | 4.3 | 0.7 | 13.7 | 6.7 | 31.1 | 9.5 | 10.2 | 23.8 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 6.6 | 0.9 | 14.0 | 11.6 | 27.9 | 14.4 | 9.8 | 14.6 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 1.4 | 0.3 | 13.3 | 0.7 | 35.0 | 3.7 | 10.7 | 34.9 | 0.0 |


| Year | Sex | Total | Agriculture, fishing and mining | Electricity, gas and waterworks | Manufacturing industry | Construction | Trade | Transportation, storage and communications | Financial establishments | Community, social and personal services | Unspecified activities |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Costa Rica ${ }^{\text {b/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Total | 100.0 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 15.3 | 6.0 | 23.4 | 7.1 | 10.5 | 28.2 | 4.2 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 5.7 | 1.6 | 17.6 | 9.6 | 21.2 | 10.0 | 11.8 | 16.4 | 6.2 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 1.3 | 0.4 | 11.8 | 0.5 | 26.8 | 2.6 | 8.5 | 46.8 | 1.2 |
| 2010 | Total | 100.0 | 3.6 | 2.1 | 11.8 | 5.8 | 28.6 | 6.5 | 11.7 | 29.5 | 0.4 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 5.4 | 3.0 | 12.5 | 9.2 | 28.5 | 9.4 | 11.9 | 19.8 | 0.3 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 10.7 | 0.4 | 28.8 | 1.8 | 11.5 | 44.5 | 0.5 |
| 2011 | Total | 100.0 | 3.6 | 1.8 | 12.0 | 6.1 | 28.1 | 6.5 | 12.1 | 29.1 | 0.6 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 5.1 | 2.6 | 13.7 | 9.5 | 28.1 | 9.4 | 13.2 | 17.7 | 0.7 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 9.4 | 0.8 | 28.1 | 2.0 | 10.4 | 46.9 | 0.5 |
| 2012 | Total | 100.0 | 3.2 | 1.6 | 10.7 | 6.5 | 26.9 | 8.0 | 12.8 | 30.0 | 0.4 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 4.7 | 2.4 | 12.3 | 10.5 | 25.7 | 11.9 | 13.5 | 18.7 | 0.4 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 8.5 | 0.6 | 28.5 | 2.6 | 11.9 | 46.1 | 0.3 |
| 2013 | Total | 100.0 | 3.0 | 1.7 | 9.4 | 5.3 | 28.9 | 8.1 | 12.3 | 31.1 | 0.3 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 4.5 | 2.4 | 11.0 | 8.8 | 28.0 | 11.6 | 13.4 | 19.8 | 0.4 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 7.2 | 0.2 | 30.1 | 3.0 | 10.6 | 47.2 | 0.1 |
| 2014 | Total | 100.0 | 4.0 | 1.5 | 9.8 | 6.9 | 27.3 | 7.0 | 13.8 | 29.4 | 0.3 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 5.8 | 2.0 | 10.9 | 10.9 | 26.5 | 10.1 | 15.3 | 18.2 | 0.2 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 1.5 | 0.8 | 8.3 | 1.0 | 28.4 | 2.3 | 11.5 | 45.8 | 0.4 |
| Dominican Republic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Total | 100.0 | 5.0 | 0.9 | 16.5 | 6.4 | 30.4 | 7.8 | 6.1 | 26.7 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 7.6 | 1.0 | 18.0 | 9.9 | 30.0 | 11.1 | 6.0 | 16.3 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 14.1 | 0.5 | 31.1 | 2.3 | 6.3 | 44.2 | 0.0 |
| 2010 | Total | 100.0 | 5.4 | 1.2 | 11.9 | 6.4 | 30.2 | 8.1 | 7.3 | 29.4 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 8.3 | 1.3 | 14.2 | 10.3 | 30.7 | 12.2 | 6.7 | 16.4 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 8.4 | 0.6 | 29.6 | 1.9 | 8.3 | 49.2 | 0.0 |
| 2011 | Total | 100.0 | 5.4 | 1.0 | 11.4 | 6.6 | 30.5 | 8.0 | 7.9 | 29.3 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 8.4 | 1.3 | 13.4 | 10.6 | 30.5 | 12.2 | 7.6 | 16.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 8.4 | 0.8 | 30.5 | 1.9 | 8.3 | 48.8 | 0.0 |
| 2012 | Total | 100.0 | 4.9 | 1.4 | 11.3 | 6.6 | 30.8 | 8.0 | 7.4 | 29.7 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 7.6 | 1.6 | 12.7 | 10.8 | 31.2 | 12.3 | 7.1 | 16.7 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 9.2 | 0.4 | 30.1 | 1.8 | 8.0 | 48.7 | 0.0 |
| 2013 | Total | 100.0 | 4.7 | 1.0 | 11.0 | 5.9 | 30.4 | 8.4 | 8.3 | 30.3 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 7.4 | 1.3 | 12.9 | 9.5 | 31.1 | 12.1 | 8.2 | 17.4 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 8.1 | 0.4 | 29.4 | 2.7 | 8.5 | 49.6 | 0.0 |
| 2014 | Total | 100.0 | 5.3 | 1.0 | 10.6 | 6.8 | 30.1 | 8.4 | 7.3 | 30.5 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 7.9 | 1.1 | 12.0 | 10.8 | 30.5 | 12.6 | 7.8 | 17.3 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 1.6 | 0.8 | 8.4 | 0.9 | 29.6 | 2.3 | 6.4 | 50.0 | 0.0 |


| Year | Sex | Total | Agriculture, fishing and mining | Electricity, gas and waterworks | Manufacturing industry | Construction | Trade | Transportation, storage and communications | Financial establishments | Community, social and personal services | Unspecified activities |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ecuador ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Total | 100.0 | 8.6 | 0.5 | 13.8 | 6.6 | 33.1 | 7.2 | 6.5 | 23.6 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 11.3 | 0.7 | 15.3 | 10.6 | 27.8 | 10.5 | 7.3 | 15.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 4.3 | 0.2 | 11.1 | 0.6 | 38.8 | 2.3 | 5.2 | 36.1 | 0.0 |
| 2010 | Total | 100.0 | 7.6 | 0.7 | 13.6 | 7.3 | 32.6 | 7.7 | 7.4 | 23.2 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 10.3 | 0.8 | 15.3 | 11.8 | 27.0 | 11.5 | 8.3 | 15.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 3.8 | 0.4 | 11.1 | 0.8 | 40.6 | 2.3 | 6.2 | 34.8 | 0.0 |
| 2011 | Total | 100.0 | 8.1 | 0.6 | 13.2 | 6.7 | 34.1 | 8.1 | 7.7 | 21.5 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 11.2 | 0.8 | 14.1 | 10.8 | 28.0 | 11.8 | 8.2 | 15.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 3.7 | 0.3 | 11.8 | 0.9 | 42.9 | 2.8 | 6.9 | 30.8 | 0.0 |
| 2012 | Total | 100.0 | 7.6 | 0.6 | 12.9 | 6.9 | 33.9 | 8.0 | 8.6 | 21.6 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 10.3 | 0.8 | 14.1 | 11.0 | 27.3 | 12.2 | 9.5 | 14.8 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 3.9 | 0.3 | 11.3 | 1.0 | 43.1 | 2.2 | 7.3 | 30.9 | 0.0 |
| 2013 | Total | 100.0 | 7.8 | 0.6 | 13.3 | 8.1 | 30.1 | 8.4 | 8.2 | 23.5 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 10.4 | 0.7 | 14.4 | 13.0 | 24.6 | 12.1 | 8.2 | 16.6 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 3.9 | 0.4 | 11.7 | 0.9 | 38.1 | 3.0 | 8.2 | 33.8 | 0.0 |
| 2014 | Total | 100.0 | 9.0 | 0.6 | 12.6 | 7.6 | 31.2 | 8.7 | 7.2 | 23.2 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 11.7 | 0.7 | 14.4 | 12.5 | 24.6 | 12.5 | 7.8 | 15.8 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 5.0 | 0.3 | 10.1 | 0.5 | 40.7 | 3.1 | 6.4 | 34.0 | 0.0 |
| El Salvador ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Total | 100.0 | 5.9 | 0.3 | 19.1 | 5.6 | 31.2 | 5.7 | 6.2 | 22.2 | 3.6 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 9.7 | 0.5 | 17.8 | 10.4 | 22.2 | 9.6 | 7.5 | 16.1 | 6.2 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 1.7 | 0.1 | 20.5 | 0.3 | 41.4 | 1.5 | 4.6 | 29.1 | 0.7 |
| 2010 | Total | 100.0 | 7.3 | 0.5 | 18.0 | 5.3 | 34.7 | 5.3 | 6.9 | 22.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 12.3 | 0.9 | 17.7 | 9.7 | 27.2 | 8.8 | 8.3 | 15.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 1.8 | 0.2 | 18.2 | 0.5 | 42.9 | 1.3 | 5.3 | 29.7 | 0.0 |
| 2011 | Total | 100.0 | 7.7 | 0.6 | 17.9 | 5.1 | 34.3 | 5.6 | 7.3 | 21.4 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 12.5 | 1.0 | 17.5 | 9.2 | 26.9 | 9.1 | 8.8 | 14.9 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 2.1 | 0.2 | 18.4 | 0.4 | 42.9 | 1.5 | 5.6 | 28.9 | 0.0 |
| 2012 | Total | 100.0 | 7.3 | 0.5 | 18.0 | 5.1 | 34.5 | 5.4 | 6.9 | 22.3 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 12.2 | 0.8 | 18.2 | 9.3 | 26.9 | 8.6 | 8.3 | 15.8 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 1.9 | 0.3 | 17.7 | 0.3 | 43.1 | 1.7 | 5.4 | 29.7 | 0.0 |
| 2013 | Total | 100.0 | 6.8 | 0.5 | 16.7 | 5.2 | 35.3 | 4.7 | 7.7 | 23.2 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 11.5 | 0.9 | 16.5 | 9.7 | 27.6 | 7.9 | 9.5 | 16.5 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 1.5 | 0.1 | 16.9 | 0.3 | 43.8 | 1.1 | 5.7 | 30.6 | 0.0 |
| 2014 | Total | 100.0 | 6.2 | 0.7 | 17.0 | 5.2 | 36.0 | 5.2 | 6.8 | 22.9 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 10.5 | 1.0 | 16.5 | 9.6 | 28.6 | 8.4 | 8.6 | 16.7 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 1.4 | 0.2 | 17.6 | 0.3 | 44.2 | 1.6 | 4.9 | 29.8 | 0.0 |


| Year | Sex | Total | Agriculture, fishing and mining | Electricity, gas and waterworks | Manufacturing industry | Construction | Trade | Transportation, storage and communications | Financial establishments | Community, social and personal services | Unspecified activities |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Guatemala ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Total | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | $\cdots$ | ... |
|  | Men | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | $\ldots$ | ... |
|  | Women | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| 2010 | Total | 100.0 | 14.3 | 0.6 | 19.2 | 5.9 | 28.1 | 6.2 | 5.1 | 20.2 | 0.6 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 20.8 | 1.0 | 16.1 | 9.8 | 23.9 | 9.3 | 5.5 | 13.2 | 0.4 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 5.4 | 0.0 | 23.4 | 0.5 | 33.7 | 1.8 | 4.5 | 29.9 | 0.8 |
| 2011 | Total | 100.0 | 14.3 | 0.7 | 18.2 | 6.0 | 27.6 | 5.2 | 6.4 | 21.6 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 20.3 | 1.1 | 18.3 | 9.2 | 23.3 | 7.7 | 7.0 | 13.1 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 4.7 | 0.1 | 18.1 | 0.8 | 34.4 | 1.1 | 5.6 | 35.0 | 0.0 |
| 2012 | Total | 100.0 | 15.6 | 0.5 | 13.8 | 6.8 | 33.5 | 4.2 | 4.8 | 20.7 | 0.1 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 22.5 | 0.7 | 15.5 | 11.3 | 25.1 | 6.4 | 5.2 | 13.1 | 0.1 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 5.5 | 0.2 | 11.3 | 0.4 | 45.6 | 1.0 | 4.3 | 31.7 | 0.0 |
| 2013 | Total | 100.0 | 13.9 | 0.6 | 11.8 | 6.3 | 33.4 | 5.1 | 6.5 | 22.3 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 21.3 | 0.9 | 12.9 | 10.3 | 26.3 | 7.5 | 7.4 | 13.3 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 2.8 | 0.3 | 10.2 | 0.4 | 44.1 | 1.5 | 5.1 | 35.7 | 0.0 |
| 2014 | Total | 100.0 | 10.5 | 0.7 | 18.1 | 4.9 | 31.3 | 4.9 | 1.9 | 27.7 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 16.2 | 1.1 | 18.8 | 7.9 | 26.4 | 6.9 | 1.8 | 20.9 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 2.4 | 0.2 | 17.0 | 0.6 | 38.3 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 37.4 | 0.0 |
| Honduras |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Total | 100.0 | 7.9 | 0.6 | 21.1 | 7.0 | 30.8 | 5.2 | 4.8 | 22.5 | 0.1 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 13.2 | 1.0 | 18.9 | 12.6 | 26.7 | 8.6 | 5.2 | 13.8 | 0.1 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 1.7 | 0.2 | 23.9 | 0.2 | 35.7 | 1.2 | 4.3 | 32.8 | 0.0 |
| 2010 | Total | 100.0 | 8.1 | 0.7 | 17.1 | 7.2 | 32.4 | 5.8 | 6.4 | 21.7 | 0.6 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 13.4 | 1.1 | 15.7 | 12.7 | 27.6 | 9.2 | 6.8 | 13.1 | 0.5 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 1.6 | 0.3 | 18.9 | 0.5 | 38.4 | 1.6 | 5.8 | 32.2 | 0.6 |
| 2011 | Total | 100.0 | 7.2 | 0.7 | 19.0 | 6.8 | 32.7 | 4.9 | 5.5 | 23.1 | 0.1 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 12.0 | 1.0 | 17.9 | 11.7 | 29.1 | 7.5 | 5.9 | 14.8 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 20.4 | 0.5 | 37.3 | 1.5 | 4.9 | 33.6 | 0.3 |
| 2012 | Total | 100.0 | 8.7 | 0.7 | 19.0 | 7.1 | 32.0 | 5.7 | 5.4 | 21.3 | 0.1 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 14.6 | 1.0 | 16.0 | 12.3 | 27.4 | 9.0 | 6.1 | 13.6 | 0.1 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 22.7 | 0.6 | 37.8 | 1.5 | 4.5 | 31.2 | 0.2 |
| 2013 | Total | 100.0 | 8.6 | 0.8 | 17.0 | 6.9 | 34.2 | 5.2 | 5.5 | 21.6 | 0.1 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 14.7 | 1.1 | 15.3 | 12.3 | 28.7 | 8.4 | 6.3 | 13.1 | 0.1 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 1.3 | 0.4 | 19.0 | 0.4 | 41.0 | 1.4 | 4.5 | 31.9 | 0.1 |
| 2014 | Total | 100.0 | 8.1 | 0.7 | 18.7 | 6.4 | 33.3 | 4.9 | 5.7 | 21.7 | 0.3 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 13.2 | 1.1 | 17.2 | 10.9 | 29.9 | 7.9 | 6.3 | 13.1 | 0.4 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 1.7 | 0.3 | 20.6 | 0.7 | 37.6 | 0.9 | 5.1 | 32.7 | 0.3 |


| Year | Sex | Total | Agriculture, fishing and mining | Electricity, gas and waterworks | Manufacturing industry | Construction | Trade | Transportation, storage and communications | Financial establishments | Community, social and personal services | Unspecified activities |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mexico ${ }^{\text {k }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Total | 100.0 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 17.9 | 7.4 | 29.1 | 6.5 | 2.1 | 34.3 | 0.9 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 1.7 | 0.9 | 19.5 | 11.6 | 25.3 | 9.3 | 2.1 | 28.7 | 1.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 15.5 | 1.0 | 34.9 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 42.8 | 0.7 |
| 2010 | Total | 100.0 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 16.0 | 7.2 | 30.3 | 6.3 | 2.1 | 35.7 | 0.9 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 1.5 | 0.7 | 18.0 | 11.5 | 26.3 | 9.0 | 2.0 | 30.0 | 0.9 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 13.1 | 0.9 | 36.2 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 43.9 | 0.7 |
| 2011 | Total | 100.0 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 16.3 | 7.4 | 29.4 | 6.2 | 2.2 | 36.2 | 0.8 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 1.4 | 0.6 | 18.3 | 11.9 | 25.1 | 9.0 | 2.1 | 30.6 | 1.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 13.4 | 0.8 | 35.7 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 44.4 | 0.7 |
| 2012 | Total | 100.0 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 16.1 | 6.7 | 29.9 | 6.2 | 2.6 | 36.1 | 1.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 1.4 | 0.6 | 18.2 | 10.9 | 25.8 | 9.0 | 2.4 | 30.8 | 0.9 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 13.4 | 1.0 | 35.7 | 2.2 | 2.8 | 43.5 | 1.1 |
| 2013 | Total | 100.0 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 16.6 | 6.8 | 29.7 | 6.3 | 2.3 | 36.0 | 0.8 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 18.8 | 11.0 | 25.5 | 9.1 | 2.2 | 30.5 | 0.9 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 13.7 | 0.9 | 35.7 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 43.6 | 0.7 |
| 2014 | Total | 100.0 | 1.1 | 0.5 | 17.4 | 7.1 | 29.4 | 6.2 | 2.3 | 35.3 | 0.7 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 19.8 | 11.3 | 25.1 | 9.0 | 2.1 | 29.6 | 0.8 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 14.0 | 1.0 | 35.6 | 2.2 | 2.6 | 43.4 | 0.5 |
| Nicaragua ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Total | 100.0 | 6.4 | 0.6 | 19.3 | 5.7 | 30.1 | 5.6 | 5.0 | 27.2 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 10.6 | 0.8 | 19.2 | 10.2 | 25.6 | 9.2 | 6.1 | 18.3 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 1.3 | 0.3 | 19.6 | 0.3 | 35.6 | 1.1 | 3.6 | 38.2 | 0.0 |
| 2010 | Total | 100.0 | 8.6 | 0.8 | 15.5 | 5.2 | 34.2 | 5.5 | 4.7 | 25.3 | 0.2 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 14.6 | 1.2 | 14.9 | 9.7 | 27.6 | 9.4 | 6.0 | 16.6 | 0.1 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 1.7 | 0.3 | 16.1 | 0.2 | 41.9 | 1.1 | 3.2 | 35.3 | 0.2 |
| 2011 | Total | 100.0 | 8.6 | 0.7 | 14.7 | 5.6 | 36.5 | 5.2 | 4.7 | 24.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 14.9 | 1.0 | 14.6 | 10.5 | 28.3 | 8.9 | 6.3 | 15.5 | 0.1 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 1.8 | 0.3 | 14.9 | 0.2 | 45.4 | 1.2 | 3.1 | 33.3 | 0.0 |
| 2012 | Total | 100.0 | 8.5 | 0.5 | 14.6 | 5.8 | 37.1 | 5.3 | 4.6 | 23.5 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 14.2 | 0.7 | 14.3 | 11.0 | 29.1 | 9.2 | 6.2 | 15.1 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 2.4 | 0.2 | 15.0 | 0.2 | 45.7 | 1.1 | 2.8 | 32.6 | 0.0 |
| 2013 | Total | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
|  | Men | ... | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | ... |
|  | Women | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | ... | ... | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | ... |
| 2014 | Total | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | ... | ... |
|  | Men | ... | ... | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | ... |
|  | Women | ... | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | ... |


| Year | Sex | Total | Agriculture, fishing and mining | Electricity, gas and waterworks | Manufacturing industry | Construction | Trade | Transportation, storage and communications | Financial establishments | Community, social and personal services | Unspecified activities |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Panama |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Total | 100.0 | 2.6 | 0.8 | 9.0 | 8.7 | 28.6 | 9.3 | 9.7 | 31.5 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 4.2 | 1.0 | 10.7 | 14.0 | 27.6 | 13.5 | 9.1 | 19.8 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 6.5 | 0.9 | 30.0 | 3.2 | 10.5 | 48.3 | 0.0 |
| 2010 | Total | 100.0 | 2.1 | 0.6 | 8.3 | 10.8 | 26.9 | 9.9 | 10.6 | 30.8 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 3.4 | 0.6 | 9.9 | 17.7 | 24.9 | 14.3 | 9.9 | 19.4 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 6.1 | 1.0 | 29.7 | 3.7 | 11.7 | 47.1 | 0.0 |
| 2011 | Total | 100.0 | 2.4 | 1.3 | 6.9 | 11.7 | 26.9 | 9.9 | 11.8 | 29.1 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 3.7 | 1.5 | 8.2 | 18.9 | 24.8 | 13.8 | 11.1 | 17.9 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 5.1 | 1.9 | 29.7 | 4.5 | 12.9 | 44.2 | 0.0 |
| 2012 | Total | 100.0 | 2.4 | 0.9 | 6.6 | 11.5 | 27.1 | 10.3 | 11.8 | 29.4 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 3.7 | 1.1 | 7.9 | 18.6 | 25.0 | 14.8 | 11.2 | 17.7 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 4.8 | 2.0 | 29.9 | 4.3 | 12.5 | 45.2 | 0.0 |
| 2013 | Total | 100.0 | 2.2 | 1.2 | 7.2 | 12.7 | 26.8 | 10.7 | 11.2 | 28.1 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 3.3 | 1.5 | 8.3 | 20.3 | 24.4 | 15.3 | 10.0 | 16.8 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 5.7 | 2.2 | 30.0 | 4.4 | 12.8 | 43.6 | 0.0 |
| 2014 | Total | 100.0 | 2.4 | 1.1 | 7.2 | 13.0 | 26.4 | 9.5 | 12.0 | 28.4 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 3.7 | 1.4 | 8.2 | 21.1 | 23.6 | 13.8 | 11.5 | 16.7 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 5.9 | 2.3 | 30.1 | 3.7 | 12.8 | 43.8 | 0.0 |
| Paraguay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Total | 100.0 | 5.8 | 1.1 | 12.7 | 7.1 | 31.1 | 5.0 | 6.2 | 31.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 6.7 | 1.6 | 14.3 | 12.9 | 32.1 | 7.3 | 7.5 | 17.5 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 4.7 | 0.4 | 10.7 | 0.0 | 29.9 | 2.0 | 4.6 | 47.6 | 0.0 |
| 2010 | Total | 100.0 | 3.6 | 0.8 | 12.9 | 8.9 | 31.9 | 5.2 | 6.8 | 29.8 | 0.1 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 4.4 | 1.2 | 15.9 | 15.0 | 30.5 | 7.2 | 7.5 | 18.2 | 0.1 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 2.5 | 0.3 | 8.8 | 0.4 | 33.8 | 2.4 | 5.9 | 45.8 | 0.1 |
| 2011 | Total | 100.0 | 4.0 | 0.7 | 13.3 | 8.1 | 32.2 | 5.6 | 7.0 | 29.0 | 0.2 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 4.8 | 0.9 | 15.6 | 14.0 | 31.3 | 8.0 | 7.1 | 18.0 | 0.3 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 2.9 | 0.6 | 10.4 | 0.4 | 33.4 | 2.4 | 6.8 | 43.2 | 0.1 |
| 2012 | Total | 100.0 | 4.4 | 0.9 | 12.8 | 6.6 | 32.7 | 5.7 | 7.1 | 29.7 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 4.7 | 1.3 | 15.1 | 11.7 | 32.6 | 8.9 | 7.2 | 18.6 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 4.1 | 0.3 | 9.9 | 0.2 | 32.9 | 1.8 | 7.0 | 43.9 | 0.0 |
| 2013 | Total | 100.0 | 3.6 | 1.0 | 12.2 | 6.9 | 31.1 | 5.1 | 8.1 | 31.8 | 0.1 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 4.0 | 1.5 | 15.4 | 12.7 | 30.8 | 7.5 | 9.5 | 18.6 | 0.1 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 3.2 | 0.4 | 8.5 | 0.3 | 31.4 | 2.4 | 6.6 | 47.1 | 0.2 |
| 2014 | Total | 100.0 | 2.8 | 0.7 | 12.6 | 8.6 | 32.7 | 5.0 | 8.1 | 29.4 | 0.1 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 3.2 | 1.0 | 15.1 | 14.7 | 32.5 | 7.6 | 8.2 | 17.5 | 0.1 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 2.3 | 0.4 | 9.4 | 0.8 | 32.9 | 1.9 | 8.0 | 44.3 | 0.0 |


| Year | Sex | Total | Agriculture, fishing and mining | Electricity, gas and waterworks | Manufacturing industry | Construction | Trade | Transportation, storage and communications | Financial establishments | Community, social and personal services | Unspecified activities |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peru |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Total | 100.0 | 11.9 | 0.4 | 12.7 | 4.6 | 32.8 | 8.6 | 5.6 | 23.5 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 14.8 | 0.5 | 14.4 | 7.8 | 24.7 | 13.5 | 6.7 | 17.6 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 8.1 | 0.2 | 10.4 | 0.3 | 43.6 | 2.1 | 4.0 | 31.3 | 0.0 |
| 2010 | Total | 100.0 | 9.1 | 0.3 | 13.0 | 6.6 | 31.7 | 9.6 | 6.6 | 23.2 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 11.4 | 0.4 | 14.6 | 11.5 | 21.6 | 15.4 | 7.8 | 17.2 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 6.1 | 0.1 | 11.1 | 0.4 | 44.2 | 2.3 | 5.2 | 30.6 | 0.0 |
| 2011 | Total | 100.0 | 9.6 | 0.2 | 12.5 | 6.7 | 31.1 | 9.9 | 7.1 | 23.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 12.2 | 0.4 | 13.8 | 11.5 | 21.0 | 15.8 | 7.9 | 17.5 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 6.5 | 0.1 | 10.8 | 0.7 | 43.6 | 2.6 | 6.0 | 29.8 | 0.0 |
| 2012 | Total | 100.0 | 9.2 | 0.2 | 13.0 | 6.9 | 31.6 | 9.2 | 7.1 | 22.8 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 12.1 | 0.3 | 14.6 | 11.8 | 20.9 | 14.8 | 8.1 | 17.4 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 5.6 | 0.1 | 10.9 | 0.8 | 45.0 | 2.2 | 6.0 | 29.5 | 0.0 |
| 2013 | Total | 100.0 | 9.8 | 0.2 | 12.1 | 7.2 | 32.1 | 9.2 | 7.3 | 22.1 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 12.5 | 0.4 | 13.6 | 12.3 | 21.8 | 14.7 | 8.2 | 16.6 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 6.4 | 0.1 | 10.4 | 0.8 | 44.9 | 2.4 | 6.1 | 28.9 | 0.0 |
| 2014 | Total | 100.0 | 10.2 | 0.3 | 11.5 | 7.4 | 31.9 | 9.7 | 7.3 | 21.7 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 13.0 | 0.4 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 21.6 | 15.4 | 8.3 | 16.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 6.7 | 0.1 | 10.0 | 0.7 | 44.9 | 2.5 | 6.2 | 28.9 | 0.0 |
| Uruguay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Total | 100.0 | 4.7 | 0.9 | 13.9 | 6.7 | 22.6 | 5.5 | 9.8 | 35.8 | 0.1 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 7.2 | 1.1 | 15.7 | 11.8 | 24.3 | 7.9 | 10.7 | 21.3 | 0.1 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 1.6 | 0.5 | 11.7 | 0.3 | 20.6 | 2.6 | 8.6 | 54.1 | 0.1 |
| 2010 | Total | 100.0 | 5.1 | 0.9 | 13.8 | 7.5 | 23.2 | 5.8 | 9.5 | 34.1 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 7.9 | 1.2 | 16.3 | 13.4 | 23.6 | 8.5 | 9.9 | 19.2 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 1.9 | 0.6 | 11.0 | 0.6 | 22.8 | 2.7 | 8.9 | 51.5 | 0.0 |
| 2011 | Total | 100.0 | 4.4 | 0.9 | 13.6 | 7.6 | 23.0 | 6.3 | 9.8 | 34.4 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 6.7 | 1.3 | 16.1 | 13.6 | 23.5 | 9.2 | 10.0 | 19.6 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 1.7 | 0.5 | 10.6 | 0.7 | 22.4 | 2.8 | 9.5 | 51.8 | 0.0 |
| 2012 | Total | 100.0 | 4.3 | 1.0 | 12.4 | 8.0 | 22.9 | 7.1 | 9.4 | 35.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 6.6 | 1.3 | 15.0 | 14.2 | 22.8 | 10.5 | 9.1 | 20.5 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 1.6 | 0.6 | 9.3 | 0.8 | 23.2 | 3.1 | 9.7 | 51.8 | 0.0 |
| 2013 | Total | 100.0 | 4.1 | 1.0 | 12.5 | 8.2 | 22.5 | 7.4 | 10.0 | 34.3 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 6.2 | 1.3 | 15.3 | 14.5 | 22.5 | 10.8 | 9.5 | 19.9 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 9.1 | 0.7 | 22.5 | 3.4 | 10.6 | 51.6 | 0.0 |
| 2014 | Total | 100.0 | 3.9 | 0.9 | 11.9 | 8.4 | 22.7 | 7.6 | 10.3 | 34.4 | 0.0 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 5.9 | 1.2 | 14.5 | 14.8 | 23.0 | 11.0 | 9.6 | 19.9 | 0.0 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 8.8 | 0.8 | 22.3 | 3.5 | 11.0 | 51.6 | 0.0 |


| Year | Sex | Total | Agriculture, fishing and mining | Electricity, gas and waterworks | Manufacturing industry | Construction | Trade | Transportation, storage and communications | Financial establishments | Community, social and personal services | Unspecified activities |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Venezuela ${ }^{\text {m/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Total | 100.0 | 10.8 | 0.6 | 11.6 | 7.8 | 24.3 | 8.3 | 4.8 | 31.3 | 0.6 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 16.0 | 0.7 | 12.8 | 12.1 | 19.7 | 11.8 | 5.0 | 21.2 | 0.6 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 2.3 | 0.3 | 9.7 | 0.8 | 31.6 | 2.5 | 4.4 | 47.7 | 0.6 |
| 2010 | Total | 100.0 | 9.6 | 0.5 | 11.5 | 8.9 | 23.5 | 9.2 | 5.4 | 31.1 | 0.3 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 14.3 | 0.6 | 12.9 | 14.1 | 18.1 | 13.8 | 5.5 | 20.3 | 0.3 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 2.1 | 0.3 | 9.3 | 0.9 | 31.9 | 2.1 | 5.3 | 47.9 | 0.3 |
| 2011 | Total | 100.0 | 9.1 | 0.5 | 11.3 | 8.9 | 23.7 | 9.4 | 5.6 | 31.3 | 0.2 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 13.7 | 0.6 | 12.8 | 14.0 | 18.5 | 13.9 | 5.7 | 20.6 | 0.2 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 2.0 | 0.3 | 9.0 | 1.0 | 32.0 | 2.2 | 5.5 | 47.9 | 0.2 |
| 2012 | Total | 100.0 | 9.0 | 0.5 | 11.0 | 8.5 | 24.2 | 9.1 | 5.5 | 31.9 | 0.3 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 13.4 | 0.6 | 12.6 | 13.3 | 19.3 | 13.5 | 5.6 | 21.4 | 0.4 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 2.0 | 0.3 | 8.6 | 1.0 | 31.9 | 2.2 | 5.4 | 48.3 | 0.3 |
| 2013 | Total | 100.0 | 8.8 | 0.4 | 11.2 | 8.2 | 24.3 | 9.4 | 5.7 | 31.8 | 0.3 |
|  | Men | 100.0 | 13.0 | 0.5 | 12.9 | 12.7 | 19.6 | 13.9 | 5.7 | 21.3 | 0.3 |
|  | Women | 100.0 | 2.2 | 0.2 | 8.6 | 1.1 | 31.6 | 2.3 | 5.7 | 48.1 | 0.3 |
| 2014 | Total | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |
|  | Men | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | ... | ... |
|  | Women |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: ILO estimate based on information from the household surveys of the countries.

b/ For the calculation of the 2010 regional weighted average, Brazil was estimated based on the average of 2009 and 2011, given that the IBGE did not carry out the PNAD in 2010 .
c/ 31 urban areas. Data correspond to working age population of 14 years and above, with temporary coverage reported through the 4th quarter of each year. Beginning in 2011 , the classification by activity is based on the CAES -MERCOSUR 1.0. Not comparable with previous years.
d/ September data of each year. The PNAD was not carried out in 2010.
e/ National total. 2005 data source is the National Employment Survey (ENE); Source of data beginning in 2010 is the New National Employment Survey. Not comparable with previous years.
f/ 2005 data correspond to the 2 nd quarter of the Continuous Household Survey; beginning in 2010, data correspond to 2nd quarter, municipal capitals, of the Large Integrated Household Survel.
g/ Source of 2005 data is the Multi-purpose Household Survey; beginning in 2010, source of data is the Continuous Household Survey. Not comparable with previous years.
/ Data refer to 4th quarter of the Employment, Unemployment and Underemployment Survey. Beginning in 2010, working age is 15 years. Not comparable with previous years.
i/ 2005 data was for working age population of 10 years. Beginning in 2010, data is based on working age population of 16 years
j/ 2013 and 2014 data correspond to the average of the two ENEI surveys of those years.
k/ Data of the National Occupation and Employment Survey (ENOE). More urbanized area
I/ Source of 2005 data is the Household Survey to Measure Urban Employment. Beginning in 2010, the data source is the Continuous Household Survey. Data not comparable with previous years. 2011 data correspond to 3rd quarter only; 2012 data correspond to annual average.
$\mathrm{m} /$ National total. Annual average.
| TABLE 8. LATIN AMERICA: URBAN EMPLOYED POPULATION WITH HEALTH AND/OR PENSION COVERAGE, BY STATUS IN EMPLOYMENT AND SEX. 2005, 2010-2014² (Percentages)

| Country, Year and Sex |  |  | TOTAL | Employees |  |  |  | Non-employees |  |  | Domestic Work |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Total | Public | Private |  | Total | Employers | Ownaccount with Contributing Family Workers |  |
|  |  |  | Establishments with a maximum of five workers |  | Establishments with six or more workers |  |  |  |  |
| Latin America |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Health | TOTAL |  | 51.6 | 70.0 | 89.8 | 32.3 | 77.6 | 21.2 | 45.8 | 16.7 | 24.8 |
|  |  | Men | 51.5 | 66.7 | 89.1 | 27.8 | 76.8 | 21.0 | 44.0 | 15.8 | 33.9 |
|  |  | Women | 51.8 | 75.4 | 90.3 | 42.4 | 79.0 | 21.4 | 49.9 | 17.9 | 24.7 |
| $2010{ }^{\text {b }}$ |  | total | 57.5 | 75.4 | 93.4 | 38.1 | 82.9 | 25.7 | 47.3 | 21.7 | 29.5 |
|  |  | Men | 57.1 | 72.5 | 92.3 | 33.3 | 82.2 | 24.8 | 44.8 | 20.4 | 39.5 |
|  |  | Women | 58.1 | 80.0 | 94.3 | 47.5 | 84.1 | 26.8 | 53.0 | 23.3 | 29.4 |
| 2011 |  | TOTAL | 59.5 | 76.7 | 93.6 | 39.5 | 84.2 | 27.3 | 49.9 | 23.5 | 32.1 |
|  |  | Men | 58.8 | 73.9 | 92.9 | 34.8 | 83.4 | 25.9 | 47.8 | 21.7 | 45.0 |
|  |  | Women | 60.4 | 81.0 | 94.1 | 48.2 | 85.7 | 29.1 | 54.3 | 25.8 | 31.8 |
| 2012 |  | TOTAL | 59.7 | 76.9 | 92.8 | 39.0 | 84.5 | 27.6 | 49.3 | 23.5 | 32.4 |
|  |  | Men | 59.1 | 74.1 | 91.3 | 34.4 | 83.8 | 26.3 | 46.9 | 21.9 | 45.8 |
|  |  | Women | 60.7 | 81.0 | 94.0 | 47.7 | 85.6 | 29.3 | 54.7 | 25.6 | 32.2 |
| 2013 |  | TOTAL | 60.7 | 77.3 | 93.1 | 40.1 | 85.0 | 28.6 | 50.3 | 24.6 | 34.4 |
|  |  | Men | 59.9 | 74.5 | 91.6 | 35.7 | 84.2 | 27.5 | 48.1 | 23.0 | 42.4 |
|  |  | Women | 61.9 | 81.6 | 94.3 | 48.3 | 86.4 | 30.1 | 55.3 | 26.5 | 34.4 |
| 2014 |  | TOTAL | 61.3 | 78.1 | 93.5 | 39.9 | 85.8 | 29.2 | 51.1 | 25.4 | 35.2 |
|  |  | Men | 60.5 | 75.4 | 92.0 | 35.0 | 85.2 | 27.9 | 48.7 | 23.7 | 44.7 |
|  |  | Women | 62.4 | 82.1 | 94.6 | 48.8 | 86.7 | 31.0 | 56.1 | 27.7 | 35.2 |
| 2005 | Pensions ${ }^{\text {c/ }}$ | TOTAL | 49.6 | 67.7 | 87.2 | 29.5 | 75.5 | 21.8 | 43.0 | 18.1 | 21.9 |
|  |  | Men | 50.0 | 64.8 | 86.2 | 25.5 | 75.1 | 22.3 | 41.9 | 18.1 | 33.8 |
|  |  | Women | 49.2 | 72.4 | 88.0 | 38.4 | 76.1 | 21.2 | 44.5 | 18.3 | 21.7 |
| $2010{ }^{\text {b/ }}$ |  | TOTAL | 58.5 | 76.6 | 93.1 | 41.0 | 83.9 | 33.0 | 59.9 | 28.2 | 32.7 |
|  |  | Men | 59.5 | 74.8 | 91.9 | 37.6 | 84.0 | 34.2 | 59.8 | 28.8 | 46.5 |
|  |  | Women | 57.3 | 79.5 | 94.0 | 47.9 | 83.5 | 31.5 | 60.3 | 27.7 | 31.8 |
| 2011 |  | TOTAL | 60.1 | 77.7 | 93.4 | 42.5 | 84.8 | 33.7 | 61.9 | 29.1 | 33.9 |
|  |  | Men | 60.7 | 75.8 | 92.3 | 38.8 | 84.8 | 34.6 | 61.7 | 29.6 | 48.7 |
|  |  | Women | 59.3 | 80.5 | 94.2 | 49.6 | 84.9 | 32.7 | 62.6 | 29.0 | 32.9 |
| 2012 |  | TOTAL | 60.9 | 78.0 | 92.9 | 42.0 | 85.1 | 35.1 | 61.8 | 30.2 | 35.4 |
|  |  | Men | 61.2 | 75.9 | 90.8 | 38.1 | 85.0 | 35.9 | 61.6 | 30.5 | 56.4 |
|  |  | Women | 60.5 | 81.0 | 94.5 | 49.4 | 85.1 | 34.3 | 62.3 | 30.3 | 34.1 |






| Country, Year and Sex |  |  | TOTAL | Employees |  |  |  | Non-employees |  |  | Domestic Work |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Total | Public | Private |  | Total | Employers | Ownaccount with Contributing Family Workers |  |
|  |  |  | Establishments with a maximum of five workers |  | Establishments with six or more workers |  |  |  |  |
| Colombia ${ }^{\text {// }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Health | TOTAL |  | 45.9 | 70.6 | 99.7 | 31.8 | 79.0 | 21.2 | 29.0 | 20.1 | 32.1 |
|  |  | Men | 42.1 | 65.8 | 99.4 | 26.0 | 76.1 | 17.1 | 26.0 | 15.5 | 36.7 |
|  |  | Women | 50.7 | 77.6 | 99.9 | 42.2 | 83.2 | 27.2 | 37.5 | 26.3 | 31.9 |
|  | Pensions | TOTAL | 35.2 | 60.3 | 98.6 | 14.3 | 69.2 | 11.0 | 22.4 | 9.4 | 14.5 |
|  |  | Men | 34.6 | 56.0 | 97.4 | 11.6 | 66.6 | 12.0 | 23.4 | 10.0 | 28.9 |
|  |  | Women | 36.0 | 66.4 | 99.8 | 19.3 | 72.8 | 9.5 | 19.7 | 8.7 | 14.0 |
|  | Health and/or Pensions | TOTAL | 49.5 | 71.7 | 99.7 | 32.6 | 80.4 | 27.7 | 41.1 | 25.9 | 32.9 |
|  |  | Men | 46.2 | 67.1 | 99.5 | 27.0 | 77.8 | 24.2 | 38.8 | 21.6 | 41.1 |
|  |  | Women | 53.6 | 78.3 | 99.9 | 42.9 | 84.2 | 32.9 | 47.7 | 31.6 | 32.6 |
| 2010 | Health | TOTAL | 47.6 | 74.8 | 96.7 | 31.5 | 86.3 | 24.4 | 33.5 | 23.5 | 29.0 |
|  |  | Men | 45.5 | 73.1 | 97.1 | 27.5 | 85.8 | 20.1 | 29.4 | 18.8 | 43.0 |
|  |  | Women | 50.3 | 77.2 | 96.2 | 37.4 | 87.1 | 30.2 | 44.8 | 29.3 | 28.6 |
|  | Pensions | TOTAL | 38.2 | 68.3 | 96.7 | 18.1 | 81.1 | 12.8 | 23.4 | 11.7 | 14.0 |
|  |  | Men | 39.3 | 67.5 | 96.5 | 17.6 | 81.0 | 13.4 | 25.4 | 11.7 | 22.5 |
|  |  | Women | 36.9 | 69.5 | 96.9 | 18.9 | 81.3 | 12.1 | 17.9 | 11.7 | 13.7 |
|  | Health and/or Pensions | TOTAL | 52.3 | 76.2 | 98.4 | 33.4 | 87.5 | 32.4 | 47.8 | 30.8 | 30.1 |
|  |  | Men | 50.5 | 74.6 | 98.4 | 29.9 | 87.0 | 28.4 | 45.1 | 26.1 | 43.2 |
|  |  | Women | 54.6 | 78.5 | 98.5 | 38.7 | 88.1 | 37.7 | 55.2 | 36.6 | 29.7 |
| 2011 | Health | TOTAL | 48.1 | 75.2 | 97.4 | 31.8 | 87.0 | 25.1 | 34.4 | 24.1 | 29.1 |
|  |  | Men | 46.1 | 73.8 | 97.9 | 28.8 | 86.3 | 19.9 | 31.5 | 18.2 | 54.2 |
|  |  | Women | 50.7 | 77.2 | 96.8 | 36.2 | 88.0 | 31.9 | 42.1 | 31.2 | 27.9 |
|  | Pensions | TOTAL | 37.9 | 67.9 | 97.6 | 17.0 | 81.1 | 12.6 | 21.5 | 11.6 | 14.3 |
|  |  | Men | 39.6 | 67.5 | 97.2 | 16.8 | 81.0 | 13.4 | 21.7 | 12.2 | 31.7 |
|  |  | Women | 35.8 | 68.6 | 98.1 | 17.2 | 81.3 | 11.5 | 21.0 | 10.9 | 13.4 |
|  | Health and/or Pensions | TOTAL | 52.6 | 76.4 | 99.6 | 33.2 | 87.9 | 32.8 | 47.8 | 31.2 | 30.5 |
|  |  | Men | 50.8 | 74.9 | 99.6 | 30.1 | 87.2 | 28.0 | 45.3 | 25.5 | 54.5 |
|  |  | Women | 54.9 | 78.5 | 99.5 | 37.7 | 89.0 | 39.0 | 54.4 | 38.0 | 29.3 |
| 2012 | Health | TOTAL | 46.1 | 74.8 | 94.8 | 31.7 | 86.3 | 21.1 | 26.5 | 20.5 | 28.3 |
|  |  | Men | 44.4 | 73.1 | 95.4 | 29.3 | 85.5 | 16.7 | 23.9 | 15.7 | 52.4 |
|  |  | Women | 48.3 | 77.2 | 94.1 | 35.4 | 87.6 | 26.8 | 33.2 | 26.4 | 27.3 |
|  | Pensions | TOTAL | 38.9 | 69.1 | 97.6 | 18.2 | 82.0 | 12.9 | 21.2 | 11.9 | 14.5 |
|  |  | Men | 40.5 | 67.8 | 96.2 | 18.0 | 81.5 | 14.0 | 22.0 | 12.8 | 56.9 |
|  |  | Women | 36.9 | 71.0 | 99.1 | 18.7 | 82.6 | 11.4 | 19.2 | 10.9 | 12.9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




| Country, Year and Sex |  |  | TOTAL | Employees |  |  |  | Non-employees |  |  | Domestic Work |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Total | Public | Private |  | Total | Employers | Own- <br> account with Contributing Family Workers |  |
|  |  |  | Establishments with a maximum of five workers |  | Establishments with six or more workers |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | Health | TOTAL |  | 87.1 | 91.1 | 99.4 | 72.4 | 93.9 | 77.8 | 90.0 | 74.7 | 76.2 |
|  |  | Men | 84.8 | 88.5 | 99.3 | 66.4 | 92.3 | 73.4 | 89.4 | 68.7 | 80.2 |
|  |  | Women | 90.3 | 95.3 | 99.5 | 83.0 | 97.1 | 85.5 | 91.4 | 84.4 | 75.9 |
|  | Pensions | TOTAL | 87.1 | 91.1 | 99.4 | 72.4 | 93.9 | 77.8 | 90.0 | 74.7 | 76.2 |
|  |  | Men | 84.8 | 88.5 | 99.3 | 66.4 | 92.3 | 73.4 | 89.4 | 68.7 | 80.2 |
|  |  | Women | 90.3 | 95.3 | 99.5 | 83.0 | 97.1 | 85.5 | 91.4 | 84.4 | 75.9 |
|  | Health and/or Pensions | TOTAL | 87.1 | 91.1 | 99.4 | 72.4 | 93.9 | 77.8 | 90.0 | 74.7 | 76.2 |
|  |  | Men | 84.8 | 88.5 | 99.3 | 66.4 | 92.3 | 73.4 | 89.4 | 68.7 | 80.2 |
|  |  | Women | 90.3 | 95.3 | 99.5 | 83.0 | 97.1 | 85.5 | 91.4 | 84.4 | 75.9 |
| Ecuador ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Health | TOTAL | 29.3 | 45.4 | 93.3 | 13.7 | 46.9 | 9.2 | 18.0 | 7.5 | 13.3 |
|  |  | Men | 29.2 | 41.2 | 94.5 | 11.2 | 44.0 | 10.1 | 17.9 | 8.1 | 16.1 |
|  |  | Women | 29.4 | 54.0 | 91.8 | 20.2 | 53.0 | 8.1 | 18.2 | 6.9 | 13.0 |
|  | Health and/or Pensions | TOTAL | 29.3 | 45.4 | 93.3 | 13.7 | 46.9 | 9.2 | 18.0 | 7.5 | 13.3 |
|  |  | Men | 29.2 | 41.2 | 94.5 | 11.2 | 44.0 | 10.1 | 17.9 | 8.1 | 16.1 |
|  |  | Women | 29.4 | 54.0 | 91.8 | 20.2 | 53.0 | 8.1 | 18.2 | 6.9 | 13.0 |
| 2010 | Health | TOTAL | 41.2 | 59.3 | 92.9 | 18.2 | 67.6 | 15.9 | 37.8 | 13.3 | 24.4 |
|  |  | Men | 40.1 | 53.7 | 93.5 | 14.0 | 63.8 | 16.7 | 37.7 | 12.9 | 16.4 |
|  |  | Women | 42.7 | 69.7 | 92.2 | 28.6 | 75.1 | 15.0 | 38.3 | 13.7 | 24.7 |
|  | Health and/or Pensions | TOTAL | 41.2 | 59.3 | 92.9 | 18.2 | 67.6 | 15.9 | 37.8 | 13.3 | 24.4 |
|  |  | Men | 40.1 | 53.7 | 93.5 | 14.0 | 63.8 | 16.7 | 37.7 | 12.9 | 16.4 |
|  |  | Women | 42.7 | 69.7 | 92.2 | 28.6 | 75.1 | 15.0 | 38.3 | 13.7 | 24.7 |
| 2011 | Health | TOTAL | 47.5 | 67.4 | 96.0 | 25.6 | 75.1 | 20.7 | 36.8 | 19.1 | 47.4 |
|  |  | Men | 46.4 | 62.8 | 98.2 | 21.8 | 71.3 | 19.9 | 38.0 | 17.4 | 63.7 |
|  |  | Women | 49.1 | 76.0 | 93.3 | 34.9 | 82.7 | 21.6 | 33.0 | 21.1 | 46.5 |
|  | Health and/or Pensions | TOTAL | 47.5 | 67.4 | 96.0 | 25.6 | 75.1 | 20.7 | 36.8 | 19.1 | 47.4 |
|  |  | Men | 46.4 | 62.8 | 98.2 | 21.8 | 71.3 | 19.9 | 38.0 | 17.4 | 63.7 |
|  |  | Women | 49.1 | 76.0 | 93.3 | 34.9 | 82.7 | 21.6 | 33.0 | 21.1 | 46.5 |
| 2012 | Health | TOTAL | 50.9 | 70.4 | 97.4 | 28.9 | 78.5 | 24.3 | 47.4 | 21.7 | 45.8 |
|  |  | Men | 49.5 | 65.1 | 97.8 | 22.4 | 75.5 | 24.1 | 45.3 | 20.6 | 59.7 |
|  |  | Women | 53.0 | 79.7 | 97.1 | 44.8 | 83.8 | 24.7 | 53.4 | 22.9 | 44.8 |



| Country, Year and Sex |  |  | total | Employes |  |  |  | Non-employees |  |  | Domestic Work |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Total | Public | Private |  | Total | Employers | $\begin{gathered} \text { Own- } \\ \text { account with } \\ \text { cantributin } \\ \text { Family Workers } \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  |  |  | Establishments with a maximum of five workers |  | stablishments with six or more workers |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 | Health | Total |  | 42.2 | 62.0 | 93.4 | 14.3 | 75.0 | 15.1 | 32.2 | 12.9 | 12.3 |
|  |  | Men | 42.3 | 56.1 | 93.1 | 9.6 | 70.8 | 12.5 | 29.6 | 9.1 | 25.7 |
|  |  | Women | 42.1 | 71.7 | 93.8 | 24.5 | 82.1 | 17.2 | 36.4 | 15.6 | 10.8 |
|  | Health and/or <br> Pensions | total | 42.2 | 62.0 | 93.4 | 14.3 | 75.0 | 15.1 | 32.2 | 12.9 | 12.3 |
|  |  | Men | 42.3 | 56.1 | 93.1 | 9.6 | 70.8 | 12.5 | 29.6 | 9.1 | 25.7 |
|  |  | Women | 42.1 | 71.7 | 93.8 | 24.5 | 82.1 | 17.2 | 36.4 | 15.6 | 10.8 |
| 2013 | Health | total | 44.7 | 64.7 | 93.4 | 15.8 | 77.1 | 17.6 | 34.8 | 15.3 | 13.5 |
|  |  | Men | 45.6 | 59.1 | 92.2 | 10.4 | 72.9 | 15.4 | 33.6 | 11.3 | 30.4 |
|  |  | Women | 43.7 | 73.9 | 94.8 | 26.5 | 84.4 | 19.3 | 37.2 | 17.9 | 12.0 |
|  | Health and/or <br> Pensions | total | 44.7 | 64.7 | ${ }^{93.4}$ | 15.8 | 77.1 | 17.6 | 34.8 | 15.3 | 13.5 |
|  |  | Men | 45.6 | 59.1 | 92.2 | 10.4 | 72.9 | 15.4 | 33.6 | 11.3 | 30.4 |
|  |  | Women | 43.7 | 73.9 | 94.8 | 26.5 | 84.4 | 19.3 | 37.2 | 17.9 | 12.0 |
| 2014 | Health | total | 44.7 | 63.9 | 94.3 | 15.9 | 76.1 | 16.4 | 29.3 | 14.6 | 11.3 |
|  |  | Men | 46.1 | 59.2 | 94.7 | 11.6 | 72.4 | 14.9 | 32.7 | 11.1 | 30.0 |
|  |  | Women | 43.3 | 71.5 | 94.0 | 23.9 | 82.2 | 17.6 | 23.8 | 17.1 | 9.9 |
|  | Health and/or Pensions | Total | 44.7 | 63.9 | 94.3 | 15.9 | 76.1 | 16.4 | 29.3 | 14.6 | 11.3 |
|  |  | Men | 46.1 | 59.2 | 94.7 | 11.6 | 72.4 | 14.9 | 32.7 | 11.1 | 30.0 |
|  |  | Women | 43.3 | 71.5 | 94.0 | 23.9 | 82.2 | 17.6 | 23.8 | 17.1 | 9.9 |
| Mexico ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Health | total | 47.8 | 68.3 | 93.7 | 17.8 | 76.8 | ... | ... | ... | 7.8 |
|  |  | Men | 48.2 | 65.7 | 93.9 | 15.0 | 77.0 | ... | ... | , | 18.6 |
|  |  | Women | 47.4 | 72.9 | 93.4 | 24.7 | 76.5 | ... | ... | ... | 6.6 |
|  | Pensions | total | 42.4 | 61.2 | 84.2 | 13.8 | 69.4 | ... | ... | ... | 1.9 |
|  |  | Men | 42.7 | 58.5 | 83.5 | 11.2 | 69.4 |  |  |  | 13.8 |
|  |  | Women | 41.9 | 65.9 | 84.9 | 20.4 | 69.4 | ... | ... | ... | 0.7 |
|  | Health and/or Pensions | Total | 49.1 | 69.4 | 94.4 | 18.8 | 78.1 | ... | ... | ... | 8.0 |
|  |  | Men | 49.6 | 66.8 | 94.6 | 16.0 | 78.2 | ... | ... | ... | 20.5 |
|  |  | Women | 48.3 | 74.0 | 94.1 | 25.6 | 78.0 | ... | ... | ... | 6.7 |
| 2010 | Health | total | 46.2 | 67.1 | 92.4 | 16.1 | 77.3 | ... | ... | ... | 6.4 |
|  |  | Men | 46.7 | 64.1 | 92.7 | 12.8 | 76.8 |  |  |  | 13.0 |
|  |  | Women | 45.6 | 72.0 | 92.2 | 23.4 | 78.2 | - | ... | ... | 5.6 |
|  | Pensions | total | 46.2 | 67.1 | 92.4 | 16.1 | 77.3 | ... | ... | ... | 6.4 |





| Country, Year and Sex |  |  | TOTAL | Employees |  |  |  | Non-employees |  |  | Domestic Work |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Total | Public | Private |  | Total | Employers | Ownaccount with Contributing Family Workers |  |
|  |  |  | Establishments with a maximum of five workers |  | Establishments with six or more workers |  |  |  |  |
|  | Pensions | TOTAL |  | 26.6 | 44.6 | 80.9 | 13.2 | 45.8 | 1.0 | 3.6 | 0.5 | 0.1 |
|  |  | Men | 26.6 | 39.5 | 79.3 | 12.3 | 42.4 | 0.6 | 1.7 | 0.3 | 0.0 |
|  |  | Women | 26.5 | 53.7 | 82.6 | 15.2 | 52.8 | 1.5 | 9.5 | 0.7 | 0.1 |
|  | Health and/or Pensions | TOTAL | 40.0 | 52.5 | 86.5 | 22.3 | 54.2 | 23.2 | 33.5 | 20.9 | 17.3 |
|  |  | Men | 36.7 | 45.3 | 82.8 | 18.8 | 48.5 | 19.0 | 29.9 | 15.3 | 22.7 |
|  |  | Women | 44.3 | 65.4 | 90.1 | 30.6 | 65.7 | 28.1 | 45.0 | 26.3 | 16.8 |
| 2012 | Health | TOTAL | 40.3 | 52.4 | 76.5 | 20.3 | 58.1 | 26.3 | 41.5 | 22.5 | 13.4 |
|  |  | Men | 38.4 | 46.7 | 74.0 | 15.6 | 53.9 | 21.6 | 32.4 | 17.7 | 20.1 |
|  |  | Women | 42.8 | 62.3 | 79.1 | 30.5 | 66.8 | 31.6 | 63.4 | 27.0 | 12.8 |
|  | Pensions | TOTAL | 26.8 | 45.2 | 77.7 | 12.5 | 47.3 | 1.7 | 5.9 | 0.6 | 3.1 |
|  |  | Men | 28.1 | 41.4 | 78.1 | 9.6 | 45.5 | 1.8 | 4.5 | 0.8 | 14.0 |
|  |  | Women | 25.1 | 51.9 | 77.3 | 18.7 | 51.0 | 1.5 | 9.2 | 0.4 | 2.1 |
|  | Health and/or Pensions | TOTAL | 41.8 | 55.0 | 84.5 | 21.0 | 59.2 | 26.4 | 41.5 | 22.6 | 14.0 |
|  |  | Men | 39.9 | 49.0 | 83.3 | 15.8 | 54.7 | 21.7 | 32.4 | 17.8 | 27.9 |
|  |  | Women | 44.3 | 65.6 | 85.8 | 32.3 | 68.4 | 31.6 | 63.4 | 27.1 | 12.8 |
| 2013 | Health | TOTAL | 42.2 | 55.9 | 81.5 | 21.2 | 59.0 | 23.7 | 34.8 | 20.4 | 21.5 |
|  |  | Men | 40.0 | 50.6 | 80.8 | 18.4 | 56.2 | 19.0 | 28.3 | 14.9 | 27.8 |
|  |  | Women | 44.8 | 64.1 | 82.1 | 27.6 | 64.1 | 28.8 | 50.2 | 25.3 | 21.2 |
|  | Pensions | TOTAL | 29.3 | 49.8 | 84.9 | 10.5 | 49.7 | 1.9 | 5.1 | 1.0 | 1.9 |
|  |  | Men | 30.6 | 45.2 | 83.6 | 9.8 | 49.1 | 2.9 | 5.4 | 1.7 | 11.9 |
|  |  | Women | 27.9 | 56.9 | 86.0 | 12.0 | 50.8 | 0.9 | 4.2 | 0.4 | 1.4 |
|  | Health and/or Pensions | TOTAL | 43.5 | 58.2 | 89.0 | 21.2 | 59.4 | 23.8 | 34.9 | 20.5 | 21.5 |
|  |  | Men | 41.1 | 52.4 | 88.2 | 18.4 | 56.5 | 19.2 | 28.4 | 15.2 | 27.8 |
|  |  | Women | 46.2 | 67.2 | 89.7 | 27.6 | 64.6 | 28.9 | 50.2 | 25.3 | 21.2 |
| 2014 | Health | TOTAL | 40.7 | 51.6 | 76.7 | 19.9 | 56.9 | 25.2 | 41.6 | 20.5 | 15.5 |
|  |  | Men | 38.5 | 45.2 | 75.1 | 14.0 | 53.2 | 21.5 | 35.9 | 15.9 | 9.4 |
|  |  | Women | 43.5 | 62.6 | 78.3 | 34.7 | 64.0 | 29.5 | 54.1 | 25.1 | 15.8 |
|  | Pensions | TOTAL | 28.5 | 46.0 | 83.0 | 12.2 | 47.0 | 1.4 | 2.8 | 1.0 | 2.5 |
|  |  | Men | 29.2 | 41.2 | 82.0 | 9.3 | 45.8 | 1.6 | 3.2 | 1.0 | 6.1 |
|  |  | Women | 27.5 | 54.4 | 83.9 | 19.4 | 49.4 | 1.1 | 1.9 | 0.9 | 2.3 |
|  | Health and/or Pensions | TOTAL | 42.4 | 54.5 | 88.2 | 19.9 | 57.4 | 25.2 | 41.6 | 20.5 | 15.5 |
|  |  | Men | 40.0 | 47.6 | 86.9 | 14.0 | 53.8 | 21.5 | 35.9 | 15.9 | 9.4 |
|  |  | Women | 45.3 | 66.4 | 89.5 | 34.7 | 64.4 | 29.6 | 54.1 | 25.1 | 15.8 |


| Country, Year and Sex |  |  | TOTAL | Employees |  |  |  | Non-employees |  |  | Domestic Work |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Total | Public | Private |  | Total | Employers | Ownaccount with Contributing Family Workers |  |
|  |  |  | Establishments with a maximum of five workers |  | Establishments with six or more workers |  |  |  |  |
| Peru ${ }^{\text {m }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Health | TOTAL |  | 29.7 | 42.7 | 76.1 | 9.6 | 46.7 | 17.7 | 24.1 | 16.7 | 16.1 |
|  |  | Men | 29.5 | 41.7 | 78.8 | 9.3 | 47.1 | 13.5 | 21.7 | 11.7 | 24.0 |
|  |  | Women | 29.8 | 44.8 | 72.7 | 10.5 | 45.7 | 22.2 | 30.8 | 21.5 | 15.5 |
|  | Pensions | total | 26.7 | 42.8 | 73.4 | 11.9 | 46.7 | 11.9 | 22.2 | 10.4 | 9.4 |
|  |  | Men | 32.7 | 44.3 | 77.7 | 14.2 | 49.7 | 17.4 | 24.4 | 16.0 | 29.6 |
|  |  | Women | 18.7 | 39.8 | 67.9 | 6.4 | 40.2 | 5.9 | 16.0 | 5.2 | 8.1 |
|  | Health and/or Pensions | TOTAL | 36.6 | 50.2 | 80.7 | 17.9 | 55.0 | 24.3 | 33.5 | 22.9 | 20.2 |
|  |  | Men | 39.3 | 50.8 | 84.6 | 19.7 | 56.5 | 24.0 | 32.6 | 22.2 | 42.7 |
|  |  | Women | 33.1 | 49.2 | 75.8 | 13.5 | 51.6 | 24.5 | 36.0 | 23.7 | 18.7 |
| 2010 | Health | TOTAL | 53.8 | 63.9 | 88.3 | 37.5 | 66.5 | 43.6 | 38.9 | 44.4 | 41.1 |
|  |  | Men | 51.5 | 62.1 | 87.4 | 33.2 | 66.5 | 36.6 | 35.9 | 36.8 | 54.5 |
|  |  | Women | 56.7 | 67.2 | 89.4 | 44.9 | 66.7 | 50.8 | 47.2 | 51.0 | 40.4 |
|  | Pensions | TOTAL | 37.7 | 55.2 | 84.4 | 19.0 | 60.6 | 20.4 | 31.5 | 18.6 | 10.2 |
|  |  | Men | 46.1 | 57.8 | 87.1 | 21.4 | 64.3 | 29.7 | 37.4 | 27.9 | 22.8 |
|  |  | Women | 27.3 | 50.7 | 81.0 | 14.6 | 53.0 | 10.8 | 15.6 | 10.4 | 9.6 |
|  | Health and/or Pensions | TOTAL | 62.4 | 71.7 | 93.1 | 46.3 | 75.0 | 53.6 | 52.7 | 53.7 | 45.4 |
|  |  | Men | 63.3 | 71.2 | 93.4 | 44.2 | 75.8 | 52.3 | 53.4 | 52.0 | 55.4 |
|  |  | Women | 61.4 | 72.6 | 92.8 | 50.1 | 73.4 | 55.0 | 50.8 | 55.3 | 44.9 |
| 2011 | Health | total | 55.5 | 65.4 | 89.0 | 37.7 | 68.8 | 44.4 | 43.8 | 44.5 | 49.2 |
|  |  | Men | 52.7 | 63.5 | 90.0 | 35.2 | 67.3 | 37.4 | 39.7 | 36.9 | 57.9 |
|  |  | Women | 59.0 | 68.5 | 87.9 | 41.7 | 71.6 | 51.8 | 55.4 | 51.5 | 48.8 |
|  | Pensions | total | 38.7 | 57.3 | 85.7 | 18.6 | 64.0 | 18.9 | 31.9 | 17.0 | 10.0 |
|  |  | Men | 45.5 | 58.4 | 88.6 | 20.4 | 65.4 | 27.3 | 34.5 | 25.8 | 38.4 |
|  |  | Women | 30.2 | 55.6 | 82.4 | 15.7 | 61.4 | 10.0 | 24.7 | 9.0 | 8.6 |
|  | Health and/or Pensions | TOTAL | 63.8 | 73.4 | 93.2 | 46.7 | 77.9 | 53.5 | 56.2 | 53.1 | 52.0 |
|  |  | Men | 64.0 | 72.8 | 94.5 | 46.2 | 77.4 | 51.7 | 54.1 | 51.2 | 75.5 |
|  |  | Women | 63.5 | 74.5 | 91.6 | 47.5 | 78.9 | 55.3 | 62.3 | 54.8 | 50.9 |
| 2012 | Health | TOTAL | 55.2 | 66.2 | 89.0 | 35.6 | 70.9 | 42.6 | 44.9 | 42.2 | 45.8 |
|  |  | Men | 53.1 | 64.6 | 88.6 | 31.7 | 70.8 | 36.4 | 42.7 | 35.0 | 39.9 |
|  |  | Women | 57.9 | 69.0 | 89.5 | 42.4 | 71.0 | 49.0 | 50.9 | 48.9 | 46.1 |
|  | Pensions | TOTAL | 40.6 | 58.9 | 87.1 | 18.7 | 65.8 | 20.2 | 33.1 | 18.3 | 12.4 |
|  |  | Men | 47.4 | 60.5 | 88.3 | 20.1 | 68.8 | 28.3 | 37.7 | 26.1 | 25.9 |
|  |  | Women | 32.0 | 56.4 | 85.6 | 16.2 | 60.3 | 11.8 | 20.3 | 11.1 | 11.6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (continues... |


| Country, Year and Sex |  |  | TOTAL | Employees |  |  |  | Non-employees |  |  | Domestic Work |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Total | Public | Private |  | Total | Employers | Ownaccount with Contributing Family Workers |  |
|  |  |  | Establishments with a maximum of five workers |  | Establishments with six or more workers |  |  |  |  |
|  | Health and/or Pensions | TOTAL |  | 63.5 | 74.1 | 94.2 | 44.8 | 79.2 | 51.7 | 56.2 | 51.0 | 50.5 |
|  |  | Men | 63.8 | 73.4 | 94.5 | 42.0 | 80.0 | 49.9 | 55.8 | 48.5 | 50.0 |
|  |  | Women | 63.2 | 75.2 | 94.0 | 49.7 | 77.7 | 53.6 | 57.4 | 53.3 | 50.5 |
| 2013 | Health | TOTAL | 59.2 | 68.6 | 90.4 | 43.1 | 72.4 | 47.4 | 45.9 | 47.6 | 53.0 |
|  |  | Men | 56.8 | 66.7 | 90.4 | 39.5 | 71.5 | 40.9 | 42.2 | 40.7 | 51.7 |
|  |  | Women | 62.1 | 71.8 | 90.4 | 49.2 | 74.0 | 54.0 | 55.3 | 53.9 | 53.0 |
|  | Pensions | TOTAL | 40.5 | 58.5 | 88.5 | 19.4 | 65.6 | 19.3 | 33.3 | 17.4 | 14.5 |
|  |  | Men | 47.4 | 60.1 | 89.8 | 22.5 | 67.8 | 26.9 | 37.9 | 24.7 | 32.1 |
|  |  | Women | 32.1 | 55.8 | 86.9 | 14.2 | 61.3 | 11.6 | 21.8 | 10.9 | 13.7 |
|  | Health and/or Pensions | TOTAL | 66.7 | 75.8 | 95.0 | 52.1 | 79.6 | 55.8 | 58.6 | 55.5 | 56.3 |
|  |  | Men | 66.9 | 75.2 | 95.9 | 50.7 | 79.7 | 53.8 | 58.2 | 52.8 | 62.4 |
|  |  | Women | 66.4 | 76.8 | 94.0 | 54.4 | 79.4 | 57.9 | 59.7 | 57.8 | 56.0 |
| 2014 | Health | TOTAL | 63.2 | 71.8 | 92.9 | 46.6 | 75.4 | 52.5 | 47.4 | 53.1 | 60.6 |
|  |  | Men | 60.3 | 70.0 | 92.7 | 42.5 | 75.1 | 45.3 | 44.9 | 45.4 | 68.0 |
|  |  | Women | 66.9 | 74.7 | 93.1 | 53.4 | 75.9 | 60.0 | 53.9 | 60.4 | 60.3 |
|  | Pensions | TOTAL | 42.9 | 61.2 | 89.9 | 21.5 | 68.6 | 21.3 | 35.7 | 19.5 | 13.7 |
|  |  | Men | 49.3 | 62.6 | 92.1 | 23.8 | 70.7 | 28.8 | 39.9 | 26.7 | 35.4 |
|  |  | Women | 34.8 | 59.0 | 87.4 | 17.7 | 64.7 | 13.5 | 25.0 | 12.7 | 12.7 |
|  | Health and/or Pensions | TOTAL | 71.1 | 79.1 | 96.7 | 55.8 | 83.1 | 61.5 | 62.5 | 61.4 | 64.5 |
|  |  | Men | 70.5 | 78.2 | 96.9 | 53.6 | 83.3 | 58.7 | 62.7 | 58.0 | 71.9 |
|  |  | Women | 71.9 | 80.4 | 96.4 | 59.5 | 82.6 | 64.4 | 62.0 | 64.5 | 64.1 |
| Uruguay ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | Health | TOTAL | 96.1 | 97.7 | 98.5 | 94.7 | 98.2 | 92.6 | 96.0 | 92.0 | 96.4 |
|  |  | Men | 95.2 | 97.0 | 98.1 | 94.0 | 97.6 | 91.6 | 95.6 | 90.7 | 93.7 |
|  |  | Women | 97.2 | 98.6 | 99.0 | 96.2 | 99.0 | 94.4 | 97.1 | 94.0 | 96.6 |
|  | Pensions | TOTAL | 61.9 | 80.3 | 98.6 | 41.5 | 83.1 | 31.8 | 84.8 | 22.8 | 28.8 |
|  |  | Men | 62.2 | 76.9 | 98.4 | 36.9 | 81.7 | 33.1 | 84.1 | 22.5 | 56.7 |
|  |  | Women | 61.6 | 85.0 | 98.9 | 51.2 | 85.2 | 29.6 | 87.1 | 23.3 | 26.5 |
|  | Health and/or Pensions | TOTAL | 96.6 | 98.2 | 99.9 | 94.9 | 98.3 | 93.4 | 98.3 | 92.5 | 96.5 |
|  |  | Men | 95.8 | 97.6 | 99.9 | 94.2 | 97.8 | 92.5 | 98.2 | 91.3 | 93.7 |
|  |  | Women | 97.6 | 99.0 | 100.0 | 96.3 | 99.1 | 94.9 | 98.7 | 94.5 | 96.8 |



| Country, Year and Sex |  |  | TOTAL | Employees |  |  |  | Non-employees |  |  | Domestic Work |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Total | Public | Private |  | Total | Employers | Ownaccount with Contributing Family Workers |  |
|  |  |  | Establishments with a maximum of five workers |  | Establishments with six or more workers |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 | Health and/or Pensions | total |  | 97.9 | 99.1 | 100.0 | 95.7 | 99.4 | 94.7 | 98.7 | 93.8 | 98.3 |
|  |  | Men | 97.2 | 98.8 | 100.0 | 94.5 | 99.2 | 93.2 | 98.8 | 91.6 | 97.3 |
|  |  | Women | 98.9 | 99.6 | 100.0 | 97.9 | 99.6 | 97.0 | 98.5 | 96.8 | 98.4 |
|  | Health | total | 98.3 | 99.3 | 100.0 | 96.9 | 99.5 | 95.4 | 98.4 | 94.8 | 98.9 |
|  |  | Men | 97.6 | 99.0 | 100.0 | 95.7 | 99.3 | 93.9 | 97.9 | 92.9 | 100.0 |
|  |  | Women | 99.1 | 99.6 | 100.0 | 98.3 | 99.8 | 97.6 | 99.5 | 97.3 | 98.9 |
|  | Pensions | TOTAL | 77.0 | 90.0 | 100.0 | 53.8 | 94.3 | 41.9 | 90.6 | 32.2 | 65.5 |
|  |  | Men | 76.5 | 89.4 | 100.0 | 54.3 | 93.5 | 43.0 | 90.1 | 31.1 | 35.0 |
|  |  | Women | 77.5 | 90.8 | 100.0 | 53.3 | 95.5 | 40.3 | 91.8 | 33.7 | 65.6 |
|  | Health and/or Pensions | TOTAL | 98.4 | 99.3 | 100.0 | 97.0 | 99.6 | 95.8 | 99.3 | 95.1 | 99.0 |
|  |  | Men | 97.8 | 99.0 | 100.0 | 95.8 | 99.4 | 94.5 | 99.2 | 93.3 | 100.0 |
|  |  | Women | 99.2 | 99.7 | 100.0 | 98.4 | 99.8 | 97.8 | 99.7 | 97.6 | 99.0 |

Source: ILO estimate based on information from the household surveys of the countries.
a/ The pension denominator may vary from that of health or that of health and/or pensions given that some countries of the region do not explore access to pensions in their surveys.
b/ For the calculation of the 2010 regional weighted average, Brazil was estimated based on the average of 2009 and 2011, given that the IBGE did not carry out the PNAD in 2010 .
c/ The weighted average of pensions excludes Ecuador, El Salvador and México.
d/ 28 to 31 urban areas. Data correspond to 3rd quarter.
e/ National Household Sample Survey (PNAD) of September of each year. In 2010, the PNAD was not carried out because the census was conducted.
f/ 2005 data correspond to the 2nd quarter of the Continuous Household Survey; beginning in 2010, data correspond to 2nd quarter, municipal capitals, of the Large Integrated Household Survey (GEIH).
g/ Source of 2005 data is the Multi-purpose Household Survey; beginning in 2010, source of data is the Continuous Household Survey. Not comparable with previous years.
h/ Data refer to the 4th quarter and include information on private insurance.
2005 data was for working age population of 10 years. Beginning in 2010, data is based on working age population of 16 years.
Data correspond to the 2nd quarter of the National Occupation and Employment Survey (ENOE). In 2013, the occupation classifier was modified.
k/ Microenterprises: establishments with fewer than five workers.
I/ Data correspond to period of October-December of the Permanent Household Survey.
$\mathrm{m} /$ Data are from the National Household Survey (ENAHO).
| TABLE 9. LATIN AMERICA (SELECTED COUNTRIES): INDEX OF AVERAGE REAL WAGES
IN THE FORMAL SECTOR. 2004-2015 (Index $2000=100)$

| Country | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2014 | 2015 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change through September |  |
| Brazil ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 99.7 | 98.8 | 102.2 | 103.2 | 105.3 | 107.7 | 109.4 | 110.9 | 114.7 | 117.1 | 119.0 | 1.6 | -2.3 |
| Chile ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 106.5 | 108.5 | 110.6 | 113.7 | 113.5 | 118.9 | 121.5 | 124.5 | 128.6 | 133.5 | 135.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 |
| Colombia ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 103.8 | 105.0 | 109.3 | 109.2 | 107.7 | 109.1 | 112.2 | 112.4 | 113.4 | 116.5 | 117.0 | 0.8 | 1.0 |
| Costa Rica ${ }^{\text {d/ }}$ | ... | 100.0 | 101.6 | 102.9 | 100.8 | 111.3 | 113.7 | 120.2 | 121.7 | 123.4 | 125.8 | 1.9 | -0.1 |
| Mexico ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 103.6 | 105.5 | 107.3 | 108.8 | 109.1 | 107.9 | 107.0 | 107.9 | 108.1 | 108.1 | 108.6 | 0.2 " | 1.2 |
| Nicaragua ${ }^{\text {// }}$ | 103.6 | 103.7 | 106.0 | 103.7 | 99.5 | 105.3 | 106.6 | 106.8 | 107.1 | 107.4 | 109.2 | 2.3 | 1.9 |
| Panama ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 94.2 | 92.4 | 97.3 | 100.3 | 98.7 | 99.4 | 109.1 | 109.7 | 113.4 | ... | ... | ... | ... |
| Paraguay ${ }^{\text {h/ }}$ | 97.1 | 98.1 | 98.7 | 101.0 | 100.2 | 104.8 | 105.5 | 108.4 | 109.1 | 112.2 | 113.9 | 0.4 " | 0.7 |
| Peru ${ }^{\text {/ }}$ | 100.0 | 99.4 | 103.8 | 111.0 | 115.9 | 120.8 | 119.8 | 124.9 | 130.4 | 130.0 | 132.0 | 7.0 | -0.8 |
| Uruguay ${ }^{\text {j/ }}$ | 80.1 | 83.7 | 86.8 | 90.4 | 94.3 | 99.6 | 103.0 | 107.1 | 112.7 | 116.4 | 120.5 | 3.1 | 2.0 |
| Venezuela (Boliv. Rep. of) ${ }^{\text {k/ }}$ | 78.6 | 80.7 | 84.8 | 85.8 | 82.2 | 78.1 | 76.3 | 76.5 | 80.3 | 75.9 | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |

Source: ILO, based on official figures of the countries.
a/ Regular average real earnings of private-sector workers protected by social and labour legislation Six metropolitan regions (Index $2003=100$ ). b/ General hourly wage index. Beginning in January 2014, the Index uses an estimate based on the 2013 Consumer Price Index $=100$. The series was combined to make it comparable.
c/ Real manufacturing wages with coffee threshing. Beginning in 2015, the Bank of the Republic publishes a total series based on the methodology $2014=100$, for which reason the series was combined to make it comparable.
d/ Average wages of employees contributing to the Costa Rican Social Security Institute. Health insurance (Index $2005=100$ ).
e/ Average daily base wage contribution to the Mexican Social Security Institute (Index 2002 = 100).
f/ Average wages reported to the Nicaraguan Social Security Institute.
g/ Average monthly wage of private sector reported by employers to the Social Security Institute.
$\mathrm{h} / \mathrm{General}$ index of public and private sector wages.
i/ Average monthly wage of urban employees. Excludes workers with monthly wages of more than 25,000 Soles (Index $2004=100$ ).
j/ Real wage index.
k/ General index of private sector wages.
// Average variation, first semester.
| TABLE 10. LATIN AMERICA: INDEX OF REAL MINIMUM WAGES. 2005-2015 (Index 2000 = 100)

| Country | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2014 | 2015 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Change, December through September |  |
| Latin America |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bolivia ${ }^{\text {a/ }}$ | 106.3 | 111.1 | 110.1 | 108.0 | 115.9 | 119.9 | 130.9 | 153.6 | 174.4 | 197.8 | 16.0 | 12.3 |
| Brazil a/ | 128.5 | 145.3 | 154.7 | 160.8 | 172.7 | 182.0 | 182.1 | 197.5 | 202.7 | 203.6 | 2.1 | 1.1 |
| Chile ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 113.4 | 116.3 | 118.4 | 118.3 | 124.7 | 126.6 | 128.7 | 132.3 | 138.7 | 144.0 | 3.1 | 3.0 |
| Colombia al | 107.2 | 109.9 | 110.7 | 110.1 | 113.7 | 115.1 | 115.2 | 118.8 | 121.2 | 123.1 | 1.4 | -0.2 |
| Costa Rica ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 99.9 | 101.6 | 102.9 | 102.6 | 107.8 | 110.4 | 112.2 | 114.4 | 115.7 | 118.7 | 2.7 | 3.7 |
| Dominican Republic ${ }^{\text {b/ }}$ | 96.3 | 89.5 | 93.7 | 87.7 | 93.8 | 93.4 | 94.6 | 97.2 | 100.2 | 102.6 | -2.5 | 12.5 |
| Ecuador ${ }^{\text {a/ }}$ | 101.9 | 105.3 | 109.4 | 118.7 | 123.0 | 130.8 | 137.7 | 144.9 | 153.6 | 158.6 | 3.7 | 0.8 |
| El Salvador ${ }^{\text {b/ }}$ | 90.7 | 90.1 | 92.4 | 92.4 | 101.5 | 100.5 | 100.4 | 101.5 | 102.6 | 107.6 | 2.1 | 5.1 |
| Guatemala ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 115.4 | 117.2 | 114.4 | 107.8 | 112.3 | 115.3 | 121.6 | 124.1 | 124.2 | 125.6 | 1.8 | 2.8 |
| Honduras ${ }^{\text {b/ }}$ | 121.6 | 127.8 | 132.7 | 132.3 | 287.8 | 275.1 | 274.3 | 275.3 | 276.5 | 273.5 | -0.4 | 2.9 |
| Mexico ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 101.3 | 101.6 | 101.6 | 100.5 | 99.8 | 100.5 | 101.2 | 101.3 | 101.8 | 101.7 | 1.7 | 4.9 |
| Nicaragua ${ }^{\text {b/ }}$ | 118.0 | 128.5 | 131.6 | 133.8 | 156.6 | 174.6 | 182.3 | 191.2 | 202.2 | 212.1 | 5.1 | 10.0 |
| Panama ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 104.5 | 107.9 | 105.9 | 106.1 | 103.8 | 110.2 | 104.1 | 113.4 | 109.1 | 120.7 | 11.5 | -0.7 |
| Paraguay ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 104.4 | 106.7 | 103.9 | 101.3 | 102.0 | 102.5 | 105.2 | 103.9 | 101.2 | 104.3 | 7.3 | -2.0 |
| Peru ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 105.2 | 112.1 | 111.8 | 114.5 | 111.2 | 110.1 | 120.7 | 133.6 | 135.6 | 131.4 | -2.7 | -3.3 |
| Uruguay ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 132.1 | 153.3 | 159.6 | 176.9 | 194.4 | 196.8 | 227.7 | 252.8 | 256.1 | 266.0 | 4.7 | 2.5 |
| Venezuela ${ }^{\text {a/ }}$ | 108.6 | 116.9 | 124.2 | 119.9 | 111.7 | 113.2 | 107.3 | 113.0 | 112.6 | 116.9 | 0.7 | $\ldots$ |
| Average ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 109.1 | 114.2 | 116.3 | 117.2 | 131.3 | 133.9 | 138.0 | 145.2 | 148.7 | 153.4 | 3.4 | 3.5 |
| Average ${ }^{\text {d/ }}$ | 115.7 | 124.8 | 129.7 | 131.7 | 138.8 | 143.6 | 144.8 | 154.0 | 156.8 | 158.4 | 1.9 | 2.0 |

Source: ILO, based on official country data.
a/ National minimum wage.
b/ Lowest minimum manufacturing wage.
c/ Simple average.
d/ Weighted average.

TABLE 11. LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN: GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT. 2005-2014 (Annual growth rates at constant prices)

| Country | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Latin America |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Argentina | 9.2 | 8.4 | 8.0 | 3.1 | 0.1 | 9.5 | 8.4 | 0.8 | 2.9 | 0.5 |
| Bolivia (Pluri. State of) | 4.4 | 4.8 | 4.6 | 6.1 | 3.4 | 4.1 | 5.2 | 5.2 | 6.8 | 5.4 |
| Brazil | 3.1 | 4.0 | 6.0 | 5.0 | -0.2 | 7.6 | 3.9 | 1.8 | 2.7 | 0.1 |
| Chile | 5.6 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 3.7 | -1.0 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 5.5 | 4.2 | 1.9 |
| Colombia | 4.7 | 6.7 | 6.9 | 3.5 | 1.7 | 4.0 | 6.6 | 4.0 | 4.9 | 4.6 |
| Costa Rica | 5.9 | 8.8 | 7.9 | 2.7 | -1.0 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 5.2 | 3.4 | 3.5 |
| Cuba | 11.2 | 12.1 | 7.3 | 4.1 | 1.5 | 2.4 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 1.3 |
| Dominican Republic | 9.3 | 10.7 | 8.5 | 3.1 | 0.9 | 8.3 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 4.8 | 7.3 |
| Ecuador | 5.3 | 4.4 | 2.2 | 6.4 | 0.6 | 3.5 | 7.9 | 5.2 | 4.6 | 3.8 |
| El Salvador | 3.6 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 1.3 | -3.1 | 1.4 | 2.2 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 2.0 |
| Guatemala | 3.3 | 5.4 | 6.3 | 3.3 | 0.5 | 2.9 | 4.2 | 3.0 | 3.7 | 4.2 |
| Honduras | 6.1 | 6.6 | 6.2 | 4.2 | -2.4 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 4.1 | 2.8 | 3.1 |
| Mexico | 3.1 | 5.0 | 3.2 | 1.4 | -4.7 | 5.2 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 1.4 | 2.1 |
| Nicaragua | 4.3 | 4.2 | 5.3 | 2.9 | -2.8 | 3.2 | 6.2 | 5.1 | 4.5 | 4.7 |
| Panama | 7.2 | 8.5 | 12.1 | 9.1 | 4.0 | 5.9 | 10.8 | 10.2 | 8.4 | 6.2 |
| Paraguay | 2.1 | 4.8 | 5.4 | 6.4 | -4.0 | 13.1 | 4.3 | -1.2 | 14.2 | 4.4 |
| Peru | 6.3 | 7.5 | 8.5 | 9.1 | 1.0 | 8.5 | 6.5 | 6.0 | 5.8 | 2.4 |
| Uruguay | 6.6 | 4.1 | 6.5 | 7.2 | 4.2 | 7.8 | 5.2 | 3.3 | 5.1 | 3.5 |
| Venezuela (Boliv. Rep. of) | 10.3 | 9.9 | 8.8 | 5.3 | -3.2 | -1.5 | 4.2 | 5.6 | 1.3 | -4.0 |
| The Caribbean |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Antigua and Barbuda | 6.1 | 13.4 | 9.5 | 0.1 | -12.0 | -7.1 | -1.8 | 4.0 | -0.1 | 3.2 |
| Bahamas | 3.4 | 2.5 | 1.4 | -2.3 | -4.2 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| Barbados | 4.0 | 5.7 | 1.7 | 0.3 | -1.5 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 0.3 | -0.1 | 0.2 |
| Belize | 2.6 | 4.6 | 1.1 | 3.2 | 0.7 | 3.3 | 2.1 | 3.8 | 1.5 | 3.4 |
| Dominica | -0.1 | 4.9 | 6.1 | 7.4 | -1.1 | 1.1 | -0.1 | -1.4 | -0.9 | 2.4 |
| Granada | 13.3 | -4.0 | 6.1 | 0.9 | -6.6 | -0.5 | 0.8 | -1.2 | 2.4 | 3.8 |
| Guyana | -2.0 | 5.1 | 7.0 | 2.0 | 3.3 | 4.4 | 5.4 | 4.8 | 5.2 | 3.9 |
| Haiti | 1.8 | 2.3 | 3.3 | 0.8 | 3.1 | -5.5 | 5.5 | 2.9 | 4.2 | 2.8 |
| Jamaica | 0.9 | 2.9 | 17.1 | -0.7 | -4.4 | -1.5 | 1.7 | -0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 |
| Saint Kitts and Nevis | 9.3 | 5.9 | 2.8 | 4.1 | -5.6 | -3.2 | 1.7 | -1.2 | 3.7 | 6.3 |
| Saint Vincent and the Grenadines | 2.5 | 7.7 | 3.3 | 1.6 | -2.1 | -3.4 | -0.5 | 1.2 | 1.8 | 0.3 |
| Saint Lucia | -1.7 | 8.3 | -0.6 | 3.5 | 0.6 | -1.0 | 1.2 | -1.6 | -0.4 | -1.6 |
| Suriname | 7.2 | 11.4 | 5.1 | 4.1 | 3.0 | 5.2 | 5.3 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 3.4 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 5.4 | 14.4 | 4.5 | 3.4 | -4.4 | -0.1 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 0.9 |
| Latin America and the Caribbean | 4.5 | 5.4 | 5.8 | 3.9 | -1.2 | 6.2 | 4.7 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 1.1 |

Source: ILO, based on information from the ECLAC database (consulted November 2015).
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