**Labour developments in dynamic Asia:
What do the data show?**

Working Paper No. 61

**David Kucera
and
Anne Chataignier**

**Statistical Development and Analysis Group
Policy Integration Department
International Labour Office
Geneva**

August 2005

Working papers are preliminary documents circulated
to stimulate discussion and obtain comments

Copyright © International Labour Organization 2005

Publications of the International Labour Office enjoy copyright under Protocol 2 of the Universal Copyright Convention. Nevertheless, short excerpts from them may be reproduced without authorization, on condition that the source is indicated. For rights of reproduction or translation, application should be made to the Publications Bureau (Rights and Permissions), International Labour Office, CH-1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland. The International Labour Office welcomes such applications.

Libraries, institutions and other users registered in the United Kingdom with the Copyright Licensing Agency, 90 Tottenham Court Road, London W1T 4LP [Fax: (+44) (0)20 7631 5500; email: cla@cla.co.uk], in the United States with the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923 [Fax: (+1) (978) 750 4470; email: info@copyright.com] or in other countries with associated Reproduction Rights Organizations, may make photocopies in accordance with the licences issued to them for this purpose.

ISBN 92-2-118050-6 (printed version)
92-2-118051-4 (web version)

First published 2005

Cover:

The designations employed in ILO publications, which are in conformity with United Nations practice, and the presentation of material therein do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the International Labour Office concerning the legal status of any country, area or territory or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers.

The responsibility for opinions expressed in signed articles, studies and other contributions rests solely with their authors, and publication does not constitute an endorsement by the International Labour Office of the opinions expressed in them.

Reference to names of firms and commercial products and processes does not imply their endorsement by the International Labour Office, and any failure to mention a particular firm, commercial product or process is not a sign of disapproval.

ILO publications can be obtained through major booksellers or ILO local offices in many countries, or direct from ILO Publications, International Labour Office, CH-1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland. Catalogues or lists of new publications are available free of charge from the above address, or by email: pubvente@ilo.org
Visit our website: www.ilo.org/publns

Printed by the International Labour Office, Geneva, Switzerland

Labour developments in dynamic Asia: What do the data show?

	<i>Page</i>
List of Tables.....	iii
List of Figures	v
Preface.....	vii
1. Introduction and Main Findings.....	1
2. GDP Growth and Per Capita Income	4
3. Trade	6
4. Foreign Direct Investment	8
5. The Sectoral Composition of Output and Urbanization.....	9
6. Macro Labour Developments.....	11
6.1 Population	11
6.2 Employment Growth and Labour Market Tightness.....	12
6.3 Gender Representation in Employment and Unemployment.....	15
6.4. Youth Unemployment.	16
6.5. Trends in Labour Force Participation.....	17
7. The Sectoral Composition of Employment.	19
8. Skills and Education.	21
9. Child Labour.	24
10. Earnings Trends.....	26
11. Poverty and the Working Poor.	28
12. Informal Employment.	30
13. Hours of Work.....	32
14. Social Protection.....	34
15. Organized Labour.....	37
16. Ratification of ILO Conventions.....	40
Bibliography	41
Notes on Main Data Sources	45

Main Data Sources in Alphabetical Order.....	45
Main Data Sources by Section	45
Annex 1 - Tables	53
Annex 2 – Figures	76

List of Tables

- Table 1: GDP Growth, 1990-2003 (average annual growth rate)
- Table 2: Total Employment ('000), 1990-2003
- Table 3: Employment-to-Population Ratio (%), 1990-2003
- Table 4: Unemployment Rate, 1990-2003 (% of total labour force)
- Table 5: Labour Force Participation Rate (15-64) (%), 1980-2010
- Table 6: Agricultural Employment, 1990-2003 (% of total employment)
- Industrial Employment, 1990-2003 (% of total employment)
- Service Employment, 1990-2003 (% of total employment)
- Table 7: Children (10-14) in Labour Force, 1990-2003 (% of age group)
- Table 8: Real Wage, 1983-1999 (annual mean wages, consumption PPP)
- Table 9: Real Manufacturing Wage Indices, 1990-2003
- Table 10: Wages and Salaries, 1990-2003 (% of value added)
- Table 11: Male-to-Female Ratio of Manufacturing Wages, 1990-2003
- Table 12: Self-employment as % of Non-agricultural Employment
- Table 13: Hours of Work per Week, 1990-2003
- Table 14: Trade Union Membership ('000), 1990-2003
- Table 15: Ratification of ILO Core Conventions

List of Figures

- Figure 1: GDP Growth by Region, 1999-2003 (average annual growth rate)
- Figure 2: Measures of Export Performance by Region (with pre-1990s OECD the benchmark region)
- Figure 3: Sectoral Composition of Output by Region, 1999-2003 (average annual percent share)
- Figure 4: Employment Growth by Country, 2002 and 2003 (annual growth rate)
- Figure 5: Ratio of Female to Male Unemployment Rates by Region, 2001 and 2003
- Figure 6: Ratio of Youth to Total Unemployment Rates by Region, 2001 and 2003
- Figure 7: Ratio of Male to Female Labour Force Participation Rates by Country, 1990 and 2000
- Figure 8: Sectoral Composition of Employment by Country, 1995-2003 (annual percent share for most recent year of data)
- Figure 9: Average Years of Educational Attainment for Adults in "High-Performing" East and Southeast Asian Countries, 1960-1999
- Figure 10: Ratio of Male to Female Adult Literacy Rates by Region, 1990 and 2000
- Figure 11: Ratio of Real Wage Change by Country, 1990s (ratio of 1989-1991/1997-1999 average annual mean wages, consumption PPP)
- Figure 12: Poverty Rate by Region, 1987-1998 (percentage of population living below \$1 per day)
- Figure 13: Trade Union Density Relative to Number of Labour Force Participants by Country, 1990-2003
- Figure 14: Average Number of Ratifications of ILO Conventions Per Country by Region, 2005

Preface

In collaboration with the ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (Bangkok), the Statistical Development and Analysis Group of the Policy Integration Department (Geneva) undertook the writing of what became in 2005 the first edition of the *Labour and Social Trends in Asia and the Pacific*. The report follows the example of *Panorama Laboral*, the ILO's annual report for Latin American and Caribbean.

The present paper, "Labour Developments in Dynamic Asia: What Do the Data Show?," is in a sense of first draft of *Labour and Social Trends in Asia and the Pacific 2005*. At the same time, the final report underwent substantial revisions – both additions and (inevitably) deletions. It was thought, therefore, that it would be useful to make "Labour Developments in Dynamic Asia: What Do the Data Show?" available in its own right, giving readers ready access to an additional set of data and data analysis. This is all the more so as the current paper was written with the final reader in mind and endeavors to be both a polished and self-contained work. The authors prepared this Working Paper when working in the Statistical Development and Analysis Group.

Working Papers are intended to stimulate debate in relation to the development of the ILO's Decent Work Agenda. Comments are welcome at integration@ilo.org.

Peter Peek
Manager
Statistical Development and Analysis Group
Policy Integration Department
International Labour Office

September 2005

1. Introduction and Main Findings

Asia is far and away the most economically dynamic region of the world. In recent years, Asian economies have grown at a rate over twice the world average and are projected to continue outpacing the rest of the world in coming years. This growth has been accompanied by large relative shifts in production away from agriculture, more towards industry in East Asia (including Southeast Asia) and more towards services in South Asia. Asia's dynamism is manifested not only by its rapid growth but by its rapid and also *competitive* integration into global markets for goods, services and investment. Asia had, for example, exceptional export performance compared to other regions of the world. This held for a wide range of labour- and capital-intensive goods for East Asia and for labour-intensive goods for South Asia.

Moreover, flows of foreign direct investment (FDI) continued to increase into China and India in recent years, in spite of having declined globally since 2000. And while the volume of FDI flows into China were considerably higher than into India, the rate of increase was considerably higher for India than for China. Asia's economic dynamism is also manifested by the expansion of intra-regional trade and investment, as countries in the region become increasingly intertwined economically. This pattern of intra-regional integration reflects both specialization among countries in different stages of production processes as well as production for final consumption for countries in the region, that latter related to a growing middle class and – especially in East Asia – to rapid urbanization.

This paper endeavors to describe how labour and social conditions fared in the face of the region's rapid economic growth and integration into global markets, focusing on the period since 1990 for 28 countries in the region.¹ Though basically descriptive, this paper provides evidence bearing on widely discussed questions of policy import, such as how rapid economic growth and globalization affect workers, whether for good or ill. In so doing, this paper uses – for the most part – readily available data from the ILO and other sources. For this paper has another aim: to address the extent to which existing data can adequately describe the evolution of labour and social conditions in the region. This paper attempts to strike a balance, then, between using readily available data to tell a story and making clear when the data make a story difficult to tell.

The data problems encountered are the usual: missing data for countries and years, lack of comparability across countries and over time, questionable data values, data from different sources showing substantively different patterns, and – fundamentally – that data do not exist that adequately address the underlying concept one wants to know about. These problems are discussed throughout the report and are also documented in the data tables. In

¹ In the order presented in the tables for this paper, the 28 countries and their respective sub-regions are China, Fiji, Kiribati, the Republic of Korea, Mongolia, Papua New Guinea, the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu, comprising East Asia-Pacific; Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Timor-Leste, Thailand and Vietnam, comprising Southeast Asia; Afghanistan, Bangladesh, India, Iran, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka, comprising South Asia; and Australia, Japan and New Zealand, comprising the so-called industrialized countries in the region. Note that this paper often makes use of averages from the World Bank's *World Development Indicators* for developing countries grouped into six regions. One of these regions combines the developing countries of East Asia-Pacific and Southeast Asia. Note that the World Bank classifies Iran as part of Middle East-North Africa whereas we classify Iran as part of South Asia, consistent with the structure of the ILO Sub-Regional Office in New Delhi.

drawing attention to these data problems, this paper also aims to provide some sense of where the ILO could usefully focus its efforts in improving data.

The mismatch between existing data and underlying concept has perhaps become more apparent in the ILO's post-1999 "decent work" years. For many aspects of decent work are of a fundamentally qualitative nature in that they do not readily lend themselves to being counted. Of the four decent work strategic objectives, this is perhaps less so for "employment and income opportunities for women and men" and "social protection" (at least for many aspects of the two) but more clearly so for "social dialogue and tripartism" and "fundamental principles and rights at work."² Important in guiding our compilation of data is the ILO paper "Measuring Decent Work with Statistical Indicators" (Anker et al. 2002), which takes a pragmatic approach to the issue addressed by its title, emphasizing how existing statistics can be used to address labour and social conditions related to the decent work strategic objectives.

So how, then, did labour and social conditions evolve amidst Asia's economic dynamism? There were a number of strikingly favorable developments in the region. There were dramatic declines in the incidence of poverty and indeed it is poverty declines in the region that drive projections that the Millennium Development Goal of halving poverty rates by 2015 will be met. Other developing regions, in contrast, lag behind in this regard. There were also sizeable earnings increases in Asia, most notably a doubling of real wages in China since 1990. There were moreover substantial improvements in skills and education in Asia as well as widespread and persistent declines in the incidence of child labour.

There were also positive developments as regards gender equality in labour and social conditions. In particular, there is evidence of a tendency towards greater equality between men and women for a number of countries in Asia as regards participation in the labour force, skills and education, and earnings. In spite of concerns about intensification of work in the face of rapid growth, there is on the contrary evidence of reduced working hours for several of the fastest growing countries in the region.

Regarding the extent of informal employment, it is difficult to determine whether this is on the rise or falling in Asia, given the limited scope of existing data. In particular, urban informal employment is proxied by just one of its components: non-agricultural self-employment. This leaves aside other important components of informal employment, such as informal wage employment. We can at least say, nonetheless, that the share of non-agricultural self-employment has been declining in most countries in the region for which we have data.

For most of these favorable developments as well as in other respects, there are marked differences between East and South Asia. Put broadly, the pace of improvement was more rapid in East than in South Asia. This is very clearly the case, for instance, with respect to poverty, skills and education and child labour. And while both East and South Asia grew rapidly in recent years, rapid growth is a much more longstanding, sustained phenomena in East than in South Asia. There is also a significant difference in population growth, which has been increasing only half as rapidly in the East as in South Asia. Lower population growth means that any given growth in national income translates into higher increases in

² In turn, the four "fundamental principles and rights at work" – addressing the abolition of child labour and forced labour, eliminating discrimination in employment and occupation, and freedom of association and collective bargaining rights – also vary in the extent to which they are fundamentally qualitative in nature and thus can be captured by traditional statistics. For example, while one can, in principle and with clear definitions, count the number of child labourers or men and women's earnings, one cannot, even with a clear definition, count freedom of association and collective bargaining rights.

per capita income and thus, for any given structure of income distribution, greater reductions in poverty.

Favorable developments in Asia outnumber problematic developments, at least as revealed by the data this paper examines. One of the most profound of these problematic developments is slow employment growth even in the face of rapid output growth, most obviously in the case of China. China's slow employment growth and rising unemployment is occurring alongside what the Chinese Government views as overheating of the economy, based for instance on excessive investment in key industries. This provides a sense of the Chinese Government's policy dilemma. Moreover, alongside weak aggregate labour demand in China are serious shortages of more highly skilled workers and managers. Other problematic developments in Asia include declines in trade union density for most countries in the region for which there are data as well as rising youth unemployment in Southeast Asia.

Longer than the list of problematic developments in Asia, though, is the list of problems that persisted alongside rapid economic growth and globalization. In spite of the improvements in gender equality noted above, there remains persistent gender inequality in earnings, skills and education, and representation in employment and the labour force. The problem of gender inequality in skills and education and representation in employment and the labour force is particularly acute in South Asia. Low levels of skills and education remain a fundamental problem for much of the region, particularly in South Asia where, for instance, adult literacy rates are lowest among six developing regions of the world. Related to low levels of skills and education, child labour remains widespread through much of the region, and is particularly prevalent in South Asia. Moreover, the incidence of informal employment in Asia (even when greatly underestimated by being proxied by non-agricultural self-employment) remains high, particularly in South Asia. In India, for instance, nine of 10 workers are estimated to be in informal employment.

While we do not observe a lengthening of working hours in Asia, working hours nonetheless remain long compared with developing countries in other regions of the world. Youth unemployment remains a problem and indeed is more acute in Southeast and South Asia than in any other region of the world, developed or developing. We also observe that the average number of ratifications per country of ILO Conventions is lowest in Asia among the regions of the world and indeed only slightly higher than half the world average.

One of the most fundamental persisting problems in Asia is poverty and the working poor. Poverty is itself related to other labour and social problems in the region – such as child labour, low levels of skills and education, and long working hours – as well as to low levels of per capita income. This is particularly striking for South Asia, which for all its dynamism and rapid growth in recent years still had the lowest levels of per capita income of any region in the world. These low levels of per capita income are relevant, of course, in that income provides the capacity to improve labour and social conditions. And in spite of the declines in poverty in Asia in recent years, the incidence of poverty and the numbers of the working poor remain high, particularly in rural areas. It is also worth noting in this regard that the Millennium Development Goal of halving poverty rates by 2015 is based on a very low poverty threshold, one dollar per day, and that a more generous definition of poverty would, of course, greatly increase estimates of the incidence of poverty and the numbers of the working poor.

This paper's portrait of problematic developments and persistent problems in Asia poses important policy challenges for the ILO. At the same time, it is a portrait based on data that have their own problems. Improving these data should thus be a priority to enable a clearer and more comprehensive sense of the nature of labour and social conditions in Asia.

2. GDP Growth and Per Capita Income

Developing Asia has been in recent years by far the most rapidly growing region of the world. In 2003, the East Asia-Pacific (including Southeast Asia) and South Asia developing regions grew by 7.7% and 7.4%, respectively, well over double the world average of 2.6% (Table 1). Differences in growth patterns across regions are nearly as striking comparing average annual growth rates for the 1999-2003 period (Figure 1). China and India, the two most populous countries in the world with the largest economies in their respective regions, were also in 2003 the most rapidly growing countries in Asia, with GDP growth rates of 9.1% for China and 8.0% for India.³ In spite of efforts by the Chinese Government beginning in early 2004 to moderate growth, the Chinese economy grew at a similar rate through 2004.⁴

The four countries hit hardest by the 1997-1998 Asian crisis – the Republic of Korea, Indonesia, Malaysia and Thailand – all experienced large declines in GDP from 1997 to 1998, but real GDP had recovered to 1997 levels by 1999 in the Republic of Korea, 2000 in Malaysia, 2001 in Thailand and 2003 in Indonesia. For these four countries, GDP growth in 2003 was particularly rapid in Thailand (6.7%) and Malaysia (5.2%) but more moderate in Indonesia (4.1%) and the Republic of Korea (3.1%). The region with the most consistent cross-country pattern of strong growth in 2003 was South Asia, much attributable to favorable weather in this highly agricultural region, with all countries excepting Nepal having growth rates in excess of 5%. In contrast, growth was weak in the Pacific, particularly in Papua New Guinea, the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu, all of which experienced GDP declines in at least three of the five years from 1999-2003.

Australia, Japan and New Zealand are commonly classified as “industrialized” countries (e.g., ILO 2004). There is a rationale for this classification, given that these are among the pre-1990s OECD countries having attained high levels of per capita income earlier than other countries in the region. It is worth noting, though, that Singapore had higher per capita income in 2003 than both Australia and New Zealand and that the Republic of Korea had per capita income not greatly lower than New Zealand. Moreover, we will see that a number of late developers have higher shares of industrial output and industrial employment than so-called industrialized countries in the region. Nonetheless we refer to these countries as industrialized on the understanding that this usefully reflects their earlier development.

Far and away the largest of the industrialized countries in the region was Japan, with an economy about 12 times larger than Australia and 80 times larger than New Zealand as of 2003. Japan experienced considerably more favorable growth in 2003, at 2.7%, than in the prior two years, and 2003 was indeed one of its best growth years stretching back through the long period of stagnation beginning in the early-1990s. This recovery is particularly significant given that Japan remains far and away the largest economy in the region (indeed, second in the world only to the United States) and given the increasingly intertwined fates of the economies in the region with the dynamic expansion of intra-regional trade and investment. In terms of overall size, Japan’s GDP in 2003 was equivalent to 5.9 trillion USD (constant 1995), 4.5 times larger than China and 10.5 times

³ For the 1999-2003 period on average, China made up 61.9% of the GDP of developing East Asia-Pacific (including Southeast Asia) and India made up 76.0% of the GDP of South Asia. For a critical assessment of GDP growth rates in China and India as well as a comparison of their economic performance and policies more generally, see Srinivasan (2004).

⁴ The World Bank’s *China Quarterly Update* for February 2005 gives GDP growth rates of 9.3% for 2003 and 9.5% for 2004 (WB 2005b, p. 15).

larger than India. Thus even though Japan's rate growth was considerably lower than either China's or India's, its contribution to regional growth in 2003 in absolute terms (155 billion USD) was greater than for China and India combined (151 billion USD). However, the Japanese economy slumped again in the last three quarters of 2004, raising concerns about the sustainability of its recovery (EIU 2005).

The World Bank provides regional estimates of GDP growth for 2004 as well as forecasts for 2005 and 2006 (WB 2005a, p. 2). World GDP growth is estimated at 4.0% for 2004 and forecast to decline to 3.2% for both 2005 and 2006. For East Asia-Pacific (including Southeast Asia), GDP growth is estimated at 7.8% for 2004 and is forecast to decline to 7.1% in 2005 and further to 6.6% in 2006; for South Asia, GDP growth is estimated at 6.0% for 2004 and forecast to increase to 6.3% in 2005 and return to 6.0% in 2006. In spite of these forecast slowdowns, Asia is expected to remain the fastest growing developing region in the world in coming years (particularly compared to Latin America-Caribbean and Sub-Saharan Africa), with forecasted growth rates roughly double those for the world.⁵ The World Bank provides several factors underlying their forecasts for slower growth in 2005-2006. These are slower growth in the US and the EU, which are important markets for Asian exports (with the slowdown resulting in part from tighter fiscal and monetary policies), higher commodity prices and particularly oil prices, and slower growth in China resulting from efforts by the Chinese government to ease the brakes on what it regards to be problematically high growth such as regarding over-investment in such key industries as cement, aluminum, steel and construction, with attendant concerns about an increase in the number of non-performing loans (cf. UNCTAD 2004a, p. 22).

Rapid growth in East Asia and South Asia was from a basis of low levels of per capita income. Compared with developing countries in four other regions – Eastern Europe-Central Asia (hereafter the transition countries), Latin America-Caribbean, Middle East-North Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa – per capita income was lowest in South Asia at 476 USD for the 1999-2003 period on average (constant 1995 USD) and third lowest in East Asia-Pacific (including Southeast Asia) at 1,001 USD (second lowest was Sub-Saharan Africa at 573 USD), compared to the world average of 5,668 USD. To provide a sense of the differences between the four largest economies in the region, per capita income in the Republic of Korea was 15.9 times higher than in China and 29.2 times higher than in India, and per capita income in Japan was 50.6 times higher than in China and 93.1 times higher than in India (USD for the 1999-2003 period on average).⁶ Thus in spite of their rapid growth, China and India must traverse a considerable distance before they make up the per capita income gap between them and their richer neighbors.

⁵ More disaggregated regional forecasts for Asia in 2005 are provided by the Asian Development Bank, with rates for East Asia of 6.8%, Southeast Asia of 5.4%, South Asia of 7.2%, Central Asia of 8.4% and the Pacific of 2.4% (ADB 2004b, p. 4). Note that these forecasts differ from those of the World Bank in that growth in 2005 is projected to be higher for South Asia than East Asia and Southeast Asia as well as the Pacific. The ADB also provides forecasts by country for 2005 (ADB 2004a, p. 23). The World Bank also presents forecasts of annual average GDP *per capita* growth rates for the 2006-2015 period. Forecasts for the world, East Asia-Pacific and South Asia are 2.1%, 5.3% and 4.1% respectively (WB 2005a, p. 17). These rates are higher for the world and South Asia but lower for East Asia-Pacific than in the 1980s and 1990s.

⁶ In PPP terms, of course, differences in per capita income are considerably less, with per capita income in the Republic of Korea 3.8 times higher than in China and 6.2 times higher than in India, and per capita income in Japan 6.3 times higher than in China and 10.3 times higher than in India for the 1999-2003 period on average.

3. Trade

A useful measure of achieved trade openness is the trade-GDP ratio – that is, exports plus imports as a percentage of GDP. The trade-GDP ratio is relevant to employment in that increases in this measure tends to creates winning and losing industries through the playing out of absolute and comparative trade advantage, with attendant compositional shifts in output and employment having different impacts on different groups of workers (such as by gender and skill) given their different concentration among industries.

East Asia-Pacific (including Southeast Asia) had the highest trade-GDP ratio of six developing regions in recent years, whereas South Asia had the lowest ratio, with figures of 76.9% and 32.3% respectively for the 1999-2003 period on average. This compares to the world average of 47.6%. The countries of Southeast Asia had the highest trade-GDP ratios in the region, exceeding 100% for Cambodia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam. The country with the lowest ratio by far was Japan, at only 19.9%. With the exception of Sri Lanka at 80.9%, the countries of South Asia had comparatively low to middling trade-GDP ratios, ranging between 28.8% for India to 50.0% for Nepal for the period.

As of 2001, the trade-GDP ratio for China, at 48.5%, was basically identical to the world average. However, this increased dramatically to 65.0% by 2003, by far the most rapid increase of any country in the region. Moreover, China by itself accounted for about one-fifth of the increase in world trade in recent years (WB 2005a, p. 8). This was driven by as much by imports as exports, with imports into China increasing by a striking 31.0% in 2003 alone. Particularly important were imports into China from India, the ASEAN countries and the Republic of Korea, increasing by at least 50% for each in 2003 (ADB 2004b, p. 6).

China ran large overall trade surpluses in recent years. For 2003, its exports of goods and services exceeded imports by 77.8 billion USD (constant 1995). However, it is noteworthy that this surplus resulted largely from trade with the US. That is, the figure of 77.8 billion USD compares with China's trade surplus with the US alone of well over 100 billion USD in 2003. This means that excluding the US, China ran a trade deficit with the rest of the world in 2003. Moreover, in the first four months of 2004, China ran overall trade deficits, even including the US (WB 2005b, p. 15). China's current account balance as a percentage of GDP averaged 2.1% from 1999-2002, compared with considerably higher figures of, for example, 18.3% for Singapore 10.3% for Malaysia over the same period. There is moreover no clear trend in China's current account balance as a percentage of GDP.

While China ran sizeable trade surpluses with the US and the EU (taken together) in such products as machinery (electrical and non-electrical), transportation equipment, precision instruments and chemical products, it ran similarly sizeable trade deficits with its nine major Asian trading partners (ADB 2004b, p. 6).⁷ These regional trade balances reflect patterns of intra-regional trade, with China functioning as a main hub. These balances are structural in the sense that they result from patterns of vertical specialization among countries in different stages of production processes, with China's Asian trading partners exporting intermediate goods into China which are further processed for re-export elsewhere, particularly to the EU and the US. At the same time, these patterns of trade along with the rapid growth of imports into China reflect changing consumption patterns, with China providing an increasingly important market for the final consumption of goods. This, in turn, results from a growing urban middle class in China, a phenomenon also

⁷ Hong Kong (China), Indonesia, Japan, Republic of Korea, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, Taiwan (China) and Thailand.

observed in other developing countries in Asia. Regarding intra-regional trade in Asia more generally, this has increased six-fold over the past thirty years, with, for example, over one-third of the exports of East Asian countries going to other countries in the region as of 2003 (UNCTAD 2004a, p. 45).

The region's exceptional trade performance is illustrated by the fact that most countries in the region ran consistent current account surpluses in recent years, and these surpluses were sizeable relative to GDP for a number of these countries. The only developing countries in the region running current account deficits for the 1999-2003 period on average were Mongolia, Vanuatu, Bangladesh, Nepal, Sri Lanka and Cambodia.

A sense of the exceptional trade performance of the developing countries in the region is also provided by measures of export performance for total exports, total manufacturing exports, and labour-intensive, capital-intensive and in-between manufacturing exports (Figure 2). These measures are derived from an econometric "gravity" trade model and show how countries grouped into six developing regions compare to each other.⁸ For total exports and total manufacturing exports, the measures of export performance are large and positive (and statistically significant) for both East Asia-Pacific (including Southeast Asia) and South Asia. East Asia-Pacific is estimated to have exceptional export performance for all three manufacturing industry groups, ranking highest to lowest by labour-intensive, in-between, and capital-intensive manufacturing industries. This accords with the view that East Asia's export success has come to be diversified across a wide range of manufacturing industries. This pattern of diversification for East Asia-Pacific contrasts with South Asia, for which there is exceptional export performance only for labour-intensive manufactures. Note that East Asia-Pacific and South Asia are the only two developing regions having exceptional export performance by these measures, compared to middling export performance for Latin America-Caribbean, Sub-Saharan Africa and the transition countries and poor export performance for Middle East-North Africa.

⁸ These measures of export performance are coefficient estimates on regional dummy variables for exporting countries from a gravity trade model evaluating exports from each country in the sample to every other country in the sample. Trade data are 1993-1999 period averages with 162 countries in the sample. The excluded regional dummy variable is for pre-1990s OECD region, and thus measures of export performance are relative to this region. For further details and interpretation of these coefficient estimates see Kucera and Sarna (2004).

4. Foreign Direct Investment

Foreign direct investment (FDI) reflects the extent of multinational enterprises' (MNEs) presence in a country. In addition to its effect on economic development more generally, FDI is also relevant to employment insofar as employment conditions are different in MNEs than in domestically based enterprises. The year 2000 was a historical peak for world FDI, with total inflows into all countries in the world at about 1.27 trillion USD (constant 1995). There have since been large overall declines in FDI inflows into both developed and developing regions, including developing Asia. From 2000 to 2003, total inflows into all countries declined by more than half, to 0.49 trillion USD (though this was nonetheless much higher than the figure of 0.24 trillion USD for 1990). The sharp decline from 2000-2003 contrasts with a steady increase of FDI into China in recent years, which was the largest net recipient of FDI inflows in the world.⁹ As of 2003, China received FDI inflows of 46.5 billion USD (constant 1995). This represents 31.1% of FDI inflows to developing countries and 49.9% of FDI inflows to Asia.¹⁰ India in 2003 received only 2.5% of FDI inflows to developing countries and 4.0% of FDI inflows to Asia, but it is noteworthy that FDI inflows into India increased a good deal more rapidly than in China from 2000-2003, at an average annual rate of 21.7% compared to 7.8% for China.

FDI inflows to China in 2003 were equivalent to 3.9% of its GDP for the 2000-2003 period on average. Other countries in the region with FDI inflows as a percentage of GDP greater than 3% for 2000-2003 were Mongolia (6.9%), Vanuatu (7.5%), Cambodia (3.4%), Singapore (13.9%), Vietnam (3.8%) and New Zealand (3.6%). For China, FDI inflows as a percentage of GDP held fairly steadily at around 4% from 1999 to 2003. This is down from about 5% for the years from the mid-1990s to the 1997-1998 Asian crisis. Similarly, FDI inflows as a percentage of gross fixed capital formation held fairly steadily around 10% since 1999 for China, down from between 12% and 13% in the years from the mid-1990s up to the Asian crisis.¹¹ There is an important policy debate as to whether FDI tends to lead economic growth or to follow it (e.g., Milberg 1999; Hanson 2001). The effects of FDI on economic growth and development depends on the type of FDI received, whether this is for investment in new plant and equipment (greenfield FDI, which makes up most FDI in Asia) or for mergers and acquisitions (brownfield FDI) and whether for gaining access to the market of the recipient country (horizontal FDI) or to take advantage of low production costs to produce in the recipient country and export elsewhere (vertical FDI), as well as other factors determining the extent of beneficial spillovers to the recipient country. It is worth noting, though, that at least in a more purely quantitative sense, FDI inflows into China did not outpace growth but merely tracked it.

The growth of intra-regional trade in Asia is mirrored by the growth of intra-regional FDI flows as well as growing FDI in such market-integrating services as finance, telecommunications and trade (UNCTAD 2004b, p. 52). For instance, FDI within and

⁹ While Luxembourg received more FDI inflows than China in 2003, FDI outflows from Luxembourg in 2003 exceeded FDI inflows, whereas FDI outflows from China were very low relative to inflows.

¹⁰ Using UNCTAD regional classifications.

¹¹ We generally report FDI data from UNCTAD, as these have the advantage of going up to 2003 but are not provided as continuous series for the 1990s. However, we complement these FDI data from the World Bank *World Development Indicators*, which provide continuous series for the 1990s. FDI data between these sources are very similar.

between Northeast¹² and Southeast Asia increased strongly in recent years, from 38% of FDI flows in these two subregions in 1999-2000 to 49% by 2001-2002.

5. The Sectoral Composition of Output and Urbanization

Among the most fundamental transformations typical of the process of economic development are compositional shifts in output and employment from agriculture to industry and services, along with population shifts from rural to urban areas. Considered next are levels of and changes in the sectoral composition of output and urbanization for developing countries in East Asia-Pacific (including Southeast Asia) and South Asia compared to four other developing regions – Latin America-Caribbean, Middle East-North Africa, Sub-Saharan Africa and the transition countries.

For these six regions, the share of agriculture in GDP for the 1999-2003 period on average was highest in South Asia at 24.6%, and third highest in East Asia-Pacific at 15.3% (second highest was Sub-Saharan Africa at 17.1%), compared to a world average of 3.9% (Figure 3). Mirroring the regional ranking by the share of agriculture in GDP, the share of urban population for the 1999-2003 period was lowest in South Asia at 27.6%, and third lowest in East Asia-Pacific at 37.9% (second lowest was Sub-Saharan Africa at 34.8%), compared to a world average of 47.3%.

The share of industry in GDP was highest in East Asia-Pacific and lowest in South Asia, at 47.0% and 25.7% respectively, compared to a world average of 29.2% for the 1999-2003 period. The share of manufacturing in GDP was also highest in East Asia-Pacific at 32.8%, but in the middle of five developing regions for South Asia at 15.5%, compared to a world average of 19.4% (data are not available for the transition countries). The difference in South Asia's regional ranking between industry and manufacturing shares of GDP results from the lower manufacturing shares of GDP for Middle East-North Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa, regions that have relative abundances of valuable industrial natural resources, such as raw petroleum and minerals. It is also worth noting that nine developing countries in the region have higher shares of industry in GDP than what are classified as the industrialized countries of Australia, Japan and New Zealand, these being China, the Republic of Korea, Papua New Guinea, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Iran (based on the most recent year of data).

The share of services in GDP was lowest in East Asia-Pacific at 37.7%, and third lowest in South Asia at 49.7%, (second lowest was Middle East-North Africa at 47.9%), compared to a world average of 66.9% for the 1999-2003 period.

It is useful to look at shifts in the sectoral composition of output and urbanization rates over a length of some years, to better address change of a structural nature. Next evaluated are percentage point differences over the ten-year period between 1993 with 2002, pre- and post-Asian crisis (2002 is taken as the endpoint as data are missing for 2003 for some regions and countries). For the six developing regions, the share of agriculture in GDP declined most rapidly in South Asia, by -6.5 percentage points, and second most rapidly in East Asia-Pacific, by -4.0 percentage points. The urbanization rate increased most rapidly in East Asia-Pacific, by 7.7 percentage points, but by only 2.1 percentage points in South Asia, second lowest of the six regions (the figure was lowest for the transition countries, with an increase of 0.4 percentage points), compared to a world average increase of 3.6 percentage points.

¹² “Mainly China, Hong Kong (China), the Republic of Korea and Taiwan Province of China” (UNCTAD 2004b, p. 91).

The share of industry in GDP increased most rapidly in East Asia-Pacific, by 4.1 percentage points, but was basically unchanged in South Asia, with an increase of just 0.2 percentage points. The share of manufacturing in GDP increased most rapidly in East Asia-Pacific, by 2.1 percentage points, and actually declined somewhat in South Asia, by -0.3 percentage points. The share of services in GDP increased in South Asia by 6.3 percentage points, third most rapid after Latin America-Caribbean and the transition countries at around 11 percentage points for both, and was basically unchanged in East Asia-Pacific, declining by -0.1 percentage points.

In sum, in spite of rapid economic growth and industrialization, East Asia-Pacific (including Southeast Asia) remains among the more agricultural regions of the world, even compared to other developing regions, and is indeed only slightly less agricultural and rural than Sub-Saharan Africa. And for all its dynamism in recent years, South Asia remains the most agricultural and rural developing region in the world. Regarding structural shifts going back a decade, one sees that the rapid growth in Asia was accompanied by large declines in the agricultural share of output, though this was accompanied by much more rapid urbanization in East Asia-Pacific than in South Asia. Indeed, setting the -6.5 percentage point decline in the share of agriculture in GDP in South Asia against the 2.1 percentage point increase in urbanization raises questions regarding the extent to which the compositional shift in agricultural output was accompanied by a compositional shift in agricultural employment over the ten-year period. The case of India is particularly striking in this regard, with a percentage point decline in the agricultural share of output of -8.3 but an increase in the urbanization rate of only 1.9. Moreover, in East Asia-Pacific, the shift in the composition of output was largely from agriculture to industry and manufacturing whereas in South Asia the shift was largely from agriculture to services. This provides a sense of the broadly different developmental paths between East Asia-Pacific and South Asia, with the former adhering more closely to the archetypical developmental paradigm based on industrialization.

Contrasts between patterns of economic development in East-Southeast Asia and South Asia are the subject of a recent study by an ILO economist, summarized as follows in the context of the Lewis model of economic development:

Ever since the publication of the influential article on economic development by W.A. Lewis (1954), economic development in countries with surplus labour has been described as a process of economic transformation towards more modern sectors and the transfer of surplus labour from traditional sectors to modern sectors until such surplus is exhausted and real wages start rising. Indeed, development in countries of East Asia...during the 1970s, 1980s and the first half of the 1990s followed that pattern. A number of countries of South-East Asia...were also on a similar journey towards the so-called "Lewisian turning point".... On the other hand, the countries of South Asia followed a different path of development, at least until the early or mid 1980s. They were generally more inward looking, and less export oriented.... They appear to have paid less attention to human capital and skill development.... The performance of the countries of South Asia in terms of economic growth and poverty reduction has been less impressive than that of ESEA [East and South-East Asia] countries. On the labour market front, they have remained much farther away from the coveted Lewisian turning point than ESEA (Islam 2003, pp. 1-2)

The data in present report provide general support for this view of the contrasting developmental paths of East-Southeast Asia and South Asia.

6. Macro Labour Developments

The next two sections (6 and 7) address the extent to which rapid GDP growth and shifts in the sectoral composition of output and urbanization described above are reflected by developments in employment. We first look at population and population growth and then compare employment growth with output growth or, in other words, the extent to which rapid GDP growth in much of Asia translated into employment growth. We then evaluate recent changes in aggregate labour market tightness, with increasing tightness defined as the demand for workers by employers outpacing the supply of those who want to work and decreasing tightness defined as the opposite. We look at two commonly-used summary indicators of aggregate labour market tightness – the employment to adult population ratio and the unemployment rate – each with different strengths and weaknesses but which, when moving in opposite directions, provide a fairly clear sense of changes in aggregate labour market tightness. As a note of caution, though, trends in aggregate labour market tightness can mask differences among different groups of workers. Noteworthy in this regard is the case of China, for which aggregate indicators of labour market tightness show decreasing tightness, masking shortages of managers and more highly skilled workers. We also look at gender differences in employment to population rates and unemployment rates and youth unemployment. We then look at longer run trends in labour supply – that is, trends in labour force participation rates – including gender differences in labour force participation rates. Section 7 addresses changes in the sectoral composition of employment in light of changes in the sectoral composition of output.

Evaluating developments in the quantity and quality of labour and social conditions is complicated by problems of data availability and definitional consistency, both across countries and over time. This is true of even for the most basic aggregate data, such as for total employment. As a consequence, a number of the following sections are necessarily somewhat less comprehensive than preceding sections.

6.1 Population

East Asia-Pacific (including Southeast Asia) and South Asia were by far the most populous of six developing regions of the world, with populations in 2003 of 1.85 and 1.42 billion, respectively, compared to a world population of 6.27 billion and a total population for six developing regions of 5.30 billion. In other words, East Asia-Pacific made up 35.0% and South Asia made up 26.9% of the population of the developing world as of 2003. The largest share of the population within these two regions was dominated by China in East Asia-Pacific and India in South Asia, with populations of 1.29 billion for China and 1.06 billion for India, comprising 69.5% and 74.7% of the populations of their respective regions.

From 1999-2003, population grew at an average annual rate of 0.9% in East Asia-Pacific (including Southeast Asia) and 1.8% in South Asia compared to the world average of 1.2%. This compares to average annual rates in other developing regions of, in order of descent, Sub-Saharan Africa at 2.3%, Middle East-North Africa at 1.9%, Latin America at 1.5%, and the transition countries at -0.1%. Countries in the region with annual average population growth rates over these years of greater than 2.0% are Kiribati (2.2%), Papua New Guinea (2.4%), the Solomon Islands (2.9%), Vanuatu (2.5%), Lao PDR (2.4%), Malaysia (2.2%), Philippines (2.2%), Afghanistan (2.8%), Nepal (2.3%) and Pakistan (2.4%); countries in the region with annual average population growth rates of less than 1.0% are China (0.7%), the Republic of Korea (0.7%), Timor-Leste (-0.1, though population growth was greater than 3.0% in 2002 and 2003), Thailand (0.7%) and Japan (0.1%).

Population growth is relevant to economic development in a number of respects, most directly as the linkage between GDP growth and the growth of per capita income. That is, more rapid population growth translates into lower per capita income growth for any given rate of GDP growth. In turn, therefore, more rapid population growth translates into lower rates of poverty reduction for any given structure of income distribution. It is worth noting in this regard that population growth in India was more than twice as rapid than in China in recent years, 1.6% for India compared to 0.7% China for the 1999-2003 period. This difference holds more broadly between South Asia with East Asia (including Southeast Asia), where average annual population growth has been twice as high in the former in recent years.

6.2 Employment Growth and Labour Market Tightness

Total employment data is available for 14 of the 28 countries in the region for 2002 and for 10 countries for 2003 (Table 2). The 14 countries make up about 90% of the adult (15 and older) population of the 28 countries in the region. For these years, the countries with the highest employment growth rates were Sri Lanka (7.3% in 2002¹³), Mongolia (4.6% in 2002, 6.4% in 2003), India (*estimated* at 4.4% in 2002¹⁴) and Pakistan (3.7% in 2002); the countries with the lowest growth rates were Singapore (-1.4% in 2002, 0.8% in 2003), Japan (-1.3% in 2002, -0.2% in 2003) and Indonesia (0.9% in 2002) (Figure 4). The Republic of Korea also experienced a small decline in total employment in 2003 (-0.1) after a solid increase in 2002 (2.8%). Strikingly, next on the list of countries having lowest employment growth rates in 2002 was China at 1.0%. Moreover, 2002 was not for China an anomalous year of employment growth, which had with an average annual employment growth of just 1.1% between 1999-2002, compared to an annual average GDP growth rate of 7.7% over these same years.¹⁵ Describing the employment situation in China (as well as the underestimation of unemployment by the official unemployment rate, discussed below), the Asian Development Bank writes:

The PRC's [People's Republic of China] rapid growth still is inadequate to absorb surplus agricultural labor, new labor market entrants, and workers laid off from state-owned enterprises (SOEs). Unofficial estimates put the jobless rate at 8%. Much of the unemployment comes from structural changes and cannot be quickly solved through rapid economic growth (ADB 2004b, p. 18).¹⁶

¹³ The employment growth rate for Sri Lanka in 2003 is 4.2%, but employment data for 2003 is based on wider geographical coverage and thus is not directly comparable with employment data for 2002.

¹⁴ The data on total employment for India were estimated by the authors from current weekly employment to population rates for India from www.indialabourstat.com. These estimates provide total employment data very similar to that in the ILO's *Laborsta* database but which are both more up to date as well as more complete for earlier years. The employment to population rates are available only with rural-urban and male-female breakdowns. To derive total employment figures, we used data from the World Bank's *World Development Indicators* on urbanization rates and male and population, making the assumption that the percentage of population by gender is the same in rural and urban areas.

¹⁵ For a detailed discussion of labour developments in China as well as a discussion of related data problems, see Rawski (2003) and Zeng (2005).

¹⁶ The main employment problems in China are summarized by another recent study as follows: "Although China has made impressive progress in economic development and improving social

The gap between output and employment growth rates is higher for China than for any other country in the region and is particularly striking when set against analogous figures for countries such as Australia and New Zealand. Taking figures for 2003, for example, for Australia output and employment growth rates were 2.4% and 2.3%, respectively; for New Zealand output and employment growth rates were 2.7% and 2.4%, respectively. In other words, for these two countries, looking at output growth rates provides a clearer sense of employment growth rates, whereas this does not hold in China and also not in the Republic of Korea, Thailand and Vietnam, where the GDP growth rate exceeded the employment growth rate by more the 3 percentage points for 2002 and 2003.

A commonly-used indicator of labour market tightness is the employment to population rate – that is, total employment as a percentage of the adult (15 and older) population. The measure is not without problems, particularly for cross-country comparisons, given that it varies by the age distribution of the adult population, for older and younger workers are generally less likely to be working. That said, it nonetheless provides a useful complement to such measures as employment growth and unemployment rates. For the period between 1999-2003, for which we have data for 19 of the countries in the region, the five countries having employment to population rates greater than 70% are China (76.0%), Cambodia (89.7%), Thailand (72.6%), Vietnam (73.1%) and Nepal (71.4%) (with figures for the most recent year of data) (Table 3). The rate in industrialized countries in the region – Australia, Japan and New Zealand – was around 60%, similar to the Republic of Korea, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines and Singapore. The rate tended to be low in South Asia, at around 45% for Pakistan and Sri Lanka and 55% for India, with the exception of Nepal, as noted, and Bangladesh, with a rate somewhat over 60%. The rate was also comparatively low in Mongolia, around 53%. Note that for the countries in the region, there is no obvious relationship between employment to population rates and GDP growth, since the countries having most rapid GDP growth in recent years are in found in both the East and Southeast Asian countries having high employment to population rates and the South Asian countries having low employment to population rates. There is something of a pattern with respect to per capital income, however, with the industrialized countries and some of the developing countries with higher per capita incomes having employment to population rates in the middle range.

The most commonly-used indicator of labour market tightness is the unemployment rate. However, cross-country comparisons of unemployment rates among countries at widely different levels of development need to be properly interpreted. For the weaker are social safety nets and the higher are poverty rates in a country – and thus the larger the share of the population that cannot afford to be unemployed and has no choice but to work – the less relevant is the unemployment rate as an indicator of the main employment problems in a country. This caveat should be borne in mind when comparing unemployment rates between countries and regions.

That said, one observes sizeable changes in aggregate labour market tightness over upswings and downswings even in the poorest developing countries. This is suggested, for instance, by comparing changes in unemployment rates with changes in employment to population rates for the developing countries in region. Beginning with East Asia-Pacific, official unemployment rates in China increased from 3.1% in 1999 to 4.0% in 2002, in

well-being, it is facing many daunting challenges while transforming toward a knowledge and service-based economy and further opening up to international competition after its WTO accession in the context of [the] knowledge revolution. One of the biggest challenges is how to create 100-300 million new jobs in the coming decade to absorb the millions of laid-offs, rural emigrants and [the] newly added labor force. China has been successful in building high-tech parks and ICT [information and communication technology] industries, but they are limited in terms of employment generation, while most of the traditional labor-intensive industries are losing competitiveness due to low productivity” (Zeng 2005, p. 1)

spite of its rapid GDP growth (Table 4). Indeed the unemployment rate for China was higher in 2002 than in any year going back to 1990. In contrast with China, unemployment rates in Republic of Korea and Mongolia declined overall from 1999, even though these two countries, particularly Mongolia, grew at a much more modest pace than did China. These differences are not explained by differences in the growth of labour supply, since the number of labour force participants increased more in Mongolia and the Republic of Korea than in China (by annual average rates of 1.8%, 1.3% and 0.8%, respectively, from 1999-2003, for total number of labour force participants).

Changes in unemployment rates in these three countries broadly mirror changes in employment to population rates, which were negative for all four years for China between from 1999-2002 but generally positive for the Republic of Korea and Mongolia over these same years. The diverging patterns of unemployment rates and employment to population rates provide, therefore, a consistent picture of increased aggregate labour tightness in the Republic of Korea and Mongolia and decreased aggregate labour market tightness in China, in spite of its rapid GDP growth.

For other countries in Asia, there were similar patterns of divergence between unemployment and employment to population rates. That is, unemployment rates increased and employment to population rates declined in Indonesia and Singapore in recent years – as in China – while the opposite pattern held in Thailand and Vietnam – as in the Republic of Korea and Mongolia. The other developing countries for which there are sufficient recent data to make such comparisons between employment and unemployment rates are Malaysia and India. In Malaysia, the unemployment rate held steady at around 3.5% and the employment to population rate also showed no clear pattern. In India, the employment to population rate went from 55.4% in 2000 to 54.1% in 2001 and then back to 55.4% in 2002. Unemployment rates for India are available for these years only with rural-urban and male-female breakdowns, but all 4 rates declined from 2000-2002, from 5.6% to 4.6% for urban males, 7.3% to 4.8% for urban females, 3.9% to 2.6% for rural males, and from 3.7% to 2.6% for rural females.¹⁷

Regarding the industrialized countries in the region, the unemployment rate fell overall in Australia and New Zealand from 1999-2003, from 7.0% to 6.0% in the former and from 6.8% to 4.7% in the latter. These declines were mirrored in by increases in the employment to population rate over these years. In spite of the upswing in Japan in 2003, the unemployment rate increased overall from 4.7% to 5.3% from 1999-2003 (peaking in 2002 at 5.4%), and the employment to population rate declined each year over this period.

Bearing in mind the cautions noted above about comparing employment to population rates and unemployment rates across countries and regions, the ILO does provide regional estimates of these rates for eight regions of the world, seven developing regions and the industrialized countries taken as a region (ILO 2004). For 2003, employment to population rates were higher in East Asia and Southeast Asia than any other region, at 76.6% and 67.1% respectively. The six other regions rank in order of descent as follows: Sub-Saharan Africa at 66.0%, Latin America-Caribbean at 59.3%, South Asia at 57.0%, the industrialized countries at 56.1%, the transition countries at 53.5%, and Middle East-North Africa at 46.4%. Also for 2003, the eight regions rank in order of ascent for unemployment rates as follows: East Asia at 3.3%, South Asia at 4.8%, Southeast Asia and the industrialized countries at 6.1% for both, Latin America-Caribbean at 9.0%, the transition countries at 9.5%, Sub-Saharan Africa at 10.6%, and Middle East-North Africa at 12.0%.

¹⁷ Current weekly unemployment rates.

In other words, unemployment rates are estimated to be lower for Asia than for other developing regions.¹⁸

To summarize main findings, comparing eight regions of the world, both developed and developing, employment to population rates are estimated to be highest in East Asia and Southeast Asia and unemployment rates are estimated to be lowest in East Asia, Southeast Asia and South Asia. Based on changes in employment to population rates and unemployment rates, we find evidence of decreased aggregate labour market tightness in China, Indonesia, Singapore and Japan; increased aggregate labour market tightness in the Republic of Korea, Mongolia, Thailand, Vietnam, India, Australia and New Zealand; and little appreciable change in Malaysia. However, changes in aggregate labour market tightness can mask important developments, as the case of China demonstrates. That is, occurring alongside decreased *aggregate* labour market tightness in China are tight labour markets for more highly skilled workers and managers as well as younger workers willing to migrate from rural to urban areas (Fuller 2005a; 2005b). The shortage of more highly skilled workers is particularly relevant in light of compositional shifts away from agriculture toward industry and services, given that the latter two sectors require more highly skilled workers (Wood 1994).

6.3 Gender Representation in Employment and Unemployment.

The ratio of male to female employment to population rates provides an indicator of gender representation in employment, with a ratio of 1 indicating equal representation relative to respective female and male adult populations. Such data are available for 17 of the countries in the region for any given year between 1999-2003. Nepal was the one country having a gender representation ratio of less than one, indicating a higher propensity for women than men to be employed. Three other countries had ratios generally less than 1.1 over these years: Mongolia, Cambodia and Vietnam. Other countries having ratios of generally less than 1.3 are Thailand, Australia and New Zealand. The three countries having the highest ratios and thus the greatest gender inequality by this measure are in South Asia. These are India and Sri Lanka, with ratios above 2, and Pakistan with a ratio above 5. These three countries also had low total employment to population rates, which the high ratios of male to female employment to population rates suggest are accounted for by the low representation of women in employment. This is confirmed by the cases of India and Pakistan, for which male employment to population rates are around 75-80%, similar to the male employment to population rates of countries having among the highest total employment to population rates, such as Vietnam. Mongolia is an anomalous case, having both a low employment to population rate and a low ratio of male to female employment to population rates.

The ratio of female to male unemployment rates provides an indicator of gender representation in unemployment, with a ratio of 1 indicating equal representation relative to the respective female and male labour force. Based on ILO estimates for eight regions of the world (seven developing regions and the industrialized countries taken as a region), these rank in order of decent for 2003 as follows: Middle East-North Africa at 1.6, Latin America-Caribbean at 1.5, South Asia at 1.4, Southeast Asia at 1.2, the industrialized countries and transition countries at 1.0 for both, Sub-Saharan Africa at 0.8, and East Asia

¹⁸ Estimates of regional unemployment rates are provided for 2001-2003, but these show little appreciable change for Asia. For example, for East Asia, the unemployment rate for 2001 and 2003 held steady at 3.3%. For Southeast Asia, the unemployment rate is 6.1% for 2001 and 6.3% for 2003; for South Asia the unemployment rate is 4.7% for 2001 and 4.8% for 2001. Employment to population rates are provided for 2003 but not for other recent years (ILO 2004).

at 0.7 (ILO 2004; Figure 5). These ratios show little change between 2001 and 2003. These ratios show that females are disproportionately represented in unemployment in five of eight regions in the world, including South Asia and Southeast Asia, and equally represented in two regions, while males are disproportionately represented in unemployment in two regions, including East Asia where indeed the ratio of female to male unemployment rates is lower than any other region.

At the country level, it is possible to construct the ratio of female to male unemployment rates for 18 countries in the region for any given year between 1999-2003. Countries with ratios generally below 0.7, indicating a higher propensity for men than women to be unemployed, are the Republic of Korea, Papua New Guinea, Iran and Nepal. For 10 of these countries, the ratio was generally around 1. These are Mongolia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Bangladesh, India, Australia, Japan and New Zealand. Countries with ratios of generally 1.3 or greater are Cambodia, Vietnam, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. The ratios are particularly high in the latter two countries, at around 2 in Sri Lanka and 3 in Pakistan. Note that Pakistan and Sri Lanka were also among the three countries (India being the third) having exceptionally low propensities for women to be in employment – that is, having exceptionally high ratios of male to female employment to population rates. In terms of gender differences in employment and unemployment rates, we see that Pakistan and Sri Lanka were highly unequal by both these measures, having both low propensities for women to be employed and high propensities for women to be unemployed.

In sum, a key finding is that the representation of females in employment is lower than for males in all but one of the countries (Nepal) for which we have data. Moreover, the comparatively low total (male and female) employment to population rates in such countries as India and Pakistan is accounted for low female employment to population rates, with male employment to population rates in these two countries are similar to countries in the region having the highest employment to population rates. We also find that females are disproportionately represented among the unemployed in South Asia and Southeast Asia, while it is males who are disproportionately represented among the unemployed in East Asia.

6.4. Youth Unemployment.

The problem of high youth unemployment has received a good deal of attention in recent years, and reducing youth unemployment is indeed among the Millennium Development Goals (UNDP 2004, p. 136). The ratio of youth (aged 15-24) to total unemployment rates provides an indicator of youth representation in unemployment, with a ratio of 1 indicating equal representation relative to the respective youth and total labour force. Based on ILO estimates for eight regions of the world (seven developing regions and the industrialized countries taken as a region), ratios of youth to total unemployment rates are highest in Asia (Figure 6). For 2001 and 2003 respectively, the eight regions have ratios as follows: South Asia, increasing from 2.8 to 2.9, Southeast Asia, increasing from 2.4 to 2.6, East Asia, declining from 2.2 to 2.1, Middle East-North Africa, holding at 2.1, the transition countries, declining from 2.1 to 2.0, the industrialized countries, holding at 2.0, Sub-Saharan Africa, holding at 1.9, and Latin America-Caribbean, increasing from 1.8 to 2.1 (ILO 2004). Note that within Asia the increase in the ratio of youth to total unemployment was largest in Southeast Asia. This is, however, a more longstanding development for Southeast Asia. Looking at data for 1993 to 2003 also shows a strong increase in the ratio in Southeast Asia, which in contrast held steady in South Asia and declined somewhat in East Asia over these years (Raychaudhuri 2004).

At the country level, it is possible to construct the ratio of youth to total unemployment rates for 11 of the countries in the region for any given year between 1999-2003. These

countries can be grouped into three categories. First are those having ratios around 1, namely China and Singapore. For only these two countries, then, is youth unemployment not particularly problematic relative to total unemployment. Second are countries having ratios around 2, these being the Republic of Korea, the Philippines, Pakistan and the three industrialized countries, Australia, Japan and New Zealand. Third are countries have ratios around 3 and thus particularly acute problems of youth unemployment, namely Thailand, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka. For the 10 countries for which there are data, the ratio of youth to total unemployment rates is very similar for males and females and thus gender does not appear to be a defining characteristic of youth unemployment in these countries.

In sum, while the problem of youth unemployment occurs throughout the world, it is more severe in Asia than any other region and especially so in South Asia, as indicated by the ratio of youth to total unemployment rates. This ratio declined in East Asia and increased in Southeast Asia, indicating improvement of the youth unemployment problem in the former and worsening in the latter.

6.5. Trends in Labour Force Participation.

Cross-country comparisons of labour force participation rates are largely driven by differences in employment to population rates, which were considered above. Yet it is also instructive to look at labour force participation rates in an analogous manner, for whereas employment to population rates are missing for a number of countries in the region, labour force participation rates are available for all but two countries. Countries having labour force participation rates (15 to 64 years of age) of greater than 80% as of 2000 include China (84.9%), Mongolia (81.7%), the Solomon Islands (85.6%), Cambodia (84.0%), Lao PDR (83.9%), Timor-Leste (82.3%), Thailand (83.8%) and Vietnam (81.4%) (Table 5).¹⁹ These figures compare with a world average rate of 73.3% in 2000. Labour force participation rates in the industrialized countries of Australia, Japan and New Zealand are around this world average. Countries with labour force participation rates of around 68% or less (that is, about 5 percentage points less than the world average) are Fiji (61.8%), Malaysia (66.5%), the Philippines (66.9%), Afghanistan (68.5%), India (66.5%), Iran (55.6%), Pakistan (62.1%) and Sri Lanka (65.1%).

The ratio of male to female labour force participation rates provides an indicator of gender representation in the labour force, with a ratio of 1 indicating equal representation relative to respective adult populations. As of 2000, the ratio for the world was 1.4 (Figure 7). Though no country had a ratio of less than 1, six countries had ratios of 1.1 or less, namely China, Mongolia, the Solomon Islands, Cambodia, Timor-Leste and Vietnam. Other countries having ratios of 1.3 or less include Papua New Guinea, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Thailand, Bangladesh, Australia and New Zealand. The three countries having ratios above 2 are Fiji, Iran and Pakistan. Malaysia, the Philippines, Afghanistan, India and Sri Lanka also had comparatively high ratios of greater than 1.6. Note that these last eight countries are the same as those having the lowest overall labour force participation rates, suggesting that their low overall rates result from their low female labour force participation rates. This is confirmed by looking at their male labour force participation rates, which are similar to other countries in the region, ranging from 79.9% in Iran to 85.9% in Pakistan.

An important and widely discussed trend in most countries in recent decades is the entry of greater numbers of women into the labour force. Looking at period between 1990 and 2000, the world average female labour force participation rate increased by 1.5 percentage

¹⁹ Nepal is the only country in the region for which we have data on both employment and labour force participation rates that does not rank among the highest by both rates.

points. The eight developing countries in the region having percentage point increases of 3.0 or greater include Fiji (10.9), the Republic of Korea (6.7), Indonesia (5.7), Malaysia (4.3), the Philippines (3.0), Iran (7.8), Pakistan (7.4), Sri Lanka (3.7). Note that six of these are among the eight countries having both low total labour force participation rates and low female labour force participation rates (India being the exception, with a lower percentage point increase in the female labour force participation rate of 2.2). There has thus been a tendency towards convergence, with the least equal countries as regards male and female labour force participation moving more rapidly to greater equality. Note too that the industrialized countries in the region all had increases in female labour force participation rates of greater than 5.0 percentage points between 1990 and 2000. Some countries saw declines in the female labour force participation rates over these years, namely the Solomon Islands, Cambodia, Myanmar, Timor-Leste, Thailand and Vietnam. However, in all these countries except for Thailand, the male labour force participation rate declined by even more. Indeed, in every country in the region but Thailand, the ratio of male to female labour force participation rates declined from 1990 to 2000, indicating a trend towards greater equality in male and female labor force participation for the region over these years.

To summarize key findings, the eight countries in the region with the lowest total (male and female) labour force participation rates are the same eight countries with the highest ratios of male to female labour force participation rates and thus the greatest gender inequality in this regard. Five of these eight countries are in South Asia. This finding, similar to that for employment to population rates, indicates that it is largely low female labour force participation rates that account for low total labour force participation rates. From 1990 to 2000, we see declines in the ratios of male to female labour force participation rates for all countries but Thailand, indicating increased relative female representation in the labour force. Moreover, there was considerable overlap among those countries having the largest increases in female labour force participation rates and greatest gender inequality in labour force participation, indicating a pattern of convergence among countries in the region towards greater gender equality in this regard.

7. The Sectoral Composition of Employment.

Data on the sectoral composition of employment for agriculture, industry and services are available for 23 countries in the region for at least one year between 1995-2003 (Table 6, Figure 8). Based on the latest year for which data are available going back to 1995, countries with shares of agricultural employment greater than 40% are China (56.6%), Mongolia (41.8%), Cambodia (70.2%), Indonesia (44.3%), Myanmar (62.7%), Thailand (44.9%), Vietnam (68.8%), Bangladesh (64.8%), India (66.7%), Nepal (74.8%) and Pakistan (42.1%). That is, about one-half of the 23 countries for which we have fairly recent data have high shares of agricultural employment. Countries in the region with shares of agricultural employment less than 10% are Fiji (2.0%), Kiribati (6.1%), Singapore (0.2%) and the industrialized countries Australia (3.9%), Japan (4.7%) and New Zealand (8.2%).

Countries having shares of industrial employment greater than 20% are China (22.7%), Fiji (33.8%), the Republic of Korea (27.6%), Malaysia (32.0%), Singapore (24.1%), Iran (31.2%), Pakistan (20.8%), Sri Lanka (24.3%) and the industrialized countries Australia (21.0%), Japan (29.5%) and New Zealand (22.4%). Four countries have shares of industrial employment around 10% or less, these being Kiribati (6.4%), Cambodia (10.5%), Bangladesh (10.7%), and Nepal (5.2%). India is in the middle range, having a 12.9% share of industrial employment.

Countries with shares of services employment greater than 40% are Fiji (64.3%), Kiribati (87.5%), the Republic of Korea (63.5%), Mongolia (42.6%), Malaysia (53.7%), the Philippines (47.0%), Singapore (75.6%), Iran (45.3%), Sri Lanka (40.1%) and the industrialized countries Australia (75.0%), Japan (65.8%) and New Zealand (69.5%). Countries with shares of services employment around 20% or less are China (20.7%), Cambodia (19.3%), Vietnam (18.7%), India (20.3%) and Nepal (20.0%).

It is worth noting that many of the fastest growing economies in the region have high shares of agricultural employment. These include China, Cambodia, Myanmar, Thailand, Vietnam, Bangladesh and India, all with average annual growth rates of around 5% or higher from 1999-2003.²⁰ Cambodia and Bangladesh are also among the countries with the lowest shares of industrial employment and China, Cambodia, Vietnam and India among the countries with the lowest shares of services employment.

As with compositional shifts in sectoral output, it is useful to evaluate compositional shifts in sectoral employment over a length of some years to address change of a structural nature. We next look then at percentage point differences from 1993-2002 in sectoral shares of employment, for which we have data for 14 countries in the region.²¹ Beginning with the share of agricultural employment, we see sizeable declines of about 4 percentage points or more for China, the Republic of Korea, Cambodia, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand, Pakistan and Sri Lanka and a comparable increase only in Mongolia. Consistent with the view that economic development is associated with rapid shifts out of agricultural employment, these are also among the most rapidly growing countries in the region since the mid-1990s (though the Philippines and Pakistan experienced comparatively slower growth).

²⁰ Lao PDR also fits in this group, having a 78.1% share of agricultural employment in 1990, the latest year for which we have data.

²¹ For Cambodia and the Philippines, percentage point differences are for 1993-2001 as a result of missing data for 2002.

Taking the roughly 4 percentage point threshold for changes in the share of industrial employment, we see declines of this magnitude or greater in the Republic of Korea, Mongolia, Singapore, and Japan and a comparable increases in Cambodia and Sri Lanka. Again using the 4 percentage point threshold for the share of services employment, we see greater than 4 percentage point increases in China, the Republic of Korea, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Japan. Five of these seven countries, with Singapore and Japan the exceptions, also saw sizeable declines in shares of agricultural employment. In this sense, the process of economic development in these countries is characterized not by industrialization as such with regards to employment, but rather by shifting shares of employment from agriculture to services. The only country with a decline in the services share of employment was Cambodia, which had a –1.2 percentage point decline over the decade.

Comparing compositional shifts in output versus compositional shifts in employment over the same ten-year span, the cases of China and Malaysia are particularly striking. In both cases, the shift away from agricultural output was largely toward industry, but the shift away from agricultural employment was largely towards services. Looking at output, in other words, both countries were becoming more industrialized, but looking at employment, both countries were becoming more service oriented. In Malaysia, for instance, the share of industrial output increased by 7.3 percentage points while the share of industrial employment remained unchanged and the share of services output declined by –2.5 percentage points while the share of services employment increased by 6.2 percentage points. For China, the share of industrial output increased by 3.7 percentage points while the share of industrial employment declined by –2.1 percentage points and the share of services output increased by just 0.8 percentage points while the share of services employment increased by 7.8 percentage points.²²

In sum, we see that the rapid economic growth experienced in much of developing Asia was associated with marked compositional shifts in both output and employment away from agriculture and toward industry and services. A critical issue in this regard is the extent to which workers displaced from agricultural employment have the skills and education to work in industrial and service employment, where the skill and education requirements are generally higher (Wood 1994). The next section addresses skills and education by looking at literacy rates and average years of educational attainment for adults.

²² It is worth noting, though, that compared to other countries in the region, China has a large share of employment that is “not adequately defined” and thus is not included under the three main sectors of the economy. This undefined share increased overall from 17.7% in 1990 to 22.1% in 2002, peaking in 2001 at 24.9%.

8. Skills and Education.

There is a point on which otherwise contrary accounts of Asian development agree: that education played was of crucial importance in facilitating the growth of manufacturing exports and economic growth more generally (WB 1993, p. 5; Amsden 2001, p. 63; Di Caprio and Amsden 2004, p. 2). The World Bank's influential report *The East Asian Miracle* states, "In nearly all the rapidly growing East Asian economies, the growth and transformation of systems of education and training during the past three decades has been dramatic" (ibid., p. 43). A sense of this transformation is provided by looking at average years of educational attainment for adults from 1960 to 1999 for the set of economies the World Bank defines as "high performing" Asian economies (Figure 9). Particularly dramatic are increases for the Republic of Korea and Taiwan (China).

There is a strong relationship between levels of per capita income and adult (15 and older) literacy rates and years of educational attainment for adults, meaning that skills and education by these measures are strongly associated with income levels.²³ Indeed, the adult literacy rate (along with GDP per capita and life expectancy) is one of the three components of the UNDP's Human Development Index, which provides a measure of economic development extending beyond per capita income levels alone.

Compared to four other developing regions, adult literacy rates as of 2000 were second highest in East Asia-Pacific (including Southeast Asia) at 90.2%, and lowest in South Asia at 55.8% (highest were the transition countries at 97.1%), compared to a world average of 79.1%. All four countries in East-Asia Pacific (not including Southeast Asia) for which we have data had adult literacy rates of greater than 90%. In Southeast Asia, most countries had adult literacy rates of about 85% or higher. The exceptions were Cambodia and Lao PDR, with adult literacy rates of less than 70%. In South Asia, Bangladesh, Nepal and Pakistan all had adult literacy rates of around 40% and India had a rate of 57.2%. Sri Lanka was the only country in South Asia with an adult literacy rate greater than 90%. The industrialized countries of Australia, Japan and New Zealand along with the Republic of Korea all had adult literacy rates of greater than 95%.

Looking at the change from 1990-2000, adult literacy rates increased by 10.4 percentage points in East Asia-Pacific (including Southeast Asia) and 8.8 percentage points in South Asia, compared to a world average of 8.3 percentage points. These are quite large increases over a relatively short period of time, given that they refer to the literacy of the entire adult population and that the increase is largely driven by younger adults, given their disproportionate concentration in formal education. Countries with greater than 10 percentage point increases in adult literacy rates over these 10 years are China, Iran and Nepal. Other countries with greater than 5 percentage point increases are Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Bangladesh and India. There was essentially no change in the adult literacy rate in Mongolia, Thailand and Vietnam (to 1999 for Vietnam), though these three countries all had literacy rates of greater than 90% throughout the 1990-2000 period.

²³ Pearson correlation coefficients between GDP per capita in PPP and adult literacy rates and average years of educational attainment for adults are 0.64 and 0.79, respectively, for a sample of about 160 developed and developing countries using data for the mid-1990s (Kucera and Sarna 2004, p. 27)

Adult literacy rates and average years of educational attainment for adults are, unsurprisingly, highly correlated across countries.²⁴ Consistent with this, the four countries with the highest adult literacy rates in 2000 are also those with the highest average years of educational attainment for adults, these being the industrialized countries of Australia, Japan and New Zealand along with the Republic of Korea, all with average years of educational attainment for adults of about 10 years or more. Other countries with more than 6 years of educational attainment for adults are concentrated in East and Southeast Asia and include China, Fiji, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and – the exception to the sub-regional pattern – Sri Lanka. Countries with less than 3 years of educational attainment for adults as of 2000 are Papua New Guinea, Myanmar (in contrast with its reported literacy rate of about 85%), Afghanistan, Bangladesh and Nepal. The other South Asian countries of India, Iran and Pakistan were in the middle range, having average years of adult educational attainment in 2000 of 5.1, 5.3 and 3.9 years, respectively.

Looking at percentage change from 1990 to 2000 in average years of educational attainment for adults, we see increases of greater than 20% in Papua New Guinea, Indonesia, Afghanistan, India, Iran and Nepal. For Papua New Guinea, Afghanistan and Nepal among these, the percentage change increases are from quite low levels in 1990 of less than 2.5 years of educational attainment. A number of other countries had increases of greater than 10% over these years, including Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand in Southeast Asia and Bangladesh and Sri Lanka in South Asia. It is noteworthy that the increases in Southeast Asia are, with the exception of Myanmar, from already comparatively high levels of educational attainment in 1990. Note that though China was one of the three countries with the largest increases in adult literacy rates, it was not among the leading countries in the region in terms of increases in years of educational attainment for adults.

The ratio of male to female adult literacy rates and male to female average years of educational attainment for adults provide indicators of gender differences in skills and education relative to respective adult populations, with a ratio of 1 indicating equality in skills and education. The relevance of such gender differences for economic development is suggested by an econometric study on the effects of gender equality in education on economic growth, which provides evidence that greater equality is associated with more rapid growth (Klasen 1999). Beginning with adult literacy rates and comparing six developing regions in the world as of 2000, Latin America-Caribbean was the most equal and, indeed, had a ratio of 0.98, indicating slightly higher literacy rates for females than males, compared to a world average of 1.1. East Asia-Pacific (including Southeast Asia) also had a comparatively low ratio of 1.0 (Figure 10). In contrast, South Asia had the greatest gender inequality in literacy of the six regions, with a ratio of 1.6. Next most unequal was Middle East-North Africa with a ratio of 1.4. In East and Southeast Asia, the exceptions to the general pattern of comparative gender equality in literacy are Cambodia and Lao PDR, both with ratios of 1.4 or greater as of 2000. In South Asia, only Sri Lanka had a ratio of 1.1 or less. Iran was also comparatively equal with respect to the rest of South Asia, with a ratio of 1.2. Bangladesh, India, Nepal and Pakistan (using 1998 data for Pakistan) all had ratios of 1.5 or higher, and Nepal had a very high ratio of 2.5. It is worth emphasizing the considerably greater equality in literacy in China than India, with ratios of 1.1 and 1.5 respectively.

Looking at change from 1990-2000 in the ratio of male to female literacy rates, the developing region with the most rapid decline in this measure (and thus the strongest

²⁴ With a Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.84 for a sample of about 160 developed and developing countries using data for the mid-1990s (Kucera and Sarna 2004, p. 27).

change toward greater equality) was Middle East-North Africa, with a decline of -0.35 . But the ratio also declined substantially in South Asia, by -0.25 , and in East Asia-Pacific (including Southeast Asia), by -0.19 . In other words, the two most unequal regions as regards male and female literacy – Middle East-North Africa and South Asia – experienced the greatest improvement in this regard. This pattern of convergence is reflected at the country level as well, where we see the largest declines in the ratio of male to female literacy rates (of about -0.20 or more) in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Bangladesh, India, Nepal and Pakistan (1990-1998 for Pakistan), the same six countries with the greatest gender inequality in literacy.²⁵

Shifting to the ratio of male to female average years of educational attainment for adults, the countries with the highest ratios as of 2000, at greater than 1.4, are China, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, India, Nepal and Pakistan. Note that while China was comparatively equal between males and females as regards literacy, this was not so as regards years of educational attainment. The ratio of male to female average years of educational attainment for adults was particularly high in Afghanistan at 3.1, Nepal at 2.3 and Pakistan at 2.0. Broadly similar with changes in the gender literacy ratio, country with the largest declines from 1990-2000 in the ratio of male to female educational attainment were, by and large, also those with the highest ratios, these being Afghanistan, Bangladesh, India and Nepal. The exception was Pakistan, which saw a slight increase in the ratio from 1990-2000, though after quite substantial declines over prior years.

Summarizing main findings, East Asia-Pacific (including Southeast Asia) and South Asia differed greatly in skills and education as measured by adult literacy rates and average years of educational attainment for adults, with East Asia-Pacific doing considerably better by both measures. Among six developing regions of the world as of 2000, for example, adult literacy rates were second highest in East Asia-Pacific and lowest in South Asia. Moreover, while the adult literacy rate increased by more than the world average in both regions from 1990-2000, it increased more rapidly in East Asia-Pacific than in South Asia, in spite of the former having higher adult literacy rates in 1990. That said, four of the six countries in the region having the largest increases in years of educational attainment since 1990 – Afghanistan, India, Iran and Nepal – were in South Asia.

East Asia-Pacific (including Southeast Asia) was generally more gender equal than South Asia as measured by ratios of male to female literacy rates and years of educational attainment, though China was notable in being comparatively gender equal as regards literacy rates but not as regards years of educational attainment. There was, however, more rapid change towards greater gender equality by both these ratios in South Asia than in East Asia-Pacific – particularly in Bangladesh, India and Nepal – indicating a pattern of convergence within Asia towards greater gender equality in literacy and educational attainment.

²⁵ In both 1990 and 2000, in spite of the pattern of convergence.

9. Child Labour.

Studies of the economics of child labour commonly refer to the relationship between child labour and education. For example, one author writes that “the dynamic consequences of child labor are likely to be large, since an increase in child labor frequently causes a decline in the acquisition of human capital” (Basu 1999, p. 1106). It is an overstatement to regard education as the simple inverse of child labour, for children can and do combine work with school attendance, depending critically on the number and seasonality of hours worked. Moreover, a decline in child labour will only lead to an increase in educational attainment in the presence of schools that are both accessible and affordable and also of sufficient quality that parents regard them as useful. But it is not happenstance that the increase in skills and education in East Asia occurred alongside rapid declines in the economic activity rates of 10-14 year olds and indeed that the declines in East Asia were more rapid than for any other region in the world. More than that, there are strong negative cross-country correlations between measures of child labour and education.²⁶ This evidence suggests that through the course of economic development, education and child labour are by and large opposite sides of the same coin.²⁷

We use the economic activity rate of 10-14 year olds as an indicator of child labour. As of 2003, East Asia-Pacific (including Southeast Asia) had a rate of 5.1% and South Asia of 13.5%, compared to a world average of 10.1% (Table 7). The transition countries had the lowest rate in 2003 at 1.0%, and Sub-Saharan Africa had the highest rate at 28.2%. Looking at percentage point differences from 1990-2003, the rate of decline for six developing regions was most rapid in East Asia (including Southeast Asia) at -9.6 percentage points and second most rapid in South Asia at -5.9, compared to a world average of -4.5. Countries in the region with declines of greater than 10 percentage points are China (-11.3), the Solomon Islands (-12.1), Thailand (-10.2) and Vietnam (-10.4).

However these data – based on ILO estimates and projections – appear to generally underestimate child labour. A word of caution is noted by an ILO statistician, who writes that measurement error for the economic activity rate is “particularly problematic at the tails of the age distribution” (Mehran 2000, p. xi). This is suggested by a comparison of these economic activity rates with others provided by the ILO’s Statistical Information and Monitoring Programme on Child Labour (SIMPOC). For example, the economic activity rate for 10-14 year olds comparing SIMPOC data with data based on ILO estimates and projections provide, respectively, figures of 18.9% and 4.9% for the Philippines in 2001, 36% and 6.8% for Vietnam in 1998, and 21.3% and 2.1% for Sri Lanka in 1999. In contrast, the comparable figures for Thailand in 2000 are 6.6% for SIMPOC data and 12.2% based on ILO estimates and projections. However, the SIMPOC data for countries in the region provide more limited information on trends, and thus the economic activity rate of 10-14 year olds based on ILO estimates and projections is useful in this regard in spite of its shortcomings.

²⁶ Pearson correlation coefficients the economic activity rate for 10-14 year olds and adult literacy rates and average years of educational attainment for adults are 0.79 and 0.77, respectively, for a sample of about 160 developed and developing countries using data for the mid-1990s (Kucera and Sarna 2004, p. 27)

²⁷ India provides a striking case, though, in which the vast majority of children who are not attending school are also not working. This is described by Ghose as follows: “In 2000, of the 248.4 million children in the age group of 5-14 years, 181.2 million or 73 percent were full-time students. Of the 67.6 million who were not attending educational institutions, only 8.6 million were in the labour force and another 8.2 million were engaged in housework” (Ghose 2004, p. 5108).

In sum, comparing East Asia-Pacific (including Southeast Asia) with South Asia, we note that East Asia-Pacific has a lower incidence of child labour than South Asia. Moreover, there were more significant improvements in reducing child labour in East Asia-Pacific than in South Asia. This mirrors the findings of the preceding section as regards literacy rates, for which it was observed that East Asia-Pacific not only had higher adult literacy rates than South Asia but also made more substantial improvements in literacy in recent years.

10. Earnings Trends.

One of the most fundamental determinants of the quality of employment is earnings. An important question for Asia, then, is the extent to which the rapid GDP growth observed in many countries in the region was associated with increases in earnings. For this we look at data on hourly labour costs in manufacturing, wage data based on the ILO's *October Inquiry* (which covers occupations across the economy), an index of manufacturing wages, manufacturing wages as a share of value added, and the gap between male and female manufacturing wages.

Estimates of hourly labour costs in manufacturing are available for 2001 and 2003 for the three largest developing economies in the region, China, the Republic of Korea and India. As a note of caution, some of these data show surprisingly high rates of increase over the span of two years, which may perhaps result from conversion to dollar denominated values. China had the lowest labour costs at 0.5 and 0.6 dollars per hour in 2001 and 2003, respectively, an increase of 20%. India had labour costs of 0.8 and 1.0 dollars per hour in 2001 and 2003, respectively, an increase of 25%.²⁸ The Republic of Korea had labour costs of 8.1 and 9.9 dollars per hour in 2001 and 2003, respectively, an increase of 22%. Comparable figures for other countries for 2001 and 2003, are 3.3 and 5.2 dollars per hour in the Czech Republic (a 57% increase), 10.8 and 13.8 dollars per hour in Spain (a 28% increase), 16.3 and 20.1 dollars per hour in France (a 23% increase) and, 19.9 and 21.6 dollars per hour in the U.S. (a 8.5% increase) (OEF 2004).

We next look at mean wages based on the ILO's *October Inquiry* dataset on occupational monthly wages and converted to real international dollars by consumption PPPs (Majid 2003). There is a fair amount of missing data and that the series are sometimes quite volatile from year to year, partly because of missing data at the occupational level (Table 8). Nonetheless some patterns emerge (patterns that are broadly similar looking at median rather than mean wages). There are eight countries for which one can compare three-year averages for 1989-1991 and 1997-1999, and we see solid wage increases in a number of these countries over the decade, more than double in China and Bangladesh (Figure 11). For the other six countries – the Republic of Korea, Singapore, India, Sri Lanka, Australia and Japan – mean wages increased from between 19% in Japan to 60% in Sri Lanka.²⁹ Looking at other countries in the region for which data are sketchier, we also for the 1990s see solid increases in Cambodia (though data are highly volatile), the Philippines and Thailand, and a decline in Papua New Guinea.

Indices of real manufacturing wages indices are useful in evaluating changes in wages. As with the *October Inquiry* data, wages are shown to increase most rapidly in China, basically doubling since 1990 (Table 9). Based on change from 1990 to the most recent year of data, we also see that real manufacturing wages increased by more than 50% in the Republic of Korea, Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore. More modest increases of between

²⁸ In comparing labour costs in China and India, a note of caution is sounded by The Hindu Business Line, as follows: "The China manufacturing sector's low labour costs may, however, not be entirely comparable to the Indian rates due to a bevy [of] state sponsored benefits extended by the Chinese government to the working class, including subsidised accommodation, rations and other benefits for workers in the manufacturing zones. The Chinese labour costs are net of these facilities extended by the state to the working class, which, thereby remain insulated from the normal inflationary spiral afflicting wages in India and other countries" (Sasi 2004).

²⁹ We leave aside data for 1999 for India, for which there is an unrealistic mean of \$615, nearly double the figure for 1998. From 1989-91 to 1997-1998, then (rather than to 1997-1999), the mean wage increased by 39% in India and the median wage by 11%.

about 10% to 20% occurred in Thailand and the industrialized countries of Australia, Japan and New Zealand, and wages were basically flat or declining in Fiji, Mongolia, the Solomon Islands, the Philippines, India, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. Note that comparing these data with the ILO's *October Inquiry* occupational monthly wage data shows diverging wage trends for the Philippines, India and Sri Lanka. While these two datasets do not refer to the same categories of workers, it nonetheless suggests that the data should be interpreted with caution. To take one example, the real manufacturing wage index for India is shown to decline overall from 100 in 1990 to 56.3 in 1998, after which it increased to 68.7 in 1999. Such a large decline, especially in a rapidly growing economy, seems implausible on the face of it. Moreover, a paper by the World Bank South Asia Region provides data showing sizeable wage increases for workers in India between 1993-94 and 1999-00: 44% for public sector workers, 35% for formal workers in the private sector, and 20% for informal workers in the private sector (WBSAR 2004, p. 22).

It is also instructive to look at changes in wages as a share of value added in manufacturing, for which we have data for 13 countries in the region for five or more years going back to 1990 (Table 10). This provides a measure of *functional* income distribution in manufacturing. For about half these countries in the region, there do not appear clear sustained upward or downward trends. These countries are Fiji, Mongolia, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Nepal, Sri Lanka and Japan. For no country is there a clearcut pattern of increase in workers' share of value added in manufacturing, though for several countries there is a fairly clear downward trend. These countries are the Philippines, Bangladesh, India, Iran and New Zealand.

We last look at the ratio of male to female wages in manufacturing, for which we have data going back to 1990 for at least one year for 12 countries and at least four years for 10 of these 12 countries (Table 11). Countries with ratios of greater than 1.6 are the Republic of Korea, Malaysia, Bangladesh and Japan. Countries having ratios of generally less than 1.2 include Mongolia, Myanmar, Sri Lanka, Australia and New Zealand. The Philippines, Thailand and Iran have ratios around 1.3 for the most recent years of data.

For most countries in the region for which we have data, there do not appear clear upward or downward trends in the ratio of male to female manufacturing wages, but such trends as appear are towards greater wage equality. This is observed in Republic of Korea and Malaysia, having declines in the ratio of about -0.2 and -0.4 points, respectively, and the industrialized countries of Australia, Japan and New Zealand, having declines of about -0.1 points since 1990. Note that three of these countries – the Republic of Korea, Malaysia and Japan – are among the four having the highest male to female manufacturing wage ratios in this period, thus providing some evidence for convergence towards gender equality in manufacturing wages, with the most unequal countries in this regard showing stronger movement toward equality.

In sum, then, we see that in parallel with exceptionally rapid GDP growth in China was exceptionally rapid wage growth. Moreover, there were also solid wage gains in other rapidly growing countries of East and Southeast Asia. It is more difficult to discern trends in South Asia, however, as wage data from different sources (though for different groups of workers) show diverging trends for such countries as India and Sri Lanka. Regarding workers' share of value added in manufacturing, insofar as trends are apparent, they are downward for five of the 13 countries for which we have data, three of these being the South Asian countries of Bangladesh, India and Iran. Regarding gender wage inequality in manufacturing, we see sizeable and fairly persistent gaps in many countries, though we also see movements towards greater equality in some of those countries in the region having the greatest gender wage inequality in manufacturing.

11. Poverty and the Working Poor.

One of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) is to reduce by half the proportion of people whose income is less than one dollar per day. Indeed a key reason why increases in GDP per capita are of such concern for economic development is because it is the relationship between the GDP per capita and income distribution that determines the incidence of poverty. Viewed more dynamically, increases in GDP per capita will reduce the incidence of poverty for any given structure of income distribution.

One recent study by an ILO economist argues that for India the main employment problem is that of the working poor. This view and related policy recommendations are summarized by the author as follows:

The core of the employment problem in India is that of the working poor and addressing this is also the most effective way of eliminating child labour and reducing gender inequality in the world of work. In principle, this can be addressed either by reducing the level of underemployment, increasing the real wage rate for casual labour or facilitating the transfer of poor self-employed persons and casual labourers to regular wage paid jobs (Ghose 2004, p. 5106).

Monitoring poverty and the number of the working poor is made difficult by both problems of data availability and different viewpoints on how to best measure poverty (Deaton 2005; Economist 2004; Majid 2004). Estimates of poverty generally differ more with respect to levels of the poverty incidence than changes in poverty incidence. Based on the ILO definition, the poverty rate between 1990 and 1998 is estimated to have declined from 31.4% to 20.6% in East Asia including China, from 17.1% to 10.1% excluding China, and from 23.9% to 22.7% in South Asia (Figure 12). These figures compare to a decline from 28.4% to 23.3% for five developing regions as a whole (excluding the transition countries) and a decline from 23.9% to 22.4% for five developing regions as a whole excluding China (Karshenas 2004).³⁰ For these same years, the poverty rate is estimated to have declined from 20.6% to 15.2% in Latin America and from 2.6% to 1.8% in Middle East-North Africa and to have increased from 45.7% to 48.2% in Sub-Saharan Africa.

According to UNDP projections for six developing regions of the world, only East Asia-Pacific (including Southeast Asia) and South Asia are projected to meet the MDG poverty target by 2015, and it is the positive developments in these two regions that drive the projection that the poverty target for the developing world as a whole will be met by 2015 (UNDP 2004, p. 130). As a note of caution, however, these poverty projections are themselves based on World Bank growth projections, and it is difficult to predict growth over such a length of years.

³⁰ Based on the World Bank definition, the poverty rate between 1990 and 1998 is estimated to have declined from 27.6% to 15.3% in East Asia including China, from 18.5% to 11.3% excluding China, and from 44.0% to 40.0% in South Asia. These figures compare to a decline from 28.4% to 24.0% for five developing regions as a whole (excluding the transition countries) and an *increase* from 23.9% to 26.2% for five developing regions as a whole excluding China (Chen and Ravillion 2001). For these same years, the poverty rate is estimated to have declined from 16.8% to 15.6% in Latin America, from 2.4% to 2.0% in Middle East-North Africa, and from 47.7% to 46.3% in Sub-Saharan Africa. Comparing the ILO and World Bank definitions for Asia, then, we see somewhat higher rates of poverty in East Asia and much lower rates of poverty in South Asia by the ILO definition, but declines in both regions, with more rapid declines in East Asia than in South Asia by both definitions. The main qualitative difference between the definitions is that for the five developing regions as a whole but excluding China, poverty rates are estimated to decline by the ILO definition but to increase by the World Bank definition.

Country estimates of the number of working poor for 1997 based on the World Bank one dollar per day definition of poverty are available for 16 countries in the region (Majid 2001). The number of working poor as a percentage of the adult (15 and older) population is around 20% or higher for four of the 16 countries, all of them in South Asia. These are Bangladesh, India, Nepal and Pakistan. However, the proportion was lower than 5% in the South Asian countries of Iran and Sri Lanka, as well as in Fiji, the Republic of Korea, Malaysia and Thailand. Countries in the middle range are China, Mongolia, Papua New Guinea, the Solomon Islands, Indonesia and the Philippines, with the number of working poor as a percentage of the adult population between 5.8% in the Philippines and 15.0% in China.

One of the concerns about poverty is that it is disproportionately concentrated in rural areas.³¹ A sense of this is provided by ratios of rural to urban poverty rates, based on national poverty lines. Based on the most recent year of data for the 13 countries for which we have data (with data spanning between 1992 and 2000), the ratio is less than 1 only in Mongolia, at 0.9. Many countries have ratios of around 2 or more, indicating rural poverty rates two or more times higher than urban poverty rates, these being China, Papua New Guinea, Cambodia, the Philippines, Vietnam, Nepal and Sri Lanka. The remaining countries – Lao PDR, Thailand, Bangladesh, India and Pakistan – have rural to urban poverty ratios between 1.2 and 1.5.

In sum, there have been dramatic declines in the incidence of poverty in East Asia-Pacific (including Southeast Asia). These declines occurred both in China and in other developing countries in East Asia-Pacific. There were smaller declines in the incidence of poverty in South Asia. It is declining poverty in East Asia and South Asia that drive projections that the MDG target of halving poverty rates for developing regions as a whole will be met by 2015. It is worth emphasizing nonetheless that the poverty rate in South Asia in recent years was second only to that in Sub-Saharan Africa. We also see that poverty disproportionately affects those living in rural areas, a phenomenon occurring in both East Asia-Pacific and South Asia.

³¹ Cf. Majid (2004) for an analysis of this issue, including policy implications regarding the favorable effect of increases in agricultural productivity on reducing poverty.

12. Informal Employment.

A fundamental issue regarding the quality of employment is the extent of informal employment, for much informal employment is characterized by poor conditions of work. A number of explanations have been offered to account for the rise in informal employment, particularly urban informal employment. Focusing on Latin America, for instance, Portes and co-authors provide a dynamic view of the growth of informal employment in the context of import substitution and export-oriented development strategies (Portes, 1989; Portes & Schauffler, 1993; Portes, 1994). They argue that the policies of import substitution industrialization adopted in the 1950s to 1970s led to the concentration of industry in just one or two cities in a country. Together with a lack of prospects in rural areas, the urban concentration of industrialization led to a massive rural to urban migration. Though a large number of industrial jobs were created in cities, these were insufficient to provide formal employment for all migrants. It was this labor surplus that contributed to the rise of informal employment. In the 1980s, the debt-induced crises led countries in the region to implement export promotion strategies. The decline in formal employment that followed was partly absorbed by informal employment as large formal firms decentralized production through sub-contracting to small firms. Other authors also describe the linkages between export-oriented and multinational firms and informal employment through, for instance, export-processing zones and global production networks, and thus the linkages more generally between globalization and informality (de Oliveira & Roberts, 1994; Maloney, 1997; Carr & Chen, 2001).³²

The large structural shifts from agriculture to other sectors in Asia and rapid integration into global markets raise the question, then, of whether informal employment is on the rise in Asia. Because of data availability constraints, informal employment is often proxied by non-agricultural self-employment (aside from professional self-employment) as a percentage of total non-agricultural employment. However, self-employment is just one component of informal employment and can therefore only provide a partial sense and may even indeed provide a misleading sense of the extent of informal employment (for discussions of the definitions of informal employment, see ILO 2002a, 2002b, 2003). To take but one scenario, non-agricultural self-employment might be declining while informal wage employment is increasing even more rapidly, in which case using non-agricultural self employment as a proxy for informal employment would lead an incorrect assessment of changes in informal employment. This caution must be born in mind and illustrates the need for improving informal employment data.

An additional consideration is that working conditions are likely to be poorer in informal wage employment than in informal self-employment and thus that focusing on the latter misses the worst of informal employment. In India, for example, the poverty rate is nearly twice as high for casual labourers than for the self-employed (Ghose 2004, p. 5109). Note also that a paper by the World Bank South Asia Region provides data indicating that the share of informally employed workers for India in 1993-94 was 91.1%, considerably higher than the figure for non-agricultural self-employment as a percentage of total non-agricultural employment of around 40%, as noted below (WBSAR 2004, p. 11). Moreover, even in non-agricultural sectors such as manufacturing, construction and trade, hotels and restaurants, the share of informally employed workers was greater than 80% for India as of 1993-94.

Looking across regions for the most recent year of data, we see that the share of total (male and female) non-agricultural self-employment as a percentage of total non-agricultural

³² This paragraph is adapted from Galli and Kucera (2004).

employment was 18% in East Asia, 33% in Southeast Asia and 50% in South Asia, compared to a world average of 32% and shares of, in descending order, 53% for Sub-Saharan Africa, 44% for Latin America, 31% for North Africa and 24% for the Middle East (Table 12).³³

For most countries in the region for which we have data, total (male and female) non-agricultural self-employment as a percentage of total non-agricultural employment declined over the past decade. This holds for the Republic of Korea (32% to 30%), Indonesia (56% to 51%), Malaysia (23% to 17%), Singapore (16% to 13%), Thailand (40% to 36%), India (44% to 37%), Pakistan (51% to 43%), Australia (14% to 9%) and Japan (18% to 14%). The share for females held steady, however, in the Republic of Korea (32%) and increased in Singapore (10% to 14%). The three countries for which there have been increases the share of total non-agricultural self-employment are Bangladesh (53% to 75%), Iran (35% to 37%) and New Zealand (8% to 16%), for which the share for both males and females increased.

The ratio of female to male non-agricultural self-employment as a percentage of total non-agricultural employment provides an indicator of gender representation in informal employment, with a ratio of 1 indicating equal representation relative to respective female and male non-agricultural employment. For the 12 countries in the region for which have data, the ratio for the most recent year of data is greater than 1 in eight countries, the four exceptions being Malaysia (1.0), Pakistan (0.8), Australia (0.6) and New Zealand (0.5). A number of countries have a ratio of around 1.1, namely, the Republic of Korea, Singapore, Bangladesh, India and Iran. Countries having higher ratios, and thus greater gender inequality by this measure, are Cambodia (1.7), the Philippines (1.5) and Japan (1.3). These ratios compare to a world average of 1.3. In terms of change over time, there were increases in the ratio of female to male non-agricultural self-employment shares for five of the 10 countries for which we have data, indicating an increased propensity for females to be in non-agricultural self-employment. These countries are the Republic of Korea, Malaysia, Singapore, Bangladesh and Iran. The ratio held steady in Pakistan and New Zealand and declined in India, Australia and Japan. Overall the, we see a mixed picture regarding changes in gender representation in non-agricultural self-employment.

In sum, because of data availability constraints, informal employment is commonly proxied by non-agricultural self-employment as a percentage of total non-agricultural employment. This percentage was far above the world average in South Asia. Indeed, fully half of non-agricultural employment in South Asia was self-employment, which represents only one component of informal employment and thus considerably underestimates the actual extent of informality. In contrast, non-agricultural self-employment as a percentage of total non-agricultural employment was well below the world average in East Asia and about equal to the world average in Southeast Asia. There is an important gender dimension of informality, suggested by the fact that women were disproportionately concentrated in non-agricultural self-employment for three-fourths of the countries for which we have data. For most countries in the region for which we have data (that is, for nine of 12 countries), non-agricultural self-employment as a percentage of total non-agricultural employment has been on the decline in recent years. However, this does enable one to say whether the proportion of those in informal employment is on the decline, given that large components of informal employment such as informal wage employment may be increasing.

³³ Each of these subregions include only the developing countries within them, and thus not Australia, Japan or New Zealand.

13. Hours of Work.

Rapid economic growth in much of Asia raises concerns about the intensification of work, such as through longer working hours. We examine this issue by looking at average hours of work per week and the proportion of employed persons working 50 hour or more per week. Data on average hours of work per week are available for eight countries in the region for recent years (Table 13).³⁴ Taking the most recent year of data, average hours of work were less than 35 in Australia and New Zealand, 41.1 in the Philippines and 42.0 in Japan. Average hours of work per week are considerably higher in the Republic of Korea at 45.9, Singapore at 46.0, Vietnam at 44.1 and India at 46.7. These four countries also have long workweeks compared to most developing countries in other regions for which we have data. For example, looking at average hours of work per week for 16 countries in Latin America-Caribbean, Middle East-North Africa, and the transition countries, we see that seven of these 14 have workweeks of about 40 hours or less, four between 41.5 and 42.5 hours, and five greater than 43 hours.³⁵ For none of the eight countries in Asia for which we have data do there appear clear upward or downward trends going back to the mid-1990s.

We next consider the number of employed persons working 50 hour or more per week as a percentage of total employment. This is an indicator of “excessive hours of work” proposed by Anker et al. (2002). Data are available for 13 of the 28 countries in the region for any given year from 2000-2004. Taking the most recent year for which data are available, countries with greater than 35% of employed persons working 50 hour or more per week are the Republic of Korea, Mongolia, Cambodia, Singapore, Thailand and Pakistan. Countries with less than 20% of employed persons working 50 hour or more per week are Indonesia and Australia. Countries in the in-between range are the Philippines, Vietnam, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and Japan.

There are seven countries for which we have five or more years of data on the proportion of employed persons working 50 hour or more per week, enabling an assessment of trends. For four of these countries, Indonesia, the Philippines and the industrialized countries of Australia and Japan, the percentage of those working the proportion of employed persons working 50 hour or more per week was quite stable over time. For the other three countries, the Republic of Korea, Thailand and Vietnam, the proportion of employed persons working 50 hour or more per week moved strongly downward. More precisely, looking at the ten-year span from 1994-2003, the measure declined in the Republic of Korea from 47.1% to 38.1%, in Thailand from 53.1% to 39.6% and in Vietnam from 50.2% to 23.8% (with data beginning in 1996 for Vietnam). These were also three of the fastest growing countries in Asia over this span of years, and thus we see no clear association between rapid growth and the proportion of employed persons working 50 hour or more per week.³⁶

³⁴ We leave aside data on Thailand and Bangladesh, given the improbable jumps over time in the average hours of work per week.

³⁵ Countries in the low hours group are Argentina, Uruguay, Estonia, Romania, Latvia, Lithuania and Slovenia; countries in the middle hours group are Brazil, Chile, Panama and Croatia; countries in the high hours group are Columbia, Costa Rica, Egypt, Mexico and Turkey.

³⁶ It might be thought that hours of work in agriculture tend to be longer than in other sectors and thus the decline in the proportion of employed persons working 50 hour or more per week may reflect the shift from agricultural to other sectors. However, considering countries in the region for which we have data, hours of work in agriculture are lower than average in Bangladesh, Japan, the Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam and higher than average only in Australia (ILO 2004 and labour

In sum, most Asian developing countries for which we have data have long workweeks compared to most developing countries in other regions of the world. However we do not find strong evidence that rapid economic in Asia was associated with increases in working hours, whether measured by average hours of work per week or the proportion of employed persons working 50 hour or more per week. Indeed, there was a decline in the proportion of employed persons working 50 hour or more per week in the fast growing economies of the Republic of Korea, Thailand and Vietnam.

force surveys for Bangladesh and Australia). Note also that of the countries with high proportions of employed persons working 50 hour or more per week, Mongolia, Cambodia, Thailand and Pakistan, have high shares of agricultural employment of greater than 40% whereas the Republic of Korea and Singapore have low shares of less than 10% and that of the countries with low proportions of employed persons working 50 hour or more per week, Indonesia and Australia, the former has an agricultural employment share of greater than 40% and the latter less than 10%. There is, therefore, no clearcut relationship between share of agricultural employment and the proportion of employed persons working 50 hour or more per week.

14. Social Protection.

Data on social protection are comparatively scarce and somewhat dated, being available mainly for the 1990s. Particularly scarce are data on coverage rates – that is, the proportion of the population covered by various aspects of social protection.³⁷ We therefore look at three alternative measures that provide some sense of the extent of social protection. First is social security expenditure as a percentage of GDP, a measure of a social protection *outcome*. We also look at two indicators addressing social security laws and employment-related laws, as constructed by Botero et al. (2004). These indicators are constructed by coding and compiling legislation on the extent of protection offered by a country's social security and employment-related laws.

Data on social security expenditure as a percentage of GDP are available for the mid-1990s for 14 countries in the region. These expenditures were considerably higher in the industrialized countries of Australia (15.7%), Japan (14.1%) and New Zealand (19.2%) than in other Asian countries, for which the next highest expenditures were in Mongolia (8.8%), Iran (6.1%), the Republic of Korea (5.6%) and Sri Lanka (4.7%). Countries that had social security expenditures of less than 2% of GDP were Indonesia (1.7%), Myanmar (0.7%), Thailand (1.9%) and India (2.6%). Data going back to 1990 are available for nine of these 14 countries. These data show increases in social security expenditures as a percentage of GDP for seven of these nine countries, namely, the Republic of Korea, Malaysia, Thailand, India, Iran, Australia and Japan. The two countries showing declines are China and New Zealand.

Indices of social security and employment laws were constructed by Botero et al. (2004) for 15 countries in the region based on legislation as of 1997. It is worth noting that these indices do not necessarily conform to relevant ILO Conventions, Recommendations and jurisprudence. These indices are normalized to range from 0 to 1, with 0 indicating weakest protection and 1 indicating strongest protection (based on observed minimum and maximum values prior to normalization).

The *social security laws index* is constructed from three sub-indices: an *old age, disability and death benefits index*, a *sickness and health benefits index* and a *unemployment benefits index*, each of which are themselves constructed of a set of more detailed components.

- For the *old age, disability and death benefits index*, values range from 0.43 in India to 0.84 in New Zealand. The industrialized countries of the region, Australia and Japan in addition to New Zealand, have the three highest values by this index. However the index value is comparatively low for Japan at 0.64, which is indeed only slightly higher than values for the Republic of Korea, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Vietnam and Sri Lanka, with values these seven countries ranging between 0.58 and 0.62.
- For the *sickness and health benefits index*, values vary more widely among countries in the region. We also do not see the pattern of strongest protection in the

³⁷There are other measures of social protection outcomes provided in the ILO's World Labour Report 2000, such as the proportion of the population covered by various aspects of social protection, but these are available for only a handful of countries in the region (ILO 2000). In addition, a paper by the World Bank South Asia Region provides coverage rates for the percentage of the population protected by formal pension systems. For the most recent year of data, the coverage rates are 0.9% for Afghanistan, 2.1% for Bangladesh, 8.9% for India, 2.7% for Nepal, 5.8% for Pakistan and 28.1% for Sri Lanka (WBSAR 2004, p. 58).

industrialized countries in the region for the sickness and health benefits index as for the old age, disability and death benefits index. Indeed the values for the sickness and health benefits index are highest in China (0.96) and Vietnam (0.94), and a number of other countries have an index value similar to or larger than New Zealand's (0.75), which has the highest value of the industrialized countries in the region. On the other hand, there are also developing countries in the region with the lowest possible value of 0, these being Indonesia, Malaysia and Sri Lanka. Japan is the one country with a sickness and health benefits index value in the middle range, at 0.54.

- As with sickness and health benefits, the *unemployment benefits index* varies widely among countries in the region. All countries in Southeast Asia and South Asia have a value of 0. All countries in East Asia have values of 0.72 or higher, comparable to the highest values of the industrialized countries in the region, with Australia at 0.84 and Japan at 0.75. New Zealand is the one country with an unemployment benefits index value in the middle range, at 0.56.

The *social security laws index* is constructed from the average of the indices for old age, disability and death benefits, sickness and health benefits, and unemployment benefits. These countries can be put into three groups as follows: those having comparatively high social security protection, which comprises all the countries of East Asia and the industrialized countries in the region, ranging between 0.64 for Japan to 0.78 for Australia; those having low values of 0.20 or less, namely Indonesia, Malaysia and Sri Lanka; and other countries in the middle range, namely, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Vietnam, India and Pakistan. It is worth noting that the social security protection index value for China, at 0.76, is a considerably higher than for India, at 0.40.

The *employment laws index* is constructed from four sub-indices: an *alternative employment contracts index*, a *cost of increasing hours worked index*, a *cost of firing workers index* and a *dismissal procedures index*, each of which are themselves constructed from a set of more detailed components.

- For the *alternative employment contracts index*, countries having a value of around 0.7 or greater, and thus comparatively high protection, are Mongolia, Malaysia, Singapore, Vietnam, India, Pakistan, Australia and New Zealand. Countries having an index value of 0.25 or less are Indonesia and Sri Lanka, with other countries falling in the middle range.
- Regarding the *cost of increasing hours worked index*, the average value is quite low in the region. The country with the highest index value is Indonesia at 0.42. Countries having index values of around 0.1 or less are Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Vietnam, India, Sri Lanka, Japan and New Zealand. Values for other countries in the region range between 0.19 for the Republic of Korea to 0.28 for Mongolia.
- As with the social security indices on sickness and health benefits and unemployment benefits, there is a wide and basically dualistic distribution of values of the *cost of firing workers index*. For all but three countries in the region, the cost of firing workers index ranges between 0.48 in Sri Lanka to 0.68 in Indonesia. The three countries having comparatively low index values are Malaysia (0.19), Japan (0.08) and New Zealand (0.00).
- The *dismissal procedures index* is noteworthy in that the industrialized countries in the region are among the countries having low index values of 0.10 or less. Other countries in the region having comparably low values are Mongolia, Malaysia and Singapore. Countries having dismissal procedures index values of 0.60 or greater

are Indonesia, the Philippines, Vietnam, India and Sri Lanka. In the middle range are China, the Republic of Korea, Thailand and Pakistan, having index values between 0.30 and 0.40.

The *employment laws index* is constructed from the average of the indices for alternative employment contracts, the cost of increasing hours worked, the cost of firing workers and dismissal procedures. There are not as strong subregional patterns as for the index of social security laws, for which protection was strongest in the developing countries of East Asia and in the industrialized countries in the region. However, two of the three countries with the lowest employment laws index values are Japan and New Zealand, and the other country having a similarly low index value was Malaysia, with index values for these three countries of 0.19 or less. The two countries having the highest employment laws index values are Indonesia (0.68) and Vietnam (0.54), with the values for other countries ranging between 0.31 for Singapore to 0.48 for the Philippines. China and India had very similar employment protection index values, at 0.43 and 0.44 respectively.

The employment laws index was updated based on legislation as of 2003. These values are not comparable over time with the index values based on 1997 legislation, as they are normalized to different maximum and minimum observed values. They are useful, however, in that regional index values are provided. For six developing regions as of 2003, the employment laws index was lowest in East Asia-Pacific (including Southeast Asia) and second lowest in South Asia, at 49.0 and 49.2, respectively, compared to a world average of 52.5, with 0 indicating lowest protection and 100 indicating highest protection. In other words, levels of protection as measured by the employment laws index were nearly identical in East Asia-Pacific and South Asia, contrary to the widespread perception that employment legislation is substantively more protective in South Asia. Comparing China and India, the employment laws index values are 47.0 and 51.0, respectively, indicating only slightly more protective employment legislation for India by this measure. The employment laws index values for the four other developing regions are, in order of descent, 62.4 for Latin America-Caribbean, 57.6 for the transition countries, 52.9 for Sub-Saharan Africa and 49.9 for Middle East-North Africa.

To summarize main findings, there was an increase in the 1990s in social security expenditure as a percentage of GDP for seven of the nine countries for which we have data. As measured by a social security laws index based on legislation as of 1997, social security legislation was more protective in East Asia and the industrialized countries in the region than in Southeast and South Asia. As measured by an employment laws index based on legislation as of 1997, the pattern for the industrialized countries in the region is somewhat in contrast with that regarding social security protection. That is, the employment laws index suggests that employment legislation was comparatively less protective in the industrialized countries of Japan and New Zealand than in all other countries in Asia excepting Malaysia. Comparing China and India, the social security laws index suggests higher levels of legislative protection in China and the employment laws index suggests basically the same level of legislative protection in the two countries. As measured by the employment laws index based on legislation as of 2003, employment legislation was nearly identically protective in East Asia-Pacific (including Southeast Asia) and South Asia – contrary to the widespread perception that employment legislation is much more protective in South Asia. Moreover, the employment laws index for 2003 suggests that employment legislation in East Asia-Pacific and South Asia was the least protective of six developing regions.

15. Organized Labour.

In addressing organized labour, we consider trade union membership, strike activity and indicators that have been constructed by Botero et al. (2004) on the regulation of trade union rights. Counting the number of trade union members presents a number of measurement issues. To name but one, from the ILO's perspective it is membership in *independent* trade unions that matters, as understood in relation to the provisions of ILO Conventions 87 and 98. However, we leave these issues aside and review reported data on the number of trade union members.

Trade union membership is generally looked at using measures of trade union density, most commonly defined as the number of trade union members as a percentage of non-agricultural workers or wage and salary earners. Such denominators are used on the reasonable grounds that it is these workers for whom union membership is most relevant (ILO 1997; Table 14 provides data on trade union membership, the numerator of trade union density measures). Yet it is also useful to look at the number of trade union members as a percentage of the number of labour force participants, to provide a sense of the importance of trade unions for the workforce and the economy as a whole. Using the labour force participants as a denominator is also useful in that there are more data available than for non-agricultural workers or wage and salary earners (for three more of our 28 countries, for instance, compared to data for wage and salary earners), enabling a more comprehensive overview of developments in trade union membership.

The denominator can, of course, make a very large difference in measures of trade union density depending on the structure of employment in a country, which itself varies by levels of economic development. For China in 2000, for instance, trade union density relative to wage and salary earners was 90.3% but relative to the labour force was only 13.7%.³⁸ The comparable figures for India as of 1997 are 26.2% and 1.8%. The differences are much smaller, though, for the industrialized countries, with trade density figures for 2000 of 24.7% and 19.4% for Australia, 21.5% and 16.9% for Japan, and 21.5% and 16.5% for New Zealand, relative to wage and salary earners and the labour force, respectively. Nonetheless, one finds that an assessment of change over time is very similar using either wage and salary earners or labour force participants as a denominator, and we refer to the latter hereafter.

Trade union density tends to be highest in the wealthiest countries. For instance, for the most recent year of data, the four countries with the highest trade union density also had the highest levels of per capita income. These are the industrialized countries Australia, Japan and New Zealand as well as Singapore, having trade union densities between about 16% and 19% relative to the labour force. Other countries with trade union densities greater than 10% relative to the labour force for the most recent year of data are China, the Philippines and Sri Lanka. Countries with trade union density relative to the labour force of less than 3% for the most recent year of data are Indonesia, Bangladesh, India and Pakistan. The two remaining countries for which we have data are the Republic of Korea at 6.5% and Malaysia at 7.9% relative to the labour force.

A striking pattern in the region is the downtrend in trade union density relative to the labour force for most of countries in the region. Taking the 11 countries for which we have five or more years of data going back to 1990, there was a trend increase in only one country: Singapore, with this increase beginning in the mid-1990s (Figure 13). In two

³⁸ With data on the number of labor force participants from the World Bank *World Development Indicators*.

countries, there was no clear upward or downward trend, namely, Bangladesh and India. In all eight other countries, there were overall downward trends going back to 1990. These countries are China (though with an upturn in 2000), the Republic of Korea, Malaysia, the Philippines (with a small but a steady year by year decline from 1994 to 2002), Sri Lanka (with a strong decline since 1994), and the industrialized countries of Australia, Japan and New Zealand.

Data on the percentage of workers covered by collective bargaining agreements are scant. One unsurprising pattern that does emerge, however, is that for the nine countries for which we have data, the four countries with the highest collective bargaining coverage rates are the same four having the highest rates of trade union density – that is, Singapore, Australia, Japan and New Zealand (ILO 1997).³⁹

Turning next to strike activity, there are a number of measurement issues that complicate comparisons, described as follows:

[I]t is clear that there are many differences in the collecting and compiling practices of different countries. An obvious implication is that considerable caution needs to be exercised when making comparisons internationally. Indeed, even domestic trends need to be viewed cautiously when there are excluded sectors...excluded stoppages...excluded workers...excluded selection criteria...and definitional changes.... However, when comparisons *are* made, as they inevitably are, fewer problems are likely to arise when (i) trends are compared and (ii) focus is given to days not worked (rather than, say, to the number of disputes or the number of workers involved) (Perry and Wilson 2004, p. 9).

Following the recommendations of these authors, we look at trends in strike activity defined as days not worked due to strikes per thousand members of the labour force. Taking the 16 countries for which we have five or more years of data going back to 1990, it is first worth noting that there is considerable volatility in strike activity for a number of countries, making it difficult to discern clearcut trends in these countries. In other countries the data is less volatile but no obvious upward or downward trend is observed. Indeed there are only four countries showing clearcut overall trends going back to 1990, and these are all downward trends. These four countries are the Philippines, Sri Lanka (particularly since the mid-1990s), Australia and New Zealand. These downward trends occurred amidst a broader downward global trend in strike activity going back to around 1970 (Perry and Wilson 2004, p. 46)

An index of *collective relations laws* addressing trade union rights was constructed by Botero et al. (2004) based on legislation as of 1997 and is available for 15 countries in the region. The index is normalized to range from 0 to 1, with 0 indicating weakest protection and 1 indicating strongest protection (based on observed minimum and maximum values prior to normalization). Note that these indices do not necessarily conform to relevant ILO Conventions, Recommendations and jurisprudence. The index is constructed from two sub-indices: a *labour union power index* and a *collective disputes index*, both of which are themselves constructed from a set of more detailed components.

- For the *labour union power index*, values range from 0.00 in Malaysia and New Zealand to 0.71 in the Republic of Korea and Japan. The only other country with a value above 0.5 is the Philippines at 0.57. The next three highest index values are for Sri Lanka at 0.43 and Thailand and Vietnam at 0.38 for both. China's value at 0.29 is somewhat higher than India's at 0.14, which according to this index suggests that laws protecting trade union rights were stronger in China than

³⁹ These data measure collective bargaining coverage as the percentage of "employees covered by collective agreements in the formal sector" (ILO 1997, p. 248).

India.⁴⁰ This suggests on the face of it the limitations of this index of as regards understanding actual trade union power.

- For the *collective disputes index*, values vary considerably less than for the labour union power index, ranging between 0.29 for Mongolia to 0.63 for India. The three countries having the next highest values after India are Sri Lanka at 0.58 and Singapore and Japan, both at 0.54. The four countries having the next lowest values after Mongolia are Thailand and Pakistan, both at 0.33, and China, the Republic of Korea and Malaysia, all at 0.38.

The *collective relations laws index* is constructed from the average of the indices for labour union power and collective disputes. The four countries having the highest values and thus the strongest legislative protection of trade union rights by this index are Japan at 0.63, the Republic of Korea at 0.54, and the Philippines and Sri Lanka, both at 0.51. The four countries having the lowest values by this index are Malaysia at 0.19, Mongolia at 0.23, New Zealand at 0.25, and Pakistan at 0.31. China and India fall in the middle range, at 0.33 and 0.38 respectively. Note that each of the four countries having the highest values is in a different sub-region of Asia, as is each of the four countries having the lowest values. Thus there are no clear patterns of strength of legislative protection of trade union right among the sub-regions of Asia, as measured by the collective relations laws index.

In sum, trade union density and collective bargaining coverage rates were highest in the four countries with highest per capita income. Looking back to 1990, there were trend declines in trade union density for most of the countries (eight of 11) for which we have data. It is more difficult to discern trends in strike activity data, measured as days not worked due to strikes per thousand members of the labour force. However for the four countries for which there are clear cut trends going back to 1990 (of the 16 for which we have data), all show a downward trend in strike activity. Regarding an indicator of the protection of trade union rights by law, there were no clear patterns of the strength of protection among sub-regions of Asia.

⁴⁰ The higher value for China is attributable to a “yes” answer for China and a “no” answer for India regarding “Workers and/or unions have a right to appoint members to the boards of directors.” Both countries also get a “yes” answer regarding “Workers councils are mandated by law” but a “no” answer for the five other evaluation criteria used to construct the labour union power index.

16. Ratification of ILO Conventions.

A country's ratification of ILO Conventions provides a sense of its commitment to promoting international labour standards as well as a commitment under public international laws. For all ILO Conventions for all ILO member countries, there is an average of 41 ratifications per country. Breaking this down by region reveals that Asia has the lowest average number of ratifications per country. For five regions of the world, the average number of ratifications per country ranks in order of descent as follows: Europe at 62, the Americas at 46, Sub-Saharan Africa at 32, Middle East-North Africa at 25 and, last, Asia at 22 (Figure 14). Within Asia, countries having a number of ratifications around or higher than the world average are, in order of descent, New Zealand at 59, Australia at 58, Sri Lanka at 40, Japan at 39 and India at 38. Bangladesh and Pakistan were next highest, each having 33 ratifications. Thus we see that the number of ratifications per country is highest in the industrialized countries in the region as well as in countries in South Asia. Countries having fewer than 15 or fewer ratifications are, in order of descent, Afghanistan at 15, the Solomon Islands and Thailand at 14 each, Cambodia and Iran at 12 each, Nepal at nine, Kiribati and Lao PDR at four each, and Timor-Leste and Vanuatu at zero each. It should be pointed out, however, that among these countries having few ratifications, Kiribati became an ILO member country only in 2000 and Timor-Leste and Vanuatu only in 2003.

The ILO's 1998 Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work covers four areas: freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining, the elimination of forced and compulsory labour, the abolition of child labour, and the elimination of discrimination in employment and occupation. Each of these four areas has as their foundation two ILO Conventions. Countries in the region having ratified six or more of these eight Conventions are, in order of descent, Fiji, Indonesia, Papua New Guinea and Sri Lanka at eight each, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Pakistan and the Philippines at seven each, and Australia, Japan, Mongolia, Nepal and New Zealand at six each (Table 15). Countries in the region having ratified two or fewer of these eight Conventions are, in order of descent, Myanmar at two, the Solomon Islands and Lao PDR at one, and Timor-Leste and Vanuatu at zero each. It should be emphasized again, though, that Timor-Leste and Vanuatu have only recently become ILO member States.

In sum, the average number of ratifications per country for all ILO Conventions was comparatively low in Asia, indeed only slightly higher than half the world average. Ratifications per country were highest in the industrialized countries in the region as well as in Bangladesh, India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka.

Bibliography

- ADB (Asian Development Bank). 2004a. *Asia Economic Monitor 2004* (December). Manila: Asian Development Bank.
- ADB (Asian Development Bank). 2004b. *Asian Development Outlook 2004*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- Amsden, Alice. 2001. *The Rise of "The Rest": Challenges to the West from Late-Industrializing Economies*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Anker, Richard, Igor Chernyshev, Phillipe Egger, Farhad Mehran and Joseph Ritter. 2002. "Measuring Decent Work with Statistical Indicators," ILO, Policy Integration Department, Working Paper No. 2.
- Barro, Robert J. and Jong-Wha Lee. 2000. International Data on Educational Attainment: Updates and Implications (CID Working Paper no. 42).
- Basu, Kaushik. 1999. "Child Labour: Cause, Consequence, and Cure, with Remarks on International Labour Standards," in *Journal of Economic Literature*, 37(3), pp. 1083-1119.
- Botero, Juan, Simeon Djankov, Rafael La Porta, Florencio Lopez-de-Silanes and Andre Shleifer. 2004. "The Regulation of Labor," in *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 119 (4), pp. 1339-1382.
- Carr, Marilyn and Martha Alter Chen. 2001. "Globalization and the Informal Economy: How Global Trade and Investment Impact on the Working Poor," Women in Informal Employment Globalizing and Organizing working paper.
- Chataignier, Anne. 2005. "Statistical Indicators of Social Dialogue: A Compilation of Multiple Country Databases," ILO, Policy Integration Department, Working Paper No. 56.
- Chen, Shaohua and Martin Ravallion. 2001. "How Did the World's Poor Fare in the 1990s?," in *Review of Income and Wealth*, 43(3), pp. 283-300.
- Deaton, Angus. 2005. "Measuring Poverty in a Growth World (or Measuring Growth in a Poor World)," in *Review of Economics and Statistics* (forthcoming).
- Di Caprio, Alisa and Alice Amsden. 2004. "Does the New International Trade Regime Leave Room for Industrialization Policies in the Middle-Income Countries?," ILO, Policy Integration Department, Working Paper No. 22.
- Economist. 2004. "Is Economic Equality Around the World Getting Better or Worse?," in *The Economist*, March 11.
- EIU (Economist Intelligence Unit). 2005. "Japan Economy: Not as Bad as it Looks," in *EIU viewswire*, 16 February.
- Fuller, Thomas. 2005a. "Skilled Help Hard to Find in China," in *International Herald Tribune* (March 16).
- Fuller, Thomas. 2005b. "China Feels a Labor Pinch," in *International Herald Tribune* (April 20).
- Galli, Rossana and David Kucera. 2004. "Labor Standards and Informal Employment in Latin America," in *World Development*, 32(5), pp. 809-828.

-
- Ghose, Ajit. 2004. "The Employment Challenge in India," in *Economic and Political Weekly*, 39(48), pp. 5106-5116).
- Hanson, Gordon. 2001. "Should Countries Promote Foreign Direct Investment?," G-24 Discussion Paper Series, No. 9, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and Center for International Development.
- ILO. 1997. *World Labour Report 1997-98: Industrial Relations, Democracy and Social Stability*, Geneva: ILO.
- ILO. 2000. *World Labour Report 2000: Income Security and Social Protection in a Changing World*, Geneva: ILO.
- ILO. 2002a. "Women and Men in the Informal Economy: A Statistical Picture," ILO, Employment Sector Paper.
- ILO. 2002b. *Decent Work and the Informal Economy, International Labour Conference, Report VI*. Geneva: ILO.
- ILO. 2003. *Report 1: General Report, Seventeenth International Conference of Labour Statisticians*. Geneva: ILO.
- ILO. 2004. *Global Employment Trends* (January). Geneva: ILO.
- Islam, Rizwanul. 2003. "Labour Market Policies, Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction: Lessons and Non-Lessons from the Comparative Experience of East, South-East and South Asia," ILO, Issues in Employment and Poverty Discussion Paper No. 8.
- Karshenas, Massoud. 2004. "Global Poverty Estimates and the Millennium Goals: Towards a Unified Framework," ILO, Employment Strategy Department, Working Paper No. 2004/5.
- Klasen, Stephen. 1999. "Does Gender Inequality Reduce Growth and Development? Evidence from Cross-Country Regressions," World Bank Policy Research Report on Gender and Development Working Paper Series No. 7.
- Kucera, David and Ritash Sarna. 2004. "Child Labour, Education and Export Performance," ILO, Policy Integration Department, Working Paper No. 52.
- Lewis, W.A. 1954. "Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labour," in *Manchester School of Economics and Social Studies*, 22(2), pp. 139-91.
- Majid, Nomaan. 2001. "The Size of the Working Poor in Developing Countries," International Labour Organization Employment Strategy Department Working Paper No. 2001/16.
- Majid, Nomaan. 2003. "Global Trends in Wages," manuscript, ILO.
- Majid, Nomaan. 2004. "Reaching Millennium Goals: How Well Does Agricultural Productivity Growth Reduce Poverty?," ILO, Employment Strategy Department Working Paper No. 2004/12.
- Maloney, William F. 1997. "Labor Market Structure in LDCs: Time Series Evidence on Competing Views," World Bank working paper.

Mehran, Farhad. 2000. "ILO Labour Force Participation Rates for 10-14 Years Old Versus UNESCO School Enrolment Ratios," in *ILO Bulletin of Labour Statistics*, No. 3, pp. xi-xxi.

Milberg, William. 1999. "Foreign Direct Investment and Development: Balancing Costs and Benefits," in *International Monetary and Financial Issues for the 1990s*, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, Vol. XI, pp. 99-115.

OEF (Oxford Economic Forecasting). 2004. As reported in "Labour Cost Gap Widens Between India, China," by Anil Sasi, in *The Hindu Business Line*, December 11, 2004.

de Oliveira, Orlandina and Bryan Roberts. 1994. "The Many Roles of the Informal Sector in Development: Evidence from Urban Labor Market Research, 1940-1989," in Cathy A. Rakowski (ed.) *Contrapunto: The Informal Sector Debate in Latin America*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Perry, Len and Patrick Wilson. 2004. "Trends in Global Work Stoppages: A Global Perspective," ILO, Policy Integration Department, Working Paper No. 47.

Portes, Alejandro. 1989. "Latin American Urbanization in the Years of the Crisis," in *Latin American Research Review*, 24(3), pp. 7-44.

Portes, Alejandro and Richard Schauffler. 1993. "Competing Perspectives on the Latin American Informal Sector," in *Population and Development Review*, 19(1), pp. 33-60.

Rawski, Thomas. 2003. "Recent Developments in China's Labour Economy," ILO, Policy Integration Department, Working Paper No. 11.

Raychaudhuri, Bijoy. 2004. "Youth Unemployment in Asia and the Pacific," in *ILO-Issues*, 3(3), pp. 3-5.

Sasi, Anil. 2004. "Labour Cost Gap Widens Between India, China," in *The Hindu Business Line* (December 11).

Srinivasan, T.N. 2004. "China and India: Economic Performance, Competition and Cooperation, an Update," Stanford Center for International Development India Program Working Paper No. 199.

UNCTAD (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development). 2004a. *Trade and Development Report, 2004: Policy Coherence, Development Strategies and Integration into the World Economy*. New York and Geneva: United Nations.

UNCTAD (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development). 2004b. *World Investment Report 2004: The Shift Toward Services*. New York and Geneva: United Nations.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). 2004. *Human Development Report 2004: Cultural Liberty in Today's Diverse World*. New York: United Nations Development Programme.

Wood, Adrian. 1994. *North-South Trade, Employment and Inequality: Changing Fortunes in a Skill-Driven World*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

WB (World Bank). 1993. *The East Asian Miracle: Economic Growth and Public Policy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

WB (World Bank). 2005a. *Global Economic Prospects 2005: Trade, Regionalism, and Development*. Washington, DC: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank.

WB (World Bank). 2005b. *China Quarterly Update* (February). Beijing: World Bank Office, Beijing.

WBSAR (World Bank South Asia Region). 2004. "Labor Markets in South Asia: Issues and Challenges," Draft paper by World Bank South Asia Region in collaboration with the Human Development Hub.

Zeng, Douglas Zhihua. 2005. "China's Employment Challenges and Strategies after the WTO Accession," World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 3522.

Notes on Main Data Sources

Main Data Sources in Alphabetical Order

Barro, Robert J. and Jong-Wha Lee. 2000. *International Data on Educational Attainment: Updates and Implications* (CID Working Paper no. 42).

Botero, Juan, Simeon Djankov, Rafael La Porta, Florencio Lopez-de-Silanes and Andre Shleifer. 2004. "The Regulation of Labor," in *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 119 (4), pp. 1339-1382.

Chataignier, Anne. 2005. "Statistical Indicators of Social Dialogue: A Compilation of Multiple Country Databases," ILO, Policy Integration Department, Working Paper No. 56.

ILO. 2000. *World Labour Report 2000: Income Security and Social Protection in a Changing World*, Geneva: ILO.

ILO. 2002a. "Women and Men in the Informal Economy: A Statistical Picture," ILO, Employment Sector Paper.

ILO. *APPLIS (Database on International Labour Standards)*.
<http://webfusion.ilo.org/intranet/db/standards/normes/appl/index.cfm?lang=EN>

ILO. *ILOLEX (Database on International Labour Standards)*.
<http://www.ilo.org/ilolex/english/docs/declworld.htm>

ILO. *KILM (Database on Key Indicators of the Labour Market)*. This database is available in printed form and on CD-Rom. Available from kilm@ilo.org.

ILO. *Laborsta*. <http://laborsta.ilo.org/>

Majid, Nomaan. 2003. "Global Trends in Wages," manuscript, ILO.

UNCTAD (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development). *Foreign Direct Investment Database*. www.unctad.org

UNIDO (United Nations Industrial Development Organization). *Database (INDSTAT3 2004). ISIC Rev.2. CD-Rom*.

World Bank. *World Development Indicators Database*.
<http://devdata.worldbank.org/dataonline/>

Main Data Sources by Section

2. GDP Growth and Per Capita Income

GDP (constant 1995 USD\$)

GDP Growth (annual %)

GDP per Capita (constant 1995 USD)

GDP per Capita, PPP (constant 1995 international \$)

Source: World Bank: *WDI*. 25 January 2005.

3. Trade

Trade (% of GDP)

Exports of Goods and Services (constant 1995 USD\$)

Imports of Goods and Services (constant 1995 USD\$)

Current Account Balance (% of GDP)

Source: World Bank: *WDI*. 12 January 2005.

4. Foreign Direct Investment

FDI, net inflows, (constant 1995 US\$)

Source: Calculated from UNCTAD and GDP deflator from World Bank: *WDI*.

3 February 2005.

FDI, net inflows (% of GDP)

Foreign Direct Investment, net inflows (% of gross capital formation)

Source: World Bank: *WDI*. 2 February 2005.

5. The Sectoral Composition of Output and Urbanization

Agriculture, value added (% of GDP)

Industry, value added (% of GDP)

Manufacturing, value added (% of GDP)

Services, etc., value added (% of GDP)

Urban population (% of total)

Source: World Bank: *WDI*. 12 January 2005.

6. Macro Labour Developments

6.1 Population

Population, Total

Source: World Bank: *WDI*. 15 March 2005.

Population, Total (annual growth rate)

Source: Table calculated from table Population, total.

6.2 Employment Growth and Labour Market Tightness

Employment

Source: *Laborsta* (Table 2), *KILM* (Table 2), *IndiaLabourstat website*.
<http://www.indialabourstat.com/>. 21 January 2005.

Unemployment Rate Total, Male, Female

Source: ILO: *Laborsta* (Table 2), ILO: *KILM* (Table 2). 21 January 2005.

Employment Growth Rate

Source: Table calculated from table Employment.

Employment-to-Population Ratio Total, Male, Female

Source: Employment from table Employment, Population 15+ from World Bank: *WDI* (Population 15-64 + Population 65 years and over). 12 January 2005.

6.3 Gender Representation in Employment and Unemployment

Ratio of Male to Female Employment-to-Population Ratio

Source: Table calculated from tables Employment-to-Population Ratio, Male and Employment-to-Population Ratio, Female.

Ratio of Female to Male Unemployment Rate

Source: Table calculated from tables Unemployment Rate, Male and Unemployment Rate, Female.

6.4 Youth Unemployment

Youth Unemployment Rate

Source: ILO: *KILM* (Table 9). 31 January 2005.

Ratio of Youth to Total Unemployment Rates

Source: Table calculated from table Youth Unemployment Rate, Male and Youth Unemployment Rate, Female.

6.5 Trends in Labour Force Participation

Labour Force Participation Rate Total, Male, Female

Source: ILO: *Laborsta* (Economically Active Population Estimates and Projections: 1950-2010)9 February 2005. (Labour force 15-64 / Population 15-64*100)

Ratio of Male to Female LFPR

Source: Table calculated from tables Labour Force Participation Rate, Male and Labour Force Participation Rate, Female.

7. The Sectoral Composition of Employment

Agricultural Employment, percentage of total employment

Industrial Employment, percentage of total employment

Service Employment, percentage of total employment

Sources: ILO: *Laborsta* (Table 2B), ILO: *KILM* (Table 4A), *WDI*. 14 February 2005.

8. Skills and Education

Literacy Rate, Adult total (% of people ages 15 and above)

Literacy Rate, Male total (% of Male ages 15 and above)

Literacy Rate, Female total (% of Female ages 15 and above)

Source: World Bank: *WDI*. 25 January 2005.

Ratio of Male to Female adult Literacy Rate

Source: Table calculated from tables Literacy Rate, Male (% of Male ages 15 and above) and Literacy Rate, Female (% of Female ages 15 and above).

Educational Attainment of the total Population aged 15 and over, average years of school;
Educational Attainment of the Male Population aged 15 and over, average years of school;
Educational Attainment of the Female Population aged 15 and over, average years of school.

Source: Barro and Lee (2000).

Ratio of Male to Female average years of Educational Attainment

Source: Table calculated from tables Educational Attainment of the Male Population Aged 15 and over, average years of school and Educational Attainment of the Female Population Aged 15 and over, average years of school.

9. Child Labour

Children in Labour Force, 10-14 (% of age group)

Source: World Bank: *WDI*. 12 January 2005.

10. Earnings Trends

Manufacturing Wage Index, Total, Male, Female

Source: ILO: *KILM* (Table 15). 23 February 2005.

Real Wage, 1983-1999 (annual mean wages, consumption PPP)

Source: Majid (2003).

Wages and Salaries, % of Value added

Source: UNIDO. (Wages and Salaries, value added (current US\$))

Male-to-Female Ratio of Manufacturing Wages

Source: ILO: *Laborsta* (Table 5B). 10 March 2005. Table calculated from table Wages in Manufacturing, Male and Wages in Manufacturing, Female.

12. Informal Employment

Self-employment as percentage of Non-agricultural Employment, Total, Male, Female

Source: ILO (2002a).

Ratio of Female to Male Non-agricultural Self-employment as a % Non-Agricultural Employment

Source: Table calculated from tables Self-employment as percentage of Non-agricultural Employment, Male and Self-employment as percentage of Non-agricultural Employment, Female.

13. Hours of Work

Hours of Work per Week

Source: ILO: *Laborsta* (Table 4A). 10 February 2005.

Excessive Hours of Work

Source: Table computed by Anne Chataignier for the Asian Regional Database. Data are from Labour Force Surveys.

14. Social Protection

Total Social Security Expenditure (percentage of GDP)

Source: ILO (2000).

Employment laws - Alternative employment contracts

Employment laws - Cost of increasing hours worked

Employment laws - Cost of firing workers

Employment laws - Dismissal procedures

Employment laws index

Social security Laws - Old age, disability and death benefits

Social security Laws - Sickness and health benefits

Social security Laws - Sickness and health benefits

Social security Laws index

Source: Botero et al. (2004).

15. Organized Labour

Trade Union Density (% of paid employees)

Source: Chataignier (2005).

Trade Union Density (% of labour force)

Source: Trade Union Membership from Chataignier (2005). Labour force from World Bank: *WDI*.

Collective relations Laws - Labour union power

Collective relations Laws - Collective disputes

Collective relations Laws index

Source: Botero et al. (2004).

16. Ratification of ILO Conventions

Ratification of ILO core Conventions

Source: ILO: *ILOLEX*. 11 May 2005.

Number of Conventions ratified by country

Source: ILO: *APPLIS*. 27 April 2005.

Annex 1 - Tables

Table 1. GDP Growth, 1990-2003 (average annual growth rate)															
	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	avg. 99-03
<u>EAST ASIA-PACIFIC</u>															
China a/	3.8	9.2	14.2	13.5	12.6	10.5	9.6	8.8	7.8	7.1	8.0	7.5	8.0	9.1	7.9
Fiji	4.4	-3.3	7.6	4.1	5.4	2.5	3.1	-5.0	1.5	9.5	-3.2	3.1	4.1	5.0	3.7
Kiribati	2.1	6.9	-1.6	1.7	8.4	5.4	3.0	5.7	12.8	9.8	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.4	3.1
Rep. of Korea	9.0	9.2	5.4	5.5	8.3	10.4	7.0	4.7	-6.9	9.5	8.5	3.8	7.0	3.1	6.4
Mongolia	-2.5	-9.2	-9.5	-3.0	2.3	6.3	2.4	4.0	3.5	3.2	1.1	1.4	4.0	4.7	2.9
Papua New Guinea	-3.0	9.5	13.8	18.2	5.9	-3.3	7.7	-4.9	-2.8	7.6	-1.2	-2.3	-0.6	2.5	1.2
Solomon Islands	1.8	3.6	9.4	2.0	5.2	7.0	3.5	-2.3	1.1	-1.3	-13.4	-10.0	-2.7	3.8	-4.7
Vanuatu	0.0	13.3	4.7	6.0	9.6	0.0	2.5	2.4	3.0	-2.1	2.5	-1.9	-0.3	2.0	0.0
<u>SOUTHEAST ASIA</u>															
Cambodia	..	..	..	..	9.0	6.9	5.0	6.8	3.7	10.8	7.0	5.7	5.5	7.6	7.3
Indonesia b/	9.0	8.9	7.2	7.3	7.5	8.4	7.6	4.7	-13.1	0.8	4.9	3.4	3.7	4.1	3.4
Lao PDR	6.7	4.1	6.9	5.9	8.2	7.0	6.8	7.0	4.0	7.3	5.8	5.7	5.0	5.0	5.8
Malaysia	9.0	9.5	8.9	9.9	9.2	9.8	10.0	7.3	-7.4	6.1	8.5	0.3	4.2	5.2	4.9
Myanmar	2.8	-0.7	9.7	6.0	7.5	6.9	6.4	5.7	5.9	10.9	13.7	9.7	...	...	11.5
Philippines	3.0	-0.6	0.3	2.1	4.4	4.7	5.8	5.2	-0.6	3.4	6.0	3.0	4.4	4.5	4.3
Singapore	9.0	6.8	6.7	12.3	11.4	8.0	8.1	8.5	-0.9	6.4	9.4	-2.4	3.3	1.1	3.6
Timor-Leste b/	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	-35.5	15.5	15.0	2.0	-2.0	-1.0
Thailand	11.2	8.6	8.1	8.3	9.0	9.2	5.9	-1.4	-10.5	4.4	4.8	2.1	5.4	6.7	4.7
Vietnam	5.1	6.0	8.6	8.1	8.8	9.5	9.3	8.2	5.8	4.8	6.8	6.9	7.0	7.2	6.5
<u>SOUTH ASIA</u>															
Afghanistan	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Bangladesh	5.9	3.3	5.0	4.6	4.1	4.9	4.6	5.4	5.2	4.9	5.9	5.3	4.4	5.3	5.2
India	5.8	0.9	5.3	4.9	7.5	7.6	7.4	4.5	6.0	7.1	3.9	5.2	4.6	8.0	5.8
Iran, Islamic Rep.	11.2	10.6	6.1	2.1	0.9	2.9	5.5	3.4	2.0	2.5	5.9	5.3	7.2	5.9	5.4
Nepal	4.5	6.6	4.3	3.5	8.6	3.3	5.3	5.3	2.9	4.5	6.1	5.5	-0.6	3.0	3.7
Pakistan	4.5	5.1	7.7	1.8	3.7	5.0	4.8	1.0	2.6	3.7	4.3	2.6	2.8	5.8	3.8
Sri Lanka	6.4	4.6	4.4	6.9	5.6	5.5	3.8	6.4	4.7	4.3	6.0	-1.5	4.0	5.5	3.6
<u>INDUSTRIALIZED</u>															
Australia	-0.1	0.3	3.7	3.9	4.2	4.2	3.8	4.5	5.3	4.0	1.8	3.9	2.7	2.4	3.0
Japan	5.2	3.3	1.0	0.3	1.0	1.9	3.4	1.8	-1.1	0.1	2.8	0.4	0.3	2.7	1.3
New Zealand	0.0	-1.3	1.1	6.4	5.3	4.1	3.5	1.5	0.4	5.0	2.7	3.5	4.3	2.7	3.6
<u>BENCHMARK VALUES</u>															
World	2.9	1.6	1.8	1.4	3.1	2.8	3.2	3.5	2.2	2.9	3.9	1.3	1.9	2.6	2.5
Low income	4.2	1.4	3.0	3.1	4.6	6.1	6.5	4.2	4.9	5.6	3.9	4.6	4.1	6.8	5.0
Middle income	1.0	1.6	1.1	2.8	2.9	3.3	4.5	4.8	1.4	2.4	5.4	2.8	3.2	4.9	3.7
High income	3.2	1.6	1.9	1.1	3.0	2.7	2.9	3.2	2.2	2.9	3.7	0.9	1.6	2.0	2.2
East Asia-Pacific	6.0	8.1	10.5	10.5	10.4	9.5	8.6	6.4	0.7	5.7	7.1	5.6	6.7	7.7	6.6
South Asia	5.6	1.8	5.5	4.5	6.6	7.0	6.7	4.2	5.4	6.4	4.2	4.7	4.3	7.4	5.4
Transition Countries	-2.1	-6.4	-9.1	-4.7	-7.6	0.1	1.0	3.4	0.1	2.3	6.9	2.9	4.7	6.0	4.6
Latin America-Caribbean	-0.6	4.2	3.5	4.1	5.2	1.4	3.6	5.2	2.1	0.1	3.7	0.3	-0.8	1.6	1.0
Middle East-North Africa	7.3	7.0	4.4	1.2	2.4	1.7	4.9	2.9	3.7	1.9	4.3	3.4	3.1	...	3.2
Sub-Saharan Africa	0.8	0.4	-1.3	0.7	2.1	3.8	5.0	3.5	2.2	2.5	3.1	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.1
Source: World Bank: <i>World Development Indicators</i> . 25 January 2005. http://devdata.worldbank.org/dataonline/															
a/ On 1 July 1997 China resumed its exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong; and on 20 December 1999 China resumed its exercise of sovereignty over Macao. Unless otherwise noted, data for China do not include data for Hong Kong, China; Macao, China; or Taiwan, China.															
b/ On May 20, 2002, Timor-Leste became an independent country. Data for Indonesia include Timor-Leste through 1999 unless otherwise noted.															
"... " indicates data not available															

Table 2. Total Employment ('000), 1990-2003

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
EAST ASIA-PACIFIC														
China c/	639,090	647,990	655,540	668,080	674,550	680,650	689,500	698,200	706,370	713,940	720,850	730,250	737,400	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Fiji ad/	89	92	92	94	95	97	110	113	113	114	...	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Kiribati ay/	11	...	...	...	...	8	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Rep. of Korea e/	18,085	18,677	19,033	19,328	19,905	20,432	20,817	21,106	19,994	20,281	21,156	21,572	22,169	22,139
Men	10,709	11,116	11,363	11,554	11,863	12,176	12,345	12,420	11,910	11,978	12,387	12,581	12,944	13,031
Women	7,376	7,561	7,669	7,774	8,043	8,256	8,472	8,686	8,084	8,303	8,769	8,991	9,225	9,108
Mongolia f/	...	...	...	765	760	768	770	765	793	814	809	832	871	927
Men	...	...	...	396	396	407	405	401	414	427	417	425	440	469
Women	...	...	...	369	364	361	365	364	378	387	392	408	431	458
Papua New Guinea ag/	1,879	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Men	1,105	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	774	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Solomon Islands ad/	...	27	27	30	33	33	34	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Vanuatu	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
SOUTHEAST ASIA														
Cambodia h/	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	5,275	6,243	...	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2,538	3,017	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2,737	3,226	...	...
Indonesia i/	75,851	76,423	78,104	79,201	80,110	82,038	85,702	85,406	87,674	88,817	89,838	90,807	91,647	...
Men	46,428	47,229	47,645	48,735	50,308	51,686	52,990	53,971	53,801	54,908	...	...	58,583	...
Women	29,423	29,194	30,460	30,465	28,424	31,729	32,712	33,079	33,773	33,908	...	...	33,064	...
Lao PDR ag/	2,085	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Men	1,110	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	975	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Malaysia j/	6,685	...	7,048	7,383	...	7,645	8,400	8,569	8,600	8,838	9,322	9,357	9,543	9,870
Men	4,311	...	4,554	4,854	...	5,057	5,514	5,658	5,719	5,851	6,086	6,056	6,142	6,324
Women	2,374	...	2,494	2,530	...	2,588	2,885	2,923	2,881	2,987	3,236	3,301	3,401	3,546
Myanmar k/	15,221	...	15,737	16,469	16,817	...	...	17,964	18,359	...	...	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Philippines l/	22,532	22,979	23,917	24,443	25,166	25,698	27,442	27,888	28,262	27,762	27,775	30,085	...	...
Men	14,347	14,642	15,147	15,468	15,985	16,193	17,308	17,437	17,654	17,131	17,258	18,334	...	...
Women	8,185	8,337	8,770	8,975	9,181	9,505	10,134	10,451	10,608	10,631	10,516	11,751	...	...
Singapore m/	1,537	1,524	1,576	1,592	1,649	1,702	1,748	1,831	1,870	1,886	2,095	2,047	2,017	2,034
Men	917	918	944	952	987	1,044	1,024	1,081	1,090	1,087	1,271	1,149	1,137	1,123
Women	620	607	632	640	662	658	725	749	780	799	824	898	880	911
Timor-Leste ag/	385	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Men	213	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	172	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Thailand n/	30,842	31,137	32,383	32,150	32,093	32,573	32,232	33,162	32,138	32,087	33,001	33,484	34,263	34,677
Men	16,456	16,850	17,486	17,451	17,350	17,778	17,486	18,121	17,667	17,721	18,165	18,471	18,872	19,082
Women	14,386	14,286	14,897	14,700	14,743	14,795	14,887	15,041	14,471	14,366	14,836	15,013	15,391	15,596
Vietnam o/	...	...	...	...	...	...	35,386	35,603	36,954	38,120	38,368	39,094	40,162	41,179
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	17,389	17,641	18,367	19,029	19,292	19,743	20,356	20,959
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	17,997	17,961	18,588	19,091	19,076	19,257	19,807	20,217

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
SOUTH ASIA														
Afghanistan ag/	5,981	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Men	3,946	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	2,035	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Bangladesh p/	50,159	...	...	...	...	...	54,597	...	...	...	51,764	...	...	...
Men	30,443	...	...	...	...	...	33,765	...	...	...	32,369	...	...	...
Women	19,716	...	...	...	...	...	20,832	...	...	...	19,395	...	...	...
India bx/	311,949	322,798	330,889	328,853	351,859	350,309	352,790	353,660	345,471	...	374,638	373,325	389,645	...
Men	228,940	236,150	240,255	241,953	248,560	256,504	261,087	263,567	262,764	...	267,261	278,818	285,848	...
Women	83,009	86,647	90,633	86,900	103,300	93,805	91,703	90,093	82,707	...	107,377	94,507	103,797	...
Iran, Islamic Rep. aq/	12,108	12,534	12,986	13,471	13,986	14,542	12,572	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Nepal r/	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	9,463	...	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4,736	...	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4,727	...	...	...	...
Pakistan s/	29,797	28,681	29,694	30,534	31,288	31,407	32,491	34,597	36,419	37,296	36,847	37,481	38,882	...
Men	26,324	25,068	25,415	26,258	26,732	27,591	28,543	29,942	31,344	32,099	31,688	32,233	33,189	...
Women	3,473	3,613	4,279	4,276	4,556	3,816	3,948	4,655	5,075	5,197	5,159	5,248	5,693	...
Sri Lanka t/	5,964	5,136	4,986	5,072	5,148	5,316	5,587	5,569	5,946	6,159	6,308	6,212	6,663	6,943
Men	3,977	3,415	3,444	3,512	3,542	3,661	3,797	...	3,855	...	4,256	4,278	4,432	4,746
Women	1,987	1,721	1,542	1,560	1,606	1,655	1,790	...	2,091	...	2,052	1,934	2,231	2,197
INDUSTRIALIZED														
Australia u/	7,837	7,668	7,612	7,645	7,904	8,218	8,324	8,391	8,572	8,720	8,951	9,063	9,248	9,459
Men	4,583	4,446	4,388	4,397	4,531	4,677	4,734	4,758	4,847	4,918	5,006	5,035	5,135	5,227
Women	3,253	3,222	3,224	3,248	3,373	3,541	3,591	3,634	3,726	3,803	3,945	4,028	4,113	4,232
Japan v/	62,490	63,690	64,360	64,500	64,530	64,570	64,860	65,570	65,140	64,620	64,460	64,120	63,300	63,160
Men	37,130	37,760	38,170	38,400	38,390	38,430	38,580	38,920	38,580	38,310	38,180	37,830	37,360	37,190
Women	25,360	25,920	26,190	26,100	26,140	26,140	26,270	26,650	26,560	26,320	26,300	26,290	25,940	25,970
New Zealand w/	1,481	1,461	1,467	1,496	1,560	1,633	1,688	1,736	1,725	1,750	1,779	1,823	1,877	1,921
Men	835	818	821	838	871	913	935	958	948	957	973	994	1,025	1,045
Women	646	643	646	657	689	720	752	778	778	794	806	830	852	876

Source: ILO: *Laborsta* (Table 2), a/ ILO: *Key Indicators of the Labour Market* (Table 2, Table 4a), b/ *indialabourstat website*, <http://www.indialabourstat.com/> 21 January 2005.

e/ Official estimates. Whole national economy. Excluding armed forces and reemployed retired persons. December of each year.

d/ Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific. Reference period: June. Coverage limitation: wage and salaried workers.

e/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 15 and over. Civilian labour force employed. 1992: series revised on basis of 1995 population census. 2000: estimates based on the 2000 population census results.

f/ Official estimates. 31 December of each year. Persons aged 16 years and over.

g/ *Laborsta*. Total employment. Persons aged 10 years and over.

h/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 10 years and over. November of each year.

i/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 15 years and over. May of each year.

j/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 15 to 64 years. Civilian labour force employed.

k/ Official estimates. Civilian labour force employed.

l/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 15 years and over. Civilian labour force employed. October of each year.

m/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 15 and over. June of each year. Labour force surveys except 1990, 2000: population census.

n/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 13 years and over. Civilian labour force employed. Third round. August of each year.

o/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 15 years and over. July of each year.

p/ Labour force survey. Year ended in June of the year indicated. 1996: persons aged 10 years and over. 2000: persons aged 15 years and over.

q/ 1990-1995: Asian Productivity Organization. 1996: Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific.

r/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 15 years and over. 1998/99 survey.

s/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 10 years and over. Civilian labour force employed. July of preceding year to June of current year. Computed from 1987/88 survey results.

t/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 10 years and over. First quarter of each year. Geographical coverage: excluding northern and eastern province except 1990, 2003: whole country.

u/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 15 years and over. Civilian labour force employed. Beginning 1995: estimates based on 1996 census benchmarks.

v/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 15 years and over. Including self-defence forces.

w/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 15 and over. Civilian labour force employed. 1997: methodology revised, data not strictly comparable.

x/ For details on calculation, please refer to the report. July of preceding year to June of current year.

y/ Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific.

"..." indicates data not available

Table 3. Employment-to-Population Ratio (%), 1990-2003

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
EAST ASIA-PACIFIC														
China a/	77.9	77.7	77.5	77.7	77.3	76.8	76.9	76.9	76.9	76.8	76.6	76.4	76.0	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Fiji	19.5	19.7	19.6	19.7	19.6	19.7	21.8	22.0	21.6	21.3	...	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Kiribati	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Rep. of Korea	56.9	57.8	57.9	57.8	58.5	59.1	59.4	59.5	55.6	55.7	57.4	58.0	59.0	58.4
Men	67.7	69.2	69.5	69.5	70.2	70.8	70.9	70.5	66.7	66.3	67.7	68.1	69.4	69.2
Women	46.1	46.5	46.4	46.2	47.0	47.5	48.1	48.7	44.7	45.3	47.2	48.0	48.8	47.7
Mongolia	...	...	...	57.9	56.1	55.3	54.0	52.3	52.8	52.8	51.2	51.4	52.5	54.5
Men	...	...	...	60.6	59.0	59.2	57.5	55.7	56.0	53.8	53.8	53.4	54.0	56.1
Women	...	...	...	55.4	53.2	51.5	50.6	49.1	49.7	49.3	48.6	49.4	51.0	53.0
Papua New Guinea	81.2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Men	91.5	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	69.9	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Solomon Islands	...	14.9	14.7	15.6	16.7	16.6	16.4	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Vanuatu	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
SOUTHEAST ASIA														
Cambodia	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	78.2	89.7	...	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	79.8	91.7	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	76.8	87.9	...	...
Indonesia b/	66.5	65.4	65.3	64.6	63.8	63.8	65.2	63.6	63.9	63.4	62.7	62.3	61.7	...
Men	81.7	81.2	79.9	79.8	80.4	80.7	81.1	80.9	79.0	79.1	...	...	79.7	...
Women	51.4	49.8	50.7	49.5	45.1	49.2	49.6	49.0	48.9	47.9	...	...	44.1	...
Lao PDR	89.8	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Men	97.8	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	82.1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Malaysia	57.8	...	57.8	59.0	...	57.9	61.7	61.1	59.5	59.3	60.7	59.5	59.2	59.8
Men	74.0	...	74.1	77.0	...	76.1	80.5	80.2	78.6	78.1	78.8	76.6	75.9	76.3
Women	41.4	...	41.2	40.7	...	39.5	42.7	41.9	40.1	40.3	42.4	42.2	42.4	43.2
Myanmar	59.8	...	59.0	60.3	60.2	...	...	60.2	60.2	...	...	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Philippines	62.4	61.9	62.7	62.4	62.5	62.1	64.4	63.5	62.5	59.6	57.9	61.1	...	...
Men	79.6	79.1	79.6	79.1	79.5	78.4	81.3	79.6	78.2	73.6	72.0	74.4	...	...
Women	45.3	44.9	45.9	45.7	45.5	45.9	47.5	47.6	46.9	45.6	43.8	47.7	...	...
Singapore	64.2	62.0	62.4	61.3	61.8	62.1	62.1	63.3	62.9	61.7	66.7	63.7	61.3	60.3
Men	76.8	74.8	74.9	73.5	74.1	76.3	72.4	74.0	72.3	69.9	79.1	69.8	67.5	65.1
Women	51.7	49.3	49.9	49.2	49.6	48.0	51.7	52.3	53.2	53.3	53.8	57.2	54.7	55.3
Timor-Leste b/	88.9	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	81.5	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Thailand	81.4	80.6	82.2	80.0	78.3	77.9	75.6	76.3	72.5	71.0	71.5	71.8	72.6	72.6
Men	88.2	88.5	90.1	88.2	86.0	86.4	84.8	85.2	81.6	80.5	81.0	81.5	82.3	82.2
Women	74.9	72.9	74.5	72.0	70.8	69.6	66.7	67.8	63.8	62.0	62.6	62.6	63.4	63.5
Vietnam	...	...	...	...	...	...	74.9	73.4	74.3	74.6	73.2	72.8	73.1	73.2
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	74.9	74.3	75.7	76.7	76.0	75.8	76.2	76.5
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	74.9	72.6	72.9	72.7	70.5	69.6	70.1	70.0

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
SOUTH ASIA														
Afghanistan	60.3	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Men	76.9	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	42.4	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Bangladesh	78.7	...	...	...	...	...	74.8	...	...	...	63.5	...	...	...
Men	91.8	...	...	...	...	...	89.8	...	...	...	79.4	...	...	...
Women	64.6	...	...	...	...	...	58.8	...	...	...	47.6	...	...	...
India	57.7	58.4	58.6	57.0	59.7	58.1	57.2	56.1	53.5	...	55.4	54.1	55.4	...
Men	82.1	82.8	82.5	81.3	81.7	82.5	82.1	81.0	79.0	...	76.7	78.4	78.7	...
Women	31.7	32.4	33.2	31.1	36.2	32.1	30.7	29.5	26.4	...	32.8	28.3	30.5	...
Iran, Islamic Rep.	39.7	40.4	41.0	41.8	42.5	43.4	35.9	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Nepal	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	71.4	...	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	70.1	...	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	72.8	...	...	...	...
Pakistan	47.6	44.8	45.3	45.5	45.6	44.7	45.0	46.7	47.8	47.6	45.8	45.0	45.2	...
Men	79.5	74.4	74.1	75.2	75.2	76.3	76.5	77.8	79.0	78.4	75.0	73.9	73.8	...
Women	11.8	11.9	13.7	13.3	13.8	11.2	11.3	13.0	13.9	13.9	13.5	13.2	13.9	...
Sri Lanka	54.0	45.7	43.5	43.4	43.2	43.7	44.9	43.8	45.7	46.3	46.4	44.9	47.4	48.6
Men	68.6	57.9	57.3	57.5	57.0	57.9	59.3	...	58.6	...	63.0	62.4	63.7	67.2
Women	38.0	32.2	28.2	27.9	28.1	28.4	29.7	...	32.6	...	30.0	27.7	31.5	30.4
INDUSTRIALIZED														
Australia	58.8	56.8	55.7	55.3	56.4	58.0	57.9	57.5	57.9	58.0	58.7	58.7	59.1	59.7
Men	69.4	66.5	64.9	64.3	65.5	66.8	66.6	65.9	66.2	66.1	66.3	65.8	66.3	66.6
Women	48.4	47.3	46.7	46.4	47.6	49.3	49.3	49.2	49.8	50.1	51.3	51.7	52.1	53.0
Japan	62.0	62.6	62.8	62.3	61.8	61.2	61.2	61.6	60.8	60.0	59.5	59.1	58.2	58.0
Men	75.8	76.4	76.5	76.3	75.6	75.0	74.9	75.2	74.2	73.3	72.7	71.9	70.9	70.4
Women	49.0	49.6	49.7	49.1	48.7	48.3	48.2	48.6	48.2	47.4	47.1	47.0	46.3	46.3
New Zealand	56.1	54.5	54.0	54.4	56.0	57.8	59.1	60.1	59.0	59.2	59.5	60.2	61.2	61.8
Men	64.8	62.7	62.1	62.7	64.2	66.5	67.5	68.4	67.1	67.0	67.5	68.0	69.2	69.5
Women	47.8	46.8	46.4	46.6	48.1	49.6	51.1	52.2	51.5	51.9	52.1	52.9	53.7	54.5
<p>Source: Employment: see Table 2 for details on sources and footnotes. Population 15 years and over: World Bank: <i>World Development Indicators</i> . 31 January 2005. http://devdata.worldbank.org/dataonline/</p> <p>a/ On 1 July 1997 China resumed its exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong; and on 20 December 1999 China resumed its exercise of sovereignty over Macao. Unless otherwise noted, data for China do not include data for Hong Kong, China; Macao, China; or Taiwan, China.</p> <p>b/ On May 20, 2002, Timor-Leste became an independent country. Data for Indonesia include Timor-Leste through 1999 unless otherwise noted.</p> <p>"..." indicates data not available</p>														

Table 4. Unemployment Rate, 1990-2003 (% of total labour force)

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
EAST ASIA-PACIFIC														
China b/	2.5	2.3	2.3	2.6	2.8	2.9	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.6	4.0	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Fiji c/	6.4	5.9	5.4	5.9	5.7	5.4	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Kiribati	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Rep. of Korea d/	2.4	2.3	2.4	2.8	2.4	2.0	2.0	2.6	6.8	6.3	4.1	3.8	3.1	3.4
Men	2.9	2.5	2.6	3.2	2.7	2.3	2.3	2.8	7.6	7.1	4.7	4.3	3.5	3.6
Women	1.8	1.9	2.1	2.2	1.9	1.7	1.6	2.3	5.6	5.1	3.3	3.1	2.5	3.1
Mongolia e/	...	...	...	8.6	9.0	5.5	6.7	7.7	5.9	4.7	4.6	4.6	3.4	3.5
Men	...	...	...	7.8	8.1	5.0	6.3	7.3	5.4	4.1	4.1	4.2	3.5	3.2
Women	...	...	...	9.4	9.9	6.7	7.2	8.1	6.4	5.3	5.0	5.1	3.8	3.8
Papua New Guinea f/	7.7	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2.8	...	...	...
Men	9.0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4.3	...	...	...
Women	5.9	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1.3	...	...	...
Solomon Islands	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Vanuatu	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
SOUTHEAST ASIA														
Cambodia g/	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2.5	1.8	...	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2.1	1.5	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2.8	2.2	...	...
Indonesia h/	...	...	...	...	...	...	4.0	4.7	5.5	6.4	6.1	8.1	9.1	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	3.3	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	5.1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Lao PDR	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Malaysia i/	5.1	...	3.7	3.0	...	3.1	2.5	2.5	3.2	3.4	3.0	3.5	3.5	3.6
Men	...	...	...	...	...	2.8	2.5	2.2	3.1	3.5	3.0	3.4	3.3	3.6
Women	...	...	...	...	...	3.8	2.6	2.8	3.3	3.3	3.1	3.8	3.8	3.6
Myanmar	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Philippines j/	8.1	9.0	8.6	8.9	8.4	8.4	7.4	7.9	9.6	9.6	10.1	9.8	...	...
Men	7.1	8.1	7.9	8.2	7.9	7.7	7.0	7.5	9.5	9.7	10.3	9.4	...	...
Women	9.8	10.5	9.8	10.0	9.4	9.4	8.2	8.5	9.8	9.3	9.9	10.3	...	...
Singapore k/	1.7	1.9	2.7	2.7	2.6	2.7	3.0	2.4	3.2	4.6	4.4	3.4	5.2	5.4
Men	1.9	2.0	2.7	2.6	2.5	2.7	2.9	2.4	3.2	4.5	4.0	3.5	5.4	5.5
Women	1.3	1.8	2.6	2.8	2.8	2.8	3.1	2.4	3.3	4.6	5.1	3.4	5.0	5.3
Timor-Leste	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Thailand l/	2.2	2.7	1.4	1.5	1.3	1.1	1.1	0.9	3.4	3.0	2.4	2.6	1.8	1.5
Men	2.1	2.0	1.3	1.2	1.1	0.9	1.0	0.8	3.4	3.0	2.4	2.7	2.0	1.6
Women	2.4	3.5	1.5	1.8	1.5	1.4	1.1	0.9	3.4	3.0	2.3	2.5	1.6	1.4
Vietnam m/	...	...	...	...	...	...	2.7	...	...	...	...	2.8	...	2.3
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	3.1	...	...	...	...	2.3	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	2.3	...	...	...	...	3.2	...	...

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
SOUTH ASIA														
Afghanistan	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Bangladesh n/	1.9	...	...	...	...	...	2.5	...	...	...	3.3	...	...	...
Men	2.0	...	...	...	...	...	2.7	...	...	...	3.2	...	...	...
Women	1.9	...	...	...	...	...	2.3	...	...	...	3.3	...	...	...
India o/	...	...	...	...	3.6	2.2	2.1	2.6	3.6	...	4.3	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...	...	3.5	2.4	2.4	2.6	3.5	...	4.3	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	3.8	1.7	1.3	2.4	3.8	...	4.3	...	...	...
Iran, Islamic Rep. p/	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	12.6	12.4	12.3	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	8.1	8.4	8.2	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	4.5	4.0	4.1	...
Nepal aq/	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1.1	...	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1.5	...	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	0.7	...	...	...	...
Pakistan r/	3.1	6.3	5.9	4.7	4.8	5.4	5.4	6.1	5.9	5.9	7.8	7.8	8.3	...
Men	3.4	4.5	4.3	3.8	3.9	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.2	6.1	6.1	6.7	...
Women	0.9	16.8	14.2	10.3	10.0	13.7	13.7	16.8	15.0	15.0	17.3	17.3	16.5	...
Sri Lanka s/	14.4	14.1	14.1	14.7	13.6	12.5	11.3	10.7	10.6	9.1	8.0	7.7	8.7	9.2
Men	9.1	10.0	10.6	9.1	9.9	8.8	8.0	8.0	7.1	7.4	6.4	5.8	6.5	6.4
Women	23.5	21.2	21.0	25.2	20.8	19.7	17.6	16.2	16.2	12.6	11.1	11.7	12.8	14.6
INDUSTRIALIZED														
Australia t/	6.9	9.6	10.5	10.7	9.5	8.4	8.3	8.4	7.8	7.0	6.4	6.9	6.4	6.0
Men	6.7	9.9	11.2	11.4	9.9	8.7	8.5	8.6	8.1	7.2	6.5	7.1	6.6	5.9
Women	7.2	9.2	9.5	9.8	9.0	7.9	7.9	8.1	7.5	6.8	6.2	6.6	6.2	6.2
Japan q/	2.1	2.1	2.2	2.5	2.9	3.2	3.4	3.4	4.1	4.7	4.7	5.0	5.4	5.3
Men	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.4	2.8	3.1	3.4	3.4	4.2	4.8	4.9	5.2	5.5	5.5
Women	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.6	3.0	3.2	3.3	3.4	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.7	5.1	4.9
New Zealand q/	7.8	10.3	10.3	9.5	8.1	6.3	6.1	6.6	7.5	6.8	6.0	5.3	5.2	4.7
Men	8.2	10.9	10.9	10.0	8.5	6.2	6.1	6.6	7.6	7.0	6.1	5.4	5.1	4.4
Women	7.2	9.5	9.6	8.9	7.7	6.3	6.1	6.7	7.4	6.5	5.8	5.3	5.3	5.0

Source: ILO: *Laborsta* (Table 3A), a/ ILO: *Key Indicators of the Labour Market* (table 8A). 31 January 2005.

b/ Official estimates. Unemployed in urban areas. December of each year. Persons aged 15 years and over.

c/ Official estimates. Persons aged 15 years and over.

d/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 15 years and over. 1992: series revised of 1995 population census. 2000: series based on 2000 population census results.

e/ Employment office records. 31 December of each year.

f/ Population census.

g/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 10 years and over. November of each year.

h/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 15 years and over. May of each year.

i/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 15 to 64 years.

j/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 15 years and over. October of each year.

k/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 15 years and over. June of each year. 1990, 2000: population census.

l/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 13 years and over. Third round (August) of each year.

m/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 15 years and over. July of each year.

n/ Labour force survey. Year ending in June of the year indicated. 1996: persons aged 10 and over.

o/ Labour force survey. 1994, 1995, 1996, 2000: January. 1997: July. 1998: April.

p/ Official estimates.

q/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 15 years and over.

r/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 10 years and over. July of preceding year to June of current year. 1990: computed from 1987-88 survey results.

s/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 10 years and over. Excluding northern provinces except 1990, 2003: whole country. First quarter of each year except 1999: third quarter.

t/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 15 and over. 1995: estimates based on 1996 census benchmarks.

"..." indicates data not available

Table 5. Labour Force Participation Rate (15-64) (%), 1980-2010

	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
<u>EAST ASIA-PACIFIC</u>					
China	83.8	84.9	85.4	84.9	82.6
Men	91.5	89.6	90.0	89.5	87.3
Women	75.5	79.9	80.3	80.0	77.6
Fiji	52.9	57.0	59.2	61.8	66.9
Men	87.1	87.9	85.3	84.4	81.9
Women	18.7	28.1	32.8	39.0	51.1
Kiribati	...	...	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...
Rep. of Korea	64.0	64.4	67.1	68.9	72.3
Men	77.6	77.4	79.2	79.8	80.1
Women	50.2	51.1	54.7	57.8	64.2
Mongolia	83.2	81.6	81.5	81.7	82.4
Men	90.4	87.5	86.8	86.3	85.9
Women	75.7	75.6	76.4	77.1	78.9
Papua New Guinea	80.8	79.2	79.2	78.6	78.1
Men	90.6	89.2	88.5	87.3	86.1
Women	70.1	68.6	69.3	69.1	69.4
Solomon Islands	88.5	87.2	87.3	85.6	84.4
Men	91.5	91.6	91.0	86.9	88.9
Women	87.0	83.8	82.5	81.9	79.8
Vanuatu	...	...	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...	...	...
<u>SOUTHEAST ASIA</u>					
Cambodia	85.4	85.6	87.1	84.0	84.3
Men	85.9	86.3	88.4	84.2	84.8
Women	85.2	85.2	85.9	83.9	83.9
Indonesia	65.7	68.3	69.6	71.2	74.5
Men	85.8	84.4	84.3	84.5	85.2
Women	45.7	52.1	54.8	57.8	63.7
Lao PDR	84.5	83.9	84.2	83.9	83.8
Men	92.1	91.2	91.1	90.3	89.4
Women	77.1	76.9	77.6	77.7	78.3
Malaysia	63.6	65.4	66.2	66.5	67.5
Men	84.6	84.0	83.2	82.0	80.1
Women	42.8	46.4	48.7	50.7	54.7
Myanmar	80.0	79.3	79.0	78.9	78.5
Men	90.5	90.1	89.7	89.5	88.8
Women	69.7	68.5	68.4	68.4	68.5
Philippines	65.3	65.7	66.3	66.9	68.5
Men	84.5	83.0	82.8	82.6	82.6
Women	45.9	48.1	49.5	51.1	54.2
Singapore	66.5	69.2	70.1	69.7	65.1
Men	84.7	83.8	84.9	83.6	77.3
Women	47.4	54.4	55.3	55.3	52.5
Timor-Leste	84.0	84.0	84.3	82.3	82.2
Men	90.6	89.8	90.1	85.8	88.0
Women	78.9	77.8	79.2	76.3	75.6
Thailand	84.5	84.0	83.9	83.8	83.2
Men	89.3	89.5	89.6	89.7	89.6
Women	79.7	78.5	78.2	78.0	76.9
Vietnam	82.4	84.5	82.9	81.4	78.1
Men	90.0	88.1	86.2	84.5	81.1
Women	74.8	81.0	79.6	78.3	75.1

Table 5 continued.

	1980	1990	1995	2000	2010
<u>SOUTH ASIA</u>					
Afghanistan	70.1	68.7	68.6	68.5	68.5
Men	89.1	87.9	87.1	86.3	84.9
Women	49.7	48.1	48.7	49.5	50.9
Bangladesh	80.9	78.8	78.9	78.8	78.9
Men	90.8	89.4	89.1	88.7	88.2
Women	70.0	67.3	67.8	68.2	69.0
India	68.9	66.0	66.4	66.5	67.0
Men	88.6	87.9	87.6	86.9	85.9
Women	47.8	42.4	43.5	44.6	46.6
Iran, Islamic Rep.	53.1	53.9	55.1	55.6	62.0
Men	84.1	83.1	82.3	79.9	80.7
Women	20.6	22.2	26.3	30.0	42.6
Nepal	75.2	73.7	73.3	73.0	72.3
Men	90.8	89.1	88.1	87.1	85.2
Women	58.5	57.4	57.7	58.2	59.0
Pakistan	59.8	60.4	60.9	62.1	65.1
Men	89.1	87.9	86.9	85.9	84.7
Women	27.9	29.5	33.2	36.9	44.8
Sri Lanka	59.7	64.2	64.8	65.1	67.0
Men	83.8	83.7	83.2	82.5	82.6
Women	32.0	42.8	44.7	46.5	50.7
<u>INDUSTRIALIZED</u>					
Australia	69.5	73.5	74.7	75.1	74.4
Men	86.6	84.7	84.4	83.2	80.2
Women	52.0	61.9	64.8	66.9	68.4
Japan	68.9	70.2	71.9	73.3	75.3
Men	86.1	84.2	84.5	85.0	84.6
Women	52.1	56.2	59.2	61.6	66.0
New Zealand	66.1	72.5	74.3	75.2	74.3
Men	85.8	82.7	83.2	82.4	79.4
Women	46.0	62.6	65.6	67.8	69.3
<u>BENCHMARK VALUES</u>					
World	72.6	72.9	73.3	73.3	73.1
Men	87.5	86.1	86.0	85.4	84.3
Women	57.4	59.3	60.2	60.8	61.6
Asia	74.8	74.6	75.0	74.8	74.4
Men	88.9	87.6	87.6	87.0	85.7
Women	59.9	60.9	61.7	62.1	62.5
Europe	72.0	71.1	71.6	71.7	71.7
Men	84.2	80.6	80.3	79.6	78.6
Women	60.2	61.9	63.0	64.0	65.0
Latin America-Caribbean	59.8	63.4	64.2	65.0	66.3
Men	86.5	86.0	85.6	85.4	84.2
Women	33.3	41.4	43.4	45.2	49.0
Source: ILO: <i>Laborsta</i> (Economically Active Population Estimates and Projections: 1950-2010). 1 February 2005					
Note: Benchmark values include developing and developed countries.					
"..." indicates data not available					

Table 6a. Agricultural Employment, 1990-2003 (% of total employment)

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	avg. 99-03
<u>EAST ASIA-PACIFIC</u>															
China c/	64.9	64.7	63.7	62.3	60.6	59.3	58.8	58.6	60.5	60.7	60.6	60.1	56.6	...	59.5
Fiji ad/	2.6	2.8	2.4	2.1	2.4	2.4	1.8	1.8	2.0	...	...	...	...	...	...
Kiribati ae/	13.0	...	...	...	...	6.1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Rep. of Korea f/	17.9	16.4	15.8	14.8	13.7	12.4	11.7	11.3	12.4	11.6	10.6	10.0	9.3	8.8	10.1
Mongolia g/	...	...	...	39.5	44.7	46.1	46.5	48.9	49.7	49.5	48.6	48.3	44.9	41.8	46.6
Papua New Guinea ah/	79.1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	73.3	...	...	...	...
Solomon Islands	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Vanuatu	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
<u>SOUTHEAST ASIA</u>															
Cambodia b/	...	...	...	75.0	...	...	...	...	...	...	73.7	70.2	...	...	...
Indonesia i/	56.0	54.0	55.0	50.7	46.2	44.0	44.0	41.2	45.0	43.2	45.5	44.3	44.3	...	44.3
Lao PDR ah/	78.1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Malaysia j/	26.0	...	21.8	21.1	...	20.0	19.4	17.3	18.8	18.4	18.4	15.1	14.9	14.3	16.2
Myanmar k/	69.7	...	69.1	68.9	68.7	...	...	63.4	62.7	...	...	...	...	...	...
Philippines l/	45.2	45.3	45.5	45.8	44.7	44.1	41.7	40.4	39.9	37.8	37.5	37.4	...	...	37.6
Singapore m/	...	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.3
Timor-Leste ah/	83.6	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Thailand o/	64.0	60.3	60.9	56.8	56.0	52.0	50.1	50.3	51.3	48.5	48.8	46.0	46.1	44.9	46.9
Vietnam ap/	...	74.6	72.8	71.6	70.0	69.7	69.2	68.8	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
<u>SOUTH ASIA</u>															
Afghanistan ah/	86.5	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Bangladesh q/	69.5	...	...	...	...	...	64.6	...	...	...	64.8	...	...	...	64.8
India ar/	69.1	68.2	66.9	66.8	66.8	66.7	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Iran, Islamic Rep. as/	26.4	25.6	24.7	23.8	23.0	22.1	23.5	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Nepal at/	83.8	82.3	80.7	78.9	76.9	74.8	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Pakistan u/	51.2	47.5	48.3	47.6	50.1	46.8	46.8	44.2	47.3	47.3	48.4	48.4	42.1	...	46.6
Sri Lanka v/	48.6	42.8	48.0	40.6	43.9	39.6	36.5	38.7	42.7	...	...	...	36.8	35.6	36.2
<u>INDUSTRIALIZED</u>															
Australia w/	5.6	5.5	5.3	5.3	5.1	5.0	5.0	5.1	4.9	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.5	3.9	4.6
Japan x/	7.3	6.7	6.4	6.0	5.8	5.7	5.5	5.4	5.3	5.2	5.1	4.9	4.7	4.7	4.9
New Zealand y/	10.6	10.8	10.9	10.6	10.4	9.7	9.5	8.7	8.5	9.4	8.7	9.1	8.8	8.2	8.8

Table 6b. Industrial Employment, 1990-2003 (% of total employment)

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	avg. 99-03
<u>EAST ASIA-PACIFIC</u>															
China c/	23.0	23.0	23.6	24.8	25.3	25.7	25.6	25.2	23.0	22.6	22.7	23.0	22.7	...	22.7
Fiji ad/	34.5	37.4	36.6	37.0	37.0	38.1	31.3	32.8	33.8	...	...	...	...	...	...
Kiribati ae/	21.3	...	...	...	...	6.4	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Rep. of Korea f/	35.4	36.0	35.0	33.6	33.2	33.3	32.5	31.2	27.8	27.5	28.2	27.5	27.3	27.6	27.6
Mongolia g/	...	...	...	20.5	16.7	18.0	17.5	16.7	15.8	15.5	14.1	13.7	14.3	15.6	14.7
Papua New Guinea ah/	6.5	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	3.7	...	...	...	...
Solomon Islands	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Vanuatu	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
<u>SOUTHEAST ASIA</u>															
Cambodia b/	...	...	...	4.5	...	...	...	...	...	...	8.4	10.5	...	...	...
Indonesia i/	13.8	14.6	14.1	15.7	18.7	18.4	18.1	19.0	16.3	17.8	16.9	17.7	18.8	...	17.8
Lao PDR ah/	6.3	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Malaysia j/	27.5	...	31.6	32.0	...	32.3	32.2	33.7	31.8	31.7	32.2	33.1	32.0	32.0	32.2
Myanmar k/	9.2	...	9.0	9.6	9.8	...	...	11.7	12.2	...	...	...	...	...	...
Philippines l/	15.0	16.0	16.0	15.5	15.8	15.6	16.6	16.7	15.7	16.2	16.0	15.6	...	...	15.9
Singapore m/	...	35.2	34.7	33.9	32.8	31.2	30.3	30.2	29.2	28.5	34.2	25.4	24.6	24.1	27.4
Timor-Leste ah/	5.2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Thailand o/	14.0	15.4	15.8	17.5	18.0	19.8	20.8	19.7	17.7	18.4	19.0	18.8	19.8	19.8	19.2
Vietnam ap/	...	12.1	12.1	12.7	12.9	13.2	12.9	12.5	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
<u>SOUTH ASIA</u>															
Afghanistan ah/	13.1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Bangladesh q/	13.6	...	...	...	...	...	9.8	...	...	...	10.7	...	...	...	10.7
India ar/	13.6	13.4	13.1	13.0	13.0	12.9	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Iran, Islamic Rep. as/	28.3	28.8	29.4	30.1	30.7	31.4	31.2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Nepal at/	2.4	2.8	3.2	3.8	4.5	5.2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Pakistan u/	19.8	19.8	19.7	18.8	17.5	18.5	18.5	18.9	17.1	17.1	18.0	18.0	20.8	...	18.5
Sri Lanka v/	20.9	26.6	21.3	21.1	20.1	24.8	23.3	24.3	23.1	...	...	...	24.9	24.3	24.6
<u>INDUSTRIALIZED</u>															
Australia w/	25.1	23.8	23.6	23.6	23.4	22.8	22.4	22.1	21.8	21.3	21.7	20.9	21.0	21.0	21.2
Japan x/	34.2	34.6	34.8	34.4	34.2	33.7	33.4	33.3	32.2	31.9	31.4	30.7	29.9	29.5	30.7
New Zealand y/	24.7	23.5	22.8	23.5	25.0	25.1	24.8	23.9	24.1	23.0	23.3	22.8	22.7	22.4	22.8

Table 6c. Service Employment, 1990-2003 (% of total employment)

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	avg. 99-03
<u>EAST ASIA-PACIFIC</u>															
China c/	12.0	12.3	12.8	12.9	14.1	15.0	15.6	16.2	16.4	16.7	16.7	16.9	20.7	...	17.8
Fiji ad/	62.9	59.8	61.0	60.9	60.6	59.5	66.8	65.4	64.3	...	...	...	...	...	...
Kiribati ae/	65.7	...	...	...	...	87.5	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Rep. of Korea f/	46.7	47.7	49.2	51.7	53.1	54.3	55.8	57.5	59.8	61.0	61.2	62.5	63.3	63.5	62.3
Mongolia g/	...	...	...	40.0	38.6	35.9	36.0	34.3	34.4	35.0	37.2	38.0	40.7	42.6	38.7
Papua New Guinea ah/	14.3	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	23.0	...	...	...	...
Solomon Islands	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Vanuatu	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
<u>SOUTHEAST ASIA</u>															
Cambodia b/	...	...	...	20.5	...	...	...	...	...	...	19.7	19.3	...	...	...
Indonesia i/	30.3	31.4	31.0	33.6	35.1	37.6	37.9	39.8	38.8	38.9	37.5	38.0	36.9	...	37.8
Lao PDR ah/	15.6	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Malaysia j/	46.5	...	46.6	46.9	...	47.7	48.4	49.0	49.4	49.9	49.5	51.8	53.1	53.7	51.6
Myanmar k/	21.1	...	21.9	21.5	21.5	...	...	24.9	25.1	...	...	...	...	...	...
Philippines l/	39.7	38.7	38.5	38.7	39.5	40.3	41.6	42.9	44.4	45.9	46.5	47.0	...	...	46.5
Singapore m/	...	64.5	65.0	65.8	66.9	68.5	69.5	69.5	70.6	71.2	65.5	74.3	75.1	75.6	72.3
Timor-Leste ah/	11.2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Thailand o/	22.0	24.2	23.3	25.7	26.0	28.3	29.1	29.9	31.0	33.1	32.2	35.1	34.0	35.3	34.0
Vietnam ap/	...	13.3	15.1	15.7	17.1	17.0	17.8	18.7	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
<u>SOUTH ASIA</u>															
Afghanistan ah/	0.4	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Bangladesh q/	16.9	...	...	...	...	...	25.6	...	...	...	24.5	...	...	...	24.5
India ar/	17.3	18.4	20.0	20.1	20.2	20.3	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Iran, Islamic Rep. as/	45.3	45.6	45.9	46.1	46.3	46.5	45.3	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Nepal at/	13.8	14.9	16.1	17.3	18.6	20.0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Pakistan u/	29.0	32.7	32.0	33.6	32.4	34.6	34.6	36.9	35.6	35.6	33.5	33.5	37.1	...	35.0
Sri Lanka v/	30.5	30.6	30.7	38.2	36.0	35.6	40.3	37.0	34.3	...	...	...	38.3	40.1	39.2
<u>INDUSTRIALIZED</u>															
Australia w/	69.3	70.7	71.1	71.1	71.4	72.2	72.5	72.7	73.3	73.7	73.3	74.3	74.5	75.0	74.2
Japan x/	58.5	58.7	58.8	59.6	60.0	60.6	61.1	61.4	62.5	62.9	63.5	64.4	65.3	65.8	64.4
New Zealand y/	64.7	65.7	66.3	66.0	64.6	65.2	65.8	67.4	67.3	67.6	68.0	68.1	68.5	69.5	68.3

Source: ILO: *Laborsta* (Table 2B), a/ ILO: *Key Indicators of the Labour Market*, b/ World Bank: *World Development Indicators*. 14 February 2005.

- c/ Official estimates. Whole national economy. Excluding armed forces and reemployed retired persons. December of each year. Excluding business services.
- d/ Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific. Reference period: June. Coverage limitation: wage and salaried workers.
- e/ Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific.
- f/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 15 years and over. Civilian labour force employed. 1992: series revised on basis of 1995 population census. 2000: estimates based on the 2000 population census results.
- g/ Official estimates. 31 December of each year. Persons aged 16 years and over.
- h/ *Laborsta*. Persons aged 10 years and over.
- i/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 15 years and over. May of each year
- j/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 15 to 64 years. Civilian labour force employed.
- k/ Official estimates. Civilian labour force employed.
- l/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 15 years and over. Including members of the armed forces living in private households. October of each year.
- m/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 15 years and over. June of each year. 2000: population census.
- o/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 13 years and over. Civilian labour force employed. Third round (Aug.) of each year. Industry sector includes repair and installation services and sanitary services.
- p/ 1991-94: ILO Labour Market Indicators Library, persons aged 13 years and over. 1995-1999: Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific.
- q/ Labour force survey. Year ending in June of the year indicated. 1996: persons aged 10 years and over.
- r/ Asian Productivity Organization. Services includes activities not adequately defined.
- s/ 1990-1995: Asian Productivity Organization. 1996: Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific.
- t/ Asian productivity Organization.
- u/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 10 years and over. Civilian labour force employed. July of preceding year to June of current year. 1990: computed from 1987-88 survey results.
- v/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 10 years and over. First quarter of each year. Geographical coverage: excluding northern and eastern province except 1990, 2003: whole country.
- w/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 15 years and over. Civilian labour force employed. Beginning 1995: estimates based on 1996 census benchmarks.
- x/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 15 years and over. Including self-defence forces.
- y/ Labour force survey. Persons aged 15 years and over. Civilian labour force employed. 1997: methodology revised, data not strictly comparable. 2000: classification revised, data not strictly comparable.

"..." indicates data not available

Table 7. Children (10-14) in Labour Force, 1990-2003 (% of age group)

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	avg. 99-03
EAST ASIA-PACIFIC															
China a/	15.2	...	...	...	...	11.6	...	...	9.3	8.6	7.9	7.1	5.7	4.0	6.6
Fiji	0.0	...	...	...	...	0.0	...	...	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kiribati	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Rep. of Korea	0.0	...	...	...	...	0.0	...	...	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mongolia	2.5	...	...	...	...	1.9	...	...	1.6	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.0	0.7	1.1
Papua New Guinea	21.5	...	...	...	...	19.3	...	...	18.0	17.6	17.2	16.8	16.4	16.0	16.8
Solomon Islands	33.6	...	...	...	...	28.9	...	...	26.1	25.2	24.2	23.3	22.4	21.4	23.3
Vanuatu	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
SOUTHEAST ASIA															
Cambodia	25.6	...	...	...	...	24.7	...	...	24.1	23.9	23.7	23.6	23.4	23.2	23.6
Indonesia b/	11.3	...	...	...	...	9.6	...	...	8.5	8.2	7.8	7.5	7.1	6.8	7.5
Lao PDR	29.1	...	...	...	...	27.2	...	...	26.1	25.7	25.4	25.0	24.6	24.3	25.0
Malaysia	4.0	...	...	...	...	3.2	...	...	2.7	2.5	2.3	2.1	1.7	1.2	2.0
Myanmar	26.1	...	...	...	...	24.5	...	...	23.6	23.3	22.9	22.6	22.3	22.0	22.6
Philippines	10.6	...	...	...	...	8.0	...	...	6.5	6.0	5.4	4.9	3.9	2.7	4.6
Singapore	0.0	...	...	...	...	0.0	...	...	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Timor-Leste b/	39.9	...	...	...	...	38.1	...	...	37.0	36.6	36.3	35.9	35.5	35.2	35.9
Thailand	20.2	...	...	...	...	16.2	...	...	13.8	13.0	12.2	11.5	10.8	10.0	11.5
Vietnam	13.0	...	...	...	...	9.1	...	...	6.8	6.0	5.2	4.7	3.8	2.6	4.5
SOUTH ASIA															
Afghanistan	26.3	...	...	...	...	25.3	...	...	24.6	24.4	24.2	24.0	23.8	23.5	24.0
Bangladesh	32.5	...	...	...	...	30.1	...	...	28.7	28.2	27.7	27.3	26.9	26.5	27.4
India	16.7	...	...	...	...	14.4	...	...	13.0	12.5	12.1	11.6	11.2	10.7	11.6
Iran, Islamic Rep.	6.8	...	...	...	...	4.7	...	...	3.4	3.0	2.6	2.3	1.9	1.3	2.2
Nepal	48.3	...	...	...	...	45.2	...	...	43.3	42.7	42.1	41.4	40.8	40.2	41.4
Pakistan	20.1	...	...	...	...	17.7	...	...	16.3	15.9	15.4	14.9	14.4	14.0	14.9
Sri Lanka	2.9	...	...	...	...	2.4	...	...	2.2	2.1	2.0	1.8	1.4	1.0	1.7
INDUSTRIALIZED															
Australia	0.0	...	...	...	...	0.0	...	...	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Japan	0.0	...	...	...	...	0.0	...	...	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
New Zealand	0.0	...	...	...	...	0.0	...	...	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
BENCHMARK VALUES															
World	14.6	...	...	...	...	13.1	...	...	12.1	11.8	11.3	11.0	10.6	10.1	11.0
Low income	23.3	...	...	...	...	21.4	...	...	20.2	19.8	19.5	19.1	18.7	18.3	19.1
Middle income	11.0	...	...	...	...	8.5	...	...	7.2	6.8	6.3	5.8	5.1	4.2	5.6
High income	0.1	...	...	...	...	0.0	...	...	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
East Asia-Pacific	14.7	...	...	...	...	11.5	...	...	9.5	8.9	8.2	7.5	6.4	5.1	7.2
South Asia	19.4	...	...	...	...	17.3	...	...	16.0	15.5	15.0	14.5	14.0	13.5	14.5
Transition Countries	2.8	...	...	...	...	2.0	...	...	1.5	1.3	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.1
Latin America-Caribbean	11.3	...	...	...	...	9.9	...	...	8.9	8.6	8.3	8.0	7.6	7.3	8.0
Middle East-North Africa	7.8	...	...	...	...	6.1	...	...	5.0	4.7	4.4	4.2	3.8	3.5	4.1
Sub-Saharan Africa	32.2	...	...	...	...	30.3	...	...	29.5	29.3	29.0	28.7	28.5	28.2	28.7

Source: World Bank: *World Development Indicators*. 12 January 2005. <http://devdata.worldbank.org/dataonline/>

a/ On 1 July 1997 China resumed its exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong; and on 20 December 1999 China resumed its exercise of sovereignty over Macao. Unless otherwise noted, data for China do not include data for Hong Kong, China; Macao, China; or Taiwan, China.

b/ On May 20, 2002, Timor-Leste became an independent country. Data for Indonesia include Timor-Leste through 1999 unless otherwise noted.

"..." indicates data not available

Table 8. Real Wage, 1983-1999 (annual mean wages, consumption PPP)

	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	Avg. 95-99
<u>EAST ASIA-PACIFIC</u>																		
China	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	171	187	249	299	332	316	384	438	448	443	406
Fiji	531	566	.	.	459	535	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Kiribati	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Rep. of Korea	639	639	674	728	773	917	1,004	1,105	1,186	1,263	1,251	1,278	1,502	1,436	1,510	1,465	...	1,478
Mongolia	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Papua New Guinea	965	1,111	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	2,020	...	1,584	1,415	...	...	...	1,499
Solomon Islands	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Vanuatu	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
<u>SOUTHEAST ASIA</u>																		
Cambodia	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	88	89	86	82	438	360	333	260
Indonesia	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Lao PDR	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Malaysia	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Myanmar	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Philippines	298	247	131	332	332	412	428	418	442	455	472	491	515	...	...	...	...	515
Singapore	...	...	585	640	651	690	772	797	782	832	838	862	925	989	1,038	1,179	1,120	1,050
Timor-Leste	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Thailand	...	339	327	421	...	...	...	...	454	...	626	574	624	...	...	...	...	624
Vietnam	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
<u>SOUTH ASIA</u>																		
Afghanistan	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Bangladesh	...	...	...	211	153	205	204	217	279	288	307	...	410	406	517	496	...	457
India	...	540	341	167	175	183	230	243	229	668	228	218	242	239	329	320	615	349
Iran, Islamic Rep.	...	...	...	694	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Nepal	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Pakistan	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Sri Lanka	119	130	131	98	136	185	121	138	168	183	188	217	245	211	200	218	264	228
<u>INDUSTRIALIZED</u>																		
Australia	1,563	1,619	1,546	1,531	1,304	1,370	1,740	1,803	1,948	1,950	2,069	2,035	2,097	2,214	...	2,423	...	2,245
Japan	1,380	1,084	1,125	1,198	1,253	1,260	1,422	1,536	1,649	1,674	1,676	...	1,702	1,747	1,761	1,838	1,869	1,783
New Zealand	...	1,431	1,386	1,284	1,440	1,483	1,502	1,583	1,645	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...

Source: Majid (2003) based on ILO *October Inquiry* data.

"..." indicates data not available

Table 9. Real Manufacturing Wage Indices, 1990-2003

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Avg. 99-03
EAST ASIA-PACIFIC															
China a/	100.0	105.4	112.6	122.2	125.1	129.2	130.3	133.3	159.9	179.0	200.7	...	...	...	189.8
Fiji b/	100.0	...	...	103.6	...	...	114.4	102.5	92.9	...	...	...	...	...	...
Kiribati	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Rep. of Korea c/	100.0	106.9	116.4	123.2	133.9	140.8	150.7	151.6	136.7	155.6	165.2	168.6	...	...	163.1
Mongolia d/	...	...	100.0	119.4	82.7	62.2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Papua New Guinea	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Solomon Islands e/	100.0	81.8	...	98.7	87.9	87.5	122.3	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Vanuatu	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
SOUTHEAST ASIA															
Cambodia	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Indonesia f/	100.0	105.7	121.8	121.1	117.5	172.4	171.6	...	175.4	160.9	...	...	...	...	160.9
Lao PDR	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Malaysia g/	100.0	104.4	110.1	113.5	119.8	125.1	134.5	142.1	...	...	148.4	161.4	...	...	154.9
Myanmar	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Philippines h/	100.0	99.1	101.4	97.7	102.5	100.6	94.5	95.4	92.3	77.3	78.3	...	...	...	77.8
Singapore i/	100.0	107.5	114.3	120.4	128.3	136.3	144.5	152.0	166.4	171.6	183.4	186.5	...	...	180.5
Timor-Leste	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Thailand j/	100.0	103.9	107.9	108.4	105.4	117.7	122.5	125.2	124.6	114.9	...	...	...	...	114.9
Vietnam	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
SOUTH ASIA															
Afghanistan	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Bangladesh k/	...	100.0	101.8	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
India l/	100.0	90.5	74.1	73.0	65.0	74.5	67.0	59.8	56.3	68.7	...	...	...	...	68.7
Iran, Islamic Rep. m/	100.0	131.0	143.2	156.6	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Nepal n/	100.0	115.4	...	99.7	98.4	...	99.1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Pakistan o/	100.0	...	...	64.3	74.5	100.7	88.4	88.6	96.3	71.5	71.2	...	...	...	71.4
Sri Lanka p/	100.0	109.1	102.2	101.9	108.3	108.6	97.4	97.8	93.7	102.3	107.6	97.7	...	...	102.5
INDUSTRIALIZED															
Australia q/	100.0	100.6	102.1	103.1	104.1	102.3	102.7	105.6	107.7	107.8	108.0	108.3	...	...	108.0
Japan r/	100.0	103.2	105.2	106.9	108.3	111.9	112.7	114.5	116.7	116.5	117.9	...	...	...	117.0
New Zealand s/	100.0	100.9	102.5	102.0	100.4	99.2	100.5	102.5	103.9	107.4	107.6	108.3	...	...	107.8

Source: ILO: *Key Indicators of the Labour Market* (Table 15). 23 February 2005.

a/ *Laborsta* : Labour-related establishment census. Earnings per month. Coverage: employees. Wage coverage limitation: state-owned units, urban collective-owned units and other ownership units.

b/ *Laborsta* : Labour-related establishment census. Wage rate per day. Coverage: wage earners. Wage reference period: June.

c/ *Laborsta* : Labour-related establishment survey. Earnings per month. Coverage: employees. Wages include family allowances and the value of payments in kinds.

d/ CPI: *WDI*. Wages: UNIDO.

e/ *Laborsta* : Labour-related establishment census. Earnings per month. Employees. CPI geographical limitation: Honiara. Wage reference period: June. Wage coverage limitation: including mining and quarrying activities.

f/ CPI: *Laborsta* . Wages: UNIDO.

g/ *Laborsta*. Establishment survey. Earnings per month. Employees.

h/ *Laborsta*. Industrial or commercial survey. Earnings per month. Employees. Wage coverage limitation: establishment with 10 or more persons employed. 1996: Break in series.

i/ *Laborsta*. Insurance records. Earnings per month. Employees. 1998: Break in series, methodology revised.

j/ *Laborsta*. Labour-related establishment survey. Wage rates per week. Employees. Wage reference period: March.

k/ CPI: *WDI*. Wages: *Laborsta*. Industrial or commercial census. Wage rates per day. Unskilled workers.

l/ *Laborsta*. Administrative reports. Earnings per month. Wage earners.

m/ CPI: *Laborsta*. Wages: UNIDO. Employees.

n/ CPI: *Laborsta*. Wages: UNIDO.

o/ *Laborsta*. Administrative reports. Earnings per month. Employees.

q/ *Laborsta*. Labour-related establishment survey. Earnings per day. Wage earners. CPI geographical limitation: Colombo. Wage reference period: March and September.

q/ OECD *Main Economic Indicators*. Household or labour force survey. Earnings per week. Total employment. Wage coverage limitation: all industrial activities.

r/ CPI: OECD *Main Economic Indicators*. Wages: Bureau of Labor Statistics, *International Comparison of Hourly Compensation*. Earnings per hour. Total employment.

s/ *Laborsta*. Labour-related establishment census. Earnings per hour. Employees. Wage reference period: February. Wage coverage limitation: establishments with more than 2 full-time paid employees.

"..." indicates data not available

Table 10. Wages and Salaries, 1990-2003 (% of value added)

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Avg. 99-03
<u>EAST ASIA-PACIFIC</u>															
China	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Fiji	47.5	48.2	46.9	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Kiribati	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Rep. of Korea	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Mongolia	28.3	26.6	15.7	24.3	26.5	24.0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Papua New Guinea	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Solomon Islands	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Vanuatu	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
<u>SOUTHEAST ASIA</u>															
Cambodia	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Indonesia	13.1	14.3	14.1	14.5	13.0	20.3	17.6	...	15.0	15.6	15.0	22.4	...	...	17.7
Lao PDR	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Malaysia	27.2	27.0	28.0	27.9	27.5	27.6	26.8	25.9	...	...	24.6	...	...	...	24.6
Myanmar	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Philippines	22.6	23.2	23.0	20.2	20.5	18.3	16.8	16.5	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Singapore	31.8	32.6	33.7	31.8	31.4	30.6	30.6	30.8	30.4	24.9	22.8	27.6	...	...	25.1
Timor-Leste	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Thailand	...	7.1	...	18.1	20.0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Vietnam	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	28.2	...	...	...	28.2
<u>SOUTH ASIA</u>															
Afghanistan	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Bangladesh	39.2	36.7	35.4	...	...	21.5	...	20.1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
India	38.8	39.4	39.2	33.4	31.5	31.6	32.2	33.6	24.3	23.8	26.8	...	...	...	25.3
Iran, Islamic Rep.	32.1	35.4	37.3	37.1	28.4	27.6	25.4	26.1	28.0	24.4	23.9	...	...	...	24.2
Nepal	23.3	24.5	...	23.0	20.4	...	18.5	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Pakistan	23.0	23.9	...	...	...	...	19.6	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Sri Lanka	16.8	19.5	19.1	21.3	20.5	19.2	19.1	17.7	17.5	17.5	19.5	...	...	...	18.5
<u>INDUSTRIALIZED</u>															
Australia	38.9	42.8	...	40.9	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Japan	33.0	33.2	34.7	36.0	28.7	27.7	27.4	27.5	28.5	28.4	27.4	30.0	...	...	28.6
New Zealand	57.0	49.8	48.4	51.3	44.1	42.1	42.0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...

Source: UNIDO: *INDSTAT3 2004, ISIC Rev2* (Wages and salaries, Value added (in current US\$, million)).

"..." indicates data not available

Table 11. Male-to-Female Ratio of Manufacturing Wages, 1990-2003

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Avg. 99-03
EAST ASIA-PACIFIC															
China	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Fiji	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Kiribati	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Rep. of Korea a/	2.0	2.0	1.9	...	...	...	...	...	...	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.8	...	1.8
Mongolia b/	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.0
Papua New Guinea	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Solomon Islands	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Vanuatu	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
SOUTHEAST ASIA															
Cambodia	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Indonesia	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Lao PDR	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Malaysia c/	2.0	1.9	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.6	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Myanmar d/	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	0.6	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.0
Philippines e/	...	...	...	...	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	...	...	...	...	...	...
Singapore	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Timor-Leste	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Thailand f/	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1.3	1.4	...	...	1.3
Vietnam	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
SOUTH ASIA															
Afghanistan	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Bangladesh g/	...	2.0	2.0	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
India	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Iran, Islamic Rep. h/	...	...	...	...	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.2	...	...	1.3
Nepal	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Pakistan	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Sri Lanka i/	1.1	1.3	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
INDUSTRIALIZED															
Australia j/	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	...	1.2	...	1.1	...	1.1	...	1.1
Japan k/	...	...	...	...	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7
New Zealand l/	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2

Source: ILO: *Laborsta* (Table 5B), 10 March 2005.

a/ Labour-related establishment survey. Earnings per month / Won. Employees. Including family allowances and the value of payments in kind. Establishments with 10 or more regular employees.

b/ Labour-related establishment survey. Earnings per month / Tughricks. Employees. 2000: fourth quarter.

c/ Establishment survey. Earnings per month / Ringgit. Employees.

d/ Establishment survey. Earnings per month / Kyats. Employees. March and September of each year. Temporary workers.

e/ Industrial / commercial survey. Earnings per month. Employees. Computed on the basis of annual wages. Establishments with 10 or more persons employed.

f/ Labour force survey. Wage rates per month / Baht. Employees.

g/ Industrial / Commercial census. Wage rates per day / Taka. Skilled. Managerial, administrative, technical, and production workers.

h/ Labour-related establishment survey. Earnings per month / Rials. Employees.

i/ Labour-related establishment survey. Earnings per hour / Rupees. Wage earners. March and September of each year.

j/ Labour-related establishment survey. Earnings per hour / dollars. Employees. Full-time adult non-managerial employees. May of each year.

k/ Labour-related establishment survey. Earnings per month / Yen. Employees. Private sector; establishments with 10 or more regular employees. June of each year. Regular scheduled cash earnings.

l/ Labour-related establishment survey. Earnings per hour / Dollars. Employees. Establishments with the equivalent of more than 2 full-time paid employees. February of each year.

"..." indicates data not available

Table 12. Self-employment as % of Non-agricultural Employment			
	1980/1990	1990/2000	Growth
<u>EAST ASIA-PACIFIC</u>			
China	...	15	...
Men	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...
Fiji	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...
Kiribati	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...
Rep. of Korea	32	30	-6.3
Men	32	29	-9.4
Women	32	32	0.0
Mongolia	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...
Papua New Guinea	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...
Solomon Islands	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...
Vanuatu	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...
<u>SOUTHEAST ASIA</u>			
Cambodia	...	49	...
Men	...	39	...
Women	...	66	...
Indonesia	56	51	-8.9
Men	50	...	...
Women	70	60	-14.3
Lao PDR	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...
Malaysia	23	17	-26.1
Men	24	17	-29.2
Women	21	17	-19.0
Myanmar	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...
Philippines	...	34	...
Men	...	28	...
Women	...	41	...
Singapore	16	13	-18.8
Men	20	13	-35.0
Women	10	14	40.0
Timor-Leste	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...
Thailand	40	36	-10.0
Men	32	...	...
Women	51	40	-21.6
Vietnam	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...
<u>SOUTH ASIA</u>			
Afghanistan	...	...	...
Men	...	...	...
Women	...	...	...
Bangladesh	53	75	41.5
Men	53	73	37.7
Women	53	83	56.6
India	44	37	-15.9
Men	42	38	-9.5
Women	55	41	-25.5
Iran, Islamic Rep.	35	37	5.7
Men	36	37	2.8
Women	32	39	21.9

	1980/1990	1990/2000	Growth
Nepal	59	...	...
Men	49	...	...
Women	80	...	...
Pakistan	51	43	-15.7
Men	51	44	-13.7
Women	40	34	-15.0
Sri Lanka	17	...	...
Men	19	...	...
Women	9	...	...
INDUSTRIALIZED			
Australia	14	9	-35.7
Men	16	11	-31.3
Women	11	7	-36.4
Japan	18	14	-22.2
Men	15	12	-20.0
Women	22	16	-27.3
New Zealand	8	16	100.0
Men	10	21	110.0
Women	5	11	120.0
BENCHMARK VALUES			
World	26	32	23.1
Men	25	27	8.0
Women	28	34	21.4
Eastern regions	18	9	-50.0
Men	21	11	-47.6
Women	15	7	-53.3
Western Europe	12	14	16.7
Men	14	17	21.4
Women	10	11	10.0
Other developed countries	10	11	10.0
Men	11	12	9.1
Women	9	9	0.0
North Africa	23	31	34.8
Men	22	28	27.3
Women	23	38	65.2
Sub-Saharan Africa	50	53	6.0
Men	41	40	-2.4
Women	69	57	-17.4
Central America	30	40	33.3
Men	27	29	7.4
Women	32	54	68.8
South America	29	43	48.3
Men	29	38	31.0
Women	29	51	75.9
Caribbean	27	55	103.7
Men	25	43	72.0
Women	28	67	139.3
Eastern Asia	23	18	-21.7
Men	24	16	-33.3
Women	20	26	30.0
South Eastern Asia	34	33	-2.9
Men	31	24	-22.6
Women	38	40	5.3
Southern Asia	40	50	25.0
Men	40	48	20.0
Women	38	55	44.7
Western Asia	13	24	84.6
Men	14	22	57.1
Women	6	10	66.7
<p>Source: ILO. 2002a. "Women and Men in the Informal Economy: A Statistical Picture," International Labour Organization Employment Sector Paper.</p> <p>Notes: Data prepared by Jacques Charmes. Data were compiled from population census, labour force surveys and from a few living standard surveys. Most population census data were in the <i>Yearbook of Labour Statistics</i> : retrospective Edition on population censuses, 1945-89 (International Labour Organization, Geneva, 1990). The United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA) Statistics Division, <i>Labour Force Statistics Database</i> CD-ROM version 3.0 (Amman Jordan, 1997) was also used for data for the Arab countries.</p> <p>"..." indicates data not available</p>			

Table 13. Hours of Work per Week, 1990-2003

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	Avg 99-03
EAST ASIA-PACIFIC															
China	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Fiji	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Kiribati	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Rep. of Korea a/	48.2	47.9	47.5	47.5	47.4	47.7	47.3	46.7	45.9	47.9	47.5	47.0	46.2	45.9	46.9
Mongolia	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Papua New Guinea	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Solomon Islands	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Vanuatu	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
SOUTHEAST ASIA															
Cambodia	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Indonesia	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Lao PDR	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Malaysia	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Myanmar	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Philippines b/	47.6	42.6	42.4	41.5	42.0	42.0	41.6	41.6	41.6	42.2	42.1	40.1	39.9	41.1	41.1
Singapore c/	46.5	46.7	46.6	46.9	47.0	47.1	47.3	47.4	46.7	46.8	47.0	46.2	46.0	46.0	46.4
Timor-Leste	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Thailand d/	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	50.1	42.4	...	...	46.3
Vietnam e/	...	...	...	...	...	...	51.8	45.3	46.2	46.2	46.8	43.9	43.6	44.1	44.9
SOUTH ASIA															
Afghanistan	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Bangladesh f/	59.0	...	...	...	...	51.0	...	...	...	...	32.0	...	...	...	32.0
India g/	47.8	47.9	47.8	47.9	44.7	45.5	46.9	46.3	47.0	47.6	47.5	46.7	...	...	47.3
Iran, Islamic Rep.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Nepal	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Pakistan	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Sri Lanka	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
INDUSTRIALIZED															
Australia h/	35.8	35.6	35.5	35.6	36.0	35.9	35.8	35.7	35.6	35.7	35.6	35.2	34.9	34.8	35.2
Japan e/	45.7	45.0	44.1	43.4	43.2	43.4	43.1	42.5	42.3	42.3	42.7	42.2	42.2	42.0	42.3
New Zealand i/	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	34.4	34.5	34.8	34.4	34.4	34.4	34.4	34.5
BENCHMARK VALUES															
France j/	...	...	...	35.3	35.7	35.5	35.2	36.8	36.5	37.3	35.6	35.8	35.2	36.0	36.0
United Kingdom k/	40.5	40.0	40.0	39.9	40.1	40.3	40.2	40.3	40.2	40.0	39.8	39.8	39.6	39.6	39.8
Argentina l/	...	...	...	...	...	...	42.7	42.8	42.9	42.8	42.2	41.4	39.2	...	41.4
Brazil m/	...	...	41.1	40.5	...	40.4	41.4	40.8	40.8	40.2	...	41.8	...	...	41.0
Chile n/	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	44.1	44.1	43.5	44.1	43.7	43.8	43.5	43.7
Colombia o/	...	48.2	47.8	48.2	48.3	47.9	48.0	47.5	47.0	46.7	45.3	...	...	...	46.0
Costa Rica p/	46.5	45.6	46.8	47.0	46.9	46.5	46.9	46.9	46.6	46.8	46.6	47.0	47.0	47.0	46.9
Mexico q/	...	42.8	...	43.8	...	43.9	44.3	44.7	43.9	44.7	43.8	43.4	44.1	43.2	43.8
Panama r/	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	43.5	43.4	43.5	43.5
Uruguay s/	...	...	43.0	39.9	40.6	39.3	...	39.6	44.4	41.8	39.2	41.2	40.5	40.2	40.6
Egypt t/	...	...	...	...	...	...	57.0	53.0	52.0	56.0	54.0	54.0	53.0	...	54.3
Turkey u/	47.1	46.3	45.4	45.2	46.1	48.0	46.6	44.3	47.2	45.2	46.5	48.6	48.7	48.7	47.5
Croatia v/	...	...	...	...	...	...	42.5	42.6	42.2	41.9	41.9	41.5	41.5	41.5	41.7
Estonia w/	...	...	33.1	33.1	34.2	34.1	34.0	34.3	34.4	34.7	34.8	35.2	34.9	...	34.9
Latvia x/	...	...	...	...	...	...	40.1	41.2	41.0	41.2	41.4	41.3	40.1	40.0	40.8
Lithuania y/	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	37.2	36.2	38.4	38.3	37.7	37.4	37.6
Romania z/	...	...	...	...	38.0	36.5	38.3	38.1	37.8	38.0	37.9	38.3	39.6	39.4	38.6
Slovenia d/	...	...	...	40.9	40.7	40.7	40.4	40.3	40.5	40.4	40.5	35.2	37.2	37.4	38.1

Source: ILO: *Laborsta* (Table 4A). 10 February 2005.

a/ Labour-related establishment survey. Hours actually worked. Employees. Establishments with 10 or more regular employees.

b/ Labour force survey. Hours actually worked. Total employment. 1990-2000: October of each year.

c/ Labour-related establishment census. Hours paid for. Employees. Private sector. Establishments with 25 or more persons employed. 1990-1998: September of each year.

d/ Labour force survey. Hours actually worked. Employees.

e/ Labour force survey. Hours actually worked. Total employment.

f/ Labour force survey. Hours actually worked. Total employment. Excluding agriculture and fishing.

g/ Administrative reports. Hours actually worked. Employees. December of each year. Excluding agriculture, coal mining and petroleum production.

h/ Labour force survey. Hours actually worked. Employees. Persons aged 15 years and over. Civilian labour force employed. 2000: data not strictly comparable due to changes in coding methods.

i/ Labour force survey. Hours actually worked. Employees. Persons aged 15 years and over.

j/ Labour force survey. Usual hours. Employees.

k/ Labour-related establishment survey. Hours paid for. Employees. April of each year. Excluding Northern Ireland. Full-time employees on adult rates of pay. Including overtime.

l/ Labour force survey. Hours actually worked. Total employment. 28 urban agglomerations. Excluding agriculture. May and October of each year.

m/ Labour force survey. Hours actually worked. Total employment. Excluding the rural population of Rondonia, Acre, Amazonas, Pará and Amapá. Major activity.

n/ Labour force survey. Hours actually worked. Total employment. Persons aged 15 years and over. 1999-2000: October-December.

o/ Labour force survey. Hours actually worked. Total employment. 7 main cities. September of each year.

p/ Labour force survey. Usual hours. Total employment. Main occupations. July of each year.

q/ Labour force survey. Hours actually worked. Employees. Persons in main job and at work.

r/ Labour force survey. Hours actually worked. Total employment. August of each year.

s/ Labour force survey. Hours actually worked. Employees. Urban areas.

t/ Labour-related establishment census. Hours paid for wage earners. Establishments with 10 or more persons employed. October of each year.

u/ Labour force survey. Hours actually worked. Total employment. Averages of April and October based on 2000 population census results. Persons aged 15 years and over.

v/ Labour force survey. Hours actually worked. Employees. 1998-2003: second semester.

w/ Labour-related establishment survey. Hours actually worked. Employees.

x/ Labour force survey. Hours actually worked. Total employment. Main job.

y/ Labour force survey. Hours paid for. Employees. Main job.

z/ Labour force survey. Hours actually worked. Total employment. Persons aged 15 and over. 1994-1995: March, persons aged 14 and over. 2002: methodology revised, data not strictly comparable.

"..." indicates data not available

Table 14. Trade Union Membership ('000), 1990-2003

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
EAST ASIA-PACIFIC														
China a/	101,356	103,891	103,225	101,761	102,025	103,996	102,119	91,310	89,134	86,899	103,615	...	...	...
Fiji	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Kiribati	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Rep. of Korea s/	1,887	1,803	1,735	1,667	1,659	1,615	1,599	1,484	1,402	1,481	1,527	1,569	1,606	...
Mongolia	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Papua New Guinea	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Solomon Islands	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Vanuatu	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
SOUTHEAST ASIA														
Cambodia	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Indonesia b/	...	...	...	...	...	1,000	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Lao PDR	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Malaysia a/	659	659	681	694	700	707	729	736	740	725	734	785	...	...
Myanmar	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Philippines a/	3,055	3,113	3,142	3,197	3,511	3,587	3,611	3,635	3,687	3,731	3,788	3,850	3,914	...
Singapore a/	212	217	229	236	233	235	255	260	273	290	314	338	390	...
Timor-Leste	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Thailand g/	...	...	...	...	...	416	...	...	...	100	...	...	1,584	...
Vietnam	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
SOUTH ASIA														
Afghanistan	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Bangladesh e/	1,619	1,643	1,649	1,675	1,682	1,721	1,731	1,793	1,824	1,857	1,905	1,938	1,995	...
India a/	7,019	6,100	5,746	3,134	4,094	6,538	5,613	7,408	...	...	...	...	...	...
Iran, Islamic Rep.	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Nepal	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Pakistan c/	...	...	...	...	984	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Sri Lanka a/	905	1,136	884	988	1,613	1,441	1,265	883	800	804	...	...	...	...
INDUSTRIALIZED														
Australia f/	2,660	...	2,509	2,377	2,283	2,252	2,194	2,110	2,038	1,878	1,902	1,903	1,834	1,867
Japan a/	12,265	12,397	12,541	12,663	12,699	12,614	12,451	12,285	12,093	11,825	11,539	11,212	10,801	...
New Zealand f/	603	514	428	409	376	362	339	328	307	302	319	330	335	...

Source: Chataignier, Anne. 2005. "Statistical Indicators of Social Dialogue: A Compilation of Multiple Country Databases," forthcoming working paper, International Labour Organization.

a/ ILO. 2004. "Statistics of Trade Union Membership," Geneva: International Labour Office, Bureau of Statistics (Unpublished).

b/ Visser, J. 2002. "Unions, Unionisation and Collective Bargaining Trends around the World," Geneva: International Labour Office.

c/ 1990: Data related to 1987. Visser, J. 2002. "Unions, Unionisation and Collective Bargaining Trends around the World," Geneva: International Labour Office.

d/ ILO. 1997. *World Labour Report 1997/98: Industrial Relations, Democracy and Social Stability*, Geneva: International Labour Office.

e/ Mujeri, M. 2004. "Bangladesh Decent work Statistical Indicators: A Fact-Finding Study," Geneva: International Labour Office.

f/ ILO. 2004. "Statistics of Trade Union Membership," Geneva: International Labour Office, Bureau of Statistics (Unpublished).

g/ Visser, J. 2002. "Unions, Unionisation and Collective Bargaining Trends around the World," Geneva: International Labour Office.

ILO. 1997. *World Labour Report 1997/98: Industrial Relations, Democracy and Social Stability*, Geneva: International Labour Office.

"..." indicates data not available

Table 15. Ratification of ILO Core Conventions

	Freedom of association and collective bargaining		Elimination of forced and compulsory labour		Elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation		Abolition of child labour	
	Convention 87 a/	Convention 98 b/	Convention 29 c/	Convention 105 d/	Convention 100 e/	Convention 111 f/	Convention 138 g/	Convention 182 h/
Afghanistan								
Australia	•	•	•	•	•	•		
Bangladesh	•	•	•	•	•	•		•
Cambodia	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
China					•		•	•
Fiji	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
India			•	•	•	•		
Indonesia	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Iran, Islamic Rep.			•	•	•	•		•
Japan	•	•	•		•		•	•
Kiribati	•	•	•	•				
Rep. of Korea					•	•	•	•
Lao PDR			•					
Malaysia		•	•	▼	•		•	•
Mongolia	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Myanmar	•		•					
Nepal		•	•		•	•	•	•
New Zealand		•	•		•			•
Pakistan	•	•	•	•	•	•		•
Papua New Guinea	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Philippines	•	•		•	•	•	•	•
Singapore		•	•	▼	•			•
Solomon Islands			•					
Sri Lanka	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Thailand			•	•	•		•	•
Timor-Leste								
Vanuatu								
Vietnam					•	•	•	•
ASIA: TOTAL RATIFICATIONS	13	16	21	16	22	17	14	18
BENCHMARK VALUES								
Canada	•			•	•	•		•
Germany	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Switzerland	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Uganda		•	•	•			•	•
United States				•				•
TOTAL RATIFICATIONS	143	154	165	163	161	161	136	153
ASIA (% of total ratifications)	9.1	10.4	12.7	9.8	13.7	10.6	10.3	11.8

Source: ILO: *ILOLEX*. 11 May 2005. <http://www.ilo.org/ilolex/english/docs/declworld.htm>

• Convention ratified

• Convention denounced.

a/ Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organize Convention (1948).

b/ Right to Organize and Collective Bargaining Convention (1949).

c/ Forced Labour Convention (1930).

d/ Abolition of Forced Labour Convention (1957).

e/ Equal Remuneration Convention (1951).

f/ Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention (1958).

g/ Minimum Age Convention (1973).

h/ Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention (1999).

Annex 2 – Figures

Source: World Bank: World Development Indicators.

**Figure 2: Measures of Export Performance by Region
(with pre-1990s OECD the benchmark region)**

Source: Kucera and Sama (2004).

Figure 3: Sectoral Composition of Output by Region, 1999-2003
(average annual percent share)

Source : World Bank : World Development Indicators.

**Figure 4: Employment Growth by Country, 2002 and 2003
(annual growth rate)**

Source :ILO Laborsta, Key Indicators of the Labour Market.

Figure 5: Ratio of Female to Male Unemployment Rates by Region, 2001 and 2003

Source : ILO (2004).

Figure 6: Ratio of Youth to Total Unemployment Rates by Region, 2001 and 2003

Source : ILO (2004).

Figure 7: Ratio of Male to Female Labour Force Participation Rates by Country, 1990 and 2000

Source : ILO : Laborsta.

Figure 8: Sectoral Composition of Employment by Country, 1995-2003
(annual percent share for most recent year of data)

Source : ILO : Laborsta, Key Indicators of the Labour Market.

**Figure 9: Average Years of Educational Attainment for Adults in
"High-Performing" East and Southeast Asian Countries, 1960-1999**

Source : Barro and Lee (2000).

Figure 10: Ratio of Male to Female Adult Literacy Rates by Region, 1990 and 2000

Source : World Bank : World Development Report.

Figure 11: Ratio of Real Wage Change by Country, 1990s
(ratio of 1989-1991/1997-1999 average annual mean wages, consumption PPP)

Source : Majid (2003) based on ILO October Inquiry data.

Note: For India, endpoint average is for 1997-1998.

Figure 12: Poverty Rate by Region, 1987-1998
(percentage of population living below \$1 per day)

Source : Karsheras (2004).

Figure 13: Trade Union Density Relative to Number of Labour Force Participants by Country, 1990-2003

Source : Various (see note to Table 10).

Figure 14: Average Number of Ratifications of ILO Conventions Per Country by Region, 2005

Source : ILO : ILOLEX.

Policy Integration Department Working Papers

- No. 1 ILO activities on the social dimension of globalization: Synthesis report
- No. 2 Measuring decent work with statistical indicators
Richard Anker, Igor Chernyshev, Philippe Egger, Farhad Mehran
and Joseph Ritter
- No. 3 Globalization and decent work: Options for Panama
Philippe Egger
- No. 4 Globalización y trabajo decente: Opciones para Panamá
Philippe Egger
- No. 5 Indicators of social dialogue: Concepts and measurements
Lane Kenworthy and Bernhard Kittel
- No. 6 Assessing the impact of the attacks of 11 September 2001 on women's
employment in the United States
Gertrude Schaffner Goldberg and Helen Lachs Ginsburg
- No. 7 Decent work and the informal economy in Central America
Juan Diego Trejos Solórzano and Miguel Del Cid
- No. 8 Poverty initiatives in the ILO: A review of past and present approaches
Pat Holden and Dagmar Walter
- No. 9 Whither the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO-88)?
Debbie Budlender
- No. 10 Improving occupational classifications as tools for describing labour markets:
A summary of recent national experiences
Debbie Budlender
- No. 11 Recent developments in China's labour economy
Thomas G. Rawski
- No. 12 The Impact of economic liberalization on employment and wages in India
Sonia Bhalotra
- No. 13 The impact of trade liberalization upon inequality in developing countries
Donald J. Robbins
- No. 14 The impact of liberalization and globalization on income inequality in
developing and transitional economies
Giovanni Andrea Cornia
- No. 15 The impact of technology transfer on employment and income distribution in
developing countries: A survey of theoretical models and empirical studies
Mariacristina Piva

Policy Integration Department Working Papers

Prepared by the World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization

- No. 16 International finance: Meeting the needs of people in developing countries
José Guilherme Almeida dos Reis
- No. 17 The gender dimensions of globalization of production
Stephanie Barrientos, Naila Kabeer and Naomi Hossain
- No. 18 Social exclusion in the context of globalization - Jan Breman
- No. 19 Gender and globalization: A macroeconomic perspective
Çağatay Nilüfer and Ertük Korkurt
- No. 20 Globalization, social exclusion, and work: with special reference to informal
employment and gender - Marilyn Carr and Martha Chen
- No. 21 Resources for social development - Antony Clunies Ross
- No. 22 Does the new international trade regime leave room for industrialization
policies in the middle-income countries? - Alisa DiCaprio and Alice Amsden
- No. 23 Social dimension of globalization in Latin America: Lessons from Bolivia and Chile,
Ivaro García Hurtado
- No. 24 The social dimension of globalization: a review of the literature
Bernhard Gunter and Rolph van der Hoeven
- No. 25 The social dimension of global production systems: A review of the issues,
Susan Hayter
- No. 26 Reforming global economic and social governance:
a critical review of recent programmatic thinking - Jeremy Heimans
- No. 27 Corporate social responsibility: an issues paper - Michael Hopkins
- No. 28 Upgrading in global value chains - John Humphrey
- No. 29 Implications of globalization and economic restructuring for skills development
in Sub-Saharan Africa - Richard K. Johanson
- No. 30 The outcome and impact of the main international commissions on development issues
Frédéric Lapeyre
- No. 31 Globalization and structural adjustment as a development tool - Frédéric Lapeyre
- No. 32 Globalization and perceptions of social inequality - Malte Luebker
- No. 33 The changing structure of international trade linked to global production systems:
what are the policy implications? - William Milberg
- No. 34 Corporate social responsibility: an overview of principles and practice, Jill Murray
- No. 35 Inclusive development strategy in an era of globalization - Ignacy Sachs
- No. 36 Social consequences of the globalization of the media and communication sector:
some strategic considerations - Seán Ó. Siochrú
- No. 37 Globalization, history and international migration: a view from Latin America
Andrés Solimano
- No. 38 Towards a different kind of globalization, or how the anti-globalists view the world
Gijsbert van Liemt

Policy Integration Department Working Papers

- No. 39 How do trade union rights affect trade competitiveness?
David Kucera and Ritash Sarna
- No. 40 Statistics on the employment situation of people with disabilities:
A compendium of national methodologies
ILO Bureau of Statistics in collaboration with the In Focus Programme on Skills,
Knowledge and Employability
- No. 41 Employment in the informal economy in the Republic of Moldova
ILO Bureau of Statistics in collaboration with the Department for Statistics
and Sociology of the Republic of Moldova
- No. 42 Decent work in a least developed country: A critical assessment of the Ethiopia
PRSP Graeme J. Buckley
- No. 43 Unemployment and Labour Market Institutions:
The Failure of the Empirical Case for Deregulation
Dean Baker, Andrew Glyn, David Howell and John Schmitt
- No. 44 Women's access to occupations with authority, influence and decision-making
power: Women as legislators, senior officials and managers around the world
Richard Anker.
- No. 45 The world of work in the context of economic integration and trade liberalization
Daniel Martínez
- No. 46 Poverty reduction in Pakistan: The strategic impact of macro and employment
policies Moazam Mahmood
- No. 47 Trends in Work Stoppages: A Global Perspective
L. J. Perry and Patrick J. Wilson
- No. 48 Generating decent work for poverty reduction in Cambodia:
The voice of workers, employers and the Government
Moazam Mahmood
- No. 49 The Social Dimension of Regional Integration in ECOWAS
René Robert
- No. 50 Measuring trade union rights: A country-level indicator constructed from
coding violations recorded in textual sources
David Kucera
- No. 51 Patterns of job quality attributes in European Union
Joseph A. Ritter
- No. 52 Child Labour, Education and Export Performance
David Kucera and Ritash Sarna

-
- No. 53 Measuring the informal economy: From employment in the informal sector to informal employment
Ralf Hussmanns
- No. 54 Indicators of labour standards: an overview and comparison
Richard N. Block
- No. 55 The pattern of globalization and some implications for the pursuit of social goals
Gerry Rodgers
- No. 56 Statistical indicators of social dialogue: A compilation of multiple country databases
Anne Chataigner
- No. 57 Trade unions and informal workers' associations in the urban informal economy of Ecuador - Catherine Vaillancourt-Laflamme
- No. 58 Decent work, standards and indicators
Monique Zarka-Martres and Monique Guichard-Kelly
- No. 59 Social Dialogue Indicators: Trade Union Membership and Collective Bargaining Coverage, Statistical Concepts, Methods and Findings
Sophia Lawrence and Junko Ishikawa
- No. 60 Informality and Gender in Latin America
María Elena Valenzuela
- No. 61 Labour Developments in Dynamic Asia: What do the Data show?
David Kucera and Anne Chataigner