

TABLE 4.2
(Cont'd)

Year	M a l e s			F e m a l e s			
	Ave. hours worked per week (1)	Ave. Weekly cash earnings (2)	Ave. hourly Wage (3)=(2)/(1)	Ave. hours worked per week (4)	Ave. Weekly cash earnings (5)	Ave. hourly Wage (6)=(5)/(4)	Wage Ratio (7)=(3)/(6)
Service, sports and related workers							
1957 ^{1/}	46.8	18	.4	52.7	5	.1	4.0
1969	50.2	37	.7	55.2	11	.2	3.5
1971	53.7	51	.9	59.6	13	.2	4.5
1972	51.9	56	1.1	57.0	12	.2	5.5
1973	52.9	63	1.2	57.3	16	.3	4.0

1/

Median hours worked and median weekly cash earnings were used.

- None reported in sample households.

* Average not computed if total is less than 9,500.

Source: National Sample Survey of Households (NSSH), previously called the Bureau of Census and Statistics Survey of Households (BCSSH) and earlier the Philippine Statistical Survey of Households (PSSH).

(The latter requirement minimizes the variance of cash earnings due to extreme high values). Her equations consist of two main regressions on the entire sample and additional regressions on some selected subsamples.

In reporting on wage differentials between the sexes, Tidalgo uses two measures: the male-female absolute wage differential and the male-female wage ratio. The male-female absolute wage differential is the coefficient of the sex variable in the estimated equation and the wage ratio for a given category of worker is the ratio of the earnings of a male in that category to the earnings of a female in the same category.^{1/}

^{1/}For example, given an equation

$$\text{Earnings} = a + b \text{ Sex} + cX_1 + dX_2$$

where Sex = 1 for males and 0 for females

X_1, X_2 are dummy variables for a 3-way classificatory variable and

$X_1 = 1$ if in first category, 0 otherwise

$X_2 = 1$ if in second category, 0 otherwise

We get the following values:

(a) male-female absolute wage differential = b
and is constant regardless of X_1 and X_2

(b) male-female wage ratio for the first category = $\frac{a + b + c}{a + c}$

male-female wage ratio for the second category = $\frac{a + b + d}{a + d}$

male-female wage ratio for the third category = $\frac{a + b}{a}$

Table 4.3 shows the results for some select groups of workers. The ranges of male-female wage ratios shown in the last column correspond to the ratios for various categories (or subgroups) of workers within the given group.^{2/} Note that the wage differentials are all positive except for domestic helpers, where they are negative in some regions,^{3/} and for workers in footwear and wearing apparel. By far the largest wage differential is that for the group of professionals in government services in regions outside Manila where males earn 7.08 pesos more than females. The highest wage ratio (2.94) was found in the domestic services where, significantly, we also find the lowest ratio (.49).

In interpreting the implications of the above-mentioned estimates of wage differentials between sexes, one must distinguish the effects of outright sex discrimination in wage determination (i.e., different wages

^{2/} The categories (or subgroups) of the seven occupational groups reported in Table 4.3 were based on subclassifications by industrial group, region or smaller occupational groups.

^{3/} Wage differentials for domestic helpers differ among regions because of the existence of sex-region interaction effects for this groups of workers.

TABLE 4.3

MALE-FEMALE WAGE DIFFERENTIALS IN DIFFERENT
OCCUPATIONS AND INDUSTRIES, MAY 1969⁺

Industry Occupation	Male-Female absolute wage differential	Male-Female wage ratio
Professionals: in Government services; regions outside Manila	7.08*	1.58 to 1.69
Clerical	1.52*	1.15 to 1.21
Agriculture	.34	1.11 to 1.30
Retail Trade except Sari-Sari store, hawking and peddling	3.11 & 3.65 ^{2/}	1.75 & 1.91
Domestic services: Domestic helpers	-.70 to 1.88	i).49 to 2.94 ii).76 to 1.76 ^{b/}
Manufacturing: Clothing industries	1.96*	1.33 to 1.56
Footwear and weating apparel	-.44	.91 to .92

*X

*Statistically significant at 1%.

^{a/} The statistical significance of the differential cannot be determined since the males' and females' wages were each estimated in separate regressions.

^{b/} (i) refers to cash earnings and (ii) refers to wages defined as cash earnings plus ₱1.50 for board and lodging allowances.

+ From Tidalgo (1957), Table 79, p.282.

for men and women doing the same work) from those of discrimination in the assignment of occupational roles between the sexes (i.e. sex-identified work roles). Where the former implies assumed differences in mental and physical abilities of both sexes, the latter attributes wage differences to socially assigned positions in the occupational scale, where men are assigned to occupations of greater responsibility or more strenuous physical demands, and therefore higher pay. Studies by Cohen (1971), Fuchs (1971) and Oaxaca (1973) on wage differentiation between the sexes in the United States show that the latter of these two considerations is significantly more dominant than the former. Although we do not test this empirically for the Philippines, it seems reasonable to assert that the same situation prevails in the Philippine labor market where sex-identification of jobs can be clearly observed.

4.2 Determinants of Incomes of Women

In a market economy where unit factors are paid according to their productivities, differences in labor incomes are bound to exist if individuals possess heterogenous productivities. The literature on human capital emphasizes individual investments in formal

education or schooling as a basic factor explaining differences in labor productivities and hence also the levels and distributions of labor incomes. Moreover, even among individuals with the same number of schooling years, part of the differences in their labor earnings reflect differences in quality of schooling.

In addition, on-the-job training or "experience" increases labor's productivity and, hence, also its potential earnings. Differences in experience further explain the variance in labor earnings among individuals belonging to the same school groups. Experience is often measured by convenient proxies such as age or the number of years spent in a particular job. However, these are particularly poor measures of experience since they fail to consider differences in "qualities of experience," similar to differences in qualities of schooling, which again contribute to labor earnings differentials among individuals. Spending equal time in a particular job does not increase earnings equally for all individuals in a particular schooling group; a variance in labor incomes of such individuals still remains.

There are a number of other factors, for which data exist, that can affect an individual's earnings.

These include, among other things, his occupation, the unemployment rate in his region, the industry in which he works, his place of residence (urban or rural), and the number of hours he works. These variables, in addition to education and experience, have been considered in our estimates of an earnings function. Of course, there may be some interdependence among these variables. For instance, since an individual's occupation often reflects his skill or capacity, an occupation variable may not operate entirely independently of education and experience when set alongside these variables in a simple regression. Nonetheless, a priori, all these factors appear to be worth considering as determinants of individual earnings.

The regional unemployment rate is used to reflect the employment opportunities open to an individual. Moreover, it can also reflect the wage level prevailing in the region. It is expected to have a negative effect on earnings from work.

The industry of employment also matters. For industries with different capital-labor ratios, differences in remunerations to labor are likely to exist. An individual's earnings would be higher in industries with higher capital-labor ratios (such as in manufacturing)

than in those with lower capital-labor ratios (as in agriculture).

Individual earnings may vary with location of residence (urban or rural). Since urban areas are often centers of economic activity with relatively higher costs of living, one can expect that, on the average, individuals in the urban areas will have higher earnings than those in the rural areas. Finally, hours of work can be expected to have a positive relationship to earnings since time spent at work usually adds to productivity.

For simplicity, linear specifications are used. Mincer (1970), suggests the use of the semi-logarithmic specification,^{4/} with the log of earnings as a linear

^{4/}Very briefly, Mincer's rationale (1970) is as follows. Let an individual, after a years of schooling, earn E_s per year for n years of working life; the present value V_s of this income stream, at interest rate r , is

$$V_s = E_s e^{-rs} (1 - e^{-rn}) / r$$

Under competitive equilibrium, present values of different income streams attributable to different periods of schooling will tend to be equal, and in particular $V_s = V_0$ where V_0 refers to zero schooling. Therefore

$$E_s e^{-rs} (1 - e^{-rn}) = E_0 (1 - e^{-rn_0}),$$

where n_0 is the number of years of working life for an individual with no schooling. Since n and n_0 are not very different, then approximately

$$E_s = E_0 e^{rs}$$

which justifies the semi-logarithmic form. Non-schooling variables can be brought in by assuming that $\log E_0$ is a linear function of them.

function of schooling and other variables; some trials were also made with this form. The sample used was the same as that for the regressions on hours of work (see section 3.2) but reduced further by eliminating households where no income was reported for the wife. The sample thus consisted of 1352 observations.

The 1968 NDS contains information on the wife's total annual income, which is used as the earnings variable. This is not without its drawbacks. The wife's annual income includes both income from work and income from sources other than work, including commissions, tips, bonuses, pensions, retirements, annuities, insurance, gifts, contributions, rentals, etc. The non-work part of the wife's annual income may not be closely related to the candidate variables for explaining earnings, such as education, experience, occupation, hours worked, etc. However, since the NDS does not provide a breakdown of wife's income by source, there is no choice but to use the wife's total annual income in the regressions.^{5/}

^{5/} In this case, there would be a rationale to include variables which may determine income from sources other than work. However, data on such variables are very difficult to obtain. Encarnacion (1974) used home ownership as a proxy variable for wealth, but found it an insignificant explanatory variable for total income.

Table 4.4 presents the results of regressions ran on the woman's total income (WY). The five equations presented were arrived at with the use of a computer program designed to perform stepwise regression and thus do not represent the complete range of specifications that could have been tested. They do serve to give some interesting (though tentative) results and to offer the initial steps from which further research can be extended.

The notations used in Table 4.4 are those listed in Table 3.2 with the addition of the AGE variable representing the wife's age. This variable is used as a proxy for experience but, like the education variables (E), measures quantity only and not quality. In all five specifications, educational attainment and age both appear to be important explanatory variables. Their coefficient estimates show significant F-values and the expected positive signs.

Curiously, the coefficient of regional unemployment rate (U) is positive, opposite that expected, in all five specifications in Table 4.4. This behavior of U in our estimates appears to have no immediate and plausible economic explanation.

The length of vocational training (VL) variable is not a good explanatory variable of wife's total

TABLE 4.4

REGRESSIONS ON WOMAN'S INCOME (WY)

Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	635.59258	555.54906	556.98898	484.60589	439.92212
	(384.159)	(242.766)	(239.530)	(156.521)	(95.036761)
CE	22.97663	21.34953	21.29031	20.03739	22.74275
	(31.683)	(27.713)	(27.476)	(25.089)	(20.773085)
	38.25020	38.65110	38.82740	45.47500	5.98044
	(10.876)	(10.871)	(10.936)	(15.441)	(18.537330)
W	9.44869	8.25840	8.25420	5.56596	9.04733
	(9.821)	(6.998)	(6.986)	(3.014)	(6.942171)
ND1		-66.51124	-66.52305	-136.02821	434.18115
		(0.227)	(0.227)	0.974	(0.11966)
ND2		-123.92849	-115.71939	4029.12743	-989.07593
		(0.431)	(0.368)	(13.181)	(1.59345)
ND3		106.95863	107.11328	3910.18469	-1143.05371
		(0.497)	(0.499)	(15.262)	(2.37292)
ND4		1048.61692	1053.77918	5306.40634	-415.76636
		(29.061)	(29.103)	(35.068)	(0.38312)
CC1				-3240.58252	2059.75098
				(12.092)	(3.50307)
CC2				-3592.61114	1629.78735
				(13.160)	(2.19122)
CC3				-3548.63079	1004.45874
				(17.470)	(0.83872)
CC4				-3930.25999	1486.30957
				(15.039)	(1.79067)
CC5				-4207.68379	1285.62134
				(14.164)	(1.21791)
CC6				-5595.17033	464.10596
				(35.527)	(0.17573)
L			- 27.77197	14.65225	- 1.30693
			(0.091)	(0.026)	(0.00028)
OC					250.75629
					(3.84255)
Constant	-1788.74288	-1605.05702	-1605.13985	-1371.72358	-2197.42358
2	0.27143	0.28780	0.28785	0.31782	0.3179
	1740.48302	1723.37226	1723.95522	1691.06545	1687.3442
	125.54682	67.88868	60.31482	41.52683	31.8054

Note: Numbers in parentheses are F-values of regression coefficients. These are equal to the squares of the t-values.

annual income. Though its coefficient estimate may have the expected sign, as in specification (4), its F-value is not significant. It seems, thus, that future estimates of earnings functions like this need not include vocational training as an explanatory variable.

The industry variables are meant to reflect the capital-labor ratios of the corresponding industries.

~~Since the manufacturing and transportation industries,~~
Since the manufacturing and transportation industries, on the whole, are thought to possess higher capital-labor ratios than agriculture, commerce, and the service sector, the marginal product of labor, hence, wage, is expected to be higher in the former than in the latter industries. Thus, the regression coefficients for both the manufacturing and transportation industries should be higher than those in agriculture and commerce. This is seen to be true in specification (4) of Table 4.4 where the values of the regression coefficients are ranked in this order: IND4 (transportation), IND2 (manufacturing), IND3 (commerce), IND1 (agriculture). The service industry, which is the omitted class in our regression, is ranked below commerce (whose coefficient is 3910) and above agriculture (with coefficient-136).

The same specification (Specification 4) reveals a pattern of decreasing coefficients from OCC 1 (professional, technical and related occupations) to OCC3 (clerical workers) to OCC2 (proprietors, managers and administrative workers) and so on. This indicates that a woman who belongs to the occupational group of professionals and technical workers receives, on average, a higher total annual income than other females who are clerical workers, proprietors and so on. Regression results permit a similar comparison for each of the other occupations vis-a-vis the rest.

Equation (5) has a location variable (LOC) added into the specification. LOC performs poorly, with its F-value below the critical level 4; therefore we might prefer equation (4). But the effect of LOC on the coefficients of the IND_x and OCC_x variables is worrisome: the signs change and the significance changes. Such a large effect implies a strong relationship between LOC and the IND_x and OCC_x variables. This suggests that LOC could be a critical variable and that, perhaps, a better alternative using it as an extra dummy variable would be to run separate regressions on subsamples defined according to urban/rural location.

TABLE 4.5

REGRESSIONS ON WOMAN'S INCOME (WY)
(Dependent variable is ln WY)

Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)
E.	.49435 (105.213)	.50462 (106.326)	.49550 (98.956)
AGE	.02659 (18.237)	.02708 (18.843)	.02736 (19.194)
ln NHW	.74344 (305.545)	.73905 (299.852)	.73657 (296.801)
ln U	.16085 (1.447)	.16890 (1.589)	
VL	.13907 (.967)		
Constant	-.69013	-.386541	-.374047
R ²	.22697	.22797	.22835
s	2.68297	2.68253	2.68256
F	132.02728	99.41494	79.72341

Note: Numbers in parentheses are F-values of regression coefficient. These are equal to the squares of the t-values.

Table 4.5 summarizes the regression results using the logarithm of wife's total annual earnings ($\ln WY$) as dependent variable. The regression coefficients of all three specifications in Table 4.5 exhibit the expected signs; and except for VL and U all coefficient estimates have high F-values. These results, however, are very experimental and tentative and should be explored further in more extensive research.

Notwithstanding the limitations of the data used, regression results summarized in Tables 4.4 and 4.5 manifest the importance of both educational attainment and age in explaining woman's total earnings. Occupation, industry of employment, location of residence and number of hours worked are likewise important though they are, on average, less significant explanatory variables than educational attainment or age. Regional unemployment rate has uncertain effects on woman's annual income; that is, though highly significant, its regression coefficients for all specifications are positive in Table 4.4, but negative in Table 4.5. Finally, length of vocational training consistently exhibits a positive regression coefficient and a low F-value; hence, it is an insignificant variable explaining total women's income.

4.3 Protection of Women Workers in Philippine Law

Public enactments for the protection of women workers are based on two criteria, that of equality where due and of discrimination where necessary. The former derives from the principle that work is an inalienable right of every person regardless of sex; the latter, from society's desire to protect a woman's moral and physical health from the hazards of the work environment and, in addition, to enable a woman to exercise her essential family functions. These criteria are among the important determinants of employment and income characteristics of women.

The Woman and Child Labor Law^{6/} of the Philippines specified that employers shall not discriminate against any woman in respect to terms and conditions of employment on account of her sex, and shall pay equal remuneration for work of equal value for both men and women.^{7/} It also defines certain occupations from which women are barred. These include;

^{6/} Known as R.A. 679. This law is enforced by the Bureau of Woman and Minors under the Department of Labor.

^{7/} Paragraph (c), section 9 of R.A. 679.

(a) occupations which require women to work

always standing or which involve the lifting of heavy objects;^{8/}

(b) any industrial undertaking carried out

at any time between 10 p.m. and 6 a.m.

in the morning of the following day;

(c) any commercial or non-industrial undertaking,

other than agricultural, carried out at any

time between 12 midnight and 7 a.m. in the

morning of the following day; and

(d) any agricultural undertaking carried out

at night time without giving her a period

of rest of not less than 9 consecutive hours.

These restrictions immediately exclude women from occupations that demand strenuous physical exertion and prejudice their employment in enterprises that involve continuous operations on a 24-hours basis. These legal barriers to free entry of women into the work force necessarily limit the opportunities for a woman's active participation in the labor force.

Earnings are likewise affected by these legal barriers. Prohibitions on night time work lower the

^{8/} Maximum weights of 20 lbs. in compact form for continuous or repetitive operation, 30 lbs. in compact form for non-continuous or non-repetitive operation. Pregnant women are not allowed to perform any lifting job whatsoever.

earning potentials of women and in fact contribute to existing wage differentials between sexes. Thus, despite the law's assurance of equal pay for equal work, legal ~~restrictions narrow the job opportunities~~ and the hours of work of women. This partly explains the lower labor force participation rates among women and the lower incomes of women workers compared to men.

The sections on maternity protection and on violations and penalties of the Woman and Child Labor Law provide not only for maternity leave with pay for six weeks prior to delivery and for eight weeks after normal delivery, but also provide against dismissals of a woman on account of pregnancy or fear of pregnancy. These provisions tend to invite more active participation of married women in the labor force. However, a further provision in the section on maternity protection that guarantees not less than 60% of a woman's regular or average weekly wage as compensation for each week on maternity leave may lower a woman's income in the event of a delivery. Again these are some of the provisions in the Woman and Child Labor Law that affect or could affect the labor force participation rates and the income potentials of women.

William J. Ferguson

Together with the Woman and Child Labor Law, other social legislation that affect incomes and labor force participation rates of different groups in the population are embodied in the Labor Code of the Philippines. Among these are what were previously referred to as the Minimum Wage Law and the Industrial Peace Act or the Magna Carta of Labor. The former legally fixes the minimum wage for agriculture and non-agriculture employees and the latter recognizes collective bargaining through free trade unionism as a means for settling labor disputes.

Fixing the minimum wage benefits present workers by assuring them of at least the minimum wage. However, this work against new labor entrants when the minimum wage distorts relative factor prices, making labor more expensive than what it would otherwise be had market forces alone prevailed. In the Philippines, where there exists a large pool of surplus labor, it can generally be said that minimum wage legislation has not effectively discouraged the employment of more labor. This is so because the condition of excess labor forces workers themselves to apply for jobs even in those areas which are exempt from the minimum wage. Of particular interest is the case of household services. The influx to the urban centers of young women seeking household jobs reflects the willingness

of a substantial group of unskilled labor entrants to receive wages lower than that which they could have demanded had they been initially employed in sectors falling under the Minimum Wage Law.

Conceptually, labor unionism constitutes another legal institution that can affect the earnings level and labor force participation rates of particular subgroups in the population. Labor unions, in their desire to uphold the general welfare of their constituents, regardless of sex, are known to have demanded higher wages, shorter hours, security of employment, etc. Insofar as labor unionism also distorts relative factor prices by making labor more expensive, the rate of employment generation in the economy may be artificially slowed down. In the Philippines, however, labor unionism, in spite of the law encouraging it, appears to be a weak force working against the free market mechanism. This is so considering the fact that almost two-thirds of the total employed are either self-employed or unpaid family workers. In fact, the Department of Labor estimates show that in 1972, only 1.3% of the total employed were covered by collective bargaining agreements, too small a proportion to be of much consequence.

4.4 Mobility of Female Labor

Population economics contends that wage differentials between regions is an important factor determining the number and quality of migrants between regions. Hence, migration is an important element not only in the distribution of population but also in the distribution of income.

Though it is difficult to be definite about the role played by wage differentials between sending and receiving regions in encouraging migration, information on internal migration in the Philippines from the 1973 NDS reveals that reasons relating to employment constitute a major motivation for migration among all reported migrants, next only to reasons of marriage. Among male migrants, reasons relating to employment rank first. However, among female migrants, these rank second only to reasons of marriage, suggesting that the migration of females is less related to employment reasons when compared to that of males.

Further analysis of internal migration in the Philippines shows that migrants are predominantly young, with higher educational attainments than those of the population in the region of destination. (Pascual 1966). Moreover, females appear to be as migratory as males,

J

their movements being move toward Manila and other urban areas than the rural areas.

The migration of labor from low wage regions to high wage regional lowers wage differentials between regions and, as such, contributes to improvements in the distributions of income. What often inhibits such labor migration, however, is the burden of transportation costs borne by potential migrants which, within an archipelago like the Philippines, is quite substantial. This is one reason why internal migration in the Philippines has failed to eliminate regional wage differences, although it may be presumed that migration has lessened wage differentials between regions in the Philippines.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUDING REMARKS

This study has been concerned with the assessment of the economic status of women in the Philippines. The analysis is partly theoretical and partly empirical. The first section was an overview, based on secondary data, of basic trends in the role of women in the economy. Such data deal almost exclusively with women's economic functions outside the home, and it may be argued that this imbalance in attention has been the result of an unnecessarily restricted view of the economic role of women. The data-gathering institutions, primarily governmental, appear to have been guided by an implicit analytical framework which has failed, among other things, to take proper account of women's economic contributions within the home.

The second part of the study was an attempt to put together a more suitable framework, patterned after recent developments in the theory of family economic decision-making, otherwise termed as the 'new home economics'. In the first place, it is argued that the family, rather than the individual, is the relevant

3

decision-making unit, and that the economic activities, both inside and outside the home, in which the various family members are to engage, are decided at the same time. The activities of the female members cannot be considered, in the analytical sense, as "supplementary". It is important to establish this; if a theory assumes a distinction between 'primary' (on male) decisions and 'secondary' (on female) decisions, then it cannot be validly used as a basis for empirical analysis inquiring into the existence and extent of economic discrimination. The conclusion of economic discrimination will have been built-in, so to speak, at the theoretical level.

Briefly, the framework deals, first of all, with the determination of income and working conditions of women, treating women in their full economic capacity, both inside and outside the home. There is a stress on the concept of full family income, which is treated as the variable with prime welfare relevance. Corollary to this is the recognition of home-training as a component of human capital, in addition to formal schooling and on-the-job training. Thus the typical complaint of sex discrimination with respect to access

to schooling and on-the-job training is incomplete; one must likewise call attention to the failure to give males an exposure to home-training similar to females. Pertinent to this is the phenomenon of a very large force of female domestic workers, in fact as large as the female work force in manufacturing, which is an important factor in allowing other women (of an obviously different social and economic class) to participate in the market labor force. Finally, the framework indicates how women's present economic conditions, through their effects on marriage, family formation and fertility, have economic implications for both males and females in the next generation.

In the third and fourth parts of the study, we attempted to estimate equations, determining women's labor force participation, hours worked, and income received, on the basis of data from the 1968 National Demographic Survey. The analytical framework was used to justify the initial list of candidate variables to be examined. Some of these variables indicated individual attributes, such as age and civil status; others referred to the attributes of the family, such as the presence of young children and of domestic help; and still others were reflections of the market in general,

such as variables indicating the industry of employment or whether the worker was self-employed or employed by others. In general, these variables performed as they would have been expected, from the theoretical viewpoint, although we were not entirely satisfied with the degree to which the factors for which data were available were able to explain the variations in the dependent variables. More research is needed, both in experimenting with alternative specifications of the available variables and in measuring new variables which might substantially reduce the magnitude of the unexplained component:

In conclusion, it may be reiterated that the research interest in the economic status of women stems primarily from an equity-orientation, i.e., from a feeling that a significant component of present-day economic injustice can probably be traced to economic discrimination on the basis of sex. Such an orientation should nevertheless be directed mainly towards the state of equity between families and only secondarily towards the state of equity between sexes. If families were identical in sex and age structure, then the various institutions which prevent women from achieving their

full economic potential would affect all families equally, i.e., the forces of economic discrimination would be treated as hindrances to economic growth, rather than as factors worsening the condition of inequity. In equity analysis, the accepted unit of comparison is the family, rather than the individual, and the relevance to equity of discrimination on the basis of sex is that those families with relatively more females, especially those where a woman is the household head, are put at a relative disadvantage. Emphasis on the individual, rather than the family, is more relevant in the rich countries, where a higher degree of spatial mobility and a greater tendency for women to live singly, apart from their families of orientation, brings about a blurring of the distinction between family equity and individual equity.

REFERENCES

- Angulo, A. and de Rodriquez, C. "Female Participation in Economic Activity in Colombia" WEP Working Paper No. 9. (World Employment Programme Research, ILO, Geneva, 1975).
- Ashenfelter, O. and Heckman, J. "The Estimation of Income and Substitution Effects in a Model of Family Labor Supply," Econometrica, 42:1, January 1974, 73-86.
- Becker, G., "A Theory of the Allocation of Time," Economic Journal, 75, September 1965, 493-517.
- _____, The Economics of Discrimination, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2nd ed., 1971.
- Boserup, E., Woman's Role in Economic Development, London: George Allen and Unwin, 1970.
- Bowen, W. and Finegan, A., The Economics of Labor Force Participation. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- Bureau of Census & Statistics, Bureau of Census and Statistics Survey of Households Bulletin: Labor Force, Series No. 18-21, 23-33, 35-40, 1965-1973.
- _____, Philippine Statistical Survey of Households Bulletin: Labor Force, Series No. 1, 3, 5, 7-11, 13, 15-17, 1956-1964.
- Cohen, M.S., "Sex Differences in Compensation" in Journal of Human Resources, Vol. 6, 1971, pp. 434-447.
- Collver, A. and Langlois, E., "The Female Labor Force in Metropolitan Areas: An International Comparison," Economic Development and Cultural Change, 10:4, July 1962.
- Concepcion, G.B. and Pernia, E.M., "Population Policy: A Perspective Approach," U.P. Population Institute, September 1975 (mimeo).
- Encarnacion, J., "Family Income, Educational Level, Labor Force Participation and Fertility," Philippine Economic Journal, 12:1 & 2, 1973, pp. 536-549. (a)

Encarnacion, J., "Fertility and Labor Force Participation: Philippines 1968" IEDR Discussion Paper No. 73-13 (Institute of Economic Development and Research, School of Economics, University of the Philippines, 1973) (b).

_____, "Income Distribution in the Philippines" The Employed and the Self-Employment," in Income Distribution Employment and Economic Development in Southern and East Asia, Japan Economic Research Center (Tokyo) and Council for Asia Manpower Studies (Manila), July 1975, Vol. II, 742-775.

_____, and others, Philippine Economic Problems in Perspective, U.P. School of Economics, forthcoming 1976.

Flieger, W. and Smith, P.C., eds., A Demographic Path to Modernity, Quezon City, University of the Philippine Press, 1975.

Fox, R., "Men and Women in the Philippines," in B.E. Ward, Women in the New Asia, Paris: UNESCO, 1964.

Fuchs, V.R., "Differences in Hourly Earnings Between Men and Women," Monthly Labor Review (U.S. Department of Labor), 94:5, May 1971, 9-15.

Gronau, R., "The Measurement of Output of the Nonmarket Sector: The Evaluation of Housewives' Time," in M. Moss, ed., The Measurement of Economic and Social Performance, New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1973.

Krishna, R., "Unemployment in India," Economic and Political Weekly, March 3, 1973.

Long, Clarence D. The Labor Force Under Changing Income and Employment, New Jersey (Princeton University Press, 1958).

Marby, B.D., Economics of Manpower and the Labor Market, New York: Intext Educational Publishers, 1973.

Mangahas, Mahar, "A Broad View of the Philippine Employment Problem" in PEJ No. 12, Nos. 1 and 2, 1973, pp. 6-23.

_____, "Towards a Working Definition of Income Equity," in Phase I Report of the Research Consortium Population, Resources, Environment and the Philippine Future, Development Academy of the Philippines, U.P. School of Economics and U.P. Population Institute, August 1975.

Mangahas, Mahad ed., Measuring Philippine Development (Technical Papers of the Social Indicators Project), Development Academy of the Philippines, forthcoming 1976.

Mijares, T.A. and Rosa Linda Tidalgo, "Labor Absorption in the Philippines," Paper presented at the Conference on Manpower Problems in East and Southeast Asia, May 22-28, 1971.

Mijares, T.A. and Ordinario, C., "Labor Absorption in the Philippines and the Reliability of Employment Data" in PEJ, No. 23, Vol. 12, Nos. 1 and 2, 1973, pp. 439-503.

Mincer, Jacob, "Labor Force Participation and Unemployment: A Review of Recent Evidence," in R.A. Gordon and M. S. Gordon, eds., Prosperity and Unemployment (Wiley, 1966), pp. 73-112.

_____, "Labor Force Participation of Married Women" in Universities-National Bureau Committee for Economic Research, Aspects of Labor Economics (Princeton: Princeton University Press for the NBER, 1962), pp. 63-97.

_____, "The Distribution of Labor Incomes: A Survey with Special Reference to the Human Capital Approach". Journal of Economic Literature 8, March 1970, pp. 1-26.

Morgensten, Richard E. "Direct and Indirect Effects on Earnings of Schooling and Socio-Economic Background" in Review of Economics and Statistics, Vol. 55, No. 2, May 1973, pp. 225-233.

National Census and Statistics Office, National Census on Population and Housing, 1970 National Summary.

_____, National Sample Survey of Households
Bulletin: Labor Force, Series No. 41-42, 1974.

Oaxaca, Ronald, "Male-Female Wage Differentials in Urban Labor Market" in International Economic Review, Vol. 14, No. 3, October 1973, pp. 693-709.

Oshima, Harry T. "Seasonality and Underemployment in Monsoon Asia" in PEJ, No. 19, First Semester 1971, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 63-97.

Peek, Peter. "Family Composition and Married Female Employment: The Case of Chile: WEP Working Paper No. 13 (World Employment Programme Research, ILO, Geneva, 1975).

Philippines, Department of Labor, Bureau of Women and Minors, Status of Working Women in the Philippines, 1976.

Porio, E., Lynch, F. and Hollnsteiner, M., The Filipino Family, Community and Nation: The Same Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow? Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University, Quezon City, April 1975 (mimeo).

Raymundo, C., "The Methodology of the 1968 NDS" Appendix C in A Demographic Path to Modernity: Patterns of Early Transition in the Philippines, ed. W. Fliieger and P.C. Smith, University of the Philippines Press, 1975.

Sison, P.S., "The Role of Women in Business and Industry in the Philippines," International Labor Review, 87:2, February 1963, 118-132.

Schultz, T.W. ed., Economics of the Family, University of Chicago Press for the National Bureau of Economic Research, 1974.

Theil, H. Principles of Econometrics (John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1971).

Tidalgo, Rosa Linda P. Wages and the Wage Structure in the Philippines (1951-1959). (Unpublished doctoral dissertation) University of Wisconsin, 1975.

Zachariah, K'C. and Pernia, E.M. "Migration in the Philippines with Particular Reference to Less Developed Regions of the Country," U.P. Population Institute, September 1975 (mimeo).

Zellner, H. "Discrimination Against Women, Occupational Segregation and the Relative Wage," and discussion by S. Sandell, American Economic Review, 62:2, May 1972, 157-160 and 175-178.

Institute of Economic Development and Research
SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS
University of the Philippines

Discussion Paper No. 76-3

January 1976

INCOME AND LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATES
OF WOMEN IN THE PHILIPPINES*

by

*MAHAR MANGAHAS and TERESA JAYME-HO***

Paper Submitted to the ILO Regional Office for Asia

*The authors wish to note that Mr. Eduardo Gamboa, Mr. Jimmy B. Quizon and Miss Melit Panga assisted in various aspects of the work, but are in no way responsible for any deficiencies.

**Associate Professor and Instructor respectively, School of Economics, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City.

INCOME AND LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATES OF WOMEN IN THE PHILIPPINES

CHAPTER		PAGE
1	THE FEMALE LABOR FORCE: AN OVERVIEW-----	1
	1.1 Sources of Labor force data-----	1
	1.2 Labor force concepts and definitions-----	4
	1.3 The Philippine labor force, 1956-1971-----	7
	1.4 Females in the Philippine labor force, 1956-1974-----	11
	1.4.1 Labor force participation-----	12
	1.4.2 Unemployment and labor absorption-----	29
	1.4.3 Working hours and underemployment--	52
2	THE ECONOMIC STATUS OF WOMEN: AN ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK-----	60
	2.1 Introduction-----	60
	2.2 Determination of work and income conditions for women-----	61
	2.3 Full family income-----	82
	2.4 The economic status of women and the equity context-----	89
3	LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN-----	97
	3.1 Determinants of labor force participation-----	97
	3.2 Data and notation-----	103
	3.3 Regressions on labor force status-----	108
	3.4 Regressions on working hours-----	113
4	INCOMES OF WOMEN-----	117
	4.1 Male-female income and wage differentials-	118
	4.2 Determinants of incomes of women-----	130
	4.3 Protection of women workers in Philippine law-----	141
	4.4 Mobility of female labor-----	146
5	CONCLUDING REMARKS-----	148
	REFERENCES-----	153

INCOME AND LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATES OF WOMEN IN THE PHILIPPINES

By

MAHAR MANGAHAS and TERESA JAYME-HO

ERRATA SHEET

<u>Page No.</u>	<u>Line No.</u>	<u>Corrections</u>
3	12	Insert "be" between will and taken
14	Fn. for Line 7	A footnote is in order here after "... rates for women."* *This may be due to the effect of the change of the definition of the unemployed (which is a part of the labor force) in October 1968.
42	20	goest should read goes
50		Years 1964-1970 for miners, quarrymen and related workers with an asterisk, meaning less than 0.1%; 1964-1967, also less than 0.1% for workers in transport & communication .
61	3	For <u>diagramatical</u> read <u>diagrammatical</u>
	14	Cap. w in 'work'
63	19	For <u>includomg</u> read <u>including</u>
65	Fn. 2 line 1	For <u>Rowen</u> read <u>Bowen</u>
68	Fn. 7 Line 10	For <u>women</u> read <u>woman</u>
71	7	Rural areas meaning country-towns.
74	6	For <u>retionalizes</u> read <u>rationalizes</u>
75	6	For <u>suctomers</u> read <u>customers</u>
77	9	For <u>160's</u> read <u>1960</u>
82	19	For <u>family</u> read <u>family</u>

<u>Page No.</u>	<u>Line No.</u>	<u>Corrections</u>
88	13	For <u>fetility</u> read <u>fertility</u>
90	10	For <u>underserved</u> read <u>undeserved</u>
91	11	For <u>head</u> read <u>heads</u>
92	Fn. 36 line 2	For <u>women</u> read <u>woman</u>
97	15	For <u>women</u> read <u>woman</u>
100	.1	For <u>decided</u> read <u>decides</u>
106	16	For <u>is</u> read <u>if</u>
109	Fn. 1 & 2	Fn. 1 and 2 should be 7 and 8, respectively.
112	22	For <u>is</u> read <u>in</u>
114	Table 3.5	Variable HT: negative sign for columns 1, 2 & 3; variable DH: negative sign for columns 2 and 3; variable CW_1 negative sign for C.2 Variable CW_2 : negative sign for Col. 2 and 2_3 Variable IND_1 : negative sign for col. 3 Variable IND_2 : negative sign for col. 3
128	Fn. 3 line 3	For <u>inteaction</u> read <u>interaction</u>
129	Table 4.3 line 10 (retail trade classification)	3.11 & 3.65 ^{2/} should read 3.11 and 3.65a/ 1st asterisk is a misprint
133	Fn. 4 line 10	$E_s e^{-rs} (1 - 3^{-rn})$ should read $E_s e^{-rs} (1 - e^{-rn})$
137	9	Delete whole line

<u>Page No.</u>	<u>Line No.</u>	<u>Corrections</u>
140	21	For <u>postive</u> read <u>positive</u>
144	13	For <u>work</u> read <u>works</u>
145	16	For <u>inspite</u> read <u>in spite</u>
147	1	For <u>move</u> read <u>more</u>
	4	For <u>regional</u> read <u>regions</u>
149	8	For <u>on</u> male read <u>or</u>
	9	For <u>on</u> female read <u>or</u>
151	7	For <u>variantions</u> read <u>variations</u>
153	30	For <u>Concepcion, G.B.</u> read <u>Concepcion, M.B.</u>
154	2nd line from bottom	For <u>Marby</u> , B.D. read <u>Mabry</u> , B.D.
155		Delete <u>in</u> For <u>PEJ</u> read <u>Philippine Economic Journal</u>
	6 & 7	<u>Population, Resources, Environment and the Philippine Future</u> should be underlined.
	10	For <u>Mangahas, Mahad</u> read <u>Mangahas, Mahar</u>
	20	Delete <u>in</u>
	4th line from bottom	For <u>Morgensten</u> read <u>Morgenstern</u>

CHAPTER 1

THE FEMALE LABOR FORCE: AN OVERVIEW

1.1 Sources of Labor Force Data

The most important source of data on the Philippine labor force is the series of labor force surveys conducted by the National Census and Statistics Office (NCSO) - formerly the Bureau of Census and Statistics (BCS). These surveys were conducted biannually, in the months of May and October, for the years 1956 to 1969¹ and then quarterly, in February, May, August and November since 1971.²

The surveys provide standard labor force data, including the labor force status of the population ten years old and over, classification by age, sex and marital status, occupational and industrial classification, hours of work, and wages. Unfortunately, information on educational attainment

¹There were no surveys conducted in May 1960, October 1964 and October 1969. In 1962 the survey was done in April instead of May and in 1958, in November instead of October.

²No survey was conducted throughout 1970 because this was the year the national census was taken.

is available only for May 1961 and October 1965. Also, urban-rural classification was not started until May 1965.

There is some controversy as to which time series (May or October) provides a better estimate of size and composition of the labor force. A large number of studies -- e.g., Mijares and Tidalgo (1971) -- have selected the October over the May series on the reasoning that students are on vacation from school in May and might therefore swell the ranks of the labor force and of the unemployed in search of temporary jobs. At the same time October falls within the planting and harvesting season of the main rice crop and will therefore represent a period of relatively full-employment. Oshima (1971) notes, however, that planting is done in the months of July to September and harvesting in the months of November to January. Thus October is, like May, a period of relative slack,

It seems most reasonable, however, to maintain that both May and October series give equally significant information and that neither one nor the other can be considered sufficient to describe conditions in the labor market. This becomes especially true in a study

concerned with female workers who are more subject to seasonalities in the labor market.

In the long-term analysis that follows here, we will cite data from both May and October (or November) series for the years where these are available.

In addition to the NCSO labor force survey, a second source of data is the national census on population and housing.³ Since the census of 1970 includes questions on the labor force status of the population ten years old and over employment data for May 1970 will be taken from the census results. No figures are available however for October 1970.

A third and very valuable source of data are the National Demographic Surveys (NDS) conducted in May 1968 and May 1975 by the University of the Philippines Population Institute and the NCSO. The surveys provide a comprehensive data set for each sample household including household size and composition, employment, educational attainment, income,

³Population Censuses were undertaken in the years 1948, 1960 and 1970.

migration, family planning practices and beliefs, fertility of the mother, and other related socioeconomic variables.

For the researcher who is interested in relating the labor force participation of women to various household and demographic variables, the NDS is a rich data source. The 1968 survey is particularly useful because it includes the complete set of questions used in the NCSO's labor force surveys and therefore allows the user to determine the labor force status of each household member ten years old and above. Such is not the case for the 1973 survey which, although it identifies those who are employed, does not distinguish the unemployed from those not in the labor force.⁴ Thus labor force status (employed, unemployed, or not in the labor force) of the individual cannot always be determined and the size of the labor force cannot be estimated.

1.2 Labor force Concepts and Definitions

The labor force concepts and definitions used by the NCSO are the standard ones used in most employment

⁴The 1973 NDS does not include a question on the desire to work of individuals who are not working.

studies and need only be summarized here. (The reference period is the "survey week", i.e. the calendar week directly preceding the interview day).

a) employed - all persons ten years old and over who were:

- i) working for pay or profit or without pay on a family farm or enterprise
- ii) with a job or business but not at work because of temporary illness, vacation, strike, or other reasons or expecting to work within 30 days from the date of interview

b) unemployed - all persons ten years old and over who were not employed but:

- i) wanted work and were looking for work on a full-time basis
- ii) wanted work on full-time basis but were not looking for work because they believed no work was available, or because of temporary illness, bad weather or other valid reasons.

c) underemployed - all persons who were employed but who wanted more hours of work

d) in the labor force - all persons who are either employed or unemployed. All others are considered not in the labor force.

The above labor force definitions are those presently used by the NCSO. They differ in certain aspects, however, from those used at the start of the series in 1956, due to a number of changes introduced in 1968 and 1971. Before 1968, the definition of "employed" did not include those who were expected to start operation of a farm or business enterprise within 30 days from the date of the interview. The inclusion of this group increased the number of people classified among the employed. In the same year, the definition of the unemployed who wanted work and were looking for work was restricted to those who were looking for work "on a full-time basis", thus reducing the size of the unemployed.

The definition of "unemployed" underwent a second revision in 1971. Those who wanted work but were not looking for work for the specified reasons now had to want full-time work specifically, thus excluding those who wanted only part-time work.

Two points should be noted here before proceeding to the next section. The first is that the population base from which the labor force is determined is the population ten years old and over. In the Philippines, it is unusual for a child of ten to be working to supplement

family income, be this on a full-time basis or on part-time after-school hours. Thus it has become necessary to widen the population base in order to account for this very young segment of the labor force.

A second point is the treatment of persons who wanted work but were not looking for work because they thought no work was available. These are classified as part of the unemployed labor force. In the light of the labor supply theory that will be discussed below, it seems more reasonable to consider these people as having dropped out of the labor force completely and to have joined the ranks of what we will call "discouraged" workers.

1.3 The Philippine Labor Force, 1956-1971

Developments in the Philippine labor market since 1956 are presented here in summary to set the background for the analysis of female participation in the labor force. For this purpose reference will be made to the findings presented by Mijares and Ordinario (1973) whose paper is the most recent and complete survey of overall labor market conditions, covering the years 1956 to 1971.

During the 16-year period covered by the Mijares-Ordinario study, the size of the labor force grew from

8.6 million in October 1956 to 13.2 million in November 1971. This indicates an overall growth of 54.6 per cent and an average annual growth rate of 3.1 per cent. This growth, however, had been fluctuating from year to year with negative growth rates registered for the years 1963 and 1968. Labor force participation rates (LFPR) - the size of the labor force as a percentage of the population 10 years old and over - averaged at 54.5 percent for the October series and 57.7 per cent for the May series. Although both May and October series registered overall declines in LFPR's (from 58.2 in May 1956 to 51.8 in May 1971; from 56.8 in October to 49.5 in August 1971), a definite downward trend seems to have been established only since 1966,⁵ with fluctuating LFPR's more of a rule than an exception for the earlier years. For all years covered, however, the LFPR was higher in May than in October, May being a school vacation month.

Participation rate differentials were also registered by age group, by sex, and by urban/rural residence. The age groups 25-44 years and 45-64 years had the highest participation rates, with almost identical average LFPR's: 69.6 per cent and 69.4 per cent, respectively, for the May series; 70.3 per cent and 70.2 per cent, respectively, for the October series.

⁵ An exception was the LFPR registered by the Census of 1970 (May) which was lower than that registered by the May 1971 labor force survey. This may probably be partly, if not wholly, attributed to sampling differences in the 2 sets of data.

The next highest participation rate came from the 10-24 year age group with LFPR's averaging 47.5 percent in the May series and 40.2 percent in the October series. As expected, LFPR's for the post-retirement age group (65 years and over) were the lowest, averaging 36.6 percent for both May and October series. It is interesting to note that the difference of 7.3 percentage points between May and October LFPR's for the school-age group (10-24 years) was significant enough to offset the reverse effects in the other age groups. Thus overall rates are higher in the May series than in the October series.

Significant differences in LFPR's were observed between the sexes. The average LFPR's for males were 76.5 in the May series and 71.4 in the October series, almost twice the rates for females' 39.4 percent in May and 37.9 percent in October. Urban-rural differentials were also evident. For the period 1965 to 1971, urban LFPR's averaged 50.5 percent for the May series and 48.8 percent for the October series while rural LFPR's were higher, averaging 58.2 percent in May and 54.2 percent in October.

Over the same 16-year period the level of employment (October series) rose from 7.7 million to 12.5

million, an increase of 63 percent. At the same time, employed persons tended to work longer hours over time and the weekly average hours worked rose from 38.9 hours in 1956 to 45.8 hours in 1971.

The rate of unemployment averaged 7.7 percent of the labor force in the May series and 6.8 percent in the October series. The actual number of unemployed persons fluctuated over the years registering 859 thousand in October 1956 and 699 thousand in November 1971. It reached its highest level in October 1967 when 909 thousand persons were unemployed.

Among the major industrial sectors, agriculture, forestry, hunting and fishing provided the most employment, absorbing from one-half to three-fifths of total employment. The share of agriculture, however, was declining over the years and had gone down to 48.8 percent in August 1971 from 59.0 percent in October 1956. The next largest share went to manufacturing, ranging from 11.0 to 12.5 percent. Commerce ranked third with shares ranging from 7.3 to 12.9 percent. By far the most significant growth was observed among the government, community, business and recreational services whose share in total employment rose from 5.1 percent in 1956 to 10.3 percent in 1971. The

remaining six industrial sectors each accounted for 5 percent or less of total employment. These sectors were, in the order of size: domestic services; transport, storage and communications; construction; personal services other than domestic; mining and quarrying; and electricity, gas, water and sanitary services.

1.4 Females in the Philippine Labor Force, 1956-1974

✓ Like most of her fellow females in the rest of the world, the Filipino woman's participation in the economy remains a poor second to that of her male counterpart. LFPR's of males in the Philippines have maintained levels almost twice those of females, while close to two-thirds of females ten years old and over remain outside the ranks of the labor force.

✓ The reason put forward to explain this phenomenon is the traditional role the woman takes as the "homemaker" in the family. ✓ In allocating its total time resources between home and market production, the family usually assigns the responsibility of home production to the wife who is generally better trained for this function than the husband or any other family member. ✓ Thus the married

woman may have little or no time left for market production.⁶ This is the underlying consideration that runs through all the subsequent discussions of female participation in the labor force presented in this section.

1.4.1 Labor Force Participation

Through the 19-year period from May 1956 to May 1974, the number of women in the labor force has grown from 3.726 million to 4.964 million (Table 1.1), indicating the addition of more than one million women into the labor force. This means an overall growth rate of 33.2 percent for that period.⁷ Labor force participation rates have varied from the low figure of 31.2 percent

⁶These considerations are discussed in detail in Chapter 2 of this paper.

⁷At this point we must note that the labor force participation rate for females in May 1956 (Table 1.1) was abnormally high (50.3 percent) and hence the estimated size of the female labor force was also high. Such a high rate has not been registered for the May series in any of the subsequent years nor in the October series for the same or other years. Hence we are inclined to suspect that this is an overstatement that may be due partly to the inexperience, at that time of the survey staff. Omitting the 1956 figure would give an overall increase of 2.054 million from 1957 to 1974, an increase of 70.6 percent.

TABLE 1.1

FEMALE LABOR FORCE; 1956 - 1974: MAY ROUNDS
(Number in Thousands Except Percent)

Year	Female Labor Force		Labor Force Participation Rate (In percent)	Percent of Total Labor Force
	Labor Force	Growth Rate of Labor Force		
1956	3,726		50.3	39.2
1957	2,910	(21.9)	37.4	32.6
1958	3,468	19.2	42.9	35.9
1959	3,298	(4.9)	39.9	34.4
1961	3,480	5.5*	40.3	33.9
1962(April)	3,817	9.7	42.5	35.7
1963	4,048	6.2	43.6	36.2
1964	3,992	(1.6)	42.0	35.4
1965	3,896	(2.2)	38.7	33.9
1966	3,969	1.9	37.7	33.4
1967	4,725	18.9	43.5	35.6
1968	4,972	5.1	44.8	36.7
1969	3,960	(20.4)	33.8	32.9
1970	3,929	(0.7)	30.6	31.9
1971	4,339	10.4	33.5	32.8
1972	4,599	6.1	34.2	32.4
1973	4,457	(3.2)	31.2	32.1
1974	4,964	11.4	34.2	32.7
Average		2.2	39.5	34.3

*Growth Rate for 1959 - 1961

Sources: 1) National Sample Survey of Households (NSSH),
previously called the Bureau of Census and
Statistics Survey of Households (BCSSH) and,
earlier, the Philippine Statistical Survey
of Households (PSSH)..

2) Census 1970

in 1973 to the very high figure of 50.3 percent in 1956, averaging 39.5 percent. Although these LFPR's do not follow any continuous trend upward or downward, the overall tendency seems to be towards lower participation rates. The sudden decline in this rate in 1969 seems to mark the start of a period of lower participation rates for women. Thus the average LFPR for the years 1969 to 1974 (32.9 percent) is almost 10 percentage points lower than that for 1956 to 1968 (42.8 percent).

Figures from the October series (Table 1.2) show that in all but four years (1957, 1966, 1971 (Nov.), 1973 (Nov.)), the size of the female labor force was lower in October than in May, and that participation rates of females were also lower in October (the average LFPR for the October series is 38.0 percent).

As we show below, this is due to the high participation rates of the school-age population during the vacation month of May.

The period starting October 1968 marks a decline in the LFPR's for the October series similar to that for the May series. The average participation rate for the October series from 1956 to 1967 is 38.9 percent. This goes down to 32.4 percent for the years 1968 to 1973, a

TABLE 1.2

FEMALE LABOR FORCE; 1956 - 1973: OCTOBER ROUNDS
(Number in Thousands except Percent)

Year	Female Labor Force		Labor Force Participation Rate (In percent)	Percent of Total Labor Force
	Labor Force	Growth Rate of Labor Force		
1956	3,153		41.0	36.8
1957	3,147	(0.2)	39.7	35.6
1958(Nov.)	3,152	0.2	38.7	35.1
1959	3,201	1.6	38.3	35.1
1960	3,089	(3.5)	36.0	33.8
1961	3,479	12.6	39.5	35.8
1962	3,740	7.5	41.2	36.4
1963	3,710	(0.8)	39.6	36.3
1965	3,608	(2.7)*	35.3	33.5
1966	4,149	15.0	38.9	35.3
1967	4,325	4.2	40.1	36.7
1968	3,848	(11.0)	33.3	33.8
1971(Nov.)	4,369	13.5**	32.7	33.0
1972(Nov.)	4,252	(2.7)	30.6	31.9
1973(Nov.)	4,830	13.6	33.1	33.2
Average		2.8	38.0	34.8

*Growth rate for 1963 - 1965

**Growth rate for 1968 - 1971

Source: National Sample Survey of Households (NSSH),
previously called the Bureau of Census and Statistics
Survey of Households (BCSSH) and, earlier, the
Philippine Statistical Survey of Households (PSSH).

difference of 6.5 percentage points.

The most significant feature of the development in the female labor force over the period covered is the continuous fluctuation in its yearly growth rate. Annual growth rates range from -21.9 percent (May 1957) to 18.9 percent (May 1967). In the October series, reductions in the size of the female labor force were recorded for six years out of fourteen.⁸ Of these six years, only two years (1963 and 1968) were marked by similar reductions in the total labor force of the country.

Apparently the woman's decision to participate in the labor force is subject to certain factors which vary from year to year, such as the yield of the year's crop or the rate of unemployment, and whose influence is stronger than that of longer-run variables, such as family size or the size of the population. Unfortunately, data limitations have made it impossible for us to test this assertion empirically for the long-run changes in female labor force participation. Instead a cross-sectional analysis of the problem is presented in section 3 of this paper.

⁸These years were 1957, 1960, 1963, 1965, 1968 and 1972.

Tables 1.3 to 1.8 present a closer profile of the female labor force in terms of age, marital status, and educational attainment. Tables 1.3 and 1.4 show the breakdown of the female labor force by age group as well as the labor force participation rates of each age group for the May and October series. The highest participation rates are observed for the age groups 25-44 years and 45-64 years at averages of 44.0 and 44.3 percent, respectively, in the May series and 45.0 and 45.1 percent in the October series. These rates show that even at the ages when individuals are expected to be most active in the economy, more than one half of the female population are economically inactive.⁹

Lower participation rates are observed for the 10-24 year age group, which includes the school-age population and the lowest participation rates are for the post-retirement age group, 65 years and over.

⁹The terms "active" and "inactive" are here used in the context of the market economy. In Chapter 2 we point out that an individual's contribution to the family's economic welfare (measured by full income) includes activity not only in the market but also at home.

TABLE 1.3

FEMALE LABOR FORCE BY AGE GROUP, 1956 - 1974, MAY ROUNDS

Year	Percent of Female Labor Force				Labor Force Participation Rate			
	10-24 yrs.	25-44 yrs.	45-64 yrs.	65 yrs. over	10-24 yrs.	25-44 yrs.	45-64 yrs.	65 yrs. over
Philippines								
1956	43.8	37.7	16.4	2.0	47.0	50.3	55.0	2.4
1957	45.3	36.1	16.6	2.0	36.2	39.8	41.8	16.8
1958	43.8	37.5	16.8	1.9	40.4	46.8	48.4	19.2
1959	42.1	36.8	18.9	2.2	36.8	43.2	47.9	19.1
1961	44.5	35.5	17.8	2.2	38.7	43.0	45.3	20.0
1962(April)	42.6	37.6	17.8	1.8	39.5	46.8	48.3	18.7
1963	43.7	37.5	17.4	1.5	40.8	48.2	48.6	17.4
1964	40.9	39.1	17.8	2.2	37.2	48.0	47.3	24.3
1965	43.4	38.9	16.0	1.7	35.0	45.3	41.7	17.3
1966	43.4	37.5	17.7	1.5	33.7	43.8	43.0	15.4
1967	44.2	36.1	18.0	1.7	40.3	47.8	49.2	21.2
1968	41.7	38.7	18.3	1.3	39.5	52.2	51.3	16.7
1969	40.5	39.0	18.7	1.7	28.8	40.5	39.4	14.9
1970	38.3	40.1	18.8	2.9	25.7	37.1	35.1	17.7
1971	42.5	38.0	17.8	1.7	29.1	39.5	39.1	15.7
1972	41.8	37.8	18.7	1.7	29.3	41.7	39.0	15.2
1973	38.1	40.2	19.1	2.5	24.5	40.2	37.4	18.7
1974	40.9	38.4	18.7	2.1	28.8	42.1	40.1	17.2
Average	42.3	37.9	17.9	1.9	35.1	44.0	44.3	17.1
Urban								
1965	45.3	40.0	13.4	1.4	35.0	46.6	38.4	14.5
1966	43.9	39.1	15.6	1.4	32.4	43.1	37.9	13.1
1967	47.9	34.8	15.8	1.4	38.6	45.3	41.7	15.7
1968	42.3	39.8	16.8	1.2	35.2	51.2	44.8	34.4
1969	41.8	41.5	15.5	1.2	25.9	40.4	32.5	10.7
1970	38.9	42.4	16.7	2.0	27.4	41.9	36.0	14.5
1971	42.9	40.1	15.8	1.1	30.8	44.6	36.8	11.3
1972	42.6	39.1	17.1	1.2	31.6	47.6	38.8	11.6
1973	40.7	41.8	15.6	1.9	28.7	47.6	37.0	14.8
1974	40.7	41.4	16.4	1.4	29.4	49.3	38.4	12.2
Average	42.7	40.0	15.9	1.4	31.5	45.8	38.2	15.3

TABLE 1.3
(cont'd)

Year	Percent of Female Labor Force				Labor Force Participation Rate			
	10-24 yrs.	25-44 yrs.	45-64 yrs.	65 yrs. over	10-24 yrs.	25-44 yrs.	45-64 yrs.	65 yrs. over
Rural								
1965	42.5	38.3	17.3	1.8	35.0	44.6	43.2	18.6
1966	43.1	36.7	18.7	1.5	34.3	44.2	45.5	16.6
1967	42.4	36.8	19.1	1.8	41.3	49.1	53.0	24.5
1968	41.4	38.1	19.0	1.4	42.0	52.7	54.7	17.9
1969	39.9	37.9	20.3	2.0	30.5	40.6	42.9	17.0
1970	37.9	38.7	20.0	3.4	33.9	34.6	34.6	19.2
1971	42.2	36.8	18.9	2.0	28.3	37.0	40.3	17.8
1972	41.3	37.2	19.6	2.0	28.2	38.8	39.0	17.0
1973	36.5	39.1	21.0	2.9	22.1	36.2	37.7	21.2
1974	40.9	36.5	20.0	2.5	28.4	38.3	41.0	19.8
Average	40.8	37.6	19.4	2.1	32.4	41.6	43.2	18.0

Sources: 1) National Sample Survey of households (NSSH), previously called the Bureau of Census and Statistics Survey of Households (BCSSH) and earlier, the Philippine Statistical Survey of Households (PSSH).

2) Census (1970).

TABLE 1.4

FEMALE LABOR FORCE BY AGE GROUP: 1956 - 1973, OCTOBER ROUNDS

Year	Percent of Female Labor Force				Labor Force Participation Rate			
	10-24 yrs.	25-44 yrs.	45-64 yrs.	65 yrs. over	10-24 yrs.	25-44 yrs.	45-64 yrs.	65 yrs. over
Philippines								
1956	41.1	40.1	16.6	2.2	35.9	48.6	47.6	18.0
1957	42.1	38.7	17.1	2.1	35.6	45.6	45.8	18.3
1958(Nov.)	39.3	39.8	18.9	1.9	33.1	45.1	48.2	16.6
1959	39.0	38.8	19.8	2.5	32.6	43.6	48.3	21.6
1960	39.6	37.9	20.1	2.3	30.8	41.4	45.4	18.2
1961	40.4	39.2	18.4	2.0	34.1	45.6	47.1	19.6
1962	38.6	40.9	18.6	1.9	34.1	48.9	50.2	21.7
1963	38.9	40.7	18.5	1.8	33.2	47.3	47.3	18.9
1965	40.1	38.9	18.2	2.2	29.2	42.7	43.2	20.9
1966	40.0	39.7	18.0	2.2	32.3	47.4	45.7	22.6
1967	36.9	42.7	18.6	1.9	31.0	51.6	48.1	20.8
1968	36.8	42.3	19.0	1.8	25.8	43.4	40.0	14.2
1971(nov.)	38.1	40.5	19.4	2.0	25.6	41.2	41.0	17.8
1972(Nov.)	36.9	41.0	19.9	2.1	23.1	40.0	39.0	15.7
1973(nov.)	38.6	40.2	19.3	1.9	26.0	43.0	40.0	15.4
Average	39.1	40.1	18.7	2.1	30.8	45.0	45.1	18.7
Urban								
1965	43.8	40.1	14.5	1.6	32.8	46.7	39.5	15.8
1966	42.5	40.3	15.7	1.5	32.6	48.4	41.3	14.9
1967	39.7	42.3	16.5	1.6	28.7	47.6	39.9	15.0
1968	39.9	41.9	16.5	1.4	27.4	46.9	38.2	12.9
1971(Nov.)	41.9	40.5	16.5	1.0	30.0	46.9	38.5	10.4
1972(Nov.)	40.7	40.8	16.3	2.1	27.7	45.7	37.4	16.6
1973(Nov.)	42.6	41.2	15.0	1.0	30.8	49.1	38.3	9.9
Average	41.6	41.0	15.9	1.5	29.9	47.3	39.0	13.6
Rural								
1965	39.0	38.3	20.2	2.6	27.3	40.7	44.8	13.4
1966	38.8	39.4	19.3	2.5	32.1	46.8	47.9	26.9
1967	35.6	42.8	19.5	2.0	32.4	53.6	52.1	24.2
1968	35.0	42.5	20.5	2.0	24.8	41.6	40.9	14.9
1971(Nov.)	35.8	40.4	21.2	2.6	23.2	38.4	42.3	21.2
1972(Nov.)	34.5	41.1	22.3	2.1	20.5	37.1	39.8	15.1
1973(Nov.)	35.9	39.6	22.0	2.5	23.2	39.6	40.8	19.1
Average	36.4	40.6	20.7	2.3	26.2	42.5	44.1	20.7

Source: National Sample Survey of Households (NSSH), previously called the Bureau of Census and Statistics Survey of Households (BCSSH) and, earlier, the Philippine Statistical Survey of Households (PSSH).

Note that the average LFPR for the 10-24 year age group is higher for the May series (35.1) than for the October series (30.8), as expected. On the other hand, average LFPR's for the other age groups are higher in the October series, because October falls within the planting-harvesting season.

Urban-rural comparisons show higher participation rates in urban areas for the 25-44 year age group, but lower rates for the two older groups. For the youngest age group (10-24 years), average LFPR is higher in the urban areas for the October series but lower for the May series.

Despite lower participation rates for the 10-24 year age group, its share in the total female labor force has been high, averaging 42.3 per cent of the female labor force in the May series and 39.1 percent in the October series. Around as large a share goes to the next youngest group (25-44 years), which averages 39.9 percent of the female labor force in May and 40.1 percent in October. This of course is attributed to the larger population base of these younger groups.

LFPR's by marital status are not available from the tabulated labor force survey results.¹⁰ This is

¹⁰ Though labor force breakdown by marital status is available, there is no such breakdown for the base population.

unfortunate, since a woman's marital status is a key factor in her decision to participate in the labor force and observations on LFPR's based on marital status could have been quite informative. We do have the percentage distributions of the female labor force according to marital status, however, and these are presented in Tables 1.5 and 1.6. An interesting observation from these tables is that in urban areas, there are consistently more never-married females in the labor force than married females whereas in the rural areas the reverse is true. Since more of the available jobs in urban areas have fixed working hours at places away from home, married women would be less inclined to take on jobs in these areas. In contrast, the less formal economy in rural areas allows married women to take on part-time jobs or jobs closer to home and therefore to fulfill their household chores as well as participate in market production.

Information on the educational attainment of the labor force is available only for May 1961 and October 1965. Tables 1.7 and 1.8 show that improved education of the population has corresponding effects on the quality of the labor force. In 1961, 60.1 percent of the female labor force had not completed more than

TABLE 1.5

PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALE LABOR FORCE BY MARITAL STATUS:
1961 - 1974, MAY ROUNDS
(Number in thousands except in percent)

Year	Never Married		Married		Widowed		Divorced & Separated	
	No.	% of Annual Total	No.	% of Annual Total	No.	% of Annual Total	No.	% of Annual Total
Philippines								
1961*	1443	47.7	1334	44.1	224	7.4	21	0.7
1962*(April)	1500	45.6	1500	45.6	257	7.8	30	0.9
1963*	1641	45.6	1666	46.3	256	7.1	40	1.1
1964*	1610	44.6	1744	48.3	235	6.5	22	0.6
1965	1812	46.5	1827	46.8	221	5.7	40	1.0
1966	1890	47.6	1785	44.9	266	6.7	29	0.7
1967	2330	49.3	2104	44.5	261	5.5	32	0.7
1968	2356	47.4	2278	45.8	280	5.6	55	1.1
1969	1998	50.5	1668	42.1	258	6.5	32	0.8
1971	2081	48.0	1944	44.8	280	6.5	34	0.8
1972	2156	46.8	2104	45.7	289	6.3	53	1.2
1973	1999	44.9	2059	46.2	324	7.3	75	1.7
1974	2298	46.3	2259	45.5	339	6.8	68	1.4
Average		47.0		45.4		6.6		1.0
Urban								
1965	722	55.6	492	37.9	66	5.1	17	1.3
1966	724	55.9	476	36.7	83	6.4	12	0.9
1967	918	55.9	528	34.2	85	5.5	13	0.9
1968	883	54.5	612	37.8	98	6.1	26	1.6
1969	701	54.3	500	38.8	78	6.1	10	0.8
1971	811	52.4	627	40.5	94	6.1	16	1.0
1972	880	53.1	649	39.1	104	6.3	26	1.5
1973	952	53.9	663	37.5	115	6.5	37	2.1
1974	984	53.3	722	39.1	114	6.2	28	1.5
Average		54.3		38.0		6.0		1.3

TABLE 1.5
(cont'd)

Year	Never Married		Married		Widowed		Divorced % Separat	
	No.	% of Annual Total	No.	% of Annual Total	No.	% of Annual Total	No.	% of Annual Total
Rural								
1965	1090	41.9	1335	51.3	155	6.0	23	0.9
1966	1166	43.5	1309	48.9	183	6.8	17	0.6
1967	1412	44.5	1577	49.5	176	5.5	19	0.6
1968	1473	44.0	1667	49.8	181	5.4	29	0.9
1969	1297	48.7	1167	43.8	180	6.8	22	0.8
1971	1271	45.5	1317	47.2	186	6.7	19	0.7
1972	1276	43.3	1455	49.4	185	6.3	28	0.9
1973	1047	38.9	1396	51.9	209	7.8	38	1.4
1974	1314	42.2	1538	49.3	225	7.2	40	1.3
Average		43.6		49.0		6.5		.9

* Includes employed females only

Source: National Sample Survey of Households (NSSH), previously called the Bureau of Census and Statistics Survey of Households (BCSSH) and, earlier, the Philippine Statistical Survey of Households (PSSH).

TABLE 1.5
(cont'd)

Year	Never Married		Married		Widowed		Divorced % Separated	
	No.	% of Annual Total	No.	% of Annual Total	No.	% of Annual Total	No.	% of Annual Total
1965	1090	41.9	1335	51.3	155	6.0	23	0.9
1966	1166	43.5	1309	48.9	183	6.8	17	0.6
1967	1412	44.5	1577	49.5	176	5.5	19	0.6
1968	1473	44.0	1667	49.8	181	5.4	29	0.9
1969	1297	48.7	1167	43.8	180	6.8	22	0.8
1971	1271	45.5	1317	47.2	186	6.7	19	0.7
1972	1276	43.3	1455	49.4	185	6.3	28	0.9
1973	1047	38.9	1396	51.9	209	7.8	38	1.4
1974	1314	42.2	1538	49.3	225	7.2	40	1.3
Average		43.6		49.0		6.5		.9

* Includes employed females only

Source: National Sample Survey of Households (NSSH), previously called the Bureau of Census and Statistics Survey of Households (BCSSH) and, earlier, the Philippine Statistical Survey of Households (PSSH).

TABLE 1.6

PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALE LABOR FORCE BY MARITAL STATUS:
1960 - 1973, OCTOBER ROUNDS
(Number in thousands except percent)

Year	Never Married		Married		Widowed		Divorced & Separated	
	No.	% of Annual Total	No.	% of Annual Total	No.	% of Annual Total	No.	% of Annual Total
Philippines								
1960*	1251	44.4	1296	46.0	240	8.5	25	0.9
1961*	1417	44.8	1449	45.8	269	8.5	25	0.8
1962*	1452	42.9	1645	48.6	267	7.9	17	0.5
1963*	1502	43.0	1718	49.2	240	6.9	21	0.6
1965	1607	44.5	1729	47.9	239	6.6	32	0.9
1966	1820	43.9	2033	49.0	256	6.2	40	1.0
1968	1839	47.8	1671	43.4	284	7.4	48	1.3
1971(Nov.)	1919	43.9	2101	48.1	306	7.0	43	1.0
1972(Nov.)	1864	43.8	2015	47.4	321	7.6	52	1.2
1973(Nov.)	2165	44.8	2269	47.0	320	6.6	76	1.6
Average		44.4		47.2		7.3		1.0
Urban								
1965	684	53.5	507	39.6	72	5.6	16	1.3
1966	757	53.5	548	38.7	90	6.4	20	1.4
1968	756	52.3	563	39.0	102	7.1	19	1.3
1971(Nov.)	860	52.2	673	40.9	93	5.7	19	1.2
1972(Nov.)	889	53.2	638	38.1	121	7.2	25	1.5
1973(Nov.)	1059	55.4	726	38.0	97	5.1	28	1.4
Average		53.4		39.1		6.2		1.4
Rural								
1965	922	39.6	1222	52.5	168	7.2	16	0.7
1966	1063	38.9	1486	54.3	166	6.1	20	0.7
1968	1083	45.0	1109	46.1	182	7.6	30	1.2
1971(Nov.)	1059	39.1	1428	52.4	212	7.8	24	1.9
1972(Nov.)	975	37.8	1377	53.4	200	7.8	27	1.0
1973(Nov.)	1106	37.9	1542	52.8	224	7.6	49	1.7
Average		39.7		51.9		7.4		1.2

*Includes employed females only

Source: National Sample Survey of Households (NSSH),
previously called the Bureau of Census and
Statistics Survey of Households (BCSSH) and
earlier, the Philippine Statistical Survey of
Households (PSSH).

TABLE 1.7

FEMALE LABOR FORCE BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT; MAY 1961
(Number in Thousands Except Percent)

	Population 10 Years and Over		In the Labor Force		Labor Force Partici- pation Rates (In percent)
	No.	%	No.	%	
Philippines					
T o t a l	8,625	100.0	3,480	100.0	40.4
No grade completed	1,630	18.9	661	19.0	40.6
Grade 5 or lower	3,812	44.2	1,430	41.1	37.5
Grade 6 to 3rd Year High School	2,320	26.9	953	27.4	41.1
4th Year High School to 3rd year college	664	7.7	303	8.7	45.6
4th Year College or Higher	198	2.3	132	3.8	66.7

Source: Philippine Statistical Survey of Households (PSSH),
May 1961

TABLE 1.8

FEMALE LABOR FORCE BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT: OCTOBER 1965
(Number in Thousands Except Percent)

	Population 10 Years and Over		In the Labor Force		Labor Force Participation Rate (In percent)
	No.	%	No.	%	
Philippines					
T o t a l	10,219	100.0	3,608	100.0	35.3
No grade completed	1,420	13.9	624	17.3	43.9
Grade 5 or lower	4,609	45.1	1,389	38.5	30.1
Grade 6 to 3rd Year					
High School	3,025	29.6	1,054	29.2	34.8
4th Year High School to					
3rd Year College	838	8.2	292	8.1	34.8
4th Year College or					
Higher	307	3.0	249	6.9	81.1
Urban					
T o t a l	3,409	100.0	1,280	100.0	37.6
No grade completed	263	7.7	92	7.2	35.0
Grade 5 or lower	1,115	32.7	347	27.1	31.1
Grade 6 to 3rd year High					
School	1,231	36.1	445	34.8	36.2
4th year High School to					
3rd Year College	576	16.9	219	17.1	38.0
4th Year College or					
Higher	228	6.7	177	13.8	77.6
Rural					
T o t a l	6,809	100.0	2,328	100.0	34.2
No grade completed	1,158	17.0	533	22.9	46.0
Grade 5 or lower	3,507	51.5	1,045	44.9	29.8
Grade 6 to 3rd Year					
High School	1,798	26.4	603	25.9	33.5
4th Year High School					
to 3rd Year College	266	3.9	75	3.2	28.2
4th Year College or					
Higher	82	1.2	75	3.2	91.5

Source: Bureau of Census and Statistics Survey of Households (BCSSH),
October 1965.

five years of schooling, and only 3.8 percent had at least four years of college. By 1965, these figures had improved slightly to 55.8 percent and 6.9 percent, respectively.

The highest LFPR's were those of females who completed fourth-year college or higher. This was 66.7 percent in 1961 and increased to 81.1 percent in 1965. This means that in 1965, almost 20 percent of female college graduates were not in the labor force. During the same four-year period, LFPR's of females of lower educational attainment decreased, except for the LFPR's of women who had not completed a single year of schooling. Thus we find, surprisingly, that LFPR's increased for the two extremes of educational attainment but went down for the in-between levels. We can assume that larger demands for technically trained labor caused increased participation of college graduates while the need to supplement family income influenced that of females with no education.¹¹

In contrast women in the in-between groups who lack the necessary technical skill for specialized jobs and do not need to supplement family income would tend to choose home-work over market-work.

¹¹ Encarnacion (1973b) shows a high correlation between the educational attainment of husband and wife ($r = .97$). Thus if the wife's educational attainment is low, her husband's attainment, and therefore income, is probably low too.

The 1965 data (Table 1.8) show the sharp differences in educational attainment between the urban and the rural populations. In the rural areas, 67.8 percent of the female labor force had not completed more than five years of schooling and only 3.2 percent had had four or more years of college. In urban areas, 34.3 percent had completed grade 5 or less and 13.8 percent had completed four years of college. The LFPR of college graduates in urban areas was only 77.6 percent, in contrast to a 91.5 percent rate for the same group in rural areas. The participation rate of women with no schooling was also higher in rural than in urban areas (46.0 percent vs. 35.0 percent). The in-between groups had higher participation rates in the urban areas.

1.4.2 Unemployment and Labor Absorption

The rate of unemployment of females has been higher than that of males. During the period May 1956 to May 1974, (Table 1.9) the female unemployment rate averaged 10.9 percent, while the unemployment rate in the male labor force averaged only 5.8 percent, a difference of 5.1 percentage points. The female unemployment rate was especially high during the years

TABLE 1.9

FEMALE LABOR FORCE BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS: 1956-1974, MAY ROUNDS
(Number in thousands except percent)

Year	Employed			Unemployed		
	No.	Growth Rate	% of Female Labor Force	No.	Growth Rate	% of Female Labor Force
Philippines						
1956	2988		80.2	738		19.8
1957	2540	(15.0)	87.3	369	(50.0)	12.7
1958	3006	18.4	86.7	462	25.2	13.3
1959	2959	(1.5)	89.7	339	(26.6)	10.3
1961	3024	2.2*	86.9	456	34.5*	13.1
1962(Apr)	3289	8.8	86.2	528	15.8	13.8
1963	3598	9.4	88.8	454	(14.0)	11.2
1964	3610	.3	90.5	379	(16.5)	9.5
1965	3385	(6.2)	86.8	516	36.2	13.2
1966	3582	5.8	90.1	392	(24.0)	9.9
1967	4193	17.1	88.7	535	36.5	11.3
1968	4464	6.5	89.8	506	(5.4)	10.2
1969	3548	(20.5)	89.7	409	(19.2)	10.3
1970	3464	(2.4)	88.2	465	13.7	11.8
1971	4062	17.3	93.6	277	(40.4)	6.4
1972	4188	3.1	90.9	416	50.2	9.0
1973	4212	.6	94.5	245	(41.1)	5.5
1974	4679	11.1	94.3	284	15.9	5.7
Average		3.1	89.1		(0.5)	10.9
Urban						
1965	1131		87.1	168		12.9
1966	1142	1.0	88.2	152	(9.5)	11.8
1967	1325	16.0	85.9	218	43.4	14.1
1968	1399	5.6	86.4	220	0.9	13.6
1969	1161	(17.0)	89.9	130	(40.9)	10.1
1970	1312	13.0	90.5	137	5.4	9.5
1971	1400	6.7	90.5	147	7.3	9.5
1972	1461	4.4	88.1	198	34.7	11.9
1973	1648	12.8	93.2	119	(39.9)	6.8
1974	1730	5.0	93.7	117	(1.7)	6.3
Average		5.3	89.4		(0.0)	10.7

TABLE 1.9
(Cont'd)

Year	Employed			Unemployed		
	No.	Growth Rate	% of Female Labor Force	No.	Growth Rate	% of Female Labor Force
Rural						
1965	2254		86.6	348		13.4
1966	2440	8.3	91.1	240	(31.0)	8.9
1967	2668	9.3	90.1	317	32.1	9.9
1968	3065	14.9	91.5	286	(9.8)	8.5
1969	2388	(20.1)	89.6	279	(2.4)	10.4
1970	2149	(10.0)	86.7	329	17.9	9.5
1971	2662	23.9	95.3	130	(60.0)	4.7
1972	2724	2.3	92.6	218	67.7	7.4
1973	2564	(5.9)	95.3	126	(42.2)	4.7
1974	2949	15.0	94.6	167	32.5	5.4
Average		4.2	91.3		0.5	8.3

*Growth Rate from 1959-1961

- Sources: 1) National Sample Survey of Households (NSS#), previously called the Bureau of Census and Statistics Survey of Households (BCSSH) and earlier, the Philippine Statistical Survey of Households (PSSH).
- 2) Census (1970)

1956 to 1970 reaching a peak of 19.8 percent in May 1956¹² and averaging 12.2 percent for the period. From 1971 on, unemployment rates have been much lower, never reaching ten percent and averaging 6.7 percent.

Urban-rural differences in unemployment rates are clearly observed. For May 1965 to May 1974 the unemployment rate averaged 10.7 percent in urban areas and only 8.3 percent in rural areas.

For the October series (Table 1.10) unemployment rates are slightly lower than for May. The average unemployment rate for October 1956 to November 1973 was 9.0 percent. In urban areas, the 1965 to 1973 average was 9.6 percent and in rural areas it was 8.0 percent. In the month of May, children on vacation from school, as well as fresh high school and college graduates, flood the market with jobseekers at a time when the market is not at its peak season and therefore demand is relatively low, thus raising unemployment rates.

The problem of the unemployed youth is made explicit by showing unemployment rates by age group (Tables 1.11 and 1.12). For both May and October rounds, the highest unemployment rates are those for females aged 10 to 24 years. These averaged 15.9 percent

¹². Again this unusually high unemployment rate seems to be an overestimate. It involves 738 thousand unemployed females, a figure much higher than that for any of the later years. The unemployment rate of 19.8 percent is itself 6.0 percentage points higher than the next highest rate registered for 1962 (13.8 percent).

TABLE 1.10

FEMALE LABOR FORCE BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS: 1956-1973, OCTOBER ROUNDS
(Number in thousands except percent)

Year	Employed			Unemployed		
			% of Female			% of Female
	No.	Growth Rate	Labor Force	No.	Growth Rate	Labor Force
Philippines						
1956	2706		87.4	462		12.6
1957	2847	5.2	90.5	300	(35.1)	9.5
1958 (Nov.)	2823	(.8)	89.6	329	9.7	10.4
1959	2920	3.4	91.2	282	(14.3)	8.8
1960	2818	(3.5)	91.2	271	(3.9)	8.8
1961	3163	12.2	90.9	316	16.6	9.1
1962	3384	7.0	90.5	356	12.7	9.5
1963	3492	3.2	92.6	218	(38.8)	5.9
1965	3296	(5.6)*	91.3	351	61.0*	8.7
1966	3742	13.5	90.2	407	16.0	9.8
1967	3807	1.7	88.0	518	27.3	12.0
1968	3410	(10.4)	88.6	439	15.3	11.4
1971 (Nov.)	4080	19.6**	93.4	289	(34.2)**	6.6
1972 (Nov.)	3982	(2.4)	93.6	270	(6.6)	6.4
1973 (Nov.)	4582	15.1	94.9	247	(8.5)	5.1
Average		3.4	90.9		1.0	9.0
Urban						
1965	1126		88.0	154		12.0
1966	1253	11.3	88.6	161	4.5	11.4
1967	1178	(6.0)	87.9	162	.6	12.1
1968	1307	11.0	90.5	137	(15.4)	9.5
1971	1510	15.5**	91.7	136	(.7)**	8.3
1972	1547	2.5	92.5	126	(7.4)	7.5
1973	1787	15.5	93.6	122	(3.2)	6.4
Average		6.2	90.4		(2.7)	9.6
Rural						
1965	2170		93.2	158		6.8
1966	2489	14.7	91.0	246	55.7	9.0
1967	2629	5.6	88.1	356	44.7	11.9
1968	2102	(20.0)	87.5	302	15.2	12.5
1971	2570	22.3**	94.4	153	(49.3)**	5.6
1972	2435	5.3	94.4	144	(5.9)	5.6
1973	2796	14.8	95.7	125	(13.2)	4.3
Average		5.3	92.0		5.9	8.0

*Growth Rate from 1963-1965

**Growth Rate from 1968-1971

Sources: National Sample Survey of Households (NSSH), previously called the Bureau Census and Statistics Survey of Households (BCSSH) and earlier, the Philippine Statistical Survey of Households (PSSH).

TABLE 1.11

RATES OF UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE FEMALE LABOR FORCE,
BY AGE GROUP, 1956 to 1974, MAY ROUNDS
(In percent)

Year	10-24 years	25-44 years	45-64 years	65 years and over
Philippines				
1956	26.3	17.5	10.1	2.0
1957	18.8	7.9	7.7	1.3
1958	18.9	10.0	7.3	4.2
1959	14.5	7.7	6.5	4.2
1961	19.3	9.2	6.3	5.3
1962 (April)	20.4	10.0	6.9	9.2
1963	16.1	7.6	6.9	7.4
1964	13.4	8.7	5.5	6.0
1965	17.8	10.6	8.4	1.6
1966	15.7	5.7	4.9	4.6
1967	18.1	7.1	4.2	-
1968	16.4	6.3	4.5	7.0
1969	14.7	8.4	5.6	4.3
1970	14.9	10.1	9.2	12.4
1971	9.3	4.6	3.7	1.1
1972	14.1	7.3	2.2	1.7
1973	9.7	3.9	1.2	1.6
1974	8.6	5.7	2.4	1.6
Average	15.9	8.2	5.8	4.2
Urban				
1965	17.0	10.0	9.0	4.7
1966	19.6	5.9	4.8	6.8
1967	22.3	7.6	4.9	-
1968	22.3	7.5	6.6	4.6
1969	13.9	7.5	4.6	9.8
1970	12.0	7.7	7.2	12.8
1971	14.7	5.8	5.2	1.7
1972	18.7	8.9	2.8	-
1973	11.7	4.3	1.3	-
1974	9.4	5.1	2.2	-
Average	16.2	7.0	4.9	3.7

TABLE 1.11

(Cont'd)

Year	10-24 years	25-44 years	45-64 years	65 years and over
Rural				
1965	18.2	10.9	8.3	-
1966	13.8	5.6	4.8	4.2
1967	15.7	6.9	4.0	-
1968	13.5	5.6	3.6	7.9
1969	14.7	8.8	6.0	2.1
1970	16.7	11.6	10.1	12.2
1971	6.3	3.8	3.0	1.2
1972	11.4	6.3	1.9	-
1973	8.1	3.6	1.1	2.1
1974	8.1	4.2	2.4	2.1
Average	12.7	6.7	4.5	3.2

-None reported in Sample households

Sources: 1) National Sample Survey of Households (NSSH), previously called the Bureau of Census and Statistics Survey of Households (BCSSH) and earlier, the Philippine Statistical Survey of Households (PSSH)

2) Census (1970)

TABLE 1.12

RATES OF UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE FEMALE LABOR FORCE,
BY AGE GROUP: OCTOBER ROUNDS
(In percent)

Year	10-24 years	25-44 years	45-64 years	65 years and over
Philippines				
1956	17.9	10.1	6.5	5.2
1957	12.4	8.5	5.4	4.1
1958 (Nov.)	14.6	9.5	4.7	2.2
1959	13.8	6.3	4.5	3.2
1960	12.8	7.1	4.7	3.4
1961	12.2	7.6	5.8	5.4
1962	12.7	7.9	6.4	11.0
1963	8.1	4.6	4.4	3.3
1965	12.6	6.9	4.1	4.7
1966	15.5	6.2	5.7	6.3
1967	16.3	10.8	6.7	4.4
1968	16.0	10.0	6.7	1.9
1971	9.5	5.8	3.3	1.7
1972	11.4	4.9	1.5	-
1973	8.9	3.1	2.1	.8
Average	13.0	7.3	4.8	3.8
Urban				
1965	16.4	9.4	6.7	6.2
1966	18.0	7.0	5.7	3.8
1967	15.2	11.7	6.0	5.4
1968	12.9	8.3	5.1	-
1971	11.9	6.5	4.0	-
1972	12.7	3.8	2.1	-
1973	11.0	3.5	1.6	1.3
Average	14.0	7.2	4.5	2.4
Rural				
1965	10.3	5.4	3.1	3.9
1966	14.0	5.8	5.7	7.1
1967	16.9	10.4	7.0	4.2
1968	18.1	10.9	1.5	2.5
1971	7.8	5.3	4.2	-
1972	10.4	4.2	1.3	-
1973	7.3	2.8	2.4	.7
Average	12.1	6.4	3.6	2.6

-None Reported in Sample households

Source : National Sample Survey of Households (NSSH), previously called the Bureau of Census Sample Survey of Households (BCSSH) and, earlier, the Philippine Statistical Survey of Households (PSSH).

in May and 13.0 percent in October. Unemployment rates were succeedinglly lower for the three older age groups probably because of increased years of experience as well as less competition (the size of the female labor force is smaller the higher the age group). Also, unemployment rates were higher in urban areas than in rural areas for all age groups.

Corresponding to the high unemployment rates of the 10-24 year age group is the high rate of unemployment of the never-married group in the classification by marital status (Tables 1.13 and 1.14). Averaging 13.5 percent for the May series and 11.2 percent for the October series, these high rates stem from the large size of the never-married female labor force who, not being tied down by the responsibilities of home-work are free to join the ranks of the labor force. The next highest rates of unemployment are those of divorced or separated women, averaging 7.2 percent in both May and October rounds. The unemployed among the married female labor force averaged only 5.1 percent in the May series and 7.1 percent in the October series; for the widowed group, these were 3.6 and 4.7 percent, respectively.

TABLE 1.13

RATES OF UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE FEMALE LABOR FORCE,
BY MARITAL STATUS, 1965-1974, MAY ROUNDS
(In Percent)

Year	Never Married	Married	Widowed	Divorced Separated
Philippines				
1965	16.1	11.0	7.9	13.0
1966	14.9	5.6	2.8	8.0
1967	16.3	6.8	2.9	11.1
1968	15.2	5.7	4.9	7.2
1969	17.8	2.2	5.3	5.0
1971	11.2	1.8	2.8	0.8
1972	13.5	5.6	1.9	4.1
1973	8.6	3.4	0.7	3.2
1974	7.8	3.8	3.6	12.1
Average	13.5	5.1	3.6	7.2
Urban				
1965	15.2	10.1	12.0	2.3
1966	17.1	5.1	4.9	5.0
1967	19.2	7.4	3.3	.0
1968	19.0	7.3	5.3	10.6
1969	12.6	7.5	5.1	3.8
1971	13.2	5.7	3.4	1.7
1972	17.4	6.5	2.1	4.9
1973	9.6	3.9	1.0	2.6
1974	7.7	4.8	2.5	11.2
Average	14.6	6.5	4.4	4.7
Rural				
1965	16.7	11.3	6.2	21.1
1966	13.6	5.8	1.9	10.0
1967	14.4	6.6	3.7	18.8
1968	13.0	5.1	4.6	4.2
1969	20.6	.0	5.3	5.6
1971	9.9	.0	2.4	.0
1972	10.8	5.2	1.8	3.4
1973	7.6	3.1	0.5	3.7
1974	7.8	3.3	4.1	12.8
Average	12.7	4.5	3.3	8.8

Source: National Sample Survey of Households (NSSH), previously
the Bureau of Census and Statistics Survey of Households
(BCSSH).

TABLE 1.14

RATES OF UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE FEMALE LABOR FORCE,
BY MARITAL STATUS, 1965-1973, OCTOBER ROUNDS
(In Percent)

Year	Never Married	Married	Widowed	Divorced or Separated
Philippines				
1965	11.6	6.3	6.2	8.8
1966	13.2	7.8	2.7	6.0
1968	20.1	3.3	4.0	3.3
1971 (Nov.)	8.6	5.1	3.5	13.6
1972 (Nov.)	9.6	4.1	2.1	7.0
1973 (Nov.)	7.9	2.9	2.5	4.6
Average	11.8	4.9	3.5	7.2
Urban				
1965	13.8	10.2	8.9	9.8
1966	14.6	8.0	4.9	12.2
1968	10.3	9.1	5.2	8.5
1971 (Nov.)	9.7	6.8	4.0	17.4
1972 (Nov.)	9.6	5.5	3.0	6.7
1973 (Nov.)	9.2	2.9	2.3	6.9
Average	11.2	7.1	4.7	10.2
Rural				
1965	10.0	4.6	5.0	7.9
1966	12.2	7.7	1.4	.0
1968	27.0	0.3	3.3	.0
1971 (Nov.)	7.8	4.3	3.0	10.5
1972 (Nov.)	9.5	3.4	1.5	7.3
1973 (Nov.)	6.7	2.8	2.6	3.2
Average	12.2	3.9	2.8	5.6

Source: National Sample Survey of Household (NSSH) previously called the Bureau of Census and Statistics Survey of Households (BCSSH).

A curious pattern emerges when unemployment is observed for different levels of educational attainment (Table 1.15). The lowest rates of unemployment are registered for females with no

grade completed (5.4 percent in 1961 and 3.2 percent in 1965), followed by those who completed 4th year college or higher. The highest rates of unemployment were registered for the group that completed high school but dropped out of college with unemployment rates as high as 26.7 percent in 1961 and 18.8 percent in 1965. These figures show that unskilled female labor is best able to find a market for its services, while the half-processed college drop-out is the most displaced in the labor force. Urban-rural differences are also present. Although college graduates have the lowest unemployment rate in urban areas (5.7 percent), they are followed closely by those with no schooling with 6.5 percent unemployment. And in the rural areas females with no schooling have a very low unemployment rate of 2.6 percent, less than half the corresponding rate in urban areas.

We move on now to a discussion of the patterns of labor absorption of female labor. Tables 1.16 to 1.21 present the distribution of the employed female labor

TABLE 1.15

RATES OF UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE FEMALE LABOR FORCE,
BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT: MAY 1961 AND OCTOBER 1965
(In Percent)

	May 1961	October 1965
Philippines		
No grade completed	5.4	3.2
Grade 5 or lower	10.6	6.5
Grade 6 to 3rd year H.S.	18.1	12.5
4th year H.S. to 3rd year College	26.7	18.8
4th year college or higher	10.6	5.6
Urban		
No grade completed		6.5
Grade 5 or lower		8.4
Grade 6 to 3rd year H.S.		14.2
4th year H.S. to 3rd year college		21.0
4th year college or higher		5.7
Rural		
No grade completed		2.6
Grade 5 or lower		5.8
Grade 6 to 3rd year H.S.		11.4
4th year H.S. to 3rd year college		13.3
4th year college or higher		5.3

Sources: Bureau of Census and Statistics Survey of Households (BCSSH), October 1965 and Philippine Statistical Survey of Household (PSSH), May 1961.

force according to class of worker, major industrial grouping and major occupational grouping. Tables 1.16 and 1.17 show that, over time, the class of wage and salary workers has been accounting for an increasingly larger share of the female labor force. In May 1956, this class constituted only 23.8 percent of the labor force; by 1974, its share had gone up to 41.4 percent. Whereas in 1956 it had the smallest share in total female employment, by 1974 it had outgrown the classes of self-employed as well as unpaid family workers to register the largest share among all three categories. This, of course, is a sign of the growing absorption of female labor into the more modern sectors of the economy and of its gradual release from the traditional family-centered producing unit.

Breaking down the labor force into the urban and the rural employed, we find vast differences in the distribution by class of worker. As can be expected, the largest share, by class of worker, in urban areas goes to the class of wage and salary workers, whose share averaged 61.8 percent of the total employed females. The class of self-employed females is a poor second with an average of 25.0 percent, and last are the unpaid family workers who make up only 12.3 percent

TABLE 1.16

EMPLOYED FEMALES BY CLASS OF WORKER, 1956-1974, MAY ROUNDS
(In thousands except percent)

Year	Wage and Salary		Self-Employed		Unpaid Family Worker	
	No.	Percent of Total Employed	No.	Percent of Total Employed	No.	Percent of Total Employed
Philippines						
1956	711	23.8	968	32.4	1267	42.4
1957	661	26.0	845	33.3	1002	39.5
1958	771	25.7	967	32.2	1250	41.6
1959	797	26.9	922	31.2	1230	41.6
1961	874	28.9	928	30.7	1158	38.3
1962	997	30.3	971	29.5	1316	40.0
(April)						
1963	1069	29.7	1087	30.2	1436	39.9
1964	1128	31.2	1080	29.9	1396	38.7
1965	1258	37.2	979	28.9	1146	33.9
1966	1200	33.5	997	27.8	1345	37.6
1967	1557	37.1	1086	25.9	1543	36.8
1968	1506	33.7	1208	27.1	1740	39.0
1969	1307	36.8	969	27.3	1266	35.7
1970	1612	41.0	917	23.3	1062	27.0
1971	1616	39.8	1190	29.3	1250	30.8
1972	1643	39.3	1178	28.2	1356	32.4
1973	1722	40.9	1179	28.0	1296	30.8
1974	1935	41.4	1068	22.8	1669	35.7
Average		33.5		28.8		36.8
Urban						
1965	678	60.0	296	26.2	156	13.8
1966	663	58.1	323	28.3	149	13.1
1967	785	59.3	330	24.9	205	15.5
1968	804	57.5	378	27.0	211	15.1
1969	712	61.3	295	25.4	151	13.0
1970	928	64.0	304	21.0	123	8.5
1971	866	61.9	377	26.9	155	11.1
1972	917	62.8	376	25.7	164	11.2
1973	1076	65.3	395	23.9	174	10.6
1974	1177	68.0	363	21.0	188	10.9
Average		61.8		25.0		12.3
Rural						
1965	580	25.7	683	30.2	990	43.9
1966	537	22.0	674	27.6	1197	49.1
1967	772	26.9	756	26.4	1338	46.7
1968	702	22.9	831	27.1	1529	49.9
1969	595	24.9	674	28.2	1115	46.7
1970	684	27.6	614	24.8	938	37.9
1971	750	28.2	813	30.5	1095	41.1
1972	725	26.6	802	29.4	1191	43.7
1973	647	25.2	784	30.6	1121	43.7
1974	758	25.7	705	23.9	1481	50.2
Average		25.6		27.9		45.3

Sources: 1) National Sample Survey of Households (NSSH), previously called the Bureau of Census and Statistics Survey of Households (BCSSH) and earlier the Philippine Statistical Survey of Household (PSSH).
2) Census (1970).