

UNEMPLOYMENT AND UNDEREMPLOYMENT IN THE ASEAN COUNTRIES*

*(With Special Emphasis on Women and Youth
in Rural Areas of the ASEAN Region)*

RENE E. MENDOZA

Introduction

Where solutions in attacking common development problems may require coordinated actions of governments in specially contiguous territories, the ASEAN or any regrouping of small countries could be recognized as a scaled-down version of the interlocking system of cross-national coordination of development thrusts. Such emerging groupings or alignments can be dedicated to reestablishing functions of employment opportunities creation and manpower development; and incidentally, with population and mobility control. It might, of course, be a tacit admission of a developing country's government of its inability to cope singly with the imperatives of both domestic and international economic pressures that impede or hamper development, economic or otherwise.

Development programs are thus often seen not only as a package of various projects that are either similar or complementary, but also as expressions of desires for national development and self-sufficiency, in a world of growing anxieties over insufficiencies and interlocking dependency configurations. Interestingly, anxiety over what may happen keeps communication lines open among the ASEAN countries. The convergence of their interests in development, and in facing common problems of critical import to their development efforts, enable a ready willingness to share in the discussion of these similar problems, solutions that appear possible or which some of them may already have tried—whether they failed or succeeded.

* Adapted from a paper prepared for the ESCAP Committee on Social Development meeting in Bangkok, December 8-15, 197.

Since their establishment, ASEAN countries appear to be spending more resources on human resources development programs than on any other resource development. Their objective is obviously one of guaranteeing their national development by strengthening the most crucial factor that can both contribute to, as well as create the demand for, development. By helping their native population build up their capabilities to share in the national development effort, the less becomes the need for the government to embark solely on more expensive wide-scale and broad-based development programs. The increasing calls for greater participation of the target beneficiaries of employment-creation and manpower development programs indicate the growing trends toward the individual or group-centered development strategies, such as the "Basic Needs" strategy currently being promoted by the International Labor Organization (ILO), or the "Redistribution of Wealth and/or Income" strategy, or the "Redistribution with Growth" strategy.

A systems view of development, however, dictates that it be a complex process of dynamic interaction between various elements, and that a phasing of activities and programs of action is needed between the different components of the developmental process, viz: human resources, capital, science and technology, and management. Development involves *progressive* changes following *conscious, coordinated action* for the attainment of *desired goals* of achieving the potentials for economic growth, social justice, environmental integrity, cultural advancement, moral upliftment and political maturity on a self-sufficient and self-sustaining basis. While national development is total, and not just economic, development, it certainly includes both qualitative as well as quantitative improvements or advances in the equalization of opportunity, full employment, equitable distribution of income, and increased access to the generally available social services based on felt rather than forced or imposed needs, and actively supported and participated in by people concerned, rather than a purely government activity.

Moreover, in the ASEAN region, where the scarcity of capital is matched by an abundance of labor, human resources development becomes an imperative strategy for national development. Indeed, pursuing a correct human resources development program for any country supports the accepted economic principle that a country should develop the resources it has in

abundance. Human resources development is not only an essential precondition but a critical factor in sustaining and accelerating growth. It entails not merely the creation of wealth but the creation of the "capacity to create wealth."

The ultimate success of a program for economic and social development will depend, in large measure, on the availability of the correct amount of manpower possessing specific levels of skills and training at the right place, and at the right time. The dearth of trained manpower has often been, and continues to be, a deterrent to the expansion of industry and social services. The mis-matches of the skills/training levels, places and times are often measured by the usual problem indices of unemployment on the supply side.

The following manpower situation may be summarized for developing countries like those in the ASEAN region, and very clearly, the need for a comprehensive manpower development program can be underscored by these factors:

1. More people educated for the legal profession and in the liberal arts than can be taken care of by the demand in the labor market, which definitely indicates lack of adequacy in vocational guidance and career counselling, even in school settings;
2. A shortage of clerical occupations holders including skilled office machine operators, complicated by increasing numbers of untrained people seeking work in the less-skilled, white collar jobs who are unable to find work;
3. A shortage of persons adequately educated in certain professional and technical occupations, particularly those required in the social service sector, such as health services personnel, etc., which is even aggravated by the "brain drain" to the developed countries;
4. A shortage of subprofessional workers willing to serve as technicians, similarly lured by external employment in the same manner as the professionals and technicians;
5. A shortage of craftsmen and skilled workers required by industrialization in service activities that support or follow industrialization;
6. A shortage of appropriately trained administrative, executive and managerial personnel, aggravated by the policies of multinationals of bringing in or hiring

nationals from developed countries rather than native professionals; and

7. A great number of unskilled and semi-skilled workers, creating widespread unemployment and underemployment in the cities and widespread underemployment in rural areas, affecting particularly agricultural laborers and owners of small farms. The former conditions are caused by migration and by the intense competition for both work and training opportunities while the latter are caused mainly by the smallness of most farms and by seasonal fluctuations of the agricultural production activity.

Thus the key problems to be dealt with are three-fold:

1. provision of high-level manpower for the critically important administrative, technical, educational and training work of development and nation-building, together with intermediate-level supporting occupations;
2. provision of skilled workers, artisans, craftsmen and operatives required for industrial development; and
3. utilization of the massive reserves of underemployed and unemployed workers who constitute the greatest potential resource of the nation, whether found in the cities or rural areas, in particular, the young and the females—who seem to represent special problems of employment.

Employment-Related Problems

Even if "materials output maximization" indicated by "full production" is more easily grasped, measured and accepted as an indicator of economic development, "human resources development" indicated by "full employment" is not as readily grasped nowadays. At less than full productive capacity, an economy can be shown to have some unutilized or underutilized resources, including human resources. When a facility or equipment is not being utilized at all or to its fullest, there is not too much official worry about its unemployment or underemployment as such; the only major loss considered is the loss of the output units it could have been producing. However, when it is human resources that are not being utilized at all or where they are being underutilized, there are other social and psychological losses, different from the mere loss of output

units to which their unemployment or underemployment contributes.

The critical employment-related problems found in most developing nations, as in the ASEAN region, have a wide range of causes which include:

1. shortage of opportunities for gainful employment or inadequacy of demand;
2. deficiencies of supply in terms of the *wrong* skills levels, at the *wrong* place, and at the *wrong* time;
3. the underutilization of labor or its inadequate recompense, even where gainful employment is available;
4. inadequate institutions for education, training, placement and employment;
5. labor market distortions;
6. lack of adequate, reliable, or up-to-date information about the labor market; and
7. abilities, values, aspirations, attitudes and job expectations, particularly among the educated and the young, that are in contrast to the available employment opportunities or with the high priority jobs for accelerating the tasks of nation-building and national development.

By any measure of the above causes, the ratio in any of the ASEAN countries' labor force severely affected by employment-related problems, greatly exceeds the proportion of its openly unemployed.

Although Table 1 is hardly indicative of these problems, it at least can suggest the magnitude of some of the dimensions of the employment-related problems. The absence of Indonesian data on employment and related statistics is also fatal for a complete ASEAN comparison. Also, due to the desire for cross-country comparability, trends cannot be reflected in the same table. What the Asian Development Bank admits in its data is that their projections are even "partly or entirely inconsistent with those published in *UN Monthly Bulletin of Statistics*, July 1975." The International Labour Office (ILO)'s *Yearbook of Labour Statistics, 1977*, provides trend data in Table 2 for unemployment, yet is not even directly correlatable with Table 1. Note for instance the Philippine data series, where 1974 is given as 4.0 rather than 4.8 in the ADB data set. However, the ILO data has 4.8 for 1973, and actually part of a downward progression from a high of 6.3 in the seventies, when

Table 1

SELECTED EMPLOYMENT AND RELATED DATA FOR ASEAN COUNTRIES, 1974

Country	Population*	Labor		Ratio to Labor Force**		Unemployed (%)		Employment/Population		Employment by Sector**		GDP/NDP Industrial Origins by Sector	
		Unem-	ployed**	Labor Force	Em-	to Em-	Manu-	Per-	Manu-	Per-	Agri-	Per-	Agri-
		ployed*	ployed**	ployed	ployed	ployed	fact-	cent	fact-	cent	cult-	cent	cult-
Indonesia	129.12	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	42.9a	10.+b
Malaysia	11.65	4,127	242	5.9	3,885	6.2	15.8	3.7	1840.70	47.88	431.05	11.10	31.7a
Philippines	41.46	15,204	725	4.8	14,479.8	5.0	19.9	3.6	8250.54	56.98	1492.56	10.31	29.2a
Singapore	2.22	***	32.5	***	824.3	3.9	***	***	***	***	***	1.7c	21.0
Thailand	41.02	13,755	110	0.80	13,645	0.81	17.2	16.1	7055.44	51.71	6604.22	48.40	27.9a

* In Millions

** In Thousands

*** Data not available

a Includes Fishing and Forestry.

b No data actually available for 1974; 1972 and 1973 data sets combine mining and quarrying (which was 5.5 in 1971) and electricity and water supply (which was 0.5 in 1971) with manufacturing (which was 9.3 in 1971) at 16.1 respectively. This is author's "guess-timate" only.

e Includes Fishing.

SOURCE: Asian Development Bank, *Key Indicators of Developing Member Countries of ADB*, October 1975,
 "Country Tables," 92-98, 111-118, 136-150, 170-176.

Table 2

GENERAL LEVELS OF UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE ASEAN COUNTRIES, 1967-1977
(in thousands)

<i>Country</i>	<i>Code</i>	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977
Indonesia	II	30.5	36.2	38.0	30.7	37.1	90.5	84.3	89.1	115.1	157.0	**
Malaysia (Peninsular)	II	117.0	127.6	140.4	169.3	157.1	160.7	154.7	134.5	125.1	110.6	122.0
Philippines (%)	I	999.0 (8.0)	977.0 (7.8)	812.0 ^b (6.7)	** **	666.0 (5.2)	867.0 (6.3)	690.0 (4.8)	584.0 (4.0)	581.0 ^c (3.9)	** **	** **
Singapore	I ^a	**	**	**	**	**	**	37.8	34.0	39.5	40.5	—
	II	77.0	65.4	59.2	50.5	37.8	36.2	35.7	32.5	41.6	34.9	32.1
Thailand	I	**	**	**	**	31.9	83.1	71.8	92.1	66.7	129.8 ^d	—

* Codes

I = Labor Force Sample Survey.

II = Employment Office Statistics.

** = Data not available.

a June

b May

c February and August

d January-March

SOURCE: International Labor Office (ILO) *Year Book of Labour Statistics*, 1977, p. 462.

martial law was declared in 1972. Furthermore, the collection and use of different types of unemployment statistics make meaningful comparisons difficult. Thus, the trend data, for proper comparison, must also keep in mind the source and data gathering procedures used, as indicated by codes (See footnote in Table 2) and explanatory notes in the ILO Yearbook, pp. 451-52. Only the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand utilize labor force sample surveys, while Indonesia and Malaysia utilize only employment office statistics. Malaysia, moreover, has data only for Peninsular Malaysia rather than for the whole Federation.

Unemployment and Underemployment

It is psychologically and socially dysfunctional when an individual who is able and willing to work, cannot find a job (unemployment) or, even if he has one, it does not fully satisfy his personal and social motivations for working (underemployment). Unemployment or underemployment therefore denies the individual the income stream that he and his family needs in a society that keeps on increasing the necessities of, or a dependence on, a steady and adequate income flow so that he can attain a certain level or standard of living. In the "monetized" economy in urban or urbanizing areas that increasingly rely on cash transactions, for purchase of goods and services rather than the traditional non-monetized exchanges, "income adequacy" becomes the relevant principle involved in defining the employment-related problems.

Unemployment

Obviously, unemployment (E_u) will mean "zero-income" for individuals and is thus undesirable, at one end of the employment-income scale in distributive terms. At the other end of this same scale, "full employment" would suggest at least more than an adequate income for the needs and desires of the individual and his family. Within this continuum, underemployment (E_d) can be operationally defined in terms of intermediate levels of inadequate income. This concept is, however, too strongly subjective and may merely represent an individual-oriented scale which has meaning only in a "distributive" rather than "aggregative" sense.

In aggregative terms, however, underemployment can be defined in terms of the number of workers, who even with a

given standard number of hours of work, still suffer from inadequacy of incomes.

Symbolically:

$$E_u = S - D$$

only for: $(1-p)S > D$

where: E_u = unemployment

S = labor force (supply)

D = jobs available (demand)

and: p = "tolerable" rate of
unemployment (also
sometimes known as
"frictional
unemployment")

$$\text{and: } E_d = S - D - K \quad (2)$$

k = $f(Y_{rd} - Y_a)$

$Y_{rd} > Y_a$

where: E_d = underemployment

S = labor force (supply)

D = jobs available (demand)

K = deflator factor representing
"under-income" jobs

Y_{rd} = required or desired income

Y_a = actual income

Also, on an aggregate scale, "full employment" is ordinarily and officially not taken to mean that all are employed, and the degree of unemployment will represent the amount or proportion of those who are unemployed beyond that "tolerable" amount or rate that is not really expected to be employed.

Symbolically,

$$FE = E + p \quad (3)$$

where: FE = the "full employment" level

and: E = employment

p = frictional unemployment

Unemployment cannot therefore be reduced totally, so that efforts at classifying the different types of unemployment have been directed at identifying the kinds that can be avoided or minimized and those about which nothing can be done, because it is inevitable or invariably a state or condition preceding employment. Both unemployment and underemployment can thus be treated as examples of the "lags and lacks" in the

matching of supply (the labor force) and the demand (jobs available) in the employment market.

No one talks about "reduction" of unemployment or underemployment any more, except in perhaps relative or ratio terms. "Minimization" is therefore often used perhaps as indicative of the realization that the growing problems of unemployment and underemployment are aggravated by growing populations, with some specific segments even growing at alarming rates, or at least at rates greater than that of the total population..

Maximum Employment

"Maximum employment" ($E_{max}a$) in the aggregative sense, shall be taken to mean the utilization of the greatest numbers of employable members of the labor force. Employability (E) is a function of location (L), and training (T) or experience (X).

Symbolically:

$$E = f(L \cdot T v X) \quad (4)$$

This definition takes the form of a "body count" approach, and will not obviously be satisfactory in handling the problem of underemployment. Defining employment in "manhours" or "man-days of work" terms, or in terms of some other standard or standardized units, approaches the problem of underemployment more realistically, but requires the ticklish decision on what will be a meaningful unit or standard of employment. For instance, will it be a seven- or eight- or ten-hour work day? a three-, or five- or six-day work week? or a work week defined in terms of 25 hours, 30 hours or 40 hours? There is unfortunately no common international standard that will render cross-national comparisons meaningful or significant. In fact, in some countries, there can even be found differences between these definitions not only between organizations, but between the public and private sector employment conditions. For example, in the Philippines, although the government maintains an official eight-hour work day or a five-day work week (or a 40-hour work week) norm, the private sector firms usually have an official six-day work-week.*

* Usually, seven hours for the week-days and five-hours on Saturday. Often business firms stagger their hours of work for individuals, or their workers may also arrive and depart in shifts, rather than uniformly as in most of the government sector, with premium pay beyond the 40-hour work week.

Table 3
HOURS OF WORK IN NON-AGRICULTURAL SECTORS FOR SELECTED ASEAN COUNTRIES, 1967-1976

<i>Country</i>	<i>Code*</i>	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976
Philippines ^{a,b}	(A)	50.2	49.4	48.1	**	45.9	44.9	46.1	46.1	46.6 ^g	**
Singapore ^{c,d}	(A)	47.6	47.1	48.0	47.	48.4	48.6	48.4	47.5	47.8 ^h	47.8 ^h
Thailand ^{e,f}	(B)	47.6	45.8	47.7	47.9	46.4	**	**	**	**	**

Table 4
HOURS OF WORK IN MANUFACTURING, ALL INDUSTRIES FOR SELECTED ASEAN COUNTRIES, 1967-1976

<i>Country</i>	<i>Code*</i>	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976
Philippines ^{a,b}	(A)	46.7	42.1	42.0	**	44.2	41.7	43.6	44.4	44.9 ^g	**
Singapore ^c	(A)	47.4	48.3	49.2	48.7	49.4	49.5	48.8	47.9	48.4 ^h	48.4 ^h
Thailand ^{a,f}	(A)	51.3	47.6	47.5	47.7	48.1	**	**	**	**	**

* **Codes:**

(A) hours actually worked

(B) hours paid for

** Data not available

^a Includes salaried employees

^b Prior to 1971: May of each year

^c Includes agriculture

^d July of each year. Beginning 1969: Adult only

^e Excluding mining and quarrying

^f September of each year, except for 1967: July and 1969: October

^g February and August

^h August

SOURCE: ILO, *Yearbook of Labour Statistics, 1977*, p. 520

Tables 3 and 4 present data on hours of work in the non-agricultural and manufacturing sectors (for all industries), for the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand. There are no data available for Indonesia and Malaysia, so that complete comparisons for ASEAN are not possible. Also, the differences in data collected, indicated by the codes, and the incomplete data for some years even render comparison among the three rather questionable, too.

"Maximum employment" ($E_{\max}d$) in the distributive sense, on the other hand, shall be taken to mean the securing, for each member of the labor force, the greatest increase in the returns to his investment of labor. This definition indicates a qualitative aspect to employment that may be presented by the income flow which enables the worker to purchase the goods and services he and his family require and desire. This definition can also help resolve the issue of underemployment raised by the use of a "body count" approach as opposed to a "standard work day/week" approach. The distributive aspect of the "maximum employment" goal is to enable the working man to improve his or his family's living standard or level.

Table 5 gives selected indicators of social development for the ASEAN countries, which again, while not strictly comparable due to different dates of collection, at least provide some insights into magnitudes of these dimensions. The first seven (7) columns represent conditions that might be considered as constraints or indicators of requirements, while the next seven (7) columns represent standards enjoyed. Tables 6 and 7 provide supplementary indicators for the ASEAN countries. Table 6 lists the minimum calorie and protein requirements, and only Singapore and Peninsular (Western) Malaysia appear to consistently exceed both of them, although all the ASEAN countries appear to exceed the minimum protein requirements. Table 7 presents the per capital GNP at factor cost from 1964 to 1969, and at market prices from 1970 to 1973. Singapore is, as may be expected, consistently the highest, and Indonesia, the lowest. This seems to illustrate the expected inverse relation between population size and per capita GNP.

Although actual income distribution data is not readily available for cross-national comparisons, we may approximate the magnitude by some gross measures such as the Gross Domestic Product per capita, GDP by expenditure, Gross National

Table 5

SELECTED INDICATORS OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT FOR THE ASEAN COUNTRIES (LATEST YEARS)

Country	Percent of Economic-ally Active Population to Total Population	Percent of Eco. Active Pop. in Agriculture to Total Eco. Active Pop.	Urban Pop. (%)	Agriculture Capita (ha.)	Land per Capita (ha.)	Life Expectancy (Years)	Infant Mortality Per 1000 Live Birth	Persons per Hospital Bed	Persons per Physician	Primary Students as % of 5-14 Age Group	Secondary Students as % of 15-19 Age Group	Literacy Rate	Daily Newspaper (Copies per 1000 Persons)	TV Receivers (Sets Per 1000 Persons)	Ratio Between Age 0-14 and Over 15 and Over (%)
Indonesia	34.6 (1971)	62.2 (1971)	18 (1973)	.11 (1973/74)	47.5 (1960)	125 (1962)	1452 (1971)	25847 (1971)	71 (1970)	12 (1970)	60 (1970)	7 (1971)	.8 (1965)	80.3 (1971)	
Malaysia	34.5 ^a (1974)	50.0 (1970)	27 (1970)	.33 (1971)	63.4(M) ^a (1971)	38a (1972)	344 (1973)	4573 (1973)	94 (1974)	39 (1974)	61 (1974)	158 (1970)	25 (1971)	76.4 (1972)	
Philippines	36.7 (1974)	54.2 (1974)	.32 (1970)	.32 (1971)	60.0 (1970-75)	68 (1972)	785 (1973)	1157 (1972)	109 ^b (1965)	39 (1965)	83 (1965)	21 (1970)	11 (1971)	75.8 (1970)	
Singapore	37.1 (1974)	2.5 (1974)	100 (1974)	.0004 (1974)	65.1(M) (1974)	17 (1974)	282 (1974)	1400 (1974)	69 (1974)	62 (1974)	76 (1974)	208 (1974)	114 (1973)	52.1 (1974)	
Thailand	33.5 (1974)	51.3 (1974)	15 (1970)	.28 (1971)	57.6(M) (1971)	27 (1972)	1345 (1969-71)	8522 (1973)	80 (1965)	12 (1965)	82 (1970)	24 (1970)	7 (1971)	83.1 (1970)	

^a Peninsular Malaysia only.^b Excess over 100% due to enrolment of older age group in primary schools.SOURCE: Asian Development Bank, *Key Indicators of Developing Countries of ADB*, October 1975, pp. 4-5.

Table 6

MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS, CONSUMPTION AND SUPPLY OF CALORIE OR PROTEIN PER CAPITA
PER DAY FOR THE ASEAN COUNTRIES, 1961, 1965, 1969-1971 and 1972 (Calorie-Cal: Protein-Gram)

Country	Minimum Requirement		Actual Consumption								Supply	1970
	1961	1965	1969-1971		1972							
Indonesia	2160	36.1	1930	42.5	1920	42.3	1790	38.3	1770	40.9	1920	43
Malaysia (Peninsular)	2240	34.0	2270	50.7	2310	52.0	2460	53.7	2530	55.5	2400	52
Philippines	2260	33.3	1880	43.8	1890	43.8	1940	46.6	*	*	1920	45
Singapore	2300	34.9	*	*	2430	62.8	2840	71.4	*	*	*	*
Thailand	2200	34.4	2120	46.9	2190	48.5	2560	56.1	*	*	2330	52

Table 7

PER CAPITA GNP AND AVERAGE ANNUAL GROWTH RATES FOR THE ASEAN COUNTRIES AS ESTIMATED
BY IBRD: 1964-1973

Country	Per Capita GNP at Factor Cost						Annual Growth Rate of Per Capita GNP (%)					
	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	'60-'72	'65-'72
Indonesia	70	85	100	100	100	100	80	80	90	100	2.1	4.3
Malaysia	260	260	280	290	330	340	380	400	430	480	3.1	2.9
Philippines	140	150	160	180	180	210	210	240	220	250	2.2	2.4
Singapore	460	450	570	600	700	800	920	1200	1300	1490	7.1	10.3
Thailand	110	120	130	130	150	160	200	210	220	240	4.6	4.2

* Data not available

SOURCE: ADB, *Key Indicators of Developing Member Countries of ADB*, October 1975, pp. 6-7.

Table 8

SELECTED GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT (GDP) AND RELATED STATISTICS FOR THE ASEAN COUNTRIES,
1965-1974

<i>Country</i>	<i>Unit or Base</i>	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974
Indonesia											
GDP/capita MP*	Rp	225	2935	7712	18660	23659	28433	31586	36940	52383	—
GDP/capita, 1960 MP	Rp	4079	4106	4074	4422	4622	4862	5085	5312	5607	—
GDP 1960 MP by Expenditure:	100%										
Private Consumption	%	82.8	79.2	85.2	83.8	83.1	79.5	77.7	77.5	73.6	—
GDCF***	%	8.4	9.3	7.4	8.2	9.8	12.2	13.7	15.3	16.5	—
Malaysia											
GDP/capita MP	M\$	—	—	—	—	—	1138	1134	1190	1491	1734
GDP/capita, 1970 MP	M\$	—	—	—	—	—	1138	1173	1207	1330	1373
GDP 1970 MP by Expenditure:	100%										
Private Consumption	%	—	—	—	—	—	60.5	56.4	54.7	54.2	55.6
GDFCF**	%	—	—	—	—	—	15.9	16.1	16.9	15.9	17.5
GNS***	M\$	162	162	163	178	222	213	195	187	312	323
Philippines											
GDP/capita, MP	P	691	744	809	873	945	1119	1312	1455	1767	2393
GDP/capita, 1967 MP	P	771	785	809	829	848	873	893	944	963	960
GDP 1967 MP by Expenditure:	100%										
Private Consumption	%	78.9	79.1	78.0	76.9	76.4	74.2	73.6	72.9	71.1	71.8
GDFCF**	%	19.0	18.3	21.1	20.6	19.6	17.5	17.5	16.9	17.2	20.0
GDS**	P	148	173	182	162	166	226	269	291	435	549

GDS/GDP, MP ratio	%	21.4	28.2	22.6	18.5	17.5	20.2	20.5	20.0	24.6	22.9
GDS/GCF ratio	%	101.1	112.2	97.8	84.5	86.0	96.9	99.3	99.5	121.0	92.1
Singapore											
GDP/capita, MP	S\$	1564	1726	1892	2147	2461	2804	3234	3793	4743	5823
GDP/capita, 1968 MP	S\$	1613	1755	1914	2147	2405	2695	2975	3312	3622	3795
GDP, 1968 MP by Expenditure:	100%										
Private Consumption	%	81.2	78.2	76.3	73.7	70.1	69.4	70.1	67.6	65.9	65.9
GDFCF**	%	21.0	19.5	19.8	23.1	26.2	30.7	33.5	33.9	33.0	34.7
GDS/capita***	S\$	154	236	260	394	444	514	597	899	1277	1519
GDS/GDP, MP ratio	%	9.8	13.7	13.7	18.4	18.0	18.3	18.5	23.7	26.9	26.1
GDS/GCF ratio	%	—	—	—	73.6	63.0	47.5	45.9	57.6	69.9	56.6
Thailand											
GDP/capita MP	Baht	2717	3168	3279	3428	3660	3753	3888	4151	4717	5936
GDP/capita 1962 MP	Baht	2562	2787	2911	3062	3204	3333	3417	3412	3597	3621
GDP 1962 MP by Expenditure:	100%										
Private Consumption	%	71.6	69.4	69.5	68.3	67.0	67.1	66.3	68.2	65.9	65.9
GFCF**	%	20.2	22.0	25.0	25.1	26.2	24.5	22.6	21.7	21.0	19.3
GDS/capita**	Baht	558	735	809	950	1083	1077	1050	983	1069	—
GDS/GDP MP ratio	%	20.6	23.0	24.7	27.7	29.6	28.7	27.0	23.7	22.7	—
GDS/GCF ratio	%	101.9	97.4	104.0	109.9	112.2	115.4	110.6	105.6	102.1	—

* Gross Domestic Product per capita, market price

** Gross (Domestic (Fixed)) Capital Formation

*** Gross Domestic [“National” for Malaysia only] Savings

SOURCE: ADB, *Key Indicators of Developing Member Countries of ADB*, October 1975, “Country tables,” pp. 92-98, 111-118, 136-150, 170-176.

Savings per capita and other related ratios, as in Table 8. Note that using a standardized year market price series, even if it varies from country to country, makes possible an insight into the slower rates of increases in real incomes as compared with money incomes which appear to increase at a faster rate. Moreover, such apparent increases are mainly due to inflation and similar trends in incomes would have been noted, had income data rather than these gross aggregate data been available. Even the proportions of gross domestic product by expenditure only indicate very roughly how the national wealth could be spent for private consumption or for creating wealth, and supporting government.

Tables 9 and 10 represent the more elaborate and more complete data regarding Gross Domestic Product (GDP) than is presented in Table 8. Table 9 shows the shares of the major sectors in GDP for 1965, 1970 and 1974 not even available in Table 8. Table 10 shows the expenditure shares of GDP for the same years.

Table 9
SHARES OF MAJOR SECTORS IN GDP*: 1965, 1970 & 1974, FOR
THE ASEAN COUNTRIES
(In Percentage)

Country	Agriculture			Manufacturing ^a			Others		
	1965	1970	1974	1965	1970	1974	1965	1970	1974
Indonesia	52.4	47.4	42.9	8.3	9.0	**	39.3	43.6	**
Philippines	33.2	32.5	29.2	17.5	19.4	20.9	49.3	48.1	49.9
Singapore	3.3	2.5	1.7	15.3	19.3	21.0	81.4	78.2	78.3
Thailand	34.0	30.0	27.9	15.5	17.1	18.3	50.5	52.9	53.8

The total amount of involuntary unemployment (U_i) is easily the most reliable indicator, albeit a negative one, of an economy's performance from the standpoint of its "full employment" goal. See Table 11 for total unemployment and selected sectoral unemployment data for the ASEAN countries. Again, as before, the lack of adequately comparable statistics due to different definitions, timing of collection, etc., limit interpretations to only proportions within years, rather than across years, or across countries. The involuntarily unemployed is essentially the difference between actual employment (E) and potential employment indicated by the labor force (L).

Symbolically:

$$U_i = (LF - E). \quad (5)$$

Table 10

EXPENDITIVE SHARES OF GDP*: 1965, 1970 & 1974 FOR THE ASEAN COUNTRIES
(In Percentage)

<i>Country</i>	<i>Private Consumption</i>			<i>Gov't Consumption</i>			<i>Cross Capital Formation</i>			<i>Net Exports & Statistical Discrepancy</i>		
	1965	1970	1974	1965	1970	1974	1965	1970	1974	1965	1970	1974
Indonesia	82.8	79.5	73.6 (1973)	6.7	8.6	10.0 (1973)	8.4	12.2	16.5 (1973)	2.1	-0.3	-0.1 (1973)
Malaysia	**	60.5	56.6	**	17.4	18.7	**	17.4	18.9	**	4.7	6.8
Philippines	78.9	74.2	71.8	9.9	8.3	8.7	21.2	19.9	22.6	-10.0	-2.4	-3.1
Singapore	81.2	69.4	65.9	10.2	12.0	11.3	21.8	36.7	39.3	-13.2	-18.1	-16.5
Thailand	71.6	67.1	65.9	10.1	10.1	10.1	21.6	27.6	21.8	-3.3	-5.8	2.2

* For different bases, see Table 8.

** Data not available

a Includes cottage industry.

SOURCE: ADB, *Key Indicators of Developing Member Countries of ADB*, October 1975, pp. 9-10.

Table II
SELECTED UNEMPLOYMENT AND RELATED STATISTICS FOR ASEAN COUNTRIES, 1967-1976

<i>Country</i>	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976
Indonesia										
Total Unemployed	30333	45837	44247	13252	64116	90832	—	—	—	—
Farmers, Fishermen & Related Workers**	2690	2428	2925	11	868	1146	—	—	—	—
Clerical Workers	1422	3057	6249	664	3409	5063	—	—	—	—
Sales Workers	49	112	74	27	352	323	—	—	—	—
Service Workers	156	239	190	47	458	556	—	—	—	—
Persons Seeking Work for the first Time	23680	35280	30899	11230	49936	72083	—	—	—	—
Malaysia*	—	—	—	157705	155902	162420	140157	128637	108242	104617
Total Unemployed	—	—	—	6470	6862	7728	7436	6550	5061	4772
Agric. & Related Workers**	—	—	—	37721	3422	32656	27947	25350	25307	26913
Clerical & Related Workers	—	—	—	866	633	683	481	521	446	336
Sales Workers	—	—	—	17932	14810	16718	12428	9784	7978	7355
Philippines										
Total Unemployed	—	—	—	—	666000	867000	690000	584000	644000**	—
Agric. & Related Workers**	—	—	—	—	92000	121000	89000	99000	90000**	—
Clerical & Related Workers	—	—	—	—	17000	24000	29000	80000	27000**	—
Sales Workers	—	—	—	—	41000	45000	41000	34000	27000**	—
Service Workers	—	—	—	—	42000	48000	43000	39000	37000	—

<i>Country</i>	<i>1967</i>	<i>1968</i>	<i>1969</i>	<i>1970</i>	<i>1971</i>	<i>1972</i>	<i>1973</i>	<i>1974</i>	<i>1975</i>	<i>1976</i>
Persons Seeking Work for the first Time	—	—	—	—	343000	465000	323000	284000	309000***	
Singapore	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	34044	39452	40487
Total Unemployed	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	340	162	371
Agric. & Related Workers**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Clerical & Related Workers	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	9373	8713	10135
Sales Workers	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2477	4871	3502
Service Workers	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2817	4005	3290
Thailand	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total Uemployed	—	—	—	—	—	83100	71820	92110	66670	129720
Agric. & Related Workers**	—	—	—	—	—	10320	4410	6160	2970	22650
Clerical Workers	—	—	—	—	—	3050	3610	2550	1210	1840
Sales Workers	—	—	—	—	—	3240	3670	1180	1310	2920
Persons Seeking Work for the First Time	—	—	—	—	—	41340	36890	64050	54560	83290
Service Workers	—	—	—	—	—	2340	1080	2240	560	1720

* Only Peninsular (Western) Malaysia.

** Agricultural, Animal Husbandry and Forestry Workers, Fishermen and Hunters.*** Actually data culled in August 1974. The Category of "persons seeking work for the first time" was combined with "workers not classifiable occupation" and was listed as 310,000. The proportion for the combination for the previous years were: 99.6% for thhe 1974, 99.4% for 1973, 98.5% for 1972, and 97.7% for 1971. The value 99.7% was used for the author's "Guess-timate" and the result rounded off.

SOURCE: ILO, *Year Book of Labour Statistics, 1977*, pp. 484, 489, 490-492.

However, only rough approximations of the labor force can be estimated, since a genuine measure of the labor force must include all of the involuntarily unemployed but at the same time excluding those who are unemployed by choice (U_c).

Thus:

$$LF = E + U_i - U_c \quad (6)$$

This category (U_c) does not necessarily mean idleness, although such a category might be included in it. A greater part of the unemployed may also include those who are not even looking for employment, but are involved in other time-consuming activities such as studying, or in non-income-producing family-enterprises, or as unpaid family workers. It is also possible that some are not looking for employment because of incapacity, ill-health or some other cause of inability to work, regardless of desire or willingness to seek employment. These kinds of data are unfortunately not always available for cross-national comparisons.

Underemployment

Underemployment is often distinguished between the "visibly underemployed" and the "invisibly underemployed." The "visibly underemployed" are often confused with those with only "part-time employment," being usually defined as those with any amount less than the usual, official or normal period of time defined as "full-time employment." As a consequence, cross-national comparisons in underemployment are obviously complicated by the official definition of the work-week. For instance, to the Philippines' 40 hours definition, Thailand has 35 hours, while Malaysia has 25 hours, within which underemployment is defined.

The "invisibly underemployed" could consist of those individuals who, inspite of their "full-time employment" status are still looking for another or a secondary job. This is because of some mismatch in their capabilities and their present job, or more likely because their income does not match their or their family's requirements and desires. Actually, it is probably more likely that the latter condition is prevalent in urban monetized economies, for people do not really go out looking for other or secondary jobs if their incomes are sufficient. In fact, so long as income is sufficient, even part-time employment becomes sufficient—unless a culture is imbued with

a cult of "busy-ness," where work is pursued for its own sake, or where the value of work is in the work itself.

In this light, the employment of women or of other members of the family as secondary income-earners becomes a function of the inability of the primary income-earner to secure the family's required or desired level or standard of living. In patriarchal societies, therefore, where the father is expected to be the primary income-earner, the employment of the women and the youth are often only in secondary (part-time, or relatively low-income earning occupations) employment. Except in single-parent or both-parent-missing families or among newly-married couples in urban areas leaving apart from their parents or other relatives, the women and youth so employed are the principal or primary income-earners, although their employment is still usually in the same types of occupations. In effect this only means that their families will have to do with less, since incomes are not directly related to whether it is earned by a sole or primary income-earner or by someone else who is a secondary income-earner. Incomes are determined more by the occupations rather than the circumstances surrounding the income earner. Thus, the women and the youth are often victimized by built-in biases that occur as a consequence of the multiple standards obtaining whether with regards to location, or to sex, or to age, in such matters as employment-income differentials, or the cultural definitions or expectations as to who should be the principal income-earners. These differentials, like socio-economic class differentials, can result in wide divergences of not only aspirations, but also of opportunities due to internalized or accepted cultural definitions of what are "right and proper."

Employment-Related Problems for Special Groups

Those in the rural areas, the women and the young appear to be discriminated against, almost as if they were suffering from certain "disabilities" which impair their employment opportunities: their location, which have already traditionally limited their participation in any of the nation's significant activities and personal development opportunities; their sex, which implies special added roles and problems even when employed; and their age, which for their tenderness and innocence require additional training outlays, which are more often

than not perceived as merely expenditures rather than "investments."

The concern for unemployment and underemployment among the ruralities, the women and the young, has increased, perhaps as a reflection of both their absolute sizes, and proportions in the total labor force, coupled with an increase in their unemployment and underemployment rates compared with that of men, or of older workers, of those in the urban areas.

In terms of the economic structure, certain weaknesses affect rural and urban areas differently. Structural distortions in the domestic or world economy, or in relations between the two are more likely to affect urban unemployment more directly, although disguised unemployment in the rural areas is often the bleak prospect of export-oriented agricultural production in most developing countries. Gross inequalities in land ownership further intensify this problem of disguised unemployment where many families have insufficient land or even unsteady tenure, to provide adequate work or income. This is once more a rural area phenomenon, where large landholdings are often underutilized.

Population-Related Problems

Historically, the demographic transition in the experience of the Western world from high to low fertility has been interfaced with the processes of development, encouraging migration by a gradual attraction through "pull" factors of the urban centers. The processes have involved changes in the demographic composition and distribution; improved levels of literacy and education; radical transformation of the occupational structure; and enhanced social mobility vertically through the social class/status structure, or horizontally through the occupational structures, and territorially as well. Simple repetition of the demographic adjustments of the Western world are unlikely in the ASEAN countries whether at present or in the future. New programs that are imperative for the 1980's have no appropriate models or useful precedents in the developed countries. Their populations are relatively more substantial with rates of increase too high to permit the style of development that countries of the Western world went through.

In Thailand for instance, the urban population increases five (5) percent annually, requiring more intensive and extensive development efforts to prevent further erosion in the

current levels or standard of living, let alone improve or raise these standards of living. At the same time the rural population, as the greatest source of much of the urban growth pressures, grows at a rate of three (3) percent annually, as a consequence of very high levels of fertility. It is thus no surprise that family planning ranks high in the priority development programs of the ASEAN countries. At the same time, the growing demand in the ASEAN for education and new manpower requirements to be met through education further add impetus to escalating expectations and aspirations.

Since social mobility and social status are associated with education, there appear to be inflexibilities in the utilization of those who are educated. There are major investments and fixed procedures in training for professionals like engineers, doctors and nurses. There are also the difficulties of standardizing and guaranteeing the quality of the secondary level graduates. The numbers of students graduating from the secondary level and aiming at tertiary education create special problems attendant to more immediate institutional expansion and the bleak prospects of unemployment and underemployment at professional levels later.

Rapid population growth, ever-growing larger cities whose inhabitants are not yet fully urbanized, and the ever-increasing numbers in rural areas, contribute serious obstacles to social and economic development and political stability in the ASEAN countries. Population grows in the developing countries today at much bigger rates than those experienced in any country of the world. There are not much chances for emigration of any significant magnitude to take place, so natural increase or growth creates problems for development in both urban and rural areas.

But ideals of a small family size and the effective practice of contraceptive techniques are associated with social structures and transformations that would affect educational aspirations, create new economic opportunities, advance the status of the youth and of women; and with actual increases in real income.

Other Problems

In addition, the poor access to capital by the ruralites, the women and the young, similarly affect the differential unemployment rates that are larger for these groups than for the urbanites, the males and their elders.

The lack of knowledge of current techniques and skills also compound the "employment disabilities" of the ruralites, the women and the young. This is often due to differential levels and quality of education which exert their toll on the ruralites, the women and the young. In general, the urbanites, the males and older individuals enjoy higher educational attainment, better formal educational attainment, better education and more up-to-date training than their counterpart "opposites." Unemployment rates generally decline with increasing amounts of education or training. Moreover, with greater education, an employee is likely to earn more. Since education and training affect (even if they do not guarantee) opportunities and also affect, if not determine, the income generated by it, the bias against ruralites, the women and the young are often held, even affect their incomes, since their wage or salary rates, even for the same positions are often lower than those for urbanites, men, and older workers. These often relate to values and bias, for and against the different locality-, sex- and age-groups.

In the rural areas, where the monetized economy is still not completely felt, the exploitation of women and youth is even further intensified. For one thing, the lack of a "proper" valuation of the worth of their labor very often results in the underestimation or under-valuing of their contribution to employment, let alone to production. Because of this, there is a growing dissatisfaction with such highly aggregative and gross indicators of economic growth such as the GNP or its components or derivatives, because of their failure to properly account for the value of all individuals' investment of labor in the productive enterprises or processes in society.

The provision of goods and services required or desired by the individual and/or family through means other than that provided by a steady income flow also complicates the picture, and adds to the problems of underestimation or under-valuing. This may be done through direct appropriation and the non-monetized exchanges of goods and services, which are not usual in urban-type contractual relations but common in traditional obligations or norms of contribution, offering or sharing of resources required for daily living, as well as for the periodic or episodic communal or institutional ritualistic or ceremonial functions.

Among the women and the young, there is a definite association between education or skills attained and employment.

Unemployment decreases at the higher education and skills levels, yet even among people with the same age, educational attainment or skills levels, the unemployment rates for women tend to be higher than those for men. Analogously, for people of the same sex, educational attainment or skills levels, the unemployment rates for the young tend to be higher than those for the older groups.

Special Problems of Women

The relatively greater mobility into and out of the labor force, sometimes also called "inter-labor force mobility," contributes to the higher rates of unemployment for women than for men. It can often be traced to the culturally-defined roles of women in the household support scheme in relation to the men. For the traditional family which is typical not only in the ASEAN countries, the women are often perceived as only secondary income-earners, either to merely add to or to supplement the income being provided for by the males. Thus, the women often embark only on part-time careers or jobs, or even when taking full-time occupations, often receive less income for the same activities and responsibilities than their male counterparts.

It is not sufficient that training schemes are available or that there are unrestricted job opportunities, since it does not necessarily follow that women will automatically be able to take advantage of these "opportunities." There are intervening variables, which, curiously enough are the values, attitudes and beliefs of women themselves about their own abilities and "proper place in the scheme of things." The way these are reinforced and enforced by unwitting or unwitting males—as employers, as husbands, as fathers, brothers, uncles, cousins or other male relatives, as sexual partners—merely strengthen the cultural "chains" that hold women back to this inequitable position.

In addition, when a woman seeks employment, she is not really only embarking on one job or replacing one with another. It is even said that a women's household job is really a formidable bunch of component jobs, as sexual partner or as wife, as housekeeper, as cook, as buyer, as all-around general factotum and flunkey, etc. Such work is obviously not only time-consuming and demanding, but also rarely acknowledged to be productive labor. It very obviously does not enter into the national

accounts system, whether through the national income accounts or through consumer expenditure outlays, since such services are not "monetized." In this light, women are clearly under-employed to begin with, even before they enter the employment market, since their home activities are not generally recognized or rendered as income-producing. Furthermore, since the "second" job that she takes, whether part-time or full-time often does not provide an adequate income as she requires or desires for herself and her family, she once more contributes to underemployment.

Very clearly, these sources of underemployment are likely to be underestimated, even if at all counted or even if taken cognizance of. Moreover, by operation of the common definitions used in the gathering and recording of unemployment statistics, women are likely to be reflected in unemployment rates more, due to this *inter-labor force mobility*, since persons not already employed while looking for a position are automatically counted as "unemployed." This situation is often more obtained for women than for men, since men, because of their *intra-labor force mobility*, would not be so readily counted as "unemployed." Since it is possible to search for new jobs even while one is still employed, this situation which is more common among men than among women, leads to some statistical bias due to employment data-gathering and recording definitions and practices.

One last remark on the statistical data-gathering and -recording: women appear to have a higher proportion of unemployment as a result of leaving their jobs, and a lower proportion as a result of losing their jobs. Another difference that is reflected in the visible underemployment rates: *i.e.*, more women than men are seeking part-time work, yet more jobless women are looking for full-time work.

Inequities Among Special Groups

Inequities also exist even within these special groups. In several instances, due to availability (or non-availability) of transportation routes, or means, distance from an urban center, etc., certain rural areas are even more favored (or held at a disadvantage). By sex, the preference for single women to married women, appears to add marital status as a "disability" factor contributing to higher unemployment rates of the married females. Curiously, for some types of positions, younger women appear to be preferred to older women—which might

suggest to the careless reader that the age factor is "reversed" when combined with sex. What is really hidden here is a more serious and devious bias—the limitation on the types of occupations in which a woman may be accepted to enter. For the older, married females, these apparent "disabilities" are merely additive factors rather than genuine "rehearsals." This is further aggravated by the cultural norms which dictate that she has really no independent choice in the matter of employment—whether to take employment or not; whether full-time or part-time; or the place or in which position, to be employed in.

For the males, moreover, the additive factors may appear to include a preference for the married to the unmarried—but these are mostly for the steady and less mobile occupations. There is also preference for the more mature (but not the definitely old-age males, who suffer just as much from this "disability" as any other group) to the young—but once more, only for the higher, and more responsible positions. The preference for younger unmarried males merely emphasizes similarly the importance of the "definition of the situation" which limits entry to occupations based on given characteristics, which obviously are expressive of rather strong culture-bound value-preferences.

Similarly, both unemployment and underemployment among the young is higher than among their elders, even holding sex constant. The female youth are thus doubly penalized, so that their unemployment and underemployment rates are higher among adults, even for female adults, and obviously higher than that of the males, even at the same age levels. Curiously though, the duration of unemployment by age runs opposite to the rates of unemployment with duration generally increasing with age. Unfortunately, no data on employment, unemployment and underemployment are readily available to provide any meaningful cross-national comparisons.

The ASEAN data is not really even better, in view of all these systemic, cultural, data-gathering and recording biases. Whatever indications or trends they may seem to show should be interpreted with care, in the light of the foregoing observation on the nature, extent and consequences of these biases. For instance, Tables 1 to 5 are the ASEAN country tables that depict the structure of the economically active population by industry or branch of economic activity. The differences

between male and female absolute values of employment, their proportions and ratios are displayed and can be readily observed and analyzed. On the other hand, Tables 6 and 10 are the ASEAN country tables that depict the structure of the economically active population by occupational group. Although there are some parallels and overlaps, they are sufficiently different as to render it impossible to convert one set into the other. The differences between male and female absolute values, their proportions and ratios are similarly presented for ready reference and analysis.

As indicated in the tables, most countries have supplied data on the basis of the nomenclature of the International Standard Industrial Classification (ISIC) of all economic activities and the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO). Classification by branch of economic activity or industry puts together people in the same establishment regardless of their specific occupation. Classification by occupational group, however, puts together individuals working in similar occupations, regardless of the industries or branches of economic activity with which they are connected.

Special manpower development and employment creation programs with revolutionary, or at least creatively innovative approaches to value re-orientation and/or behavioral modification, would seem to be the best prescription to these multi-standards problem-situations. But jerry-built, scattered and piece-meal stop-gap programs will not do. Only a total, comprehensive, integrated and coordinated approach can spell the difference between success and failure.

Table 1
**STRUCTURE OF ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION
 BY INDUSTRY OR
 ECONOMIC ACTIVITY, INDONESIA, 1971**

<i>Industry (Branch of Economic Activity)</i>	<i>Males</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>S</i>
		<i>%</i>	<i>Females</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>		<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>		
1. Agriculture, hunting, forestry and fishing	17,978,477	65.20	8,495,000	62.07	26,473,477	64.2	67.91	32.09					
2. Mining and quarrying	79,700	.29	6,128	.05	85,828	0.2	92.86	7.14					
3. Manufacturing	1,538,506	5.58	1,143,446	8.36	2,681,952	6.5	57.36	42.64					
4. Electricity, gas and water	35,877	.13	1,482	.01	37,359	0.1	96.03	3.97					
5. Construction	665,963	2.42	12,509	.09	678,472	1.6	98.16	1.84					
6. Wholesale and retail trade, restaurants and hotels	2,403,845	8.72	1,857,716	13.57	4,261,561	10.3	56.41	43.59					
7. Transport, storage and communication	935,689	3.39	15,665	.12	951,354	2.3	98.35	1.65					
8. Financing, insurance, real estate, and business services	81,163	.29	12,229	.09	93,462	0.2	86.84	13.16					
9. Community, social and personal services	2,992,928	10.85	1,126,624	8.23	4,119,552	10.0	72.65	27.35					
10. Activities not adequately described Persons seeking work for the first time	862,949	3.13	1,015,250	7.40	1,878,199	4.6	45.95	54.05					
T O T A L	27,575,097	100.00	13,686,119	100.00	41,261,216	100.00	66.83	33.17					

SOURCE: International Labor Office, *Yearbook of Labour Statistics*, 1977, pp. 102-103.

Table 2
**STRUCTURE OF ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION
 BY INDUSTRY OR
 ECONOMIC ACTIVITY, MALAYSIA, 1970**

<i>Industry (Branch of Economic Activity)</i>	<i>Males</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>S</i>
			<i>Females</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Male</i>		<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>				
1. Agriculture, forestry, hunting and fishing	994,459	42.68	603,454	53.63	1,597,913	46.24	62.24	37.76						
2. Mining and quarrying	50,092	2.15	7,185	.64	57,277	1.66	87.46	12.54						
3. Manufacturing	199,531	8.56	77,805	6.91	277,336	8.03	71.95	28.05						
4. Electricity, gas, water and sanitary services	21,391	.90	1,211	.11	22,602	.65	94.64	5.36						
5. Construction	66,823	2.87	4,856	.43	71,679	2.07	93.22	6.75						
6. Commerce	248,973	10.69	55,426	4.93	304,399	8.81	81.79	18.21						
7. Transport, storage and communication	106,671	4.58	4,845	.43	111,516	3.23	95.66	4.34						
8. Services	387,574	16.63	157,380	13.99	544,954	15.77	71.12	28.88						
9. Activities not adequately described	169,609	7.28	155,884	13.85	325,493	9.42	52.11	47.89						
10. Persons seeking work for the first time	84,912	3.64	57,237	5.09	142,149	4.11	59.73	40.27						
T O T A L	2,330,035	100.00	1,125,283	100.00	3,455,318	100.00	67.43	32.57						

SOURCE: International Labor Office, *Yearbook of Labour Statistics*, 1977, pp. 112-113.

Table 3
 STRUCTURE OF ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION
 BY INDUSTRY OR
 ECONOMIC ACTIVITY, PHILIPPINES, 1975

<i>Industry (Branch of Economic Activity)</i>	<i>Males</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>S</i>
		<i>Females</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Females</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>		<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>				
1. Agriculture, forestry, hunting and fishing	6,156,000	61.60	1,726,000	33.39	7,882,000	52.0	78.10						
2. Mining and quarrying	54,000	.54	3,000	.06	57,000	0.4	94.74						
3. Manufacturing	914,000	9.15	806,000	15.59	1,720,000	11.3	53.14						
4. Electricity, gas, water and sanitary services	43,000	.43	6,000	.12	49,000	0.3	87.76						
5. Construction	496,000	4.96	7,000	.14	503,000	3.3	98.61						
6. Commerce	704,000	7.04	956,000	18.50	1,660,000	10.9	42.41						
7. Transport, storage and communication	490,000	4.90	25,000	.48	515,000	3.4	95.16						
8. Services	961,000	9.62	1,506,000	29.14	2,467,000	16.3	38.95						
9. Activities not adequately described	25,000	.25	15,000	.29	40,000	0.3	62.50						
10. Persons seeking work for the first time	150,000	1.50	119,000	2.30	269,000	1.8	55.76						
T O T A L	9,993,000	100.00	5,169,000	100.00	15,162,000	100.00	65.91						34.09

SOURCE: International Labor Office, *Yearbook of Labour Statistics*, 1977, pp. 116-117.

Table 4
STRUCTURE OF ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION
BY INDUSTRY OR
ECONOMIC ACTIVITY, SINGAPORE, 1976

<i>Industry (Branch of Economic Activity)</i>	<i>Males</i>	<i>T O Females</i>	<i>T A %</i>	<i>L %</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>R A %</i>	<i>T I O S</i>	
							<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>
1. Agriculture, hunting, forestry and fishing	14,964	2.40	4,723	1.65	19,686	2.2	76.01	23.99
2. Mining and quarrying	1,380	.22	478	.17	1,857	0.2	74.31	25.74
3. Manufacturing	139,343	22.31	94,611	33.03	233,954	25.6	59.56	40.44
4. Electricity, gas, and water	38,125	6.11	3,874	1.35	11,249	1.2	93.40	6.60
5. Construction	10,506	1.68	743	.26	42,026	4.6	90.78	9.22
6. Wholesale and retail trade, restaurants and hotels	140,033	22.42	60,969	21.29	201,002	22.1	69.67	30.33
7. Transport, storage and communication	86,492	13.85	15,123	5.28	101,615	11.2	85.12	14.88
8. Financing, insurance, real estate and business services	35,924	5.75	20,588	7.19	56,512	6.2	63.57	36.43
9. Community, social and personal services	132,020	21.14	68,610	23.95	200,630	22.0	65.80	34.20
10. Activities not adequately described	1,539	.25	371	.13	1,910	0.2	80.58	19.42
11. Persons seeking work for the first time	5,519	.88	8,915	3.11	14,433	1.6	38.24	61.77
12. Unemployed	18,625	2.98	7,429	2.59	26,054	2.9	71.49	28.51
T O T A L	624,496	100.00	286,433	100.00	910,931	100.0	68.56	31.44

SOURCE: International Labor Office, *Yearbook of Labour Statistics*, 1977, pp. 116-117.

Table 5
STRUCTURE OF ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION
BY INDUSTRY OR
ECONOMIC ACTIVITY, THAILAND, 1976

<i>Industry (Branch of Economic Activity)</i>	<i>Males</i>	<i>T O Females</i>	<i>A L %</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>R A T Male</i>	<i>I O S</i>			
						<i>%</i>	<i>Female</i>		
1. Agriculture, forestry, hunting and fishing	5,461,090	63.61	3,182,760	59.37	8,643,850	61.9	63.18	36.82	
2. Mining and quarrying	39,260	.46	10,690	.20	49,950	0.4	78.60	21.40	
3. Manufacturing	754,220	8.79	759,830	14.18	1,514,050	10.9	49.81	50.19	
4. Construction	319,110	3.72	39,760	.74	358,870	2.6	88.92	11.08	
5. Electricity, gas, water and sanitary services	44,810	.52	3,820	.07	48,630	0.3	92.14	7.86	
6. Commerce	663,270	7.73	719,950	13.43	1,383,220	9.9	47.95	52.05	
7. Transport, storage and communication	338,600	3.94	17,860	.33	356,460	2.6	94.99	5.01	
8. Services	876,540	10.21	583,740	10.89	1,460,280	10.5	60.02	39.98	
9. Activities not adequately described	210	.002	—	—	210	—	100.00	0.00	
10. Persons seeking work for the first time	61,540	.72	21,750	.41	83,290	0.6	73.89	26.11	
11. Unemployed	26,100	.30	20,380	.38	46,480	0.3	56.15	43.85	
T O T A L		8,584,750	100.00	5,360,540	100.00	13,945,190	100.0	61.56	38.44

SOURCE: International Labor Office, *Yearbook of Labour Statistics*, pp. 120-121.

Table 6
STRUCTURE OF ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION
BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP, INDONESIA, 1971

<i>Occupational Group</i>	<i>Males</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>S</i>
		<i>%</i>	<i>Females</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>		<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>		
1. Professional, technical and related workers	599,432	2.17	284,105	2.08	883,537	2.1	67.84	32.16					
2. Administrative and managerial workers	178,008	.65	11,459	.08	189,467	0.5	93.95	6.05					
3. Clerical and related workers	1,141,886	4.14	128,667	.94	1,270,553	3.1	89.87	10.13					
4. Sales workers	2,347,349	8.51	1,840,466	13.45	4,187,815	10.1	56.05	43.95					
5. Services workers	892,071	3.24	680,898	4.98	1,572,969	3.8	56.71	43.29					
6. Agricultural, animal husbandry and forestry workers, fishermen and hunters	17,195,818	62.36	7,947,639	58.07	25,143,459	60.9	68.39	31.61					
7. Production and related workers, transport equipment, operators and laborers	3,386,529	12.28	1,258,477	9.20	4,645,006	11.3	72.91	27.09					
8. Workers not classifiable by occupation	1,834,004	6.65	1,534,408	11.21	3,368,412	8.2	54.45	45.55					
9. Persons seeking work for the first time													
T O T A L	27,575,097	100.00	13,686,119	100.00	41,261,216	100.0	66.83	33.17					

SOURCE: ILO, *Yearbook of Labour Statistics*, 1977, pp. 224-225.

Table 7
STRUCTURE OF ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION
BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP, MALAYSIA, 1970

<i>Occupational Group</i>	<i>Males</i>	<i>T Females</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>S</i>
			<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>		<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>		
1. Professional, technical and related workers	99,222	4.26	51,836	4.61	151,058	4.37	65.68	34.32					
2. Administrative and managerial workers	23,086	.99	746	.07	23,832	.69	96.87	3.13					
3. Clerical and related workers	115,950	4.98	39,172	3.48	155,122	4.49	74.75	25.25					
4. Sales workers	211,638	9.08	47,101	4.19	258,739	7.49	81.80	18.20					
5. Services workers	175,263	7.52	81,745	7.26	257,008	7.44	68.19	31.81					
6. Agricultural, animal husbandry and forestry workers, fishermen and hunters	1,039,754	44.62	648,898	57.66	1,688,652	48.87	61.57	38.43					
7. Production and related workers, transport equipment operators and laborers	508,243	21.81	100,568	8.94	608,811	17.62	83.48	16.52					
8. Workers not classifiable by occupation	71,967	3.09	98,980	8.80	170,947	4.95	42.10	57.90					
9. Persons seeking work for the first time	84,912	3.64	57,237	5.09	142,139	4.11	59.74	40.26					
T O T A L	2,330,035	100.00	1,125,283	100.00	3,455,318	100.00	67.43	32.57					

SOURCE: ILO, *Yearbook of Labour Statistics*, 1977, pp. 236-239.

Table 8

**STRUCTURE OF ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION
BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP, PHILIPPINES, 1975**

<i>Occupational Group</i>	<i>Males</i>	<i>T O Females</i>	<i>T A L %</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>R A %</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>S</i>
						<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>
1. Professional, technical and related workers	336,000	3.36	476,000	9.21	811,000	5.3	41.38	58.62	
2. Administrative, executive and managerial workers	119,000	1.19	29,000	.56	148,000	1.0	80.40	19.60	
3. Clerical workers	307,000	3.07	284,000	5.49	591,000	3.9	51.95	48.05	
4. Sales workers	558,000	5.58	888,000	17.18	1,446,000	9.5	38.59	61.41	
5. Farmers, fishermen, hunters, loggers and related workers	6,102,000	61.08	1,724,000	33.35	7,826,000	51.6	77.97	22.03	
6. Miners, quarrymen and related workers	29,000	.29	1,000	.01	30,000	0.2	96.67	3.33	
7. Workers in transport and communication occupations	501,000	5.01	12,000	.23	513,000	3.4	97.66	2.34	
8. Craftsmen, production-process workers and laborers not elsewhere classified	1,441,000	14.42	753,000	14.57	2,195,000	14.5	65.68	34.32	
9. Service, sport and recreation workers	432,000	4.32	869,000	16.81	1,301,000	8.6	38.20	66.80	
10. Workers not classifiable by occupation	16,000	.16	14,000	.27	30,000	0.2	53.33	46.67	
11. Persons seeking work for the first time	150,000	1.50	119,000	2.30	269,000	1.8	55.76	44.24	
T O T A L	9,993,000	100.00	5,168,000	100.00	15,161,000	100.0	65.90	34.10	

SOURCE: ILO, *Yearbook of Labour Statistics*, 1977, pp. 242-243.

Table 9
STRUCTURE OF ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION
BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP, SINGAPORE, 1976

<i>Occupational Group</i>	<i>Males</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>S</i>
			<i>Females</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>		<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>				
1. Professional, technical and related workers	53,912	8.63	32,952	11.50	86,864	9.5	62.06	37.94						
2. Administrative and managerial workers	25,789	4.13	1,910	.67	27,699	3.0	93.10	6.90						
3. Clerical and related workers	64,365	10.31	73,014	25.49	137,380	15.2	46.85	53.15						
4. Sales workers	103,579	16.59	32,581	11.37	136,159	14.9	76.07	23.93						
5. Service workers	50,781	8.13	41,920	14.64	92,701	10.2	54.78	45.22						
6. Agricultural, animal husbandry and forestry workers, fishermen and hunters	18,890	3.02	5,094	1.78	23,984	2.6	78.76	21.24						
7. Production and related workers, transport equipment, operators and laborers	229,178	36.69	81,823	28.57	311,001	34.2	73.69	26.31						
8. Workers not classifiable by occupation	53,859	8.62	796	.28	54,655	6.0	98.54	1.46						
9. Unemployed	24,144	3.87	16,343	5.71	40,487	4.4	59.63	40.37						
T O T A L	624,497	100.00	286,433	100.00	910,929	100.0	68.56	31.44						

SOURCE: ILO, *Yearbook of Labour Statistics*, 1977, pp. 244-245.

Table 10
STRUCTURE OF ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION
BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP, THAILAND, 1976

<i>Occupational Group</i>	<i>Males</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>S</i>
		<i>Females</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>		<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>
1. Professional, technical and related workers	203,390	2.37	159,630	2.98	363,020	2.6	56.03	43.97					
2. Administrative and managerial workers	136,780	1.59	19,460	.36	156,240	1.1	87.54	12.46					
3. Clerical and related workers	141,630	1.65	83,210	1.55	224,840	1.6	62.99	37.01					
4. Sales workers	638,700	7.44	815,670	15.22	1,454,370	10.4	43.92	56.08					
5. Service workers	216,600	2.52	186,260	3.48	402,860	2.9	53.77	46.23					
6. Agricultural, animal husbandry and forestry workers, fishermen and hunters	5,448,700	63.47	3,197,740	59.65	8,646,440	62.1	63.02	36.98					
7. Production and related workers, transport equipment operators and laborers	1,737,440	20.24	876,320	16.35	2,613,760	18.7	66.47	33.53					
8. Workers not classifiable by occupation	—	—	500	.01	500	—	0.00	100.00					
9. Persons seeking work for the first time	61,540	.72	21,750	.40	83,290	0.6	73.89	26.11					
T O T A L	8,584,780	100.00	5,360,540	100.00	13,945,320	100.7	61.56	38.44					

SOURCE: ILO, *Yearbook of Labour Statistics, 1977*, pp. 250-251.