## SECTION- III

## RESULTS

The Survey's estimates are based on the data of 32,744 sample households enumerated on quarterly basis through July 2005 to June 2006. Findings are presented in the form of proportions and percentages to provide for all-purpose employability. The population of Pakistan as on $1^{\text {st }}$ January 2006 is estimated at 155.37 millions by extrapolating the population census 1998 with average growth rate of $1.90 \%$ per annum. Since LFS 2005-06 is the $1^{\text {st }}$ ever-held on quarterly basis, quarterly configuration of the select text tables is also provided at annex-III.

## Marital Status

2. Marital status is categorized as never married, married, widowed and divorced. The comparative figures are proximate to each other, though, proportion of never married indicate a sort of scaling-up. At the outset, the composition of marital status seems to be time-invariant which brings forth the resilience of socio-cultural norms. Detailed information is given at Statistical Appendix Tables 4 to 4.4.

Table-1
MARITAL STATUS - DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION 10 YEARS OF AGE AND ABOVE
(\%)

| Marital Status | $\mathbf{2 0 0 1 - 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 3 - 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5 - 0 6}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Never Married | 43.6 | 44.4 | 44.6 |
| Married | 52.1 | 51.0 | 51.2 |
| Widowed | 4.1 | 4.3 | 3.9 |
| Divorced | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

## Sex Ratio

3. Sex ratio is defined as average number of males per 100 females. Comparative figures for the overall sex ratio tend to proximate to expected level (105). Area wise, urban follow the overall pattern whereas rural indicate declining trend which, interalia, may be due to better female reporting. Province-wise, Punjab follows the national trend. Sindh and Balochistan exhibit a cyclical pattern, whereas NWFP presents a falling series. Level and variability of sex ratio seems to be correlated with the level of population's stakes in the immediate environment.

Table-2
SEX RATIO - PAKISTAN AND ITS PROVINCES

| Province/Area | 2001-02 | 2003-04 | 2005-06 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Pakistan | 107 | 105 | 105 |
| Rural | 106 | 104 | 103 |
| Urban | 110 | 108 | 108 |
| Punjab | 105 | 103 | 103 |
| Sindh | 113 | 112 | 113 |
| NWFP | 104 | 99 | 98 |
| Balochistan | 113 | 109 | 116 |

Source:- Derived from Statistical Appendix Table-1 of LFS 2001-02, 2003-04 and 2005-06.

## Literacy

4. Literacy rates form an increasing step function of time. Overall literacy rate (53.1\%) is one and half percentage points higher than that of LFS, 2003-04. The same holds for LFS 2003-04 in comparison with its predecessor for 2001-02. Improvement is more for females and rural than males and urban. This notwithstanding, rural-urban divide and male-female disparity seem to be intransigent over time. Needed is an unremitting initiative to address the inequities in the social structure by increasing the access to educational facilities across the area and gender. Province-wise, Sindh and Punjab are more literate as compared to NWFP and Balochistan. Longitudinally, the former two provinces are getting closer in terms of literacy gap whereas the latter ones appear to be diverging in this regard. A comparative picture of literacy rates by gender, province and rural/urban areas is given in table-3.

Table-3
LITERACY RATES (10 YEARS AND ABOVE) - PAKISTAN AND PROVINCES
(\%)

| Province/Area | 2001-02 |  |  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 3 - 0 4}$ |  |  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5 - 0 6}$ |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Pakistan | $\mathbf{5 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 1 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 3 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 5 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 . 6}$ |
| Rural | 40.5 | 55.0 | 25.4 | 41.6 | 56.3 | 26.6 | 43.9 | 58.2 | 29.3 |
| Urban | 67.8 | 75.5 | 59.3 | 69.7 | 76.5 | 62.5 | 69.8 | 77.1 | 61.8 |
| Balochistan | $\mathbf{3 3 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 4 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 2 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 7 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 . 3}$ |
| Rural | 26.8 | 40.8 | 9.4 | 27.7 | 43.9 | 9.2 | 31.3 | 47.2 | 11.6 |
| Urban | 59.4 | 73.9 | 42.3 | 60.7 | 75.9 | 42.9 | 58.4 | 73.6 | 39.1 |
| NWFP | $\mathbf{3 9 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 8 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 3 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 3 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 . 4}$ |
| Rural | 35.9 | 55.9 | 15.9 | 39.8 | 59.2 | 21.7 | 41.3 | 61.4 | 22.6 |
| Urban | 56.6 | 70.4 | 41.3 | 58.3 | 74.0 | 42.6 | 61.1 | 75.7 | 46.3 |
| Punjab | $\mathbf{5 1 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 3 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 5 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 5 . 2}$ |
| Rural | 44.3 | 56.6 | 31.7 | 45.1 | 57.7 | 32.6 | 47.7 | 59.6 | 35.7 |
| Urban | 67.4 | 73.7 | 60.5 | 69.8 | 75.1 | 64.2 | 70.2 | 75.9 | 64.3 |
| Sindh | $\mathbf{5 4 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 7 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 6 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 7 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 . 2}$ |
| Rural | 36.0 | 52.9 | 16.3 | 35.6 | 53.3 | 15.7 | 37.9 | 54.2 | 19.0 |
| Urban | 71.0 | 79.1 | 61.8 | 72.4 | 78.8 | 65.3 | 71.6 | 79.5 | 62.8 |

[^0]
## Level of Education

5. The comparative profile of educational attainment smacks of improvement particularly in the "no formal education" and "below matric" categories. It is indicative of increasing access to basic education. Post-matric categories reflect a diminishing level of improvement, probably, due to restricted access. Both gender post improvement, though, males are more educated compared to females. The comparative picture is given in table-4. Detail is available at Statistical Appendix Tables 3 to 3.4.

Table-4
LEVEL OF EDUCATION - DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION 10 + YEARS OF AGE BY SEX

| Level of Education | 2003-04 |  |  | 2005-06 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| No formal education | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Below matric | 33.7 | 41.1 | 26.0 | 35.0 | 42.6 | 27.0 |
| Matric but less than Intermediate | 9.7 | 12.3 | 7.0 | 10.0 | 12.4 | 7.5 |
| Intermediate but less than Degree | 3.9 | 4.7 | 3.1 | 4.1 | 4.9 | 3.2 |
| Degree and above | 3.8 | 4.9 | 2.6 | 3.8 | 4.8 | 2.7 |
| Literate | $\mathbf{5 1 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 3 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 5 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 . 6}$ |
| Illiterate | $\mathbf{4 8 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 9 . 4}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |

## Labour Force Participation Rates: Crude

6. Crude participation rates of the comparative Labour Force Surveys are given in table-5. The overall rate ascends significantly from $30.4 \%$ in 2003-04 to $32.2 \%$ in 2005-06. As for area and gender, rise in the rural and female rates is higher than that of urban and male. This observation has bearing for the size of informal sector. Province wise participation rates make the expected sequence of Punjab, Sindh, Balochistan and NWFP in descending order. Crude participation rates for Pakistan by sex and rural/urban areas are presented in figure-1. Detail is presented in Statistical Appendix Tables 11 to 11.4.
7. Augmentation of the labour participation for marginal economic activities, unlikely to be captured through conventional questions, posts female participation rates (i.e. $28 \%$ in 2003-04 Vs $29 \%$ in 2005-06) substantially higher than shown by the conventional methodology ( $11 \%$ and $13 \%$ ). This brings up the overall participation rates significantly ( $39 \%$ in 2003-04 Vs $40 \%$ in 2005-06). The same generally holds for provinces as well. Statistical Appendix Tables 12 to 12.4 is referred for detail.

Table-5
CRUDE ACTIVITY (PARTICIPATION) RATES - PAKISTAN AND PROVINCES
(\%)

| Province/ Area | 2003-04 |  |  |  |  | 2005-06 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | *Augmented |  | Total | Male | Female | * Augmented |  |
|  |  |  |  | Total | Female |  |  |  | Total | Female |
| Pakistan | 30.4 | 48.7 | 11.2 | 38.5 | 27.5 | 32.2 | 50.3 | 13.3 | 40.0 | 28.8 |
| Rural | 31.0 | 48.2 | 13.2 | 42.2 | 35.8 | 33.2 | 49.9 | 16.0 | 43.9 | 37.3 |
| Urban | 29.2 | 49.8 | 7.0 | 31.1 | 10.8 | 30.2 | 51.0 | 7.9 | 32.1 | 11.7 |
| Balochistan | 25.7 | 45.0 | 4.8 | 36.2 | 26.5 | 29.5 | 48.2 | 8.0 | 40.3 | 30.9 |
| Rural | 26.4 | 46.1 | 5.0 | 39.3 | 31.8 | 30.9 | 49.5 | 9.4 | 43.9 | 37.0 |
| Urban | 23.4 | 41.3 | 3.9 | 26.0 | 9.3 | 25.1 | 43.9 | 3.1 | 28.8 | 10.9 |
| NWFP | 24.6 | 42.3 | 6.9 | 38.1 | 33.8 | 26.4 | 44.4 | 8.8 | 41.3 | 37.7 |
| Rural | 24.5 | 41.8 | 7.3 | 39.8 | 37.7 | 26.3 | 44.1 | 9.2 | 43.1 | 41.6 |
| Urban | 25.1 | 44.8 | 5.1 | 29.1 | 13.1 | 26.7 | 46.4 | 6.4 | 31.2 | 15.4 |
| Punjab | 33.4 | 50.6 | 15.6 | 39.1 | 27.1 | 34.9 | 51.6 | 17.9 | 40.0 | 28.0 |
| Rural | 34.5 | 50.3 | 18.4 | 42.2 | 33.9 | 36.4 | 51.3 | 21.2 | 43.2 | 34.5 |
| Urban | 30.9 | 51.3 | 9.4 | 32.3 | 12.1 | 31.9 | 52.1 | 10.5 | 33.4 | 13.7 |
| Sindh | 27.9 | 48.8 | 4.6 | 37.6 | 24.9 | 30.0 | 51.1 | 6.4 | 38.9 | 24.9 |
| Rural | 27.8 | 48.3 | 4.7 | 45.0 | 41.0 | 31.2 | 51.2 | 8.1 | 47.1 | 41.7 |
| Urban | 28.1 | 49.3 | 4.4 | 30.2 | 8.7 | 28.9 | 50.9 | 4.6 | 30.6 | 8.1 |

Note:- * Putatively, persons 10 years of age and over, reporting housekeeping and other related activities are considered out of labour force. However, from the perspective of time use, they are identified as employed if they have spent time on the specified fourteen agricultural and non-agricultural activities.

FIGURE-1: CRUDE ACTIVITY (PARTICIPATION) RATES BY SEX FOR PAKISTAN, RURAL AND URBAN


2005-06


APR:- Augmented Participation Rates: are based on additional probing questions asked from persons especially females engaged in housekeeping and other related activities.

## Labour Force Participation Rates: Refined

9. Like crude activity rate(s), refined activity rate registers significant increase from $44 \%$ in 2003-04 to $46 \%$ in 2005-06. Similarly, the rates for rural and females post higher growth than that of urban and males. However, male-female disparity in this case is wider than observed in crude rates. As before, augmented rates are substantially higher than conventional ones. Arguably, refined rates behave in line with their crude twins along the area, province and gender. A comparative picture of refined activity rates for Pakistan and its provinces by rural and urban areas are given in table-6. Detail is given in Statistical Appendix Tables 11 to 11.4 and 12 to 12.4 .

Table-6
REFINED ACTIVITY (PARTICIPATION) RATES - PAKISTAN AND PROVINCES

| Province/Area | 2003-04 |  |  |  |  | 2005-06 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | *Augmented |  | Total | Male | Female | *Augmented |  |
|  |  |  |  | Total | Female |  |  |  | Total | Female |
| Pakistan | 43.7 | 70.6 | 15.9 | 55.3 | 39.3 | 46.0 | 72.0 | 18.9 | 57.1 | 41.1 |
| Rural | 46.3 | 72.6 | 19.5 | 62.9 | 52.7 | 48.9 | 73.8 | 23.4 | 64.7 | 54.6 |
| Urban | 39.2 | 67.1 | 9.4 | 41.7 | 14.5 | 40.7 | 68.7 | 10.6 | 43.2 | 15.8 |
| Balochistan | 40.0 | 68.1 | 7.6 | 56.4 | 42.6 | 45.2 | 71.5 | 12.6 | 61.7 | 49.1 |
| Rural | 42.0 | 71.5 | 8.2 | 62.6 | 52.1 | 47.9 | 74.4 | 15.2 | 68.0 | 59.5 |
| Urban | 34.0 | 58.1 | 5.9 | 37.8 | 14.0 | 37.0 | 62.6 | 4.8 | 42.5 | 16.6 |
| NWFP | 37.2 | 65.7 | 10.2 | 57.7 | 50.0 | 39.7 | 68.0 | 13.0 | 62.2 | 55.8 |
| Rural | 37.5 | 66.0 | 10.8 | 61.1 | 56.2 | 40.2 | 68.5 | 13.8 | 65.8 | 62.4 |
| Urban | 35.7 | 64.3 | 7.1 | 41.4 | 18.5 | 37.5 | 65.9 | 8.9 | 43.9 | 21.4 |
| Punjab | 47.0 | 71.8 | 21.8 | 55.0 | 37.8 | 48.9 | 72.6 | 24.9 | 56.1 | 39.0 |
| Rural | 49.9 | 73.6 | 26.4 | 61.1 | 48.5 | 52.2 | 74.2 | 30.3 | 61.9 | 49.2 |
| Urban | 41.0 | 68.5 | 12.3 | 42.8 | 16.0 | 42.5 | 69.5 | 14.0 | 44.6 | 18.2 |
| Sindh | 40.5 | 70.8 | 6.6 | 54.5 | 36.1 | 42.9 | 72.7 | 9.1 | 55.6 | 35.7 |
| Rural | 43.6 | 75.8 | 7.4 | 70.5 | 64.3 | 47.2 | 77.2 | 12.4 | 71.5 | 63.7 |
| Urban | 37.8 | 66.4 | 5.9 | 40.6 | 11.7 | 39.0 | 68.5 | 6.2 | 41.3 | 10.9 |

Note:- * Putatively, persons 10 years of age and over, reporting housekeeping and other related activities are considered out of labour force. However, from the perspective of time use, they are identified as employed if they have spent time on the specified fourteen agricultural and non-agricultural activities. Men's augmented activity rates are less than $0.5 \%$ higher than the standard refined rates and are therefore not shown in this table.

## Labour Force Participation Rates: Age Specific

10. Table-7 (and figure 2) presents a comparative picture of age specific participation rates (ASPR). The rates appear to be constructing a mildly dome-shaped trajectory across the age intervals with relatively flatter tail beyond mid fifties. Arguably, post-twenties to fifties mark the most productive period of life. The comparative data sets in tandem support these observations. Invariably, this pattern befits the government's delimitation of productive life years. Further, female ASPRs post higher growth as compared to that of males. Again, the size of gender disparity throws gauntlet to socio-economic planners. Detailed information is given at Statistical Appendix Tables 11 to 11.4.

Table-7
AGE SPECIFIC ACTIVITY (PARTICIPATION) RATES - BY SEX FOR PAKISTAN
(\%)

| Age Groups | 2003-04 |  |  | 2005-06 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| $10-14$ | 12.8 | 18.5 | 6.7 | 15.2 | 20.7 | 9.2 |
| $15-19$ | 37.4 | 59.0 | 14.5 | 39.9 | 60.9 | 16.9 |
| $20-24$ | 51.5 | 85.7 | 18.0 | 53.6 | 87.6 | 20.7 |
| $25-29$ | 55.6 | 96.2 | 17.7 | 56.6 | 96.7 | 20.5 |
| $30-34$ | 55.3 | 96.3 | 19.1 | 57.7 | 97.5 | 23.0 |
| $35-39$ | 59.0 | 97.7 | 20.9 | 59.9 | 97.6 | 25.1 |
| $40-44$ | 60.1 | 97.0 | 22.6 | 62.2 | 97.5 | 25.0 |
| $45-49$ | 59.8 | 96.5 | 20.9 | 63.7 | 97.6 | 26.5 |
| $50-54$ | 58.1 | 94.5 | 21.0 | 60.2 | 95.8 | 22.5 |
| $55-59$ | 55.9 | 89.7 | 18.6 | 59.0 | 90.6 | 22.8 |
| $60+$ | 38.7 | 58.4 | 12.9 | 40.5 | 59.4 | 14.7 |

FIGURE-2: AGE SPECIFIC ACTIVITY RATE (ASAR) BY SEX FOR PAKISTAN


## Labour Force: Absolute Figures

11. The absolute figures of labour force are calculated by multiplying crude participation rate of the survey with the estimated population as on 1st January of its reference year. The numbers of employed and unemployed persons are obtained by multiplying the labour force with their percentages. Thus, labour force increases from 45.50 million in 2003-04 to 50.05 million in 2005-06. The volume of labour force expands in all provinces irrespective of area and gender. However, female labour force in urban Balochistan remains at par, probably, due to rising cost of maintaining families in the cities. Relevant for the comparative surveys is given in table-8.

Table-8
CIVILIAN LABOUR FORCE - PAKISTAN AND PROVINCES
(Million)

| Province/Area | Labour Force |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 3 - 0 4}$ |  |  | 2005-06 |  |  |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Pakistan | $\mathbf{4 5 . 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 7 . 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{8 . 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 . 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 . 9 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 . 0 8}$ |
| Rural | 30.90 | 24.45 | 6.45 | 34.32 | 26.22 | 8.10 |
| Urban | 14.60 | 12.90 | 1.70 | 15.73 | 13.75 | 1.98 |
| Balochistan | $\mathbf{1 . 9 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2 8}$ |
| Rural | 1.51 | 1.37 | 0.14 | 1.80 | 1.55 | 0.25 |
| Urban | 0.41 | 0.38 | 0.03 | 0.46 | 0.43 | 0.03 |
| NWFP | $\mathbf{5 . 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 2}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 9 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 9 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ |
| Rural | 4.26 | 3.63 | 0.63 | 5.00 | 4.11 | 0.89 |
| Urban | 0.83 | 0.74 | 0.09 | 0.92 | 0.81 | 0.11 |
| Punjab | $\mathbf{2 8 . 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 . 5 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 . 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 . 6 4}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 6 5}$ |
| Rural | 19.88 | 14.63 | 5.25 | 21.46 | 15.23 | 6.23 |
| Urban | 8.14 | 6.94 | 1.20 | 8.83 | 7.41 | 1.42 |
| Sindh | $\mathbf{1 0 . 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{9 . 6 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 8 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 . 5 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 . 4 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 1 5}$ |
| Rural | 5.25 | 4.82 | 0.43 | 6.06 | 5.33 | 0.73 |
| Urban | 5.22 | 4.84 | 0.38 | 5.52 | 5.10 | 0.42 |

Note:- Labour force figures for 2003-04 are revised on the basis of the latest population estimates.
Source:- Computed from Statistical Appendix Tables 11 to 11.4 of LFS 2003-04 and 2005-06.

## Employed: Absolute Figures

12. The number of employed increases from 42 million in 2003-04 to 46.94 million in 2005-06 across the gender, area and provinces. However, the volume of female employment in urban Balochistan levels same during the comparative periods. Since better part of city's populace constitutes rural migrants, the stagnating quantum of female employment in Balochistan betokens increasing inability of working men to keep their families in the cities. The detail is given in table-9.

Table-9
EMPLOYED - PAKISTAN AND PROVINCES
(Million)

| Province/Area | Employed |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 3 - 0 4}$ |  |  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5 - 0 6}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |  |
| Pakistan | $\mathbf{4 2 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 . 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 . 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 7 . 8 1}$ | $\mathbf{9 . 1 3}$ |  |
| Rural | 28.81 | 23.07 | 5.74 | 32.48 | 25.01 | 7.47 |  |
| Urban | 13.19 | 11.82 | 1.37 | 14.46 | 12.80 | 1.66 |  |
| Balochistan | $\mathbf{1 . 7 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 6 4}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 9 3}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2 6}$ |  |
| Rural | 1.40 | 1.30 | 0.10 | 1.76 | 1.52 | 0.24 |  |
| Urban | 0.36 | 0.34 | 0.02 | 0.43 | 0.41 | 0.02 |  |
| NWFP | $\mathbf{4 . 4 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 9 3}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 5 2}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 0}$ |  |
| Rural | 3.73 | 3.28 | 0.45 | 4.42 | 3.79 | 0.63 |  |
| Urban | 0.71 | 0.65 | 0.06 | 0.80 | 0.73 | 0.07 |  |
| Punjab | $\mathbf{2 5 . 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 . 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 8 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 . 4 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 . 3 4}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 1 2}$ |  |
| Rural | 18.66 | 13.82 | 4.84 | 20.42 | 14.51 | 5.91 |  |
| Urban | 7.30 | 6.31 | 0.99 | 8.04 | 6.83 | 1.21 |  |
| Sindh | $\mathbf{9 . 8 4}$ | $\mathbf{9 . 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 . 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 . 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 5}$ |  |
| Rural | 5.02 | 4.67 | 0.35 | 5.88 | 5.19 | 0.69 |  |
| Urban | 4.82 | 4.52 | 0.30 | 5.19 | 4.83 | 0.36 |  |

Note:- Figures for employed 2003-04 are revised on the basis of the latest population estimates.
Source:- Computed from Statistical Appendix Tables 11 to 11.4 of LFS, 2003-04 and 2005-06.

## Employed: Major Industry Divisions

13. Employment share of agricultural and allied activities (43.4\%) in 2005-06 levels slightly higher than that of 2003-04 (43.1\%). Male employment declines while female's climbs about $2 \%$ up. As for non-agricultural employment, manufacturing and construction scale up respectively from $13.7 \%$ and $5.8 \%$ in $2003-04$ to $13.8 \%$ and $6.1 \%$ in 2005-06. Community, social \& personal services lose a half percentage point from $15 \%$ in 2003-04 to $14.4 \%$ in 2005-06 while wholesale and retail trade and transport remain unchanged. It seems that employability of secondary and tertiary activities is generally on rise though, the rate of growth has to go a long way to assume sustainable momentum. A comparative picture of the proportions of persons employed in major industry divisions is given in table-10. Industrial distribution of employed persons is shown in figure-3. Detail is provided in Statistical Appendix Tables 13 to 13.4.

Table-10
EMPLOYED - DISTRIBUTION BY MAJOR INDUSTRY DIVISIONS

| Major Industry Divisions | 2003-04 |  |  | 2005-06 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| Agriculture, forestry, hunting and <br> fishing | 43.1 | 38.1 | 67.3 | 43.4 | 37.2 | 68.8 |
| Manufacturing |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction and | 5.7 | 6.9 | 0.1 | 5.7 | 7.1 | 0.3 |
| Wholesale and retail trade storage | 13.7 | 13.5 | 14.7 | 13.8 | 13.7 | 14.6 |
| Transport, <br> communication | 14.8 | 17.5 | 1.7 | 14.7 | 17.7 | 2.1 |
| Community, social and personal <br> services | 15.0 | 14.8 | 15.8 | 14.4 | 14.5 | 13.6 |
| Others (includes mining \& quarrying, <br> electricity, gas \& water financing, <br> insurance, real estate \& business | 1.9 | 2.2 | 0.1 | 1.9 | 2.3 | 0.2 |
| services and activities not adequately <br> defined) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## FIGURE - $\mathbf{3}$ DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYED: MAJOR INDUSTRY DIVISIONS



2005-06


## Employed: Major Occupational Groups

14. Comparative labour force surveys present a mixed picture of marginal ascents and falls, though, ascents are more numerous than falls. Of the ascending categories, Legislators, senior officials and managers, Service workers and shop \& market sale workers and Plant and machine operators and assemblers scale up for both genders whereas Technicians and associate professionals register male-driven increase. Conversely, ascent in skilled agriculture and fishery workers is women centered. As for descending categories, Clerks and Craft and related trade workers post male-led decline whereas Elementary occupations descend due to drastic fall in female employment. Comparative percentage distribution is given in table-11. Occupational pattern of employed persons is indicated in figure-4. Detail is provided at Statistical Appendix Tables 14 to 14.4.

Table-11
EMPLOYED - DISTRIBUTION BY MAJOR OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS

| Major Occupational Groups | $\mathbf{2 0 0 3 - 0 4}$ |  |  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5 - 0 6}$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| Legislators, senior officials and <br> managers | 11.5 | 13.5 | 1.4 | 12.0 | 14.4 | 2.1 |
| Professionals | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 1.2 |
| Technicians and associate professionals | 4.9 | 4.1 | 8.7 | 5.1 | 4.4 | 7.8 |
| Clerks | 1.6 | 1.9 | 0.2 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 0.3 |
| Service workers and shop \& market <br> sales workers | 5.2 | 6.1 | 0.8 | 5.4 | 6.5 | 0.9 |
| Skilled agricultural and fishery workers | 34.9 | 32.2 | 48.4 | 35.3 | 30.8 | 54.1 |
| Craft and related trades workers | 15.9 | 16.2 | 14.3 | 15.8 | 16.0 | 14.6 |
| Plant and machine operators and <br> assemblers | 3.7 | 4.5 | 0.1 | 4.1 | 5.1 | 0.2 |
| Elementary (unskilled) occupations | 20.3 | 19.5 | 24.2 | 19.2 | 19.3 | 18.8 |

FIGURE-4: DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYED: MAJOR OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS


2005-06


| $\square$ Legislators, senior officials and managers | $\square$ Professionals |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\square$ Technicians and associate professionals | $\square$ Clerks |
| $\square$ Service workers and shop and market sales workers | $\square$ Skilled agricultural and fishery workers |
| $\square$ Craft and related trades workers | $\square$ Plant and machine operators and assemblers |
| $\square$ Elementary (unskilled) occupations |  |

## Employed: Employment Status

15. Employed persons are denominated mainly as employees, own account workers, unpaid family workers and employers. During the comparative periods, the two foremost categories recede whereas the last one fares nigh at the same level. Thus, the profile of activities likely to siphon labour force from unorganized into organized sector weakens comparatively. A conspicuously women-led surge in the third one (unpaid family workers) also suggests the aforementioned observation. Majority (37\%) constitutes employees followed by own account workers (35\%), unpaid family workers (27\%) and employers (1\%). As expected, more female workers are engaged as unpaid family workers ( $59 \%$ ) compared to male workers ( $19 \%$ ). Contrarily more male workers are engaged in the category of own account workers, employees and employers. Comparative data are given in table-12. Detail may be seen at Statistical Appendix Tables-15 to 15.4

Table-12
EMPLOYED - DISTRIBUTION BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS AND SEX
(\%)

| Employment Status | 2003-04 |  |  | 2005-06 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Total |  |  | Male | Female | Total |
| Male | Female |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| Employers | 0.9 | 1.1 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 0.1 |
| Own account workers | 37.1 | 41.4 | 15.9 | 34.9 | 39.8 | 15.0 |
| Unpaid family workers | 24.1 | 18.3 | 52.8 | 26.9 | 19.1 | 59.2 |
| Employees | 37.9 | 39.2 | 31.2 | 37.3 | 40.0 | 25.7 |

## Employed: Number of Hours Worked During the Week

16. Of the currently employed persons, $1 \%$ constitutes the group of people who had a job attachment but did not work last week due to certain reasons. On the other end of the spectrum lies a large proportion ( $30 \%$ ) of employed persons worked 56 hours or more a week. However, $15 \%$ of the employed persons falls left to the water shed " 35 hours a week", liable to be bracketed as underemployed. The corresponding figures for urban ( $8 \%$ ) and rural (19\%) areas point out prevalence of underemployment in the latter. However, the predominant proportion (more than $80 \%$ ) of overworked persons which lies to the right of " 35 hours a week" obliquely brings forth the prevalence of lower than subsistence wages in the (fractured) job market. Relevant information is given in table-13. Detail is provided at Statistical Appendix Tables-15 to 15.4.

Table-13
EMPLOYED - DISTRIBUTION BY HOURS WORKED, 2005-06

| Area/ <br> Province | Total <br> employed | Not <br> worked | Less than <br> $\mathbf{1 5}$ hours | $\mathbf{1 5 - 2 4}$ <br> hours | $\mathbf{2 5 - 3 4}$ <br> hours | $\mathbf{3 5}-\mathbf{4 1}$ <br> hours | $\mathbf{4 2 - 4 8}$ <br> hours | $\mathbf{4 9 - 5 5}$ <br> hours | $\mathbf{5 6}$ hours <br> above |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Pakistan | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 . 3 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 . 4 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 . 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 . 0 7}$ |
| Rural | 100.0 | 1.12 | 2.49 | 6.54 | 9.47 | 18.45 | 23.11 | 11.62 | 27.20 |
| Urban | 100.0 | 1.12 | 1.01 | 2.33 | 4.41 | 11.76 | 30.82 | 12.04 | 36.52 |
| Balochistan | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 3 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 . 8 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 . 9 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 . 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 . 1 1}$ |
| Rural | 100.0 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 1.11 | 5.90 | 23.70 | 31.83 | 16.62 | 20.59 |
| Urban | 100.0 | 0.37 |  | - | 0.44 | 3.15 | 14.24 | 42.76 | 15.77 |
| NWFP | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 . 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{9 . 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 . 4 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 . 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{9 . 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 . 4 2}$ |
| Rural | 100.0 | 1.74 | 5.66 | 12.24 | 10.39 | 18.51 | 21.75 | 9.84 | 19.87 |
| Urban | 100.0 | 3.64 | 1.61 | 5.04 | 6.18 | 18.16 | 25.28 | 10.15 | 29.95 |
| Punjab | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{8 . 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 . 6 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 . 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 . 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 . 9 3}$ |
| Rural | 100.0 | 1.15 | 2.61 | 7.15 | 10.33 | 16.97 | 22.49 | 11.03 | 28.26 |
| Urban | 100.0 | 1.21 | 1.42 | 3.02 | 4.74 | 12.15 | 28.94 | 10.85 | 37.69 |
| Sindh | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 7}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 . 3 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 . 3 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 . 6 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 . 7 2}$ |
| Rural | 100.0 | 0.86 | 0.40 | 1.78 | 6.86 | 21.95 | 23.67 | 13.49 | 31.00 |
| Urban | 100.0 | 0.66 | 0.39 | 1.01 | 3.73 | 9.93 | 33.60 | 13.86 | 36.81 |

Note:- Total may not add to 100 due to rounding effect.

## Employed: Informal Sector:

17. In consonance with often-held contention, informal sector accounts for $73 \%$ of the employment in main jobs outside agriculture sector. In the same refrain, percentage of employed ( $75 \%$ ) in rural areas is higher than that of urban areas ( $71 \%$ ). As expected, formal sector activities are more concentrated in urban areas ( $29 \%$ ) as compared to rural areas ( $25 \%$ ). Male workers are more numerous relatively in urban areas while female lead in rural ones. The profiles of comparative survey are analogous which indicates structural rigidities. Informal sector's employment surges from $70 \%$ in 2003-04 to $73 \%$ in 2005-06, across the gender and area. Aggressive consumer finance schemes launched by various financial institutions might be one of the reasons. Similarly, excessive focus on revenue generation at the expense, more often than not, of the quality of governance might also hold some explanation. Comparative proportions are given in table-14. Detail may be seen at Statistical Appendix Table-17.

Table-14
FORMAL AND INFORMAL SECTORS - DISTRIBUTION OF NON-AGRICULTURE WORKERS
(\%)

| Sector | 2003-04 |  |  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5 - 0 6}$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| Formal | 30.0 | 29.6 | 34.3 | 27.1 | 27.3 | 25.8 |
| Informal | 70.0 | 70.4 | 65.7 | 72.9 | 72.7 | 74.2 |
| Rural | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| Formal | 27.1 | 26.7 | 30.1 | 25.2 | 25.7 | 20.6 |
| Informal | 72.9 | 73.3 | 69.9 | 74.8 | 74.3 | 79.4 |
| Urban | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| Formal | 32.8 | 32.2 | 38.4 | 29.0 | 28.8 | 30.9 |
| Informal | 67.2 | 67.8 | 61.6 | 71.0 | 71.2 | 69.1 |

Source: - Computed from Statistical Appendix Table-17.

## Major Industry Divisions: Informal Sector

18. The largest slice ( $35 \%$ ) goes to wholesale and retail trade. Manufacturing ranks second with one-fifth (21\%) followed by community, social and personal services (18\%), construction ( $14 \%$ ) and transport ( $11 \%$ ). The other categories including mining \& quarrying; electricity, gas \& water and finance, insurance, real estate \& business services account for less than two percent. Comparative Labour Force Surveys indicate a mixed trend though ascents are more numerous than descents. Manufacturing and construction register a relatively maleintensive rise whereas that of wholesale and retail trade is female-driven. Services pare down more for females than males while transport fares nigh equivalently. Males employment forms a bit skewed unimodal pattern peaked in wholesale and retail trade while females employment is bimodally apportioned with maxima lying in manufacturing (57\%) and community and social services ( $31 \%$ ). Comparative surveys do not betoken imminence of an enduring structural shift for better. Percentage distribution of informal sector workers by major industry divisions is given in table-15. Detail may be seen at Statistical Appendix Tables 18 to 18.4.

Table-15
INFORMAL SECTORS WORKERS - DISTRIBUTION BY MAJOR INDUSTRY DIVISIONS

| Major Industry Divisions | 2003-04 |  |  | 2005-06 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| Manufacturing | 20.6 | 16.9 | 57.3 | 21.3 | 17.0 | 57.1 |
| Construction | 13.4 | 14.6 | 1.2 | 13.8 | 15.3 | 1.7 |
| Wholesale and retail trade | 34.6 | 37.3 | 7.6 | 34.5 | 37.6 | 8.9 |
| Transport, <br> communication storage and | 11.2 | 12.3 | 0.3 | 11.1 | 12.3 | 0.9 |
| Community, social and personal <br> services | 18.7 | 17.2 | 33.5 | 17.7 | 16.1 | 31.2 |
| Others (includes mining \& quarrying; <br> electricity, gas \& water and finance, <br> insurance, real estate \& business <br> services | 1.5 | 1.7 | 0.1 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 0.2 |

## Major Occupational Groups: Informal Sector

19. Majority ( $31 \%$ ) are reported as Craft and related trade workers. Nigh a quarter ( $26 \%$ ) are Legislators, senior officials \& managers. About one-fifth (21\%) are engaged in Elementary (unskilled) occupations. Services workers, shop and market sales workers rank fourth ( $10 \%$ ) followed by plant \& machine operators \& assemblers (7\%), Technicians \& associate professionals (5\%) and Professionals (2\%). As expected, occupational distribution of workers is marked by wide sex differentials. Figures on males sit in the vicinity of overall pattern, at wide variance with that of females. Further, apportionment of number among activities is, relatively, more even for men than for women. Vertically, Craft \& related trade activities constitute the peak and three-fifth (59\%) of female workers. Technicians and associate professionals are also more attuned to fair sex. Low status/wages may hold out better part of explanation in the regard. Men dominate in all other occupations, though, Plant and machine operators \& assemblers being brawn taxing and Legislators, senior officials and managers as repository of decision making, are exceptionally male-intensive in the same order. Majority of grouping indicate relative ascent during the comparative periods. Main information is given in table-16. Detail may be seen at Statistical Appendix Tables 19 to 19.4.

Table-16
INFORMAL SECTORS WORKERS - DISTRIBUTION BY MAJOR OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS

| Major Occupational Groups | 2003-04 |  |  | 2005-06 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
|  <br> managers | 24.9 | 26.7 | 5.9 | 25.6 | 27.9 | 7.1 |
| Professionals | 1.6 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 1.5 |
| Technicians and associate <br> professionals | 3.8 | 3.2 | 9.8 | 4.5 | 3.4 | 13.2 |
| Clerks | 0.4 | 0.5 | - | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.1 |
| Service workers and shop \& market <br> sales workers | 9.5 | 10.1 | 3.1 | 9.6 | 10.4 | 3.2 |
| Skilled agricultural and fishery <br> workers | - | - | - | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| Craft and related trade workers | 31.1 | 28.4 | 58.6 | 30.9 | 27.4 | 59.1 |
| Plant and machine operators and <br> assemblers | 6.1 | 6.7 | 0.2 | 6.7 | 7.4 | 0.5 |
| Elementary (unskilled) occupations | 22.6 | 22.9 | 19.9 | 20.5 | 21.2 | 15.0 |

## Employment Status: Informal Sector

20. The employment status categorizes majority (45\%) as employees followed by own account workers ( $42 \%$ ). The former, embracing majority ( $49 \%$ ) of women and latter, containing better part ( $43 \%$ ) of men, are mutually obverse in gender skewness. About one in ten workers ( $12 \%$ ) is reported as unpaid family workers and one \& a half percent is identified as employers. The former is home to two-time more women than men while the latter in acutely men centric. As far change in the comparative periods, unpaid family workers scale up, employees gain two points, employers level same while own account workers lose equivalently. It seems that organized activities tend to concede ground to unorganized ones during the referred periods. Relevant information is given in table-17. Detail is provided in Statistical Appendix Table-20.

Table-17
INFORMAL SECTORS WORKERS - DISTRIBUTION BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS

| Employment Status | 2003-04 |  |  | 2005-06 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| Employers | 1.5 | 1.6 | 0.2 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 0.3 |
| Own account workers | 43.7 | 44.7 | 34.0 | 41.8 | 43.4 | 28.9 |
| Unpaid family workers | 11.7 | 10.9 | 19.5 | 11.9 | 10.7 | 21.7 |
| Employees | 43.1 | 42.8 | 46.3 | 44.8 | 44.3 | 49.1 |

## Unemployment Rates: Overall

21. Unemployment rate decreases from $7.7 \%$ in 2003-04 to $6.2 \%$ in 2005-06. Gender disaggregating also reflects the same pattern though women rates ( $13 \%$ Vs $9 \%$ ) outpace men $(6.6 \%$ Vs $5.4 \%)$ in term of descent down the time lane. Rural and urban rates seem to be falling in tandem. The relevant figures are presented in table-18.

Table-18
UNEMPLOYMENT RATES - BY AREA AND SEX
(\%)

| Area/Sex | 2003-04 |  |  | 2005-06 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Pakistan | $\mathbf{7 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{9 . 3}$ |
| Rural | 6.7 | 5.7 | 10.9 | 5.4 | 4.6 | 7.7 |
| Urban | 9.7 | 8.4 | 19.8 | 8.0 | 6.9 | 15.8 |

## Unemployment Rates: Age Specific

22. Age specific unemployment rates form a spectrum of three-different hues. The $1^{\text {st }}$ one of teens and early twenties (10-19) exhibits longitudinal decline in unemployment, more for women than men. The $2^{\text {nd }}$ part of the spectrum spans over six age groups between 25 to 54 years. This group, with the exception of last one (50-54), also paints declining picture of unemployment, again, more for women than men. The unemployment rates of the last onelatter fifties and beyond sixties - scale up due to men exclusively. Relevant data may be seen in table-19 and figure 5. Detail is given at Statistical Appendix Tables 11 to 11.4.

Table-19
UNEMPLOYMENT RATES - BY SEX AND AGE
(\%)

| Age Groups | 2003-04 |  |  | 2005-06 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| $10-14$ | 12.8 | 13.6 | 10.4 | 7.9 | 8.8 | 5.7 |
| $15-19$ | 13.2 | 12.8 | 14.9 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 9.8 |
| $20-24$ | 10.3 | 9.3 | 15.0 | 7.4 | 6.9 | 9.4 |
| $25-29$ | 7.1 | 6.1 | 12.5 | 4.9 | 4.3 | 7.3 |
| $30-34$ | 4.5 | 3.8 | 7.4 | 2.9 | 2.5 | 4.3 |
| $35-39$ | 2.9 | 2.0 | 7.2 | 2.4 | 1.7 | 4.9 |
| $40-44$ | 2.9 | 2.5 | 4.8 | 2.7 | 2.0 | 5.5 |
| $45-49$ | 3.5 | 2.3 | 9.5 | 2.9 | 2.1 | 6.0 |
| $50-54$ | 5.1 | 3.5 | 12.2 | 6.3 | 4.5 | 14.5 |
| $55-59$ | 7.1 | 4.5 | 20.7 | 8.4 | 5.9 | 19.5 |
| 60 years and above | 12.8 | 8.9 | 36.1 | 14.2 | 10.2 | 36.0 |

FIGURE-5: AGE SPECIFIC UNEMPLOYMENT RATES (ASUR) BY SEX FOR PAKISTAN


## Unemployed: Absolute Figures

23. The volume of unemployed shrinks from 3.50 million in 2003-04 to 3.11 million in 2005-06 across the area and gender during the comparative periods. Provinces follow the national pattern except NWFP, where, considerable rise is observed in the quantum of unemployed women in rural areas.

Table-20
UNEMPLOYED - PAKISTAN AND PROVINCES
(Million)

| Province/Area | Unemployed |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | 2003-04 |  |  |  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5 - 0 6}$ |  |  |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |  |
| Pakistan | $\mathbf{3 . 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 4 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 5}$ |  |
| Rural | 2.09 | 1.38 | 0.71 | 1.84 | 1.21 | 0.63 |  |
| Urban | 1.41 | 1.08 | 0.33 | 1.27 | 0.95 | 0.32 |  |
| Balochistan | $\mathbf{0 . 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 2}$ |  |
| Rural | 0.11 | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.01 |  |
| Urban | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.01 |  |
| NWFP | $\mathbf{0 . 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 4 4}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 3 0}$ |  |
| Rural | 0.53 | 0.35 | 0.18 | 0.58 | 0.32 | 0.26 |  |
| Urban | 0.12 | 0.09 | 0.03 | 0.12 | 0.08 | 0.04 |  |
| Punjab | $\mathbf{2 . 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 4 4}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 8 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 3}$ |  |
| Rural | 1.22 | 0.81 | 0.41 | 1.04 | 0.72 | 0.32 |  |
| Urban | 0.84 | 0.63 | 0.21 | 0.79 | 0.58 | 0.21 |  |
| Sindh | $\mathbf{0 . 6 3}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 4 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 0}$ |  |
| Rural | 0.23 | 0.15 | 0.08 | 0.18 | 0.14 | 0.04 |  |
| Urban | 0.40 | 0.32 | 0.08 | 0.33 | 0.27 | 0.06 |  |

Note:- Figures for unemployed 2003-04 have been revised on the basis of the latest population estimates.
Source:- Computed from Statistical Appendix Tables 11 to 11.4 of LFS 2003-04 and 2005-06.

## Underemployment Rates: Time-related

24. Prevalence of low wages and, by the same token, low saving doesn't lend an average citizen to countenance asset-based stream of income to provide for rainy days. Similarly, paucity of social security and unemployment insurance schemes makes remaining out of work an un-workable proposition even after retirement. Thus, bulk of the working hands tends to do all the time some sort of economic activity to make the both ends meet even partly.
25. Consequently, vast proportion of people, worked less than 35 hours a week, and glued to the quest for alternative or additional work, may be considered at best as "employed at fringe" or underemployed. The incidence of underemployment seems to be on retreat during the comparative periods ( $2.7 \%$ Vs $1.9 \%$ ) more for women and rural than men and urban. Relevant information is given in table-21.

Table-21
UNDEREMPLOYMENT (TIME-RELATED) RATES OF PAKISTAN- BY AREA AND GENDER
(\%)

| Areas | 2003-04 |  |  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5 - 0 6}$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Pakistan | 2.70 | 2.10 | 5.44 | 1.86 | 1.71 | 2.47 |
| Rural | 3.17 | 2.60 | 5.36 | 2.22 | 2.23 | 2.18 |
| Urban | 1.68 | 1.15 | 5.76 | 1.07 | 0.70 | 3.66 |

## Employed: Occupational Safety and Health

26. Questions on occupational safety and health are asked from the employed persons ten years of age and above. About one out of thirty-three ( $2.9 \%$ ) employed persons reports some sort of occupational injury/disease in the 12 months preceding the date of enumeration that resulted in the loss of working time or the consultation with a practitioner. Explicably, the percentage suffered finds male workers (3.4\%) more vulnerable relative to female workers ( $0.8 \%$ ). Same holds for rural workers (3\%) vis-à-vis urban workers (2.7\%). Nevertheless, urban woman $(0.6 \%)$ is more shielded in comparison with her rural and urban compatriots of same and opposite sex. Generally, susceptibility to occupational hazards seems to be rising for males and declining for females across the areas. Rural areas follow the national pattern while urban ones reflect a bit riskier scenario. Comparative data sets are given in table- 22 .

Table-22
OCCUPATIONAL INJURIES/DISEASES - EMPLOYED PERSONS 10 + YEARS OF AGE BY STATUS
(\%)

| Status of <br> Injuries/Diseases | 2003-04 |  |  | 2005-06 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| Suffered | 2.8 | 3.2 | 1.0 | 2.9 | 3.4 | 0.8 |
| Not suffered | 97.2 | 96.8 | 99.0 | 97.1 | 96.6 | 99.2 |
| Rural | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| Suffered | 3.1 | 3.6 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 3.7 | 0.9 |
| Not suffered | 96.9 | 96.4 | 98.9 | 97.0 | 96.3 | 99.1 |
| Urban | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| Suffered | 2.2 | 2.4 | 0.5 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 0.6 |
| Not suffered | 97.8 | 97.6 | 99.5 | 97.3 | 97.0 | 99.4 |

## Major Industry Divisions: Occupational Safety and Health

27. Well nigh half ( $40 \%$ ) of those suffered from occupation hazards belong to agricultural sector. Manufacturing accounts for about one-sixth (17\%), followed by construction (13\%), wholesale \& retail trade ( $10 \%$ ), transport, storage and communication ( $10 \%$ ) and community, social and personal services ( $9 \%$ ). From the gender perspective, women are more than one and half times as exposed to risk as men in agriculture ( $65 \mathrm{Vs} 39 \%$ ). Contrarily, men's exposure is fourteen times higher than women's ( $14 \mathrm{Vs} 1 \%$ ) in construction and five times ( 10 Vs $2 \%$ ) in wholesale and retail trade. The last two categories indicate male-led deterioration over time. Manufacturing's risk profile increases in the comparative period, more for women than, men. The generally masculine activity of transport \& communication is getting a bit riskier while community, social and personal services display improvement in the comparative periods solely for men with women on flip side. Relevant information is given in table-23. Detail may be seen at Statistical Appendix Tables 27 to 27.4

Table-23
OCCUPATIONAL INJURIES/DISEASES -DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYED PERSONS BY MAJOR INDUSTRY DIVISIONS

| Major Industry Divisions | $\mathbf{2 0 0 3 - 0 4}$ |  |  | 2005-06 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| Agriculture, forestry, hunting and <br> fishing | 44.9 | 42.6 | 79.8 | 39.9 | 38.5 | 64.6 |
| Mining \& quarrying | - | - | - | 0.5 | 0.5 | - |
| Manufacturing | 14.6 | 15.0 | 8.0 | 17.1 | 16.8 | 23.1 |
| Electricity, gas and water | 1.0 | 1.0 | - | 0.6 | 0.6 | - |
| Construction | 10.7 | 11.4 | - | 13.2 | 13.9 | 0.7 |
| Wholesale \& retail trade and <br> restaurants \& hotels | 9.1 | 9.5 | 3.4 | 9.5 | 10.0 | 1.5 |
| Transport, <br> communication storage and | 8.9 | 9.5 | - | 9.5 | 10.0 | - |
| Financing, insurance, real estate and <br> business services | 0.5 | 0.6 | - | 0.4 | 0.4 | - |
| Community, social and personal <br> services | 10.3 | 10.4 | 8.8 | 9.3 | 9.3 | 10.1 |

## Major Occupational Groups: Occupational Safety and Health

28. On the pattern of major industry divisions, majority of suffered (34\%) is concentrated in skilled agriculture and fishery activities. Comparative survey figures ( 39 Vs $34 \%$ ) indicate improvement over time. Since three-fifth of suffered women belong to this group, one need not be feminist to get alarmed. Women's exposure to risk recedes from one and half ( 76 Vs $36 \%$ ) of men's in 2003-04 to less than twice ( $59 \mathrm{Vs} \mathrm{33} \mathrm{\%)} \mathrm{in} \mathrm{2005-06}$. present longitudinal rise in vulnerability. Elementary occupations (24\%) and craft \& related
trade activities (22\%) are the next major occupational groups followed by legislators, senior officials \& managers ( $8 \%$ ) and plant and machine operators \& assemblers ( $6 \%$ ). The foremost two categories are getting riskier, steeply for women than men. The third one's increasing susceptibility to risks owes more to men than women. The well nigh masculine group of "plant and machine operators and assemblers" sets the same tone. Other relatively minor occupations experience slight decline in the proportions of suffered workers. Relevant information is given in table-24. Detail is provided at Statistical Appendix Tables 28 to 28.4.

Table-24
OCCUPATIONAL INJURIES/DISEASES -DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYED PERSONS BY MAJOR OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS
(\%)

| Major Occupational Groups | 2003-04 |  |  | 2005-06 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
|  <br> managers | 6.3 | 6.4 | 3.4 | 7.6 | 7.7 | 4.1 |
| Professionals | 0.4 | 0.4 | - | 0.9 | 1.0 | - |
| Technicians and associate <br> professionals | 2.3 | 2.3 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 2.0 |
| Clerks | 1.0 | 1.1 | - | 0.3 | 0.3 | - |
| Service workers and shop \& market <br> sales workers | 2.8 | 3.0 | - | 3.4 | 3.6 | - |
| Skilled agricultural and fishery <br> workers | 38.7 | 36.3 | 76.3 | 34.4 | 33.0 | 58.9 |
| Craft and related trade workers | 21.4 | 22.1 | 11.2 | 21.5 | 21.5 | 21.4 |
| Plant and machine operators and <br> assembles | 5.7 | 6.1 | - | 6.1 | 6.4 | - |
| Elementary (unskilled) occupations | 21.4 | 22.3 | 7.5 | 24.1 | 24.7 | 13.6 |

## Employment Status: Occupational Safety and Health

29. Majority (45\%) of the suffered falls in the category of employees. The comparative proportions ( $41 \%$ in $2003-04 \mathrm{Vs} 45 \%$ of 2005-06) bespeak risk as increasing function of time for both genders. The women paint an acutely rising exposure to risk from $7 \%$ in 2003-04 to $34 \%$ in 2005-06. It adduces gender selective access to safety regime/assignment of duties at the work place. The second important category is own account workers (42\%) followed by unpaid family workers ( $12 \%$ ). The former seems to be improving over time gender neutrally. The latter indicates sharp fall in women's vulnerability, more than offset by rise in men's exposure to risk. Relevant information is given in table-25. Detail is Statistical Appendix Table 29.

Table-25
OCCUPATIONAL INJURIES/DISEASES - DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYED PERSONS BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS
(\%)

| Employment Status | 2003-04 |  |  | 2005-06 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| Employers | 0.7 | 0.8 | - | 0.5 | 0.5 | - |
| Own account workers | 48.7 | 50.2 | 25.2 | 42.1 | 43.5 | 18.2 |
| Unpaid family workers | 10.1 | 6.3 | 67.9 | 11.9 | 9.9 | 48.3 |
| Employees | 40.5 | 42.7 | 6.9 | 45.4 | 46.1 | 33.5 |

## Types of Treatment Received: Occupational Safety and Health

30. Majority ( $65 \%$ ) of the suffered is reported to have consulted a doctor or other medical professionals, $16 \%$ get hospitalized and $15 \%$ take time off work. The $1^{\text {st }}$ two categories ascend while the last one descends during the comparative period more for women than men. It appears that affordability to pursue treatment is improving. Women exude more savvy for doctor's advice relative to men ( $67 \mathrm{Vs} 65 \%$ ). Similarly, women seem better disposed to get hospitalized ( $18 \mathrm{Vs} 16 \%$ ). However, the event of taking time off work declines considerably to change from women to men-centered in composition during the comparative periods. The remaining 4\% did not avail themselves of any of the aforementioned option. Auspiciously, the lattermost category stemming, probably, from aversion/inhibition/lack of access to doctor's advice also declines steeply. Relevant information is given in table-26. Detail in available at Statistical Appendix Table 30.

Table-26
OCCUPATIONAL INJURIES/DISEASES - DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYED PERSONS 10 + YEARS OF AGE BY TYPES OF TREATMENT RECEIVED

| Types of Treatment Received | 2003-04 |  |  | 2005-06 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| Hospitalized | 12.2 | 12.6 | 6.3 | 15.8 | 15.7 | 18.4 |
| Consulted a Doctor or other Medical <br> Professional | 61.1 | 60.9 | 64.3 | 65.1 | 64.9 | 66.9 |
| Took time off work | 19.0 | 18.8 | 21.4 | 14.9 | 15.2 | 9.9 |
| None | 7.7 | 7.7 | 8.0 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.8 |

## Parts of Body Injured: Occupational Safety and Health

31. Majority of the workers (31\%) report general injuries followed by lower limb (29\%), upper limb ( $23 \%$ ), multiple locations ( $7 \%$ ) and head injuries ( $7 \%$ ). During the comparative periods, the foremost category symptomizes considerable decline in the exposure to risk more steeply for women than men. It seems that buck of residual tasks stops more on men's than women's shoulders. Longitudinally, both upper and lower limb injuries are on rise. More women are succumbing particularly, to latter affliction relative to men. "Multiple location" type pares down over time, more for men whereas, incident of the most malevolent categoryhead injury-recedes a bit mercifully. Proportion for trunk injuries increases slightly whereas that of neck plummets significantly. Relevant information is given in table-27. Detail is at Statistical Appendix Table 31.

Table-27
OCCUPATIONAL INJURIES/DISEASES - DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYED PERSONS 10 + YEARS OF AGE BY PARTS OF BODY INJURED

| Parts of Body Injured | $\mathbf{2 0 0 3 - 0 4}$ |  |  | 2005-06 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
|  | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0}$ |
| Head | 6.7 | 7.1 | - | 6.8 | 6.7 | 7.7 |
| Neck | 1.9 | 2.0 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 1.1 | - |
| Trunk | 1.7 | 1.8 | - | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.1 |
| Upper Limb | 15.9 | 16.2 | 12.6 | 23.4 | 23.0 | 30.3 |
| Lower Limb | 19.8 | 20.8 | 3.4 | 29.2 | 29.3 | 27.7 |
| Multiple Locations | 8.9 | 9.3 | 1.9 | 7.0 | 7.3 | 1.8 |
| General Injuries | 45.1 | 42.8 | 81.6 | 30.8 | 30.8 | 31.4 |


[^0]:    Source:- Derived from Statistical Appendix Tables 3 to 3.4 of LFS 2001-02, 2003-04 and 2005-06.

