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## Introduction

## Significance of Topic:

- Since the 1970s to present various household surveys and surveys of living conditions have shown a higher incidence of poverty among women than men in TnT.

Figure 1. A framework for understanding the links between gender equality and growth/poverty reduction


Source: Morrison, Andrew et al. 2007.

## Introduction

Significance of Topic:

- Female labour force participation rates
(FLFPR) in TnT are substantially lower than male participation rates.
- Why is the FLFPR not higher?


## Chart 1: Labour Force Participation Rates



Source: Key Indicators of the Labour Market Database, International Labour Organisation.

## Chart 2: Average income by occupational group and gender



Source: Continuous Sample Survey of the Population, CSO Trinidad and Tobago.

## Chart 3: Employment by occupational group and gender



Source: Continuous Sample Survey of the Population, CSO Trinidad and Tobago.

## Research Question??

"What factors influence the ability and/or desire of a woman to join the labour force in

Trinidad and Tobago (TnT)?"

## Literature Review

Female Labour Force Participation Rate:

- Is a broad indicator of women's labour market activity.
- Can be defined as the percentage of working age women who are either working or looking for work.
- Will have a direct impact on the supply of labour.


## Literature Review

Neoclassical Theory of the Allocation of Time:

- An Individual values time according to his/her preferences that maximises utility.
- The value of market activities depends on the prevailing wage rate.
- The value of non-market activities is determined by individual's tastes and preferences plus time demands for non-market activities.


## Literature Review

Factors influencing female labour force participation:

- Average market wage rate
- Number of dependents living at home
-Educational attainment
- Marital status
-Household headship status
-Access to social security programmes
-Residence (rural vs. urban)
- Health


## Methodology

Study Design:

- Literature Review.
- Analysis of secondary "published" data to guide expectations (CSSP, SLC and Census reports).
- Model estimation (probit) using dataset from HBS 2008/2009.
- Discussions on findings and possible explanations.


## Methodology

Household Budgets Survey (HBS) 2008/2009:

- Nationally representative sample.
- Two Stage Cluster Sample.
- 12 monthly samples further divided into fortnightly sub-samples.
- Sample of 7,680 households.
- Interviewer-administered questionnaires and self-administered diaries.


## Gender and Income

| Income <br> Area |  | Male | Female | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Low | \% within Income <br> Area | 59.79 | 40.22 | 100.00 |
|  | \% within Gender | 26.44 | 25.10 | 25.89 |
| Middle | \% within Income <br> Area | 59.98 | 40.02 | 100.00 |
|  | \% within Gender | 52.19 | 49.13 | 50.92 |
| High | \% within Income <br> Area | 53.91 | 46.09 | 100.00 |
|  | \% within Gender | 21.37 | 25.77 | 23.19 |
| Total | \% within Income <br> Area | 58.52 | 41.49 | 100.00 |
|  | \% within Gender | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |

Source: Household Budget Survey 2008/2009

## Location and Gender

| Location |  | Male | Female | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Urban | \% within Urban/Rural | 55.57 | 44.43 | 100.00 |
|  | \% within Gender | 57.05 | 64.35 | 60.07 |
| Rural | \% within Urban/Rural | 62.96 | 37.04 | 100.00 |
|  | \% within Gender | 42.95 | 35.65 | 39.93 |
| Total | \% within Urban/Rural | 58.52 | 41.48 | 100.00 |
|  | \% within Gender | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Source: Household Budget Survey 2008/2009

## Results- Probit Model

| Variable | Coefficient | Marginal Effect* |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Hindu | -0.0959 | -0.0381 |
| Roman Catholic | 0.0940 | 0.0373 |
| Head of Household | 0.4131 | 0.1641 |
| Presence of Children | -0.2391 | -0.0950 |
| Primary | 0.3155 | 0.1253 |
| Secondary | 0.3519 | 0.1398 |
| Tertiary | 0.2127 | 0.0845 |
| Urban | 0.1744 | 0.0693 |
| African | 0.2596 | 0.1031 |
| East Indian | -0.2607 | -0.1035 |

*The Probability Density Function of 0.3972 was used in the calculation of the marginal effects.

## Results- Probit Model Cont'd

| Variable | Coefficient | Marginal Effect* |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Single | 0.1709 | 0.0679 |
| Non-Labour Income | -0.3421 | -0.1359 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 - 2 4}$ | 1.2040 | 0.4783 |
| $\mathbf{2 5 - 2 9}$ | 1.4147 | 0.5620 |
| $\mathbf{3 0 - 3 4}$ | 1.3744 | 0.5459 |
| $\mathbf{3 5 - 3 9}$ | 1.3475 | 0.5353 |
| $\mathbf{4 0 - 4 4}$ | 1.4307 | 0.5683 |
| $\mathbf{4 5 - 4 9}$ | 1.1721 | 0.4656 |
| $\mathbf{5 0 - 5 4}$ | 0.9522 | 0.3782 |
| $\mathbf{5 5 - 5 9}$ | 0.7321 | 0.2908 |
| Chronic IIIness | -0.1613 | -0.0641 |
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## Special Focus- Education

|  |  | Work | Unable to find work | School | Retired | Disabled | House | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| None | NPart | - | - | 4 | 2 | - | 15 | 22 |
|  | Part | 28 | 4 | - | - | - | - | 32 |
| Primary | NPart | - | - | 200 | 49 | 31 | 595 | 913 |
|  | Part | 985 | 70 | - | - | - | - | 1055 |
| Secondary | NPart |  |  | 495 | 117 | 56 | 1449 | 2209 |
|  | Part | 2620 | 176 | - | - | - | - | 2796 |
| University | NPart | - | - | 99 | 13 | 13 | 217 | 361 |
|  | Part | 316 | 28 | - | - | - | - | 344 |

## Special Focus- Education

| Level of Education | Status | Per cent of Total |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| None | Not participating | 40.7 |
|  | Participating | 59.3 |
| Pre-school | Not participating | 51.7 |
|  | Participating | 48.3 |
| Primary | Not participating | 46.4 |
|  | Participating | 53.6 |
| Secondary | Not participating | 44.1 |
|  | Participating | 55.9 |
| University | Not participating | 51.2 |
|  | Participating | 48.8 |

## Findings

- Results of the model broadly fell in line with $a$ priori expectations...with a few surprises.
- As expected, level of schooling, age, household headship and being single all had positive influences on female participation.
- Surprisingly, women with tertiary level education were only $8 \%$ more likely to participate, compared to $13 \%$ for women with primary level education and $14 \%$ for women with secondary level education.


## Findings

- Negative influences on female participation came from the presence of dependents (children) in the household, accessing social security programmes and chronic illness.
- Positive relationships were found between participation and women of African descent (10\%) and Roman Catholic women (4\%).
- Negative relationships exist between participation and women of East Indian origin (10\%) and Hindu women (4\%).


## Future Research

- Do gender wage differentials impact female participation?
- Why is the marginal effect of female participation by those with tertiary level education much lower than the marginal effects for primary and secondary educated women?
- Deeper analysis needed on socio-cultural and historical factors and their impact on female participation.


## Policy Implications

- Given the higher incidence of poverty among women in Trinidad and Tobago, women should remain a target group for intervention.
- Female labour force participation can possibly be improved through reform of the conditions of maternity leave.
- Promote public policy that reduces labour market discrimination.



[^0]:    *The Probability Density Function of 0.3972 was used in the calculation of the marginal effects.

