WORK ACROSS THE WORLD: SOME BASIC FEATURES

JUAN J. LLACH

The purpose of this presentation is to demonstrate the variability of the labour force growth, of employment structures, and of the unemployment levels across the world, and to suggest some hypotheses that could explain these variations.

The hypotheses. The main hypothesis is that even when the level of economic development (GDP per capita or GDPpc) appears as a crucial determinant of the observed differences in labour force size and growth, and of employment structures, cultural factors like religion, family and government also play a very important role.

This role is played in different and sometimes contradictory ways. In the case of the supply of labour, it seems clear that those countries whose religion or culture give a central role to family and natality will tend to show lower female participation rates in the labour force, and higher labour force growth rates. In contrast, growth in labor force participation tends to be diminished by such typical forms of govermental intervention as the creation of pension systems or the extension of opportunities for formal education. Indeed, we will see that the form of governmental intervention influences not only the demand for labour, but the structures of employment.

The typology of countries. To elucidate these different sources of variability, a typology of countries (Annex 1)[1] was constructed in such a

---

[1] Enormous economic contrasts appear among the different cohorts. The first two cohorts, Low Income Africa and Low Income Asia, comprise 32.2% of the world population (WP) but have only 3.1% of the World Gross Product (WGP). The immediately following cohorts, 3 to 6, comprise respectively 37.7% of WP and 9.4% of the WGP; they include Low Income Former Socialist countries, Emerging Asia, Low Income Latin America and the Middle East, Turkey and North Africa. Considered together, these six country cohorts have 69.9% of the WP but only

way that economically and culturally homogeneous types of countries were obtained. Although very important differences remain among countries of the same type, they are clearly less intense than those observed among countries belonging to different types.

A. THE SUPPLY OF LABOUR

The growth rate of the labour force can be defined as the estimated increase in the supply of labour over a period of time. This rate is determined by demographic factors — not explicitly considered here — and by the participation rates in the labour force.

1. *Labour Force Growth* (Table 1). Although poor countries have higher labour force growth rates than rich countries, no linear relationship exists between economic development and work force growth. As the example of the Oil Exporters (Table, I, cohort 14) clearly demonstrates, however, high immigration rates qualify this observation. Culture also can exert a significant impact on labour force growth rates, as one can observe in the comparatively high rates of growth in Latin America, Middle Income Africa and other countries with strong Muslim influence (Table I, cohort groups 6 and 14).[2] Cultural influences also explain the very low rates of growth in the Middle Income Former Socialist countries.[3]

Shifting our attention to a comparison of the historical rates of labour force growth in the period 1965-1995 with the projected rates of 1995-2005, a drop in growth can be observed across most of the cohorts. Noteworthy exceptions are Low Income African and Asian countries (still in the demographic transition stage, but also with Muslim influence), the

---

12.5% of the WGP. Cohorts 7 to 11 can be considered as the world middle class because they have 13.6% of the WP and 11.2% of the WGP; they include Middle Income Former Socialist countries, Middle Income Africa, the Pacific Islands, the Middle Income Caribbean countries, and Middle Income Latin America and Europe. Finally the world's richest countries (cohorts 12 to 16) have only 16.5% of the world population but 76.4% of the WGP, and include Small European countries, High Income Caribbean countries, Oil Exporters, High Income Asia and the OECD countries, plus Israel and excluding Japan.

[2] It is interesting to point out that in the case of Low Income Asia and Low Income Africa, half of the countries within the cohorts are mainly Muslim. So we have there a typical problem of overdetermination, and it is not possible to learn if the high labor force growth rates and the low female labour participation rates are explained by poverty or rather by their religion.

[3] In spite of their history as socialist-bloc states, Muslim countries belonging to the Low Income Former Socialists type also show high labour force growth rates.

Table 1. *Labour force annual growth rate.*

	Labour force annual growth rate	
	1965-1995	1995-2005
1. Low Income Asia *n = 11*	2.2 *11*	2.4 *11*
2. Low Income Africa *n = 44*	2.5 *36*	3.1 *36*
3. Low Income Former Socialists *n = 9*	2.1 *9*	... *0*
4. Emerging Asia *n = 6*	2.6 *6*	1.4 *6*
5. Low Income Latin America *n = 14*	2.8 *14*	2.2 *14*
6. Middle East, Turkey And North Africa *n = 12*	3.0 *11*	3.0 *11*
7. Middle Income Former Socialists *n = 18*	1.0 *18*	0.1 *7*
8. Pacific Islands *n = 16*	2.1 *1*	2.2 *1*
9. Middle Income Caribbean *n = 17*	2.0 *2*	1.3 *2*
10. Middle Income Africa *n = 6*	2.6 *3*	2.0 *3*
11. Middle Income Latin America and Europe *n = 8*	2.0 *8*	1.0 *8*
12. Small European *n = 10*	... *0*	... *0*
13. High Income Caribbean *n = 4*	1.8 *1*	0.9 *1*
14. Oil Exporters *n = 8*	5.3 *5*	2.7 *5*
15. High Income Asia *n = 6*	2.2 *5*	0.5 *4*
16. OECD and Israel excl. Japan *n = 21*	1.2 *19*	0.1 *18*

Middle East, Turkey and North Africa (again probably attributable to cultural factors) and the Pacific Islands (whose projected labour force growth may be due to increased immigration). In the Middle Income Former Socialist and OECD countries, the projected stagnation of labour force growth could promise lower unemployment levels, but be very troublesome for the maintenance of pension systems.

2. *Labour force participation rates: the "U shape"* (Table 2). Female participation in the labour market is the most important, single determinant of general participation rates; hence, general labour force participation rates, and the rates of female work force participation show a similar pattern. Women's participation in the labour force, however, is a complex phenomenon associated with cultural and religious factors, as well as economic ones. Even when female participation is generally considered as being "U shaped" along the process of economic development, with higher rates in the traditional societies and in the most developed ones, we can observe the omnipresent influence of cultural factors (Table 2, third column). Thus, cohorts with significant Muslim (Table 2, cohorts 1, 6 and 14) or Catholic (cohorts 5, 11 and 13) influence, tend to show the lower levels of female participation. On the other hand, socialist or ex-socialist countries show very high female participation rates (types cohorts 3, 7 and also 4).

Male labour force participation also demonstrates an (albeit attenuated) "U shape". The downward zone of the curve can be explained by the gradual spread of pension systems, while the upward zone observed in high income countries could be the result of the gradual increase in the retirement age.

The participation rates of young people (i.e., persons between the ages of 10-19) also demonstrate a certain "U pattern", which is more pronounced in the case of young women. The initial decrease can be explained by the gradual extension of opportunities for formal education, even when this factor is overdetermined by the peculiar culture of Former Socialists, Muslim and Latin American Countries in the central zone of the tyipology.[4] The upturn observed in the high GNP zone of the typology is less clear, although it eventually could be explained by a higher incidence of independent households established by young people.

---

[4] In other words, we do not know if the lower level of labour activity among females aged 10-19 in the central zone of the typology is due to the medium level of income, or to the strong influence of cultural traditions in Muslim and Catholic countries, and to the massive incorporation of females in this age-group into the educational system in the Former Socialist countries, given the fact that both types of countries are located in the central zone of the typology.

Table 2. *Labour force participation rate.*

	Labour force annual growth rate				
	% 1995	Males 15-64	Females 15-64	Males 10-19	Females 10-19
1. Low Income Asia *n = 11*	65.1 *11*	90.3 *11*	39.3 *11*	37.2 *11*	22.5 *11*
2. Low Income Africa *n = 44*	70.2 *43*	89.1 *36*	51.9 *36*	45.7 *36*	29.5 *36*
3. Low Income Former Socialists *n = 9*	... *0*	79.1 *9*	59.8 *9*	14.5 *9*	12.7 *9*
4. Emerging Asia *n = 6*	73.8 *6*	86.5 *6*	60.8 *6*	32.7 *6*	27.7 *6*
5. Low Income Latin America *n = 14*	55.8 *14*	83.7 *14*	28.1 *14*	27.6 *14*	10.4 *14*
6. Middle East, Turkey And North Africa *n = 12*	51.7 *11*	82.5 *11*	20.9 *11*	23.4 *11*	10.1 *11*
7. Middle Income Former Socialists *n = 18*	74.2 *10*	79.9 *18*	68.0 *18*	16.3 *18*	14.1 *18*
8. Pacific Islands *n = 16*	67.8 *8*	89.0 *1*	58.0 *1*	44.0 *1*	36.0 *1*
9. Middle Income Caribbean *n = 17*	67.7 *8*	89.0 *2*	57.0 *2*	22.5 *2*	12.5 *2*
10. Middle Income Asia *n = 6*	64.9 *5*	79.3 *3*	39.3 *3*	24.7 *3*	14.3 *3*
11. Middle Income Latin America and Europe *n = 8*	58.2 *8*	81.9 *8*	35.0 *8*	25.4 *8*	11.9 *8*
12. Small European *n = 10*	67.0 *5*	... *0*	... *0*	... *0*	... *0*
13. High Income Caribbean *n = 4*	54.1 *2*	75.0 *1*	29.0 *1*	13.0 *1*	4.0 *1*
14. Oil Exporters *n = 8*	60.1 *8*	86.2 *5*	14.8 *5*	20.0 *5*	3.4 *5*
15. High Income Asia *n = 6*	67.0 *4*	84.1 *5*	49.8 *5*	16.6 *5*	15.4 *5*
16. OECD and Israel excl. Japan *n = 21*	69.8 *20*	85.2 *19*	53.5 *19*	23.0 *19*	19.0 *19*

B. The employment structure and the labour demand

The employment structure across and within the three classical economic sectors gives some basic evidence about the demand for labour in the economy. Even when these structures are strongly influenced by the level of economic development, it is also possible to find here the influence of unexpected and significant "cultural" factors which are associated with characteristic types of govermental interventions. These cultural factors provide a basis for formulating hypothetical explanations of the differences found among types of countries.

3. *Distribution of the labour force across sectors* (Table 3). The participation of agriculture in the total work force is strongly related with the GNPpc or development level (column 1). This is not surprising, since the increase in agricultural productivity and the resulting urbanization process is virtually a definition of economic growth, i.e., we are referring to a tautology. However, the "premature" urbanization of the labour force observed in both Former Socialists types (Table 3, cohorts 3 and 7) shows that some exceptions, perhaps artificial and costly, are possible. The relatively high proportion of agriculture in Middle Income Africa and Middle Income Latin America, on the other hand, possibly could be explained by a relatively high land endowment.

Another tautological conclusion of Table 3 is that the higher the GNPpc level, the higher the industry and services work force proportion.[5] What is not obvious, however, is the behaviour of the ratio of service workers to manufacturing workers, which is implicitly shown in the tables. Its positive correlation with the GNPpc is so weak that the exceptions are as important as the rule. Asiatic and Former Socialist countries have a low ratio, while Low Income Africa, Low Income Latin America, the Pacific Islands, and the Caribbean countries show a high ratio of service workers to manufacturing workers. An interesting hypothesis which could explain these exceptions is that, in the "low ratio case", government intervention was applied to create manufacturing employment, whereas in the types where the ratio is high, this intervention took place through the creation of government employment.[6]

4. *Distribution of the labour force within sectors: wage and non-wage employment* (Table 4). As in the previous case with agriculture, a strong

---

[5] Because this proportion is the inverse of the participation of agriculture in the work force

[6] In the case of the Pacific Islands and the Caribbean countries, the explanation lies perhaps in their comparative advantage in the tourism industry.

Table 3. *Distribution of the work force across sectors.*

	Distribution of the work force across sectors (in %)		
	W.F. in agriculture	W.F. in industry	W.F. in services
1. Low Income Asia *n = 11*	67.3 *11*	11.7 *11*	21.1 *11*
2. Low Income Asia *n = 44*	71.0 *42*	8.9 *42*	20.1 *42*
3. Low Income Former Socialists *n = 9*	30.0 *9*	32.2 *9*	37.9 *9*
4. Emerging Asia *n = 6*	55.0 *6*	18.2 *6*	26.8 *6*
5. Low Income Latin America *n = 14*	30.3 *10*	22.1 *10*	47.6 *10*
6. Middle East, Turkey And North Africa *n = 12*	32.7 *11*	24.2 *11*	43.1 *11*
7. Middle Income Former Socialists *n = 18*	21.0 *18*	36.8 *18*	42.3 *18*
8. Pacific Islands *n = 16*	18.8 *5*	22.7 *5*	58.5 *5*
9. Middle Income Caribbean *n = 17*	9.9 *3*	21.7 *3*	68.4 *3*
10. Middle Income Africa *n = 6*	19.7 *5*	26.0 *5*	54.3 *5*
11. Middle Income Latin America and Europe *n = 8*	18.1 *8*	28.0 *8*	53.9 *8*
12. Small European *n = 10*	8.1 *2*	32.3 *2*	59.6 *2*
13. High Income Caribbean *n = 4*	4.6 *2*	21.4 *2*	74.0 *2*
14. Oil Exporters *n = 8*	11.3 *8*	25.6 *8*	63.1 *8*
15. High Income Asia *n = 6*	10.4 *5*	32.6 *5*	57.0 *5*
16. OECD and Israel excl. Japan *n = 21*	6.1 *21*	28.9 *21*	65.0 *21*

relationship between the level of GNPpc and wage employment exists. While in the first four (low income) cohorts, the average proportion of salaried workers is only 30%, in the four highest income cohorts, that average amounts to 85%. This also can also be considered a tautology since the process of economic development has implied up to now an increasing participation of firms organized around salaried work. The agricultural sector, however, shows a "cultural" exception to that tautology (first column, Table 4). Economic underdevelopment typically is characterized by a high proportion of poor peasants in the work force — and to have a salary is rather a privilege there. Notwithstanding this, the two richest types of countries show a high proportion of independent farmers (not peasants); that phenomenon can be explained by the protection given by the government to the agricultural sector. In manufacturing and services, on the other hand, the relationship between GNPpc and salaried work is almost linear, the main exception being the relatively high proportion of salaried workers in the Former Socialist countries (columns 2 and 3, Table 4).

5. *Employment structure: a synthesis* (Table 5). Contrasts in the employment structure among country cohorts are as striking as their differences in the income level. The most significant is the proportion of independent agricultural workers: 50% of the total labour force are peasants in the poorest countries, while less than 5% are farm workers in the richest countries. On the other hand, while only 22.4% are urban salaried workers in the first four groups, this proportion amounts to 81.4% in the five richest countries. Independent work in the cities, on the contrary, decreases more gradually with the level of economic development as it amounts to 19.7% of the labour force in the four poorest countries, and to 11.7% in the five richest.

C. UNEMPLOYMENT

The analysis of the unemployment rates is more complex than those matters previously discussed. In the first place, these unemployment statistics are less reliable and limited to open urban unemployment.[7] In the second place, because intense changes in the labour supply arising from changes in the participation rates are nowadays very frequent, even in the short run, the economic meaning of open unemployment rates is not as

---

[7] Statistics on underemployment and rural unemployment do not exist or are not internationally homogeneous.

Table 4. *Distribution of the work force within sectors.*

	Distribution of the work force across sectors		
	Share of wage employment in		
	Agriculture (%)	Industry (%)	Services (%)
1. Low Income Asia *n = 11*	9.1 *11*	50.0 *11*	50.3 *11*
2. Low Income Asia *n = 44*	15.2 *43*	48.7 *43*	44.1 *43*
3. Low Income Former Socialists *n = 9*	17.2 *9*	77.6 *9*	75.8 *9*
4. Emerging Asia *n = 6*	8.9 *6*	62.2 *6*	52.2 *6*
5. Low Income Latin America *n = 14*	38.7 *14*	67.1 *14*	62.5 *14*
6. Middle East, Turkey And North Africa *n = 12*	24.5 *11*	73.9 *11*	70.2 *11*
7. Middle Income Former Socialists *n = 18*	30.1 *18*	88.4 *18*	87.7 *18*
8. Pacific Islands *n = 16*	22.8 *8*	79.6 *8*	78.4 *8*
9. Middle Income Caribbean *n = 17*	55.9 *8*	81.8 *8*	78.1 *8*
10. Middle Income Africa *n = 6*	43.5 *5*	78.4 *5*	74.4 *5*
11. Middle Income Latin America and Europe *n = 8*	38.6 *8*	77.9 *8*	70.7 *8*
12. Small European *n = 10*	36.7 *4*	92.6 *4*	92.2 *4*
13. High Income Caribbean *n = 4*	58.6 *2*	86.9 *2*	87.4 *2*
14. Oil Exporters *n = 8*	63.6 *8*	92.8 *8*	89.6 *8*
15. High Income Asia *n = 6*	29.7 *5*	88.0 *5*	77.2 *5*
16. OECD and Israel excl. Japan *n = 21*	33.9 *21*	89.2 *21*	86.5 *21*

Table 5. *Distribution of the work force.*

	Distribution of the work force					
	Agriculture (%)		Industry (%)		Services (%)	
	Wage	Non-Wage	Wage	Non-Wage	Wage	Non-Wage
1. Low Income Asia *n = 11*	7.0 *4*	49.3 *4*	8.2 *4*	8.7 *4*	14.1 *4*	12.8 *4*
2. Low Income Africa *n = 44*	9.7 *12*	51.9 *12*	6.1 *12*	3.5 *12*	14.9 *12*	13.9 *12*
3. Low Income Former Socialists *n = 9*	... *0*	... *0*	... *0*	... *0*	... *0*	... *0*
4. Emerging Asia *n = 6*	5.9 *4*	49.8 *4*	8.8 *4*	6.7 *4*	15.1 *4*	13.7 *4*
5. Low Income Latin America *n = 14*	10.1 *10*	20.2 *10*	15.8 *10*	6.4 *10*	29.4 *10*	18.1 *10*
6. Middle East, Turkey And North Africa *n = 12*	4.9 *6*	26.1 *6*	19.9 *6*	6.7 *6*	30.1 *6*	12.3 *6*
7. Middle Income Former Socialists *n = 18*	11.5 *6*	19.2 *6*	21.1 *6*	1.4 *6*	44.2 *6*	2.6 *6*
8. Pacific Islands *n = 16*	1.4 *4*	8.3 *4*	17.7 *4*	4.8 *4*	55.9 *4*	11.8 *4*
9. Middle Income Caribbean *n = 17*	6.6 *3*	3.3 *3*	19.4 *3*	2.4 *3*	57.7 *3*	10.7 *3*
10. Middle Income Africa *n = 6*	6.9 *2*	6.0 *2*	13.3 *2*	2.3 *2*	60.2 *2*	11.4 *2*
11. Middle Income Latin America and Europe *n = 8*	6.6 *8*	11.5 *8*	21.9 *8*	6.2 *8*	38.0 *8*	15.8 *8*
12. Small Europea *n = 10*	1.5 *2*	8.0 *2*	29.5 *2*	3.7 *2*	48.4 *2*	9.0 *2*
13. High Income Caribbean *n = 4*	2.7 *2*	1.9 *2*	18.9 *2*	2.5 *2*	64.9 *2*	9.2 *2*
14. Oil Exporters *n = 8*	2.5 *5*	1.0 *5*	31.6 *5*	1.4 *5*	58.9 *5*	4.6 *5*
15. High Income Asia *n = 6*	2.2 *5*	8.8 *5*	28.7 *5*	3.8 *5*	44.2 *5*	12.2 *5*
16. OECD and Israel excl. Japan *n = 21*	1.9 *19*	4.2 *19*	24.8 *19*	2.8 *19*	57.1 *19*	9.2 *19*

evident as in the past.[8] In the third place, there is no clear relationship between open unemployment and economic development levels. However, the highest levels of unemployment are located in the central zone of the typology. This is understandable when one keeps in mind that, while in the poorest regions, the rural-urban migration process is still absent or just mild, in the intermediate level of the economic development it is at its highest point, and rapid enough to overcome the possibilities of employment creation in the cities. Furthermore, global reforms and processes of "transition to capitalism" are more frequent in the middle income countries, and generally imply an important, although transitory, increase in unemployment.

Beyond this general consideration about "economies in transition", it is possible to obtain further insight from the following, more detailed analysis of unemployment levels.

A. *Low unemployment cohorts-types (at or below 6%) and labour flexibility.* Low Income Asia, Low Income Africa, Emerging Asia, the Pacific Islands, the Small European countries (only one case), and High Income Asia show the lowest unemployment rates. It is clear enough that Asia has found the mostly unknown recipe to avoid unemployment. Beyond doubt, one of the ingredients is the sort of implicit bargaining that exists inside the firm: high flexibility of labour relationships against lifetime employment. The case of Africa is different and could perhaps be explained by the fact that in the poorest countries, to be unemployed is a luxury most find impossible to afford.

B. *Middle unemployment types (6% to 12%): high labour costs or strong rigidities plus economic stagnation or systemic transitions.* Belonging to this group are both Latin American cohorts, both Former Socialists cohorts, and the OECD. High labour costs and strong labour rigidities, both inside within the firm and within the labour markets as a whole, are very widespread in these countries, and appear as a very probable explanation of the high unemployment level. In Latin America and the Former Socialist countries, the combination of those rigidities with global economic reforms have resulted in a dangerous mix. In the OECD countries, the dangerous combination is one of high labour costs, labour rigidities and low economic growth.

---

[8] An increase in the unemployment rate arising after a sudden increase in the participation rates has not the same social or economic meaning that an increase explained by a drop in labour demand has.

C. *High unemployment types (more than 12%).* Middle and High Income Caribbean countries, the Middle East, Turkey and North Africa and Middle Income Africa show the highest unemployment rates.

D. *Successful cases.* In a world characterized by high unemployment rates, it is very important to analyze the successful stories. These not only include the noteworthy case of Asia, but also some "deviant" cases in cohorts with high or medium unemployment averages. Such is the situation observed in some OECD countries like the United States (5.8%), which has a very flexible labour market, and and Austria (4.6%) and Switzerland (3.8%), both of which have interesting schemes of social agreements. In Latin America, Costa Rica (5.5%) and Chile (5%) deserve special attention concerning their social policies in general.[9] In turn, Estonia (2.6%), Latvia (5.3%), Lithuania (1.4%) and the Czech Republic (3.1%) have performed the "transition to capitalism" with almost no costs in terms of unemployment.[10]

D. EPILOGUE

The purpose of this presentation was not to attain conclusions, but simply to describe some basic features of human work across the world. Even at the very general level pictured by these statistics, we can see sharp contrasts with the principles of the social doctrine of the Church. At the same time, however, it is very important to observe the very intense differences exhibited among countries, and to understand the fact that these differences are explained not only by economic determinism, but also by cultural peculiarities and the quality of governments.

---

[9] In the case of Chile, however, the low unemployment rate was obtained after performing a deep economic reform, whose initial impact was a huge increase in unemployment lasting almost seven years.

[10] The explanation lies perhaps in the nature of the stabilization programs undertaken in these countries. Some other countries of the Former USSR show low unemployment rates, but these statistics are less reliable.

ANNEX 1 — *Typology of countries*

1. Low Income Asia (11)
Avg. GNP per capita (in U$S): **369**
Total Population (000): **1,262,981**

Afghanistan
Bangladesh
Bhutan
Cambodia
India
Laos PDR
Mongolia
Myanmar
Nepal
Pakistan
Sri Lanka

2. Low Income Africa (44)
Avg. GNP per capita (in U$S): **529**
Total Population (000): **514,536**

Angola
Benin
Botswana
Burkina Faso
Burundi
Cameroon
Cape Verde
Central African Republic
Chad
Comoro Islands
Congo
Côte d'Ivoire
Djibouti
Equatorial Guinea
Eritrea
Ethiopia
Gambia, The
Ghana
Guinea
Guinea Bissau
Kenya
Lesotho
Liberia
Madagascar
Malawi
Mali
Mauritania
Mozambique
Namibia
Niger
Nigeria
Rwanda
São Tomé and Principe
Senegal
Sierra Leone
Somalia
Sudan
Swaziland
Tanzania
Togo
Uganda
Zaire
Zambia
Zimbabwe

3. Low Income Former Socialist (9)
Avg. GNP per capita (in U$S): **647**
Total Population (000): **58,782**

Albania
Armenia
Azerbaijan
Bosnia and Herzegovina
Georgia
Kyrgiz Republic
Macedonia FYR
Tajikistan
Uzbekistan

4. Emerging Asia (6)

Avg. GNP per capita (in U$S):   **1,001**
Total Population (000):   **1,581,041**

China
Indonesia
Korea Dem. Rep.
Philippines
Thailand
Viet Nam

5. Low Income Latin America (14)

Avg. GNP per capita (in U$S):   **1,269**
Total Population (000):   **137,531**

Bolivia
Colombia
Costa Rica
Cuba
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
El Salvador
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
Nicaragua
Panama
Paraguay
Peru

6. Middle East, Turkey and North Africa (12)

Avg GNP per capita (in U$S):   **1,513**
Total Population (000):   **295,171**

Algeria
Egypt Arab Rep.
Iran Islamic Rep.
Iraq
Jordan
Lebanon
Morocco

Syrian Arab Rep.
Tunisia
Turkey
West Bank and Gaza
Yemen Rep.

7. Middle Income Former Socialists (18)

Avg. GNP per capita (inU$S):   **2,216**
Total Population (000):   **357,422**

Belarus
Bulgaria
Croatia
Czech Republic
Estonia
Hungary
Kazakhstan
Latvia
Lithuania
Moldova
Poland
Romania
Russian Federation
Slovak Republic
Slovenia
Turkmenistan
Ukraine
Yugoslavia Fed. Rep.

8. Pacific Islands (16)

Avg. GNP per capita (in U$S):   **2,963**
Total Population (000):   **7,174**

American Samoa
Fiji
French Polynesia
Guam
Kiribati
Macao
Maldives
Marshall Islands

Micronesia Fed. Sts.
New Caledonia
Northern Mariana Is.
Papua New Guinea
Solomon Islands
Tonga
Vanuatu
Western Samoa

9. Middle Income Caribbean (17)
Avg. GNP per capita (in U$S): **3,822**
Total Population (000): **7,088**

Antigua and Barbuda
Aruba
Barbados
Belize
Dominica
French Guiana
Grenada
Guadeloupe
Guyana
Jamaica
Martinique
Netherland Antilles
St. Kitts and Nevis
St. Lucia
St. Vincent and the Grenadines
Suriname
Trinidad and Tobago

10. Middle Income Africa (6)
Avg GNP per capita (in U$S): **4,619**
Total Population (000): **43,811**

Gabon
Mauritius
Mayotte
Reunion
Seychelles
South Africa

11. Middle Income Latin America and Europe (8)
Avg. GNP per capita (in U$S): **4,895**
Total Population (000): **334,565**

Argentina
Brazil
Chile
Greece
Mexico
Portugal
Uruguay
Venezuela

12. Small European (10)
Avg. GNP per capita (in U$S): **7,650**
Total Population (000): **1,557**

Andorra
Channel Islands
Cyprus
Faeroe Islands
Gibraltar
Greenland
Isle of Man
Liechtenstein
Malta
San Marino

13. High Income Caribbean (4)
Avg. GNP per capita (in U$S): **9,630**
Total Population (000): **4,003**

Bahamas, The
Cayman Islands
Puerto Rico
Virgin Islands

14. Oil Exporters (8)

Avg. GNP per capita (in U$S):   **12,238**
Total Population (000):   **28,679**

Bahrain
Brunei
Kuwait
Libya
Oman
Qatar
Saudi Arabia
United Arab Emirates

15. High Income Asia (6)

Avg. GNP per capita (in U$S):   **15,890**
Total Population (000):   **196,665**

Hong Kong
Japan
Korea Rep.
Malaysia
Singapore
Taiwan

16. OECD and Israel excl. Japan (21)

Avg. GNP per capita (in U$S):   **21,776**
Total Population (000):   **673,522**

Australia
Austria
Belgium
Canada
Denmark
Finland
France
Germany
Iceland
Ireland
Israel
Italy
Luxembourg
Netherlands
New Zealand
Norway
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland
United Kingdom
United States