

5150/22

PN-AAN-236

ISN 29913

LA ACADEMIA DE CENTRO AMERICA

RDO

Return to RDO
USMO/CR

POVERTY IN COSTA RICA

METHODOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE DETERMINATION OF SOME OF ITS CHARACTERISTICS

**VICTOR HUGO CESPEDES
ALBERTO DI MARE
CLAUDIO GONZALEZ VEGA
EDUARDO LIZANO**

LA ACADEMIA DE CENTRO AMERICA

POVERTY IN COSTA RICA

**METHODOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE DETERMINATION
OF SOME OF ITS CHARACTERISTICS**

**VICTOR HUGO CESPEDES
ALBERTO DI MARE
CLAUDIO GONZALEZ VEGA
EDUARDO LIZANO**

**SAN JOSE, COSTA RICA
JANUARY, 1977**

This study has been financed by the United States Agency for International Development, under Contract N° AID-515-262-T (Project N° 515-11-199-122) - Academia de Centro América.

Translation of LA POBREZA EN COSTA RICA, PROBLEMAS METODOLÓGICOS PARA DETERMINAR ALGUNAS DE SUS CARACTERÍSTICAS. San José, Academia de Centro América, January 1977.

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

Mr. Joe J. Sconce
Director
Office of the Agency for International
Development
San José

Dear Mr. Sconce:

We have the pleasure to deliver the study POVERTY IN COSTA RICA, METHODOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE DETERMINATION OF SOME OF ITS CHARACTERISTICS, which was entrusted to La Academia de Centro América by the Agency for International Development.

The study contains, in the first place, a comprehensive methodological discussion concerning the problems posed by any investigation about poverty. In the second place, the study includes several remarks and comments about some of the main characteristics of poverty in Costa Rica. In addition, it offers some suggestions in connection with desirable ways in which to proceed with the study of these topics, since we believe that the present piece is just a first stage in their investigation. Finally, the appendices and the statistical annex contain information and data that we have considered useful to publish.

The completion of this study was made possible by the cooperation of several persons. It would be impossible, despite our wishes, to mention all of them. However, we want to explicitly acknowledge the cooperation of the following:

- Dr. Manuel Carvajal, Director of the Latin American Data Bank of the University of Florida, Gainesville, had an important participation in the computations, since La Academia de Centro América contracted with this institution the tasks of electronic computation.
- Lic. René Sánchez, Director of the Costa Rican Statistics and Census Bureau (Dirección General de Estadística y Censos), as well as other officials in his agency, in particular those at the Mechanic Tabulations Section, provided valuable aid.
- Mr. Milton Lau, Mr. Travis A. King and Mr. Richard Kreitman, of the Rural Development Unit of the Agency for International Development in San José, made constructive suggestions and criticisms during the development of the study. Similar suggestions were received from Dr. Samuel Daines of the AID in Washington.
- Lic. Alvaro Vargas was entrusted with an important portion of the compilation and computation of the agricultural costs of production used in the study.
- Mr. Milton Lobell aided in the search for bibliographical references.
- The lengthy and detailed typing job was undertaken by Miss Ana Isabel López and Mrs. Carmen Mata, with the same patience and efficiency as always.
- Miss Alicia Chaves participated in the elaboration of the statistical information.

We do not want to finish this letter without expressing our gratitude for your continuous confidence, reaffirmed when the Agency for International Development entrusted this difficult and complex study to La Academia de Centro América. We think that the effort has been worthwhile. We believe that, despite its limitations, this first stage of the investigation is an important contribution towards a better understanding of poverty in Costa Rica. Complementary studies undertaken in the future will further increase the usefulness of the results of this effort.

With our best wishes,

LA ACADEMIA DE CENTRO AMERICA

Alberto Di Mare F.,

Chairman

C O N T E N T S

Letter of Introduction	iv
Contents	vii
List of Tables	ix
<u>CHAPTER I.</u> Objectives	1
<u>CHAPTER II.</u> Methodology	5
A. Criterion of poverty	5
B. Estimation of income	16
B-1 General considerations	16
B-2 Non-farming families	22
B-3 Farming families	25
C. Characteristics of poverty	39
<u>CHAPTER III.</u> Observations and comments about poverty	50
A. Poverty at the national level	52
A-1 Global figures	52
A-2 Geographic concentration	55
A-3 Geographic distribution	59
B. Demographic and social characteristics	61
B-1 Family size	61
B-2 Age structure and dependency index	65
B-3 Fertility	66
B-4 Migration	67
C. Economic characteristics	69

	C-1 Activity of the family	69
	C-2 Sector of activity of the head of the family	71
	C-3 Unemployment	72
	C-4 Land tenure	74
	C-5 Land use and technology	75
	C-6 Sources of income	76
	D. Impact of public expenditures	79
	D-1 Illiteracy	79
	D-2 Schooling	80
	D-3 Housing	82
	D-4 Overcrowding	83
	D-5 Water, sewer and electricity	85
<u>CHAPTER IV.</u>	Conclusions and recommendations	86
	A. Conclusions	86
	B. Recommendations	93
APPENDIX A	Glossary	A-1
APPENDIX B	Costs of production and prices of some agricultural products	B-1
APPENDIX C	Other data	C-1

STATISTICAL ANNEX

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER II

2.01	Monthly incomes to impute in the case of self-employed workers and of employers, according to occupation, sex and urban and rural areas	26
2.02	Average rent according to cantón, urban and rural area and the condition of the house (good, fair, bad), 1973	33

CHAPTER III

3.01	Proportion of poor families in the country	54
3.02	Classification of the poor families of the country according to urban and rural and to farming and non-farming	55
3.03	Geographic concentration of the total number of poor families in the country	57
3.04	Coefficient of elasticity of the geographic concentration of poverty	58
3.05	Geographic distribution of the total number of poor families in the country	60
3.06	Geographic distribution of poverty. Ten cantones with the highest percentage of poor families, with respect to their total population	62
3.07	Geographic distribution of poverty. Ten cantones with the lowest percentage of poor families, with respect to their total population	63
3.08	Some demographic indicators of poor and non-poor families	65
3.09	Average number of children born alive per mother, according to the age of the mother	67
3.10	Proportion of migrant families, poor and non poor	69

3.11	Land tenure, area of farms and poverty	74
3.12	Use of land by poor and non-poor farmers	75
3.13	Illiteracy rate, by sex, urban and rural area and condition of poverty	79
3.14	Index of schooling, by sex, rural and urban area and condition of poverty	80
3.15	Percentage of families according to the condition of the house and the index of overcrowding	84

APPENDIX B

B-1	Coffee: cantones included in each one of the zones and prices received by the producers in each cantón ..	B-16
B-2	Coffee: requirements and costs of materials and labor in zone one	B-20
B-3	Coffee: requirements and costs of materials and labor in zone two	B-21
B-4	Coffee: requirements and costs of materials and labor in zone three	B-22
B-5	Coffee: requirements and costs of materials and labor in zone four	B-23
B-6	Coffee: requirements and costs of materials and labor in zone five	B-24
B-7	Prices received by the producers in each cantón per ton of sugar cane, corn and tobacco	B-26
B-8	Cantones included in each one of the potatoe producing zones and prices received by the producer	B-42

APPENDIX C

C-1	Equivalences used	C-1
C-2	Costa Rica: cantones included in each one of the agricultural regions	C-2

C-3	Costa Rica: Distances in kilometers between the capital of each cantón and the city of San José and the cantones included in each province in 1973	C-4
C-4.0	Geographic concentration of the poor families of the country	C-6
C-4.1	Geographic concentration of the poor urban families of the country	C-7
C-4.2	Geographic concentration of the poor rural non-farming families of the country	C-8
C-4.3	Geographic concentration of the poor farming families of the country	C-9
C-5.0	Distribution of poverty: poor families as a proportion of the total number of families	C-10
C-5.1	Distribution of poverty: poor urban families as a proportion of the urban families	C-11
C-5.2	Distribution of poverty: poor rural non-farming families as a proportion of the rural non-farming families	C-12
C-5.3	Distribution of poverty: poor farming families as a proportion of the farming families	C-13

STATISTICAL ANNEX

1-A Indicators related to the annual family income of non-farming families in urban areas, by deciles and administrative division (Parts I and II)

- 1-A-0 Costa Rica
- 1-A-1 San José
- 1-A-2 Alajuela
- 1-A-3 Cartago
- 1-A-4 Heredia
- 1-A-5 Guanacaste
- 1-A-6 Puntarenas
- 1-A-7 Limón

1-B Indicators related to the annual family income of non-farming families in rural areas, by deciles and administrative division (Parts I and II)

1-B-0	Costa Rica
1-B-1	San José
1-B-2	Alajuela
1-B-3	Cartago
1-B-4	Heredia
1-B-5	Guanacaste
1-B-6	Puntarenas
1-B-7	Limón

2-A Indicators related to the annual family income of non-poor non-farming families, by urban-rural area, quartiles and administrative division

2-A-0	Costa Rica
2-A-1	San José
2-A-2	Alajuela
2-A-3	Cartago
2-A-4	Heredia
2-A-5	Guanacaste
2-A-6	Puntarenas
2-A-7	Limón

2-B Indicators related to the annual family income of poor non-farming families, by urban-rural area, quartiles and administrative division.

2-B-0	Costa Rica
2-B-1	San José
2-B-2	Alajuela
2-B-3	Cartago
2-B-4	Heredia
2-B-5	Guanacaste
2-B-6	Puntarenas
2-B-7	Limón

3. Number of families and dependency index of the poor urban population

3 - 0	Costa Rica
3 - 1	San José
3 - 2	Alajuela
3 - 3	Cartago
3 - 4	Heredia
3 - 5	Guanacaste
3 - 6	Puntarenas
3 - 7	Limón

11

4. Activity of the poor urban population between 15 and 64 years of age. Costa Rica.
5. Composition of the economically active population, by age group and by sex. Urban population (poor and non poor) and poor non-farming rural population. Costa Rica.
6. Rate of unemployment of the economically active population, by level of formal education and by sex. Urban population (poor and non poor) and poor non-farming rural population. Costa Rica.
7. Index of schooling of the urban population 7 years old and older, illiteracy rate of the urban population 10 years old and older and rate of unemployment of the urban economically active population.

7 - 0	Costa Rica
7 - 1	San José
7 - 2	Alajuela
7 - 3	Cartago
7 - 4	Heredia
7 - 5	Guanacaste
7 - 6	Puntarenas
7 - 7	Limón
8. Percentage distribution according to the condition of the house and the coefficient of overcrowding of the urban population. Costa Rica.
9. Percentage distribution according to the forms of tenure of the house and the coefficient of overcrowding of the urban population. Costa Rica.
10. Fertility (average number of children born alive), by age group of the urban population. Costa Rica.
11. Fertility (average number of living children), by age group of the urban population. Costa Rica.
12. Average annual wages of the members of the economically active population with a job. Non-farming families, by urban-rural area. Costa Rica.

CHAPTER I

OBJECTIVES

1.01 This study pursued several objectives. As expected, some were achieved satisfactorily, while others were only partially reached and a few were not attained at all in this opportunity.

Given the nature and difficulty of the study, which to a large extent consisted basically of methodological explorations, it was never expected that all of its specific objectives would be fully attained. On the contrary, these objectives were reevaluated and modified when the progress of the study made it necessary and when material and time constraints led to more modest goals. In this respect the study must be viewed as the first stage of a long journey. The present pause is justified in order to offer the information gathered to a wider audience and to share the experience accumulated so far and in order to make some comments and recommendations concerning the tasks remaining.

1.02 Among its more ambitious objectives the study attempted, in the first place, to determine the possible uses of the censuses -population, housing and agricultural- of Costa Rica, in relation to the establishment of a typology of poverty, in general, and of a typology of rural poverty, in particular.

In addition to this purely methodological objective, i.e. besides the search for procedures that would allow a better utilization of the available census data, a second specific objective of the study was to increase the existing knowledge about the poor within the population of Costa Rica and, in particular, about the rural poor, in order to improve the decision making process and the preparation, execution and evaluation of programs and projects related to this sector of the population.

It is important to insist from the beginning that a determination of the distribution of income and of the concentration of wealth in Costa Rica is not included among the purposes of this study. The information available is not sufficient and the methods employed are not appropriate for such an analysis.

Given its own nature, it is necessary to keep in mind the main limitations of this study. In the first place, the study is mostly based on the information explicitly contained in the censuses and on data derived from them. The nature, quality and coverage of the census data thus impose an initial restriction on the results of the study.

In the second place, poverty is a complex phenomenon, influenced by multiple variables of the most diverse nature: cultural, anthropological, psychological, historical, economic, etc. It is, therefore, with great difficulty that poverty can be analyzed on the basis of the census data only. The available census material is mostly

demographic, social and economic. For this reason, the typology of poverty that is attempted in this study, being based mainly on such variables, turns out to be incomplete and of limited scope.

- 3 The scarcity of information would not necessarily be an important limitation if, among the data available, one possessed sufficient information to establish the condition of poverty. This limitation, however, could only be overcome if one had previously defined criteria to determine which of the data at hand are the important ones. That is, this method, which could be called heuristic, requires a theory about the phenomenon being studied.

In effect, if a theory of poverty existed, one could establish if the data required by the theoretical model are contained among those at hand. However, in the absence of an adequate theoretical model, it was considered preferable to attempt the construction of a universal or type, on the basis of the diverse information available.^{1/}

Therefore, the method attempted in this study was that of a filing system, in an effort to derive a type through the determination of certain common denominators. Thus, the point of view adopted was

^{1/} This procedure has been frequently employed in the social sciences, following Quetelet and Weber. For some authors, like Croce, this procedure constitutes the only ordering of reality possible to scientific knowledge.

merely taxonomic. This method does not allow, under any circumstances, statements about the existence of causal relationships between any of the specific characteristics observed and the condition of poverty. In the same sense in which Linnaeus' taxonomy does not say anything about plant physiology, the characteristics of poverty, by themselves, do not say anything about its causes. A typology usually attempts to characterize a situation on the basis of the conditions appropriate to produce the type. The present study attempts solely to describe some of the variables that accompany the type. For those for whom a typological analysis had the first meaning, these words should make it clear that it was not with such an intention that this study was approached.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

2.01 A taxonomic analysis of some of the characteristics that accompany poverty in Costa Rica requires, at least, that the following tasks be performed:

- a. the selection of a criterion of poverty;
- b. the determination of the income (and/or wealth) of the economic units studied;
- c. the classification and grouping of such units between the poor and the non poor as well as among the various categories of the poor that may be considered useful for the analysis;
- d. the selection and measurement of characteristics of interest when it may be expected that they accompany poverty; and
- e. the verification of the existence and of the magnitude of any association between poverty and some of the characteristics selected for the study.

A. CRITERION OF POVERTY

2.02 In any study of this nature it is necessary to start from an initial arbitrary definition of poverty. That is, it is necessary to select a criterion for the determination of who are the poor. The choice of this criterion of poverty is beyond the data. In the same sense in which Linnaeus had to, *prima facie*, determine if he was

looking at a plant or not, before proceeding to examine it taxonomically, the present study required the selection, a priori, of a definition of poverty.

It was necessary, in addition, to arbitrarily choose a unit of analysis, with respect to which the study attempted to determine through the application of the criterion of poverty selected, if it was poor or not. The basic unit of analysis chosen was the census family. As it was also the case with respect to other concepts, the definition of family used was equivalent to that employed in the 1973 censuses of Costa Rica.^{1/} This selection implies that poverty was conceived, not as a characteristic of the individual but as a characteristic of the group with which the individual lives, namely, the family group.

- 2.03 A universally accepted definition of poverty does not exist. As already indicated, poverty being a complex concept, an attempt to measure it on the basis of only one or of a few socio-economic indices turns out to be a difficult task, with serious limitations. This is not the place, however, to attempt a convincing definition of poverty. All that is desired is to report that the various conceptual difficulties involved were taken into account at the time when the criterion of poverty employed in the study was selected.

^{1/} A detailed definition of the census family can be found in the Glossary.

Poverty is frequently related to the amount of net assets possessed by the unit being studied, in this case the family. That is, poverty is related to the unit's net worth. Nevertheless, the measurement of a family's net worth is never an easy task and in this particular case the required information was not available. Instead, considering that the level of a family's income is closely related to its net worth and since the estimation of the former is more reliable, this study attempted an approximation to the magnitude of each family's poverty through the direct measurement of each family's average income.

As it is usually the case in studies of this nature, the estimation of the data required several computational efforts, called here "generations" or "methodologies". It has been considered appropriate to report the results obtained with three of these generations, under the belief that the comparisons that thus become possible are of interest from the point of view of the development of the methodology. For several reasons to be explained later, these generations differ, among other things, because of the adoption of different criteria of poverty.

- 2.04 In consequence and partly because one of the objectives of the study was to investigate the possibility of intercountry comparisons of poverty, the definition selected for the first generation was based on income per capita.

The figure chosen was US\$ 150, at 1969 prices, as the annual average income for each of the members of the family. In addition, the selection of this figure of income per capita reflected a definition of poverty adopted by the United States Agency for International Development (AID), which has already been employed in similar studies in other countries.

It must be noted that both the selection of income per capita as the criterion of poverty and the choice of a figure for this income per capita measured in a foreign currency and at prices different from those that ruled when the census observations were made (the agricultural year 1972-73) introduce important methodological difficulties. These difficulties explain, in part, the adoption of different criteria of poverty in connection with the various generations of computations.

- 2.05 The approximate measurement of each family's poverty as attempted in this study would have been more precise if it had resulted from the consideration of the family's income during several economic periods. However, the census information employed did not allow more than the estimation of the family's income in a single period, namely, one year.

The previous limitation gave rise to some difficulties worth mentioning. Since the definition of income used in the study represented net income in a given period (a year), those who had losses

during the period appear as poor, independently of their net worth and of their permanent standard of living.

In effect, the first generation of computations led to the classification in the group of the poor of a large number of families, even though other considerations indicated that these families should have been classified as non poor, according to more traditional criteria of poverty. This was the case, in many instances, of families which appeared to have negative net incomes, while in many cases these families possessed rather large farms or cattle ranches.

In order to improve the identification of the group of the poor in Costa Rica, a new definition of poverty was adopted during the second generation of computations, which complemented the income-per-capita definition with considerations about the possession of land by the family unit. Obviously, this new criterion of poverty did not affect the classification of the total population; it affected only the classification of farmers.

This additional criterion is a criterion of wealth, not of income. As a result, a family which possessed an amount of land estimated to be sufficient to generate the income per capita that corresponded to the non-poor population was considered, during this second generation, as non poor, even though such land may have not generated, during the specific period covered by the study, an income sufficiently large to allow, when added to the income from other

activities, the classification of such a family as non poor, on the basis of income considerations alone.^{1/}

In effect, the additional criterion employed led to the classification as non poor of farmers which, independently of the level of their family incomes, possessed more than 10 hectares of land or more than 5 hectares of cultivated land, since it was considered that these families had enough land to potentially generate an income per capita above US\$ 150, at 1969 prices.^{2/}

During the third generation of computations the additional criterion employed led to the exclusion from the group of the poor of those farmers which, independently of their income levels, possessed more than 20 hectares of land, rather than 10 hectares.

- 2.06 In order to further improve the identification of the group of the poor, an alternative definition of poverty was tested during both the first and the second generations of computations. According to this procedure, those families which simultaneously appeared with a high index of overcrowding, with a low level of education and with bad housing conditions, were considered as poor, independently of their income levels.^{3/}

^{1/} The attempted revision was partial, in the sense that it did not affect the whole productive endowment of the farming families, but only their land.

^{2/} The adoption of the additional criterion meant that the percentage represented by the poor among the farmers declined from 28.6 per cent (first generation) to 20.7 per cent (second generation). As will be indicated, these figures must be treated with caution.

^{3/} The Glossary contains a detailed definition of all these concepts.

As a result of the employment of this alternative criterion of poverty, two groups of the poor were identified during the first and the second generations:

- a. the poor, according to income, and
- b. the poor, according to other conditions.

The first group of the poor included all the families with average family incomes below US\$ 150, at 1969 prices (first generation), excluding those with amounts of land sufficient to potentially produce such an income (second generation). The second group of the poor included all those families which, not being poor according to their incomes, simultaneously met the three conditions of the alternative definition. Both groups were kept separated throughout the first stage of analysis. The poor according to income represented the bulk (about 99 per cent) of the poor.

- 2.07 As already indicated, the family incomes estimated in the study correspond to a one-year period. In the case of the agricultural output, its value was estimated on the basis of the amounts produced during the agricultural year from May 1st, 1972, to April 30th, 1973, such as they were reported in the agricultural census. In the case of wage incomes, however, their amount was estimated on the basis of the working conditions of the family members -their occupation and wages- during the week from May 7th to May 12th of 1973, when they were surveyed in connection with the population

census of 1973. This gave rise to some difficulties with respect to the estimation of the annual family income which also deserve mention.

In effect, those families, whose members were unemployed during the week when the census observations were made or whose members received in that period incomes below those corresponding to other weeks of the year, may appear as poor, even though this would not be the case if their income would have been directly measured all year round. Similarly, poor families would appear as non poor if their members received exceptionally high wages during the week of the census observations.

At the aggregate level this difficulty would not be very important if the unemployment rate and the amount of family wage incomes earned during the month of May would have not been very different from their annual averages. However, to the extent to which May would have been a month of low (high) seasonal occupation, this procedure would imply an underestimation (overestimation) of the income of several families, with the corresponding impact on the number of the poor.

- 2.08 For the purposes of the first and of the second generations of computations, US dollars of 1969 were converted into colones of 1969 by means of the "effective exchange rates for the current receipts and payments of the Balance of Payments", according to the

Central Bank.^{1/}

In turn, colones of 1969 were converted into colones of 1972-73 by using the low and middle income consumer price index for the Metropolitan Area.^{2/} Taking into account that the crop of the agricultural year was sold between May of 1972 and April of 1973, the figure of the price index employed corresponded to an intermediate date, that is, to October of 1972.

On the basis of the described procedures, US\$ 150 at 1969 prices are equivalent to ¢ 1.153.20, at the prices of the agricultural year 1972-73. However, in order to simplify the computations, an average annual income per member of the family of ¢ 1.100 was used to separate the poor from the non poor.

2.09 During the third generation of computations, undertaken by officials of the Agency for International Development (AID), three alternative definitions of poverty were employed:

- a. A conservative definition, which separated the poor from the non poor on the basis of an annual income per capita of 1.100 colones. This was equivalent to the definition employed in the previous two generations.

^{1/} Banco Central de Costa Rica. Cifras de Cuentas Nacionales de Costa Rica, Serie 1960-1973, Estimación 1974. 1975, p. 23.

^{2/} Dirección General de Estadística y Censos. Anuario Estadístico de Costa Rica, 1969. San José, 1971, p. 235. Anuario Estadístico de Costa Rica, 1973. San José, s.d., p. 221.

- b. A moderate definition of poverty, which separated the poor from the non poor at the level of 1.400 colones.
- c. A liberal definition of poverty, which made the separation at the level of 1.700 colones.

Obviously, the new levels of income per capita considered do not correspond to the original level of US\$ 150, at 1969 prices. The use of the new definitions of poverty allows some sensitivity analysis, since it makes explicit the extent to which the number of the poor increases, as the level of income per capita employed for the separation is augmented.^{1/}

2.10 Given the arbitrary selection of the level of income per capita which separated the poor from the non poor, it was considered useful to take into account several segments, according to the level of income per family member. During the first and the second generations of computations, the segments considered were the following:

- Less than 100 colones
- From 100 to 299 colones
- From 300 to 499 colones
- From 500 to 699 colones
- From 700 to 899 colones
- From 900 to 1.099 colones

^{1/} It is important to remember that, during the third generation, the classification between poor and non poor was determined, in addition to the indicated levels of income per capita, by the possession or not of more than 20 hectares of land.

It is apparent that only the poor but not the non poor were classified according to their income segment. A similar procedure could have been followed with respect to the non poor, but this was not possible because such a task would have required expenditures in computation beyond the resources available.

Three additional income segments were considered during the third generation of computations. This allowed a more detailed analysis of bordering groups. The new segments taken into account were:

From 1,100 to 1,399 colones

From 1,400 to 1,699 colones

From 1,700 to 1,999 colones

In summary, for each of the three generations of computations, the poor were separated from the non poor, on the basis of the following criteria:

- i) First generation: an annual average income of US\$ 150, at 1969 prices, per member of the family.
- ii) Second generation: an annual average income of US\$ 150, at 1969 prices, per member of the family and the possession of 10 hectares of land or of 5 hectares of cultivated land.
- iii) Third generation: the possession of 20 hectares of land and an annual average income of ¢ 1,100, at 1973 prices (conservative definition), of ¢ 1,400, at 1973 prices (moderate definition) or of ¢ 1,700, at 1973 prices (liberal definition).

In addition, for the first and for the second generations, those families with a low level of education, bad housing conditions and a high index of overcrowding, were considered as poor according to other conditions, irrespective of their income levels.

B. ESTIMATION OF INCOME

B.1 General considerations

2.11 As already indicated, the basic unit of analysis for the study was the family. That is, the analysis not only is referred to the family group and not to individual persons, but the level of income per capita itself was computed on the basis of the family income. In effect, the family's income was computed first, as a whole, and then it was divided by the number of the family's members, in order to obtain the family's average income per capita.

Each family's income was defined as the sum of the incomes received during the year by all the persons making up the family group.

Nevertheless, at the time of the computations, not all the possible sources of income were taken into account and what was included varied with the generations of computations.

For the purposes of the first and of the second generations of computations, the following sources of income were taken into account:

- a. the wages and salaries of employed workers;
- b. the income of self-employed workers and of employers, as a remuneration for their labor effort;

- c. the net income originated in the exploitation of a farm, including the net imputed value of goods produced on the farm and consumed there, as well as the value of firewood employed for cooking; and
- d. the income imputed for the occupation of a self-owned house or of one provided free of charge.

As a result, net family income can be defined as the sum of the previous items, to the extent to which the family receives incomes from these sources. Other sources of income for the family, such as interest earnings, profits, capital gains, etc. as well as income transfers like scholarships, pensions, donations, etc. were not taken into account. To this extent, therefore, the corresponding family income was underestimated.^{1/}

The income thus computed did not take into consideration transfers in kind and public services enjoyed by the families, such as technical assistance provided free of charge to the farmers, education and health services, etc. Finally, it is important to keep in mind that the family's income, even though correctly estimated, does not necessarily reflect the levels of welfare enjoyed by the family members, among other things because income is a concept that does not take into account factors like the influence of the environment.

^{1/} In the case of the farming families, the net income originated in the exploitation of their farms does implicitly include a component attributable to profits and the rent of the land.

The computation of income described was modified during the third generation in at least two important ways:

- a. the income imputed as a result of the enjoyment, free of charge, of firewood was excluded from the components of the family income, and
- b. the income imputed for the occupation of a self-owned house or of one provided free of charge was reduced from 100 percent of the estimated value of the rent to 15 percent of this value.

In the first place it was considered that usually the value of the firewood used is equivalent to its cost of collection and that, in consequence, its use free of charge did not add anything to the family's net income. In the second case it was considered desirable to subtract from the value of the imputed rent the expenditures in maintenance and repairs of the house. Since these expenditures were unknown, it was arbitrarily decided that the corresponding net income was equivalent to 15 per cent of the estimated rental value of the house.^{1/}

A consequence of these two changes in the computation of incomes, to the extent to which they reduced the contribution of sources of income taken into account during the previous generations, was a significant increase in the number of the poor. Once more, this

^{1/} The selection of this percentage was made by officials of the Agency for International Development (AID) and La Academia de Centro América does not necessarily agree with it.

revision may be viewed as an exercise in sensitivity, with respect to the modified variables, which has provided additional elements of judgement for the identification of the group of the poor in Costa Rica.

2.12 The computation of the net incomes of the various groups of families was based upon information contained in the agricultural, population and housing censuses of Costa Rica of 1973, as well as on specific information about the prices and costs of production of agricultural products, which was obtained independently of the censuses.

A task of matching the data of the population census with the corresponding data of the agricultural census was necessary, previously to the computation of the net income from the exploitation of a farm by a farming family. In effect, as of the date of the censuses, there were 331,000 census families and a similar number of privately occupied houses, as well as 82,000 farms, the great majority of which were the property of individuals. Since these individuals were members of families, it was then possible to relate the families to which they belonged to the corresponding farms. By establishing this connection between the farm and the census family that exploited it, it became possible to obtain for each farming family an integrated set of data about its demographic, social and economic characteristics, as well as the information necessary for the computation of the net income that the family received for the exploitation of the farm.

While each questionnaire of the population and of the housing censuses provides information about each family and each questionnaire of the agricultural census provides information about a particular farm, the latter questionnaires do not have a number or code of identification that is comparable to that of the questionnaires of the population and housing censuses, corresponding to the family that owns the farm. For this reason it was necessary first to identify the questionnaires of the agricultural census, with data related to the farms exploited by families, and then to identify the questionnaires of the population census that corresponded to the families which exploited those farms, to finally match each questionnaire of the agricultural census with the corresponding questionnaires of the population and housing censuses.

This procedure required two sizeable efforts:

- a. the identification of the questionnaires (manually), and
- b. the matching of the questionnaires in a manner appropriate for their tabulation with the help of computers. This allowed the production of a tape which performs the desired matching:

Eventually it was possible to match about 90 percent of the agricultural observations with the corresponding population and housing observations. Farms exploited by corporations instead of by individuals were not matched. To the extent to which corporations tend to exploit larger farms, it can be assumed that few of the poor were excluded from the computations by this matching procedure.

In the case of the farming families, the matching achieved allowed the determination of the amount of production of each crop and of the portion of this amount consumed on the farm, as well as information about production technology, output per hectare, and the employment of certain inputs such as machinery and fertilizer.

- 2.13 From the point of view of the sources of their income, the members of a family can be divided into three basic groups:
- a. those whose incomes consist only of wages (remunerated workers);
 - b. those whose income is derived only from the exploitation of farms (farmers); and
 - c. those whose incomes originate only from their independent activities (self-employed workers and employers).

Obviously, in a given family, in addition to these simple forms, one can find any of the following four combinations:

- d. those whose incomes are derived both from wages and from the exploitation of farms;
- e. those whose incomes are derived both from wages and from their independent activities;
- f. those whose incomes are derived from the exploitation of farms and from their independent activities; and
- g. those whose incomes are originated simultaneously from the previous three sources (a, b and c).

The different nature of the sources of incomes and of the type of information required for their computation made it necessary to design three methodologies: one to determine the incomes of salaried workers, another one to determine the incomes derived from the exploitation of farms and a third one to determine the incomes from independent activities other than the exploitation of farms.

B.2 Non-farming families

2.14 The members of the working force (of the economically active population) were classified in the population census of 1973 into four categories:

- a. remunerated workers: those who work for an employer and receive a wage or salary;
- b. self-employed workers: those who are not employed by another person and do not employ others themselves. They may be helped by family workers or by non-remunerated apprentices;
- c. employers: those workers who are assisted by one or more remunerated workers; and
- d. non-remunerated family workers: those who work with their family and do not receive an explicit remuneration.

While remunerated workers receive an income on account exclusively of their labor contribution, self-employed workers and employers receive an income which remunerates both their work as well as their entrepreneurial ability and the capital advanced to the

enterprise in which they also participate as workers. To the extent to which the study inputed a wage solely for the labor contributed by self-employed workers and by employers, their income was underestimated.

- 2.15 The population census of 1973 provides adequate information about the incomes, in the form of wages and salaries, of the members of the families of the country who had remunerated jobs during the week from the 7th to the 12th of May of 1973. The estimation of the monthly incomes of these persons was identical to that undertaken by the General Bureau of Statistics and Censuses (Dirección General de Estadística y Censos) and, under the assumption that the incomes thus reported can be considered as representative for the whole year, the annual incomes were estimated by multiplying the monthly incomes by twelve.

On the other hand, the 1973 population census does not contain information about the probable incomes of self-employed workers and of employers. The incomes of these classes of workers were estimated under the assumption that all of them received, in their respective occupations, an income at least equal to that received by remunerated workers in the same occupations. It was considered that this would be a minimum income per unit of time, since it seemed reasonable to expect that in general a self-employed worker receives an income per unit of time greater than that received by a remunerated worker.

In effect, urban self-employed workers and employers were classified according to their occupation, at the two digit level of the International Uniform Industrial Classification, and an annual income was inputed for their work equal to the annual average wage received by remunerated workers who performed the same tasks in urban areas.

The income inputed to self-employed workers and to employers in the rural areas was computed in the same fashion, on the basis of the annual average wages of the remunerated workers in the same occupation in the rural areas. This procedure excluded those who exploited farms. Table 2.01 reports the monthly wages corresponding to the occupations considered, by sex and by urban or rural area.

The procedure described considered only main occupations, i.e. those for which, at the two digit level of the International Uniform Industrial Classification, there were one thousand or more self-employed workers in the country. All other occupations, which represented only 7 per cent of the self-employed workers, were grouped in a single category. An annual average income was inputed to the members of this group on the basis of a representative wage for the various occupations included in the group.

As already indicated, the computation described underestimated the true level of the incomes of these persons, both because it is likely that self-employed workers and employers receive, on the average, an income on account of their work above that received by remunerated workers and because their incomes should include a

remuneration not only for the labor contributed, but also for the capital and entrepreneurial capacity supplied.

Furthermore, the imputation on the basis of an average wage for each occupational category, at the two digit level of the International Uniform Industrial Classification, hides income differences at the individual level. Although one would expect that the market would tend to equate these incomes, it is likely that in these types of activities, income differences will be more pronounced than in the case of remunerated workers.

Finally, this procedure was not followed with respect to the class 41 of the International Uniform Industrial Classification, which includes "farmer-owners" as self-employed workers. Rather, their incomes were estimated on the basis of the net income from the farms which they exploited. This group of farmers includes, in addition to owners, renters, sharecroppers and others who are in charge of their farms, ranches or other agricultural exploitations.

B.3 Farming families

2.16 The income of a farming family includes the net income from the farm. This net income from the farm results from the following equation:

Net income from the farm =

Value of the total output of the farm during the agricultural year 1972-73 (sales plus consumption on the farm);

Table 2.01

MONTHLY INCOMES ^{1/} TO IMPUTE IN THE CASE OF SELF-EMPLOYED
WORKERS AND OF EMPLOYERS, ACCORDING TO OCCUPATION, ^{2/},
SEX AND URBAN AND RURAL AREAS

O C C U P A T I O N	CODE	MONTHLY INCOME (Colones per month)			
		URBAN		RURAL	
		Men	Women	Men	Women
Other directors, managers and administrators	12	2.080	1.370	1.506	1.053
Merchants and commercial owners	30	1.001	755	642	347
Store attendants and travelling salesmen	31	513	460	462	403
Drivers and other vehicle operators	50	743	...	665	...
Tailors, seamstresses and similar	61	665	455	494	406
Shoemakers, leather workers and similar	62	500	374	470	359
Carpenters, cabinetmakers and similar	63	637	421	617	356
Mechanics, machinery repairmen	68	817	...	763	...
Food products operators	75	509	339	487	279
Barbers, beauticians and similar	96	576	529	479	559
Professionals, technicians and similar ^{3/}	0	1.940	1.350	1.523	1.250
All others, with occupations not specified in this list		500	339	462	279

^{1/} The monthly income imputed to each worker according to occupation is equal to the national average for the urban and rural areas. Dirección General de Estadística y Censos. Censo de 1973, Tomo 2, pp. 345-352.

^{2/} Considers only main occupations, namely those which at the two digit level employed 1,000 or more self-employed workers, except occupation 41. Op. cit., pp. 300-306.

^{3/} This group is considered at the one digit level only.

- Minus: the cost of the materials used in that production during the agricultural year ;
- Minus: the cost of the transportation of those products which, for the estimation of the value of sales and consumption on the farm, the market price and not the price on the farm (at the producer level) was employed;
- Minus: the value of the labor necessary to produce the output of that year, including both hired labor as well as the imputed wages of the members of the farming family who participated in the exploitation of the farm.

Thus computed, the net income from the farm was overestimated to the extent to which financial costs, depreciation and the rent of the land were not deducted. However, an attempt to estimate these costs, in order to exclude them from the net income of the farm, would have been an impossible task, given the information and the resources available.

- 2.17 A farm frequently cultivates more than one crop. For this reason, the net income from the farm was computed by adding the net incomes originated in the production of each one of the individual crops considered. The annual output of the farm consisted of the products of vegetable origin cropped or collected during the year; of the products of animal origin obtained during the year and of the increment in the size and weight of the herd which resulted from the breeding, growing and fattening activities of the year.

The following 27 products of vegetable origin were taken into consideration:

avocados	coffee	plantain
bananas	corn	potatoes
beans	corn on the cob	rice
beets	lettuce	sorghum
cabagges	onions	string beans
cacao	oranges	sugar cane
carrots	papaya	sweet potatoes
cassava (yuca)	pineapple	tobacco
coconuts	plantain (guineo)	tomatoes

For each farm, the data about the total output of each one of these products were directly reported by the informant at the time when the census questionnaires were filled. Timber and other relatively less important products, in terms of volume of production and/or number of farms which produced them, were not considered. In other cases, the information required was not contained in the census. With respect to products of animal origin, only milk and eggs were considered, while honey, cheese and others were excluded. In order to estimate the annual production of milk and of eggs, the daily production was multiplied by 365.

With respect to animals proper, only the production of beef, hogs and chickens was considered, excluding the production of rabbits, goats, horses and other animals. In this case, the census data are referred to the stock (number of heads) possessed by the farm on the day of the visit by the census interviewer. On the other hand, output is the result of a process assumed to take place throughout the year. During this process the stock changes: the number of

animals is modified by deaths, births, purchases and sales and the weight of the animals changes, while the animals may have been on the farm the whole or part of the year. In this case, the output of the farm consists of the net result of this process, both in terms of the number and of the weight of the animals.^{1/}

In order to estimate the net income from the farm it was necessary to find, in addition to the physical amount of production of each crop, the selling price of each one of them. These prices were obtained through specific investigations, as reported in Appendix A. While in some cases it was possible to get the price of the product at the farm level, in other cases only the selling price of the product in the market place was available. In the latter it became necessary to subtract transportation costs, in order to estimate the value of the output at the farm level.

The value of the output was computed by multiplying the amount of each crop produced by the corresponding price at the farm level. The value thus computed included both the portion of the production sold and the portion consumed on the farm.

On the other hand, the estimation of the costs of production was based, in general, on an input per hectare coefficient. This procedure was justified on the assumption that the producer, when

^{1/} Appendix A contains a detailed explanation of the methodology followed to estimate this production.

considering his production plans, makes decisions about the area that he expects to cultivate, but does not know the final outcome of his efforts, because he cannot completely control this result. As a consequence, it seemed more reasonable to compute costs of production as costs per unit of area (a hectare)

To estimate the cost of the materials used in the production of the farm it was necessary to first determine the level of technology employed. The study distinguished, in general, between those farms which employed a traditional technology and those farms which employed an advanced technology. A farm was considered to have employed an advanced technology when it had used fertilizer, irrigation, agricultural machinery or dusters. When the farm did not use any of these, it was considered that it employed a traditional technology. The distinction was applied to each one of the specific crops.^{1/}

In general, it was not possible to determine, on the basis of the information contained in the agricultural census of 1973, the level of technology employed for each product on each farm. Instead, the yield per cultivated area for each crop was estimated, either for the whole country or for several regions. When the yield per hectare in a given farm was above the modal yield, it was assumed that this farm had employed an advanced technology, while in all other cases it was assumed that it had employed a traditional technology.

^{1/} See Appendix A.

- 2.19 In effect, the costs of production per hectare were estimated on the assumption that either an advanced or a traditional technology were employed. In addition to the value of the materials used, these costs included the value of the labor required by this production. That is, total cost per hectare resulted from the addition of the cost of the materials per hectare and the labor cost per hectare. The latter was computed on the basis of an estimation of the number of working days required per hectare in the case of each product -according to the technology employed- and on the basis of the corresponding daily wage. The information concerning both the levels of agricultural daily wages and the technical coefficients relative to the amounts of labor required were obtained through specific investigations, for the whole country or for some regions, independently of the agricultural census of 1973.
- 2.20 The procedure adopted to estimate the amount of wages paid to labor hired from outside of the farming family was the following:
- a. the number of men-hours required for the production of the farm (amount of labor demanded), was determined according to the amounts of each crop produced, the area cultivated and the technical requirements of labor in each case;
 - b. the amount of labor at the disposal of each family was computed, according to the number of members and their ages;
 - c. the amount of work performed by the members of the family outside

the farm, either in the agricultural sector or in other sectors of the economy, was subtracted from the availability of family labor, in order to estimate the amount of labor that the family could have devoted to the farm; and

- d. finally, the time that the family could have devoted to the farm (c) was subtracted from the time required by the production of the farm (a). When the result from this subtraction was negative, it was assumed that the farm had to hire workers from outside the family, since the amount of labor that this could have supplied was insufficient.
- e. Once the amount of labor that each farm had to hire from outside the family was estimated, the amount of wages that it must have paid for it was computed.

2.21 When the house occupied by the family was owned by it or enjoyed free of charge, an income equivalent to the rent that otherwise would have been paid was imputed to the family. This amount was considered as part of the family's income, since it is attributable to a service enjoyed by it, even though the family did not pay for it at the time of the census.

In effect, an average rent estimated according to the condition of the house (good, fair or bad) and according to its location by canton and by rural and urban area was assigned to each house, owned

Table 2.02

AVERAGE RENT ACCORDING TO CANTON, URBAN AND RURAL AREA
AND THE CONDITION OF THE HOUSE (GOOD, FAIR, BAD), 1973
(Colones per month)

CANTON	CODE	AVERAGE RENT					
		URBAN			RURAL		
		Good	Fair	Bad	Good	Fair	Bad
San José	101	581	293	211	76	143	139
Escazú	102	762	205	126	01	100	83
Desamparados	103	310	216	169	53	105	100
Puriscal	104	229	205	130	20	100	86
Tarrazú	105	173	106	100	31	52	50
Aserrí	106	218	163	114	15	79	76
Mora	107	219	138	89	15	67	59
Goicoechea	108	430	255	214	26	124	120
Santa Ana	109	411	178	97	16	87	64
Alajuelita	110	230	186	149	21	91	90
Coronado	111	302	207	182	59	101	100
Acosta	112	223	135	102	17	66	60
Tibás	113	409	243	175	15	119	116
Moravia	114	655	236	194	15	115	110
Montes de Oca	115	692	287	204	34	140	135
Turrubares	116	93	88	...	19	43	...
Dota	117	200	92	64	05	45	40
Curridabat	118	369	216	145	34	105	90
Pérez Zeledón	119	251	170	124	32	83	80

Cuadro 2.02 - Cont ...

CANTON	CODE	AVERAGE RENT					
		URBAN			RURAL		
		Good	Fair	Bad	Good	Fair	Bad
León Cortés	120	90	66	60	48	32	32
Alajuela	201	417	265	127	179	136	98
San Ramón	202	348	252	109	149	130	84
Grecia	203	400	216	107	267	111	82
San Mateo	204	78	106	64	34	34	30
Atenas	205	240	153	116	103	79	70
Naranjo	206	278	191	90	119	99	69
Palmares	207	293	183	102	126	94	78
Poás	208	218	117	76	94	60	50
Orotina	209	165	122	97	71	63	60
San Carlos	210	310	261	116	133	100	89
Alfaro Ruiz	211	222	206	64	95	90	49
Valverde Vega	212	237	206	75	102	90	58
Upala	213	184	180	123	79	70	70
Los Chiles	214	170	99	64	73	51	49
Guatuso	215	329	83	64	141	42	40
Cartago	301	341	221	129	166	126	103
Paraíso	302	202	182	92	98	104	73
La Unión	303	350	210	109	170	120	88
Jiménez	304	210	144	81	102	82	66
Turrialba	305	373	176	97	181	101	78

Cuadro 2.02 - Cont ...

CANTON	CODE	AVERAGE RENT					
		URBAN			RURAL		
		Good	Fair	Bad	Good	Fair	Bad
Alvarado	306	210	144	81	102	82	66
Oreamuno	307	210	144	81	102	82	66
El Guarco	308	210	144	81	102	82	66
Heredia	401	537	306	159	241	140	130
Barva	402	258	164	76	116	75	63
Santo Domingo	403	389	236	94	174	108	79
Santa Bárbara	404	261	250	94	117	110	79
San Rafael	405	282	172	94	127	79	70
San Isidro	406	282	172	94	127	79	70
Belén	407	282	172	94	127	79	70
Flores	408	282	172	94	127	79	70
San Pablo	409	282	172	94	127	79	70
Sarapiquí	410	219	190	98	98	87	80
Liberia	501	416	226	88	178	129	74
Nicoya	502	390	187	70	167	107	59
Santa Cruz	503	396	213	110	170	122	92
Bagaces	504	238	137	70	102	78	59
Carrillo	505	205	140	83	88	80	69
Cañas	506	377	164	75	162	94	62
Abangares	507	274	176	74	118	101	62
Tilarán	508	279	188	86	120	108	73

Cuadro 2.02 - Cont ...

CANTON		AVERAGE RENT					
		URBAN			RURAL		
		Good	Fair	Bad	Good	Fair	Bad
Nandayure	509	261	141	67	112	81	56
La Cruz	510	261	141	67	112	81	56
Hojancha	511	261	141	67	112	81	56
Puntarenas	601	332	269	191	195	151	140
Esparta	602	239	178	89	147	100	65
Buenos Aires	603	218	134	79	128	75	58
Montes de Oro	604	149	110	77	87	62	57
Osa	605	227	196	109	133	110	80
Aguirre	606	277	199	143	162	112	105
Golfito	607	278	196	102	163	111	75
Coto Brus	608	317	149	98	186	84	72
Parrita	609	275	192	109	161	107	80
Limón	701	347	257	169	171	133	121
Pococí	702	307	170	77	151	88	56
Siquirres	703	256	170	97	126	88	69
Talamanca	704	68	60	76	40	40	40
Matina	705	109	100	66	54	50	47
Guácimo	706	156	120	81	77	62	58

Source: Dirección General de Estadística y Censos.
Censos Nacionales de 1973, Vivienda. San José, 1974.

or free of charge.^{1/} The computation of the imputed rents was based on the figures contained in the housing census of 1973. The rents thus estimated appear in Table 2.02.

The procedure followed cannot be completely justified, to the extent to which the imputation of a higher or of a lower rent was based on the condition of the house and not on its size and quality, but the latter information was not available. Thus, in reality a higher rent may correspond to a large house built with expensive materials, but in bad condition, than to a small house, built with cheaper materials, but in good condition. Nevertheless, the procedure followed assigned a higher imputed rent to the latter than to the former.

During the third generation of computations, only 15 percent of the amount of the rent was imputed as part of the income of families living in their own house or in one free of charge. The obvious consequence of this procedure was to increase the number of the poor.^{2/}

1/ Detailed definitions of housing and of the various forms of tenure appear in the Glossary.

2/ Since in the case of farming families, the third generation differs from the second generation with respect to more than one criteria, it is not possible to know exactly the extent to which the number of poor farmers increased as a consequence. However, in the case of non-farming families, both urban and rural, this was the only difference between the two generations. In this case, the number of poor farmers increased from 63,315 to 87,558. The increase was more pronounced in the urban areas.

2.22 In summary, during the first and the second generations of computations, the total net income of the families was estimated on the basis of the following addition:

- a. the wages earned outside of the farms by remunerated workers, both in the agricultural sector as well as in other sectors of the economy, and the wages imputed to self-employed workers and to employers, for the labor performed outside of the farms; plus
- b. the wages imputed to the members of the family for their work on the farm, estimated according to the technical coefficients and daily wages; plus
- c. the net income of the farm, as a result of its exploitation; plus
- d. the imputed value of firewood used for cooking and not purchased in the market; and plus
- e. the imputed rent when the family lived in its own house or in one free of charge.

Once the total net income of the family was computed, the average income per member of the family was computed by dividing the total net income by the number of members. On the basis of this income per capita and according to the various definitions of poverty, the poor were separated from the non poor. In addition, both the population of the poor and the population of the non poor were

subdivided, between urban and rural and, in turn, the rural population was subdivided between farmers and non farmers.^{1/}

C. CHARACTERISTICS OF POVERTY

2.23 The geographic distribution of poverty received special attention in this study. That is, the study investigated the proportion that the poor represented of the total population of each administrative division of the country. This analysis (for each cantón) covered not only the total population but also its subdivisions between urban and rural and between farming and non farming.

2.24 Another aspect which received special attention was the geographic concentration of poverty, i.e. the proportion of the poor of the country that were located in a given administrative division (a cantón). This analysis was referred, too, not only to the total population of the country, but also to each one of the subdivisions of this population considered in the study. For example, the study investigated the percentage of the poor rural non-farming population that is located in a given administrative division.

The attention devoted to this topic is a recognition that there are areas where poverty is concentrated which do not correspond to

^{1/} This classification ignores the fact that the census reports a few urban farms (3,160). As it is indicated in the tabulations, in some cases these urban farms were included along with the rural farms, while in other cases they were included among the urban population.

environments unfavorable to the human welfare. This statement reflects a working hypothesis according to which poverty, in a spatial sense, is proper of certain geographic spaces which imply a difficult relationship of man with the environment. However, poverty is a characteristic also of environments favorable to human activities.

2.25 A series of characteristics, considered likely to accompany poverty, were studied with respect to the various categories of the poor (urban and rural, farming and non-farming). The characteristics studied were divided into two classes:

- a. those relative to what might be called the environment of poverty, and
- b. those relative to the utilization of the environment.

In the first case the objective was to verify if the circumstances, a product of past situations, differ for the poor in comparison with the non poor, as well as if these circumstances differ with respect to the various categories of the poor. In particular, this implied an examination of differences among the demographic and social characteristics of the various groups. On the other hand, the characteristics relative to the utilization of the environment are basically referred to the manner in which income is generated.^{1/}

^{1/} In Chapter III the analysis of the results of the study has been organized by distinguishing the demographic and social characteristics of the various groups, the characteristics with an

In order to decide if a given characteristic was or was not specific to poverty, it was investigated if it was shared or not by both the poor and the non poor. That is, when a given characteristic was shared by both groups, it was considered as not proper to poverty.

- 2.26 Once the group of the poor was separated from the non poor, both in the case of the total population, as in the case of each one of its subdivisions (urban families and rural families and, among these, farming families and non-farming families), the typical values of a series of demographic, social and economic characteristics were estimated, for all the administrative divisions of the country (provinces and cantones), in order to determine if the differences among the typical values corresponding to the various groups of families were significant.

In effect, during the three generations of computations the study attempted to generate information, both at the country level and at the level of the seven provinces and of the 79 cantones, which would allow the establishment of a relationship between the average income level for each group of families and other of their demographic, social and economic characteristics.

During the first generation of computations the study attempted a

specifically economic meaning and those characteristics traditionally affected by policies of public expenditures.

classification of the families among deciles, according to the average level of the annual income per member of the family. The study also attempted to compute several statistical indicators, including the range of the family income, its standard deviation, its coefficient of variation and its upper and lower limits, for each one of the deciles.

The demographic characteristics of the groups of families studied, in relation to the average income level per member of the family, were the following:

- a. the size of the family;
- b. the age of the head of the family;
- c. the age distribution of the family group and the sex of its members;
- d. the dependency index;^{1/} and
- e. fertility, according to the mother's age, both in the sense of the average number of children born alive per woman and in the sense of the average number of living children per woman.

The social characteristics of each group of families, to be related to the average income level per family member, were the following:

- a. the index of schooling, for the population of seven years and older;
- b. the rate of illiteracy, for the population of ten years and older;

^{1/} All the concepts are adequately defined in Appendix A, the Glossary.

- c. the level of formal education of the head of the family;
- d. the form of tenure of the house;
- e. the condition of the house;
- f. the index of overcrowding; and
- g. access to certain services (water, sewer, electricity) and the use of certain appliances (radio).

Finally, the economic characteristics of each group of families examined were the following:

- a. the average number of persons between 15 and 64 years old, per family, as well as their participation in the economically active population;
- b. the composition of the economically active population, by sex and by age groups;
- c. the sector of economic activity of the head of the family;
- d. for the members of the economically active population, if they worked, if they did not work or if they were looking for a job;
- e. the rate of activity, by sex and by age group;
- f. the rate of unemployment of the economically active population, by sex and by level of formal education;
- g. the type of occupation, by sex;
- h. the percentage of migrants;
- i. the average age of the head of the family and the index of schooling of the family, if it was a migrant family or not;
- k. the use of the land (in cultivation, permanent crops, pastures, woods and others) by the farming families;

- l. the size of the farms;
- m. the use of alternative technologies (fertilizer, irrigation and various types of agricultural machinery);
- n. the value of output per hectare, according to the technology employed;
- o. the sources of the family income, in the case of farmers, through the estimation, on the one hand, of the wages imputed for the family labor on the farm and the wages earned outside of the farm, either in the agricultural sector or in other sectors of the economy, and, on the other hand, of the net income of the farm, as already indicated, as well as the income imputed for the consumption of firewood and because the family lived in its own house or in one free of charge;
- p. the average annual wages, earned or imputed, of the members of the economically active population who had a job;
- q. the excess supply of family labor, according to the size of the farm and the size of the family;
- r. the monetized portion of the family income, according to the main agricultural product cultivated by the farming family;
- s. the sensitivity of the condition of poverty (of the number of the poor) with respect to increases of 5 percent in the price of the main agricultural product cultivated by the farming family; and

t. the value of output per hectare of various agricultural products, according to the employment of various kinds of agricultural machinery.

As already indicated, the criterion to separate the poor farmers from the non-poor farmers, taking into account the possession of land by the family, was modified during the second generation of computations. For this reason, during this second generation the study again attempted to obtain the demographic, social and economic information examined during the first generation, for the farming families of the country. This would have allowed a comparison between the results of the two generations.

Finally, as it has been indicated, too, several changes in the definition of poverty and in the methodology employed to estimate incomes were introduced during the third generation. The study attempted to analyze, during this generation, the sources of income of the farming families, the size of the farm and the use of the land, the average size of the family, the monetization of income and the value of output per cultivated area.

2.27 The previous sections have described what the study attempted and the various methodologies employed to achieve it. Unfortunately, it was not possible to finally get all the information desired, since several programming errors have been found with respect to each one of the three generations -shortcomings which took place during the stage of electronic computation, which was outside the

control of the Academia- and which invalidate a very important portion of the data produced. It was not possible to correct these mistakes, given the limitations imposed by time and the resources available.

The most important programming errors affected the estimation of the incomes of the farming families, since the program operated incorrectly with the amounts both of the wages paid during the exploitation of the farm to persons outside of the farming families and of the wages imputed for the work of the family at the farm.^{1/} These mistakes resulted in an incorrect estimation of the income of the farming families, underestimating it in the case of the first and of the second generations and overestimating it in the case of the third generation. They also resulted in the incorrect estimation of all those indicators in whose estimation the study employed the distinction between poor farmers and non-poor farmers.

1/

In the case of the first and of the second generations, instead of adding the income imputed for the family labor on the farm, the program added the amount of the wages paid to labor hired outside of the family, for the estimation of the family incomes. Since the item added represented a much smaller portion of the cost of labor in the exploitation of the farm, than the item omitted, the family's income was underestimated to that extent. In the case of the third generation, the cost of the family labor was not deducted while estimating the net income of the farm and this error resulted in a corresponding overestimation of the family income.

As a consequence of another programming error, the farming families of the province of Guanacaste were added to the non-farming rural families of this province, when computing the latter figure, resulting in an excess of 11,000 families and of 74,000 persons, with respect to this province and with respect to the country in general.^{1/}

For all these reasons, the present publication reports only a small portion of the information that the study attempted to generate. It is expected that the errors made will be corrected in the future and that, through new generations of computations, with a relatively small marginal effort, it will be possible to produce a very substantial amount of information, given the magnitude of the job as it has been performed up to this moment. This new information will complement the present effort and will be very useful, among other things, for the study of poverty in Costa Rica.

- 2.28 The Statistical Annex presents information relative to the urban families and to the non-farming rural families, since the programming

^{1/} The total number of persons that results in the study (1,955,730) is greater than the number of persons that appears in the population census of 1973 (1,871,780), both because of the programming error reported and because, during the matching of the agricultural census and of the population census, when a family was assigned to each census farm, some families were taken into consideration more than once, if they possessed more than one farm. On the other hand, the total area in hectares of the farms that appear in the study (2,251,000) is less than the extension of the farms of the country according to the agricultural census of 1973, which reports 3,122,000 hectares, since farms owned by corporations could not be assigned to a specific family during the matching procedure.

errors relative to the income of the farming families did not invalidate the computation of the income corresponding to these other groups of families.

For these families, the information published includes: the classification of the families by deciles and by quartiles of income, the statistical parameters relative to the average income per family member and the demographic, social and economic indicators as follows:

- a. the average size of the family;
- b. the average number of persons between 15 and 64 years old per family;
- c. the age of the head of the family;
- d. the level of formal education of the head of the family;
- e. the economic activity of the head of the family;
- f. the index of dependency;
- g. the condition of activity of the members of the family;
- h. the composition of the economically active population by sex and age group;
- i. the rate of unemployment of the economically active population by sex and by level of formal education;
- j. the index of schooling and the rate of illiteracy;
- k. the tenure and condition of the house;
- l. fertility; and
- m. the level of the wages earned and imputed.

The previous information is presented according to the estimations generated during the first generation of computations.

In chapter three, which describes some of the most salient demographic, social and economic characteristics which accompany poverty in Costa Rica, some of the data presented, produced during one or more of the three generations of computations, are affected by the programming errors described. These data are presented in view of their possible utility, but they should be treated with extreme caution. Relative and ordinal figures were used in several cases, since these have suffered less the impact of the mistakes mentioned.

CHAPTER. III

OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS ABOUT POVERTY

- 3.01 The comments and observations about poverty contained in this chapter are an attempt to examine the extent to which the available information allows an identification of significant enough differences among the groups of the poor and of the non poor. If significant differences are discovered, then it would be possible to compare an "ideal type" of the poor with another one corresponding to the non poor. The objective would be to answer the questions: which ones are the main differences between the poor and the non poor and which ones, among these differences, are more pronounced.
- 3.02 With this objective in mind, the following comments and observations have been grouped into four sections. The first one contains a global analysis of the situation of poverty. The second one includes information about some demographic and social characteristics of the poor and of the non poor. The third section presents data about some economic features of these groups and the fourth one examines how much access the poor have to certain services affected mostly by policies of public expenditures. It is assumed that if there are not important differences between the poor and the non poor, with respect to access to these services, this would mean that the government expenditures have been able to reduce the expected differences. On the other hand, if sharp differences

persist, this would indicate that the public expenditures have not been sufficient or have been unable to reduce such differences.

3.03 In order to prevent a mistaken interpretation or wrong inferences from certain statements, it is important to keep in mind that an assertion about the level of poverty of a given group (e.g. poor families, poor farming families, etc.) or a comparison of the degree of poverty among various geographical areas (e.g. provinces, cantones, etc.) can be made from any of the following points of view:

- i) In absolute terms one may be comparing the average income of the total number of families (poor and non poor) in a given administrative unit (e.g. a province) or of a given category (e.g. farmers), with the average income of another administrative unit or of another category. Alternatively, one may be comparing the average income of the poor families of a given administrative unit or of a given category, with the average income of the poor families of another administrative unit or category.
- ii) In relative terms one may be comparing the number of poor families (their total or the number corresponding to a certain category), in a given administrative unit (e.g. a province) as a proportion of the total number of poor farmers

(of the same category) in a larger administrative unit (e.g. the country). Alternatively, one may be comparing the number of poor families of a given category (e.g. urban or rural, farmers or non farmers) in a given administrative unit as a proportion of the total number of families of the same category in such a unit. The term concentration will be used to refer to the first type of proportion, while the term distribution will be used to refer to the second one.

A. POVERTY AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL

A-1 Global figures

3.04 The number of poor families in the country differs significantly depending on which one of the methodologies or on which one of their variants is used. The differences are marked: the number of poor families ranges between 79,000, according to the results of methodology II, and 177,000, according to methodology III 1. In relative terms, this implies that the poor families may represent between one-quarter and one-half of the total number of families in the country.^{1/}

^{1/} Methodology II means the one used during the second generation of computations, as described in Chapter II. In the case of the third generation, the variants of the corresponding methodology III c., III m. and III l. are referred to the employment of a conservative, of a moderate and of a liberal definition of poverty, respectively.

3.05 Table 3.01 indicates that the proportion that the poor represent among the urban population is always less than one-half of the proportion that the poor represent among the rural population, irrespective of the methodology employed. At the most (for methodology III l.), the urban poor represent one-third of the urban families of the country, while the rural poor are, at least, one third of the rural families of the country and, in some cases (methodologies III m. and III l.) they represent over 50 percent of them. This seems to indicate that, in general, the rural areas are "poorer" than the urban areas.^{1/} In the case of the poor among the rural population, poor farmers represent a proportion of the total number of farmers of the country which is very similar to the proportion represented by the poor among the non-farming rural population.

1/ A greater proportion of poor families among the rural population does not necessarily imply that the average income per capita of the rural population is lower than the average income per capita of the urban population. Neither does it imply that the average income per capita of the rural poor is lower than the average income per capita of the urban poor. Unfortunately, it was not possible to get reliable figures about the incomes of the rural poor.

65

Table 3.01
PROPORTION OF POOR FAMILIES IN THE COUNTRY

	METHODOLOGIES				
	I	II	III c.	III m.	III l.
Poor families as a % of the total number of families in the country	24.5	23.0	35.6	44.1	51.4
Poor urban families as a % of the urban families of the country	13.8	13.8	22.1	28.5	35.0
Poor rural families as a % of the rural families of the country	31.9	29.2	44.9	54.8	62.8
Poor farming families as a % of the farming families of the country	28.6	20.7	47.3	55.4	62.0
Poor non-farming rural families as a % of the non-farming rural families of the country	33.8	33.8	43.6	54.5	63.3

Source: Academia de Centro América

3.06 The classification of the poor families of the country into urban and rural and, of the latter, into farmers and non-farmers, is presented in Table 3.02. Two observations are relevant:

- 1) The distribution of the poor families into urban and rural is fairly constant, for all the methodologies used and for all their variants. The rural poor represent about 75 percent of the poor families of the country and the urban poor represent the remaining 25 percent.

- ii) Among the rural poor, the non-farming families represent about twice the number of the farming families in this category. Rural poverty, therefore, consists of two-thirds of non-farming families and one-third of farming families.

TABLE 3.02

CLASSIFICATION OF THE POOR FAMILIES OF THE COUNTRY ACCORDING
TO URBAN AND RURAL AND TO FARMING AND NON FARMING ^{1/}

	METHODOLOGIES				
	I	II	III c.	III m.	III l.
a. Poor urban families	25.3	25.3	25.5	26.5	27.9
b. Poor rural families (c+d)	<u>74.7</u>	<u>74.7</u>	<u>74.5</u>	<u>73.5</u>	<u>72.1</u>
c. Poor farmers	27.0	20.0	28.4	26.9	25.7
d. Poor non-farming rural families	47.7	54.7	46.1	46.6	46.4

Source: Academia de Centro América.

A-2 Geographic concentration

3.07 With respect to the concentration of poverty in the country (the proportion of the total number of poor families in the country located in each province), the relative importance of each of the provinces does not change with each of the three methodologies and

^{1/} Each group of poor families as a proportion of the total number of poor families in the country.

their variants (Table 3.03). In effect, San José and Alajuela possess, among themselves, about one-half of the total number of poor families in the country, either in the case of the urban poor or in the case of the rural poor, farmers and non farmers. The provinces of Heredia and Limón, on the other hand, possess each one of them about 6 percent of the poor families of the country. The following remarks are relevant:

- i) as one would expect, a high proportion (almost one-half) of all the urban poor of the country are concentrated in the province of San José, and
- ii) in an analysis of the concentration of the poor rural non-farming families, the provinces with the greatest numbers are San José and Alajuela.^{1/}

3.08 Table 3.04 contains information about the coefficient of elasticity of the geographic concentration of poverty, for each one of the provinces of the country. This coefficient results from the division of the percentage of the poor (total number of poor in a given province divided by the total number of poor in the country) by the percentage of the population (population of a province divided by the total population of the country). It appears that for certain

^{1/} Section 3.08 examines a coefficient of elasticity of poverty which relates the concentration of the poor with the concentration of the total population of each province. Appendix C contains data about the concentration and distribution of the different groups of the poor by province.

provinces like San José, Heredia and Puntarenas, this coefficient is less than one, indicating that the poor are relatively less concentrated in those provinces than the total population, while for some other provinces, particularly Guanacaste, the coefficient is greater than one.

Table 3.03
GEOGRAPHIC CONCENTRATION OF THE TOTAL NUMBER
OF POOR FAMILIES IN THE COUNTRY

PROVINCES	METHODOLOGIES				
	I	II	III c.	III m.	III l.
San José	0.28	0.29	0.28	0.29	0.30
Alajuela	0.21	0.21	0.20	0.19	0.19
Cartago	0.12	0.12	0.11	0.11	0.11
Heredia	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.06
Guanacaste	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.16	0.16
Puntarenas	0.11	0.10	0.13	0.13	0.13
Limón	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06

Source: Academia de Centro América.

When the different groups of the poor are examined individually, several interesting questions emerge :

- i) with respect to the poor farmers, the most unfavorable situation appears in Cartago;

- ii) with respect to the non-farming poor, the most adverse situation appears in Guanacaste;
- iii) with respect to the poor rural population, again the provinces of Cartago and of Guanacaste present the worst situation; and
- iv) the urban population shows high coefficients for Limon and Puntarenas, highlighting an important concentration of poverty in the port areas of the Pacific and of the Atlantic.

Table 3.04

**COEFFICIENT OF ELASTICITY OF THE GEOGRAPHIC
CONCENTRATION OF POVERTY ^{1/}**

	F A M I L I E S				
	Farming	Rural non farming	Rural	Urban	Total
<u>Costa Rica</u>					
San José	1.12	1.00	1.02	0.78	0.77
Alajuela	1.07	1.18	1.12	1.33	1.27
Cartago	1.52	1.05	1.18	1.14	1.22
Heredía	0.93	0.75	0.82	0.82	0.84
Guanacaste	0.98	1.24	1.19	1.75	1.43
Puntarenas	0.66	0.75	0.71	1.35	1.88
Limón	0.61	0.72	0.70	1.44	1.00

^{1/} On the basis of the data from methodology II.

Source: Academia de Centro América.

A-3 Geographic distribution

- 3.09 The distribution of poverty by province did not experience significant changes as the methodologies were modified or with respect to their variants, either (Table 3.05). San José is the "less poor" province (lower percentage represented by the poor families of this province with respect to the total number of families in the province), although this is the province where the largest number of poor families in the country live. Heredia is the second province "less poor". On the contrary, Guanacaste and afterwards Alajuela are the provinces with greater poverty, in this respect, for all the methodologies.
- 3.10 An important change is observed, once the poor farmers are segregated, when one moves from methodologies I and II to methodology III;
- i) while with methodologies I and II Cartago and San José are the provinces for which the proportion of poor farmers with respect to the total number of farmers is higher, with methodology III this is the case for Guanacaste and Puntarenas.
 - ii) Puntarenas is the province which experiences the greatest change: with methodologies I and II it occupies one of the first places, while with methodology III it becomes one of the provinces for which the proportion of poor farmers with respect to their total is greater;

- iii) the province of Limón shows, in this respect, a good relative position with the three methodologies.

Table 3.05

GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF
POOR FAMILIES IN THE COUNTRY

PROVINCE	METHODOLOGIES				
	I	II	III c.	III m.	III l.
San José	0.18	0.18	0.27	0.35	0.41
Alajuela	0.31	0.29	0.43	0.52	0.59
Cartago	0.28	0.28	0.39	0.49	0.57
Heredia	0.20	0.19	0.28	0.37	0.45
Guanacaste	0.36	0.33	0.51	0.61	0.69
Puntarenas	0.23	0.20	0.40	0.49	0.56
Limón	0.23	0.20	0.31	0.39	0.47
COSTA RICA	0.24	0.23	0.36	0.44	0.51

Source: Academia de Centro América.

3.11 The information contained in Table 3.06 for the 10 "poorest" cantones, and in Table 3.07, for the 10 "least poor" cantones, results from the classification, given the different methodologies, of the cantones of the country according to the distribution of poverty. Several facts should be mentioned:

- i) there is a greater constancy among the least poor cantones than among the poorest, as the methodology used is changed.

Among the 10 least poor cantones with methodology II and with all the variants of methodology III there are eight common cantones: Montes de Oca, Tibás, San José Central, Heredia Central, Moravia, Goicoechea, Curridabat and Desamparados. In the case of the 10 poorest cantones, on the contrary, only four were common to the two methodologies: Turrubares, Orotina, Dota and Mora.

- ii) The canton of Turrubares is the poorest canton in the country, irrespective of the methodology employed.
- iii) The cantones of Montes de Oca and of Tibás are the least poor cantones of the country, irrespective of which methodology is used.
- iv) It seems that, according to its distribution, the greatest poverty of the country can be found in a series of cantones which constitute a sort of semi-circle (half-moon) towards the West and the South of the Central Valley, consisting mainly of the following cantones: San Mateo, Orotina, Turrubares, Puriscal, Mora, Acosta, Dota, Tarrazú and León Cantón

B. DEMOGRAPHIC AND SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS

B-1 Family size

- 3.12 From the information gathered through the application of each one of the different methodologies, it appears that, as the average family

Table 3.06

GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF POVERTY. TEN CANTONES WITH THE HIGHEST
PERCENTAGE OF POOR FAMILIES, WITH RESPECT TO THEIR TOTAL POPULATION

Ranking of the cantones	M E T H O D O L O G I E S							
	II	%	III c.	%	III m.	%	III l.	%
1	Turrubares	48	Turrubares	69	Turrubares	76	Turrubares	81
2	Orotina	47	Puriscal	60	Acosta	70	Acosta	76
3	Dota	45	Acosta	60	Puriscal	69	Puriscal	74
4	San Mateo	44	Mora	56	Los Chiles	66	Los Chiles	73
5	Carrillo	43	Dota	56	Bagaces	65	La Cruz	73
6	Mora	42	Los Chiles	56	La Cruz	65	Hojancha	73
7	La Cruz	40	Nicoya	55	Alvarado	64	León Cortés	72
8	Jiménez	40	Santa Cruz	55	Nicoya	64	Upala	72
9	Alvarado	40	San Mateo	54	Mora	64	Nicoya	72
10	Aserri	40	Orotina ^{1/}	54	Santa Cruz ^{2/}	64	Bagaces y Nandayure	72

^{1/} The cantones of Bagaces, Carrillo, Hojancha and Buenos Aires have 54 % too.

^{2/} The cantones of Hojancha, Buenos Aires and León Cortés have 64 %, too.

Source: Academia de Centro América.

Table 3.07

GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF POVERTY. TEN CANTONES WITH THE LOWEST
PERCENTAGE OF POOR FAMILIES, WITH RESPECT TO THEIR TOTAL POPULATION

Ranking of the cantones	M E T H O D O L O G I E S							
	II	%	III c.	%	III m.	%	III l.	%
79	Montes de Oca	10	Montes de Oca	16	Montes de Oca	22	Montes de Oca	28
78	Tibás	10	Tibás	17	Tibás	23	Tibás	29
77	* San José	11	Moravia	18	*San José	24	*San José	30
76	* Heredia	12	*San José	19	Moravia	25	Moravia	32
75	Moravia	12	Goicoechea	19	Goicoechea	25	Goicoechea	33
74	Goicoechea	12	Curridabat	20	*Heredia	28	*Heredia	34
73	Curridabat	14	*Heredia	21	Curridabat	28	Curridabat	37
72	Desamparados	18	Desamparados	24	*Limón	31	Desamparados	39
71	Flores	18	*Limón	25	Desamparados	32	*Limón	39
70	Santo Domingo	18	Belén	26	Belén & Santo Domingo	34	Belén ^{1/}	43

* Implies the central canton of each province.

1/ The cantones of Santo Domingo and of Escazú have 43 %, too.

Source: Academia de Centro América.

income increases, greater is, *pari passu*, the average size of the family. This higher family income as the family's size increases can be explained, at least in part, by the largest proportion of members old enough to work included in the larger families, as shown in Tables 1A and 1B of the Statistical Annex. In turn, due to biological-demographic factors, the latter families tend to be "older", since the average age of their heads is greater (see Tables 2A and 2B of the Statistical Annex).

- 3.13 When the families are classified into poor and non poor, it appears that the size of the former is larger than that of the latter. In the case of methodology III, for which the division between the poor and the non-poor families takes place at a level of income per capita of $\text{C} 1,100$, the average size of the non-poor families is 5.3 members, while the average size of the poor families is 6.3 members; that is, there is a difference of about one person per family. It should also be mentioned that, as the level of income per capita employed in the classification of the families into poor and non poor increases to $\text{C} 1,400$ and to $\text{C} 1,700$, the difference between the average sizes of these two groups of families tends to increase. In effect, when the limiting income becomes $\text{C} 1,700$, there is a difference of 1.4 members, since the non-poor families possess on the average five members and the poor families possess on the average 6.4 members.

3.14 In general, poor families tend to have more members than non-poor families. In addition, rural families are larger than urban families and farming families tend to be larger than non-farming families.

Table 3.08
SOME DEMOGRAPHIC INDICATORS OF POOR
AND NON-POOR FAMILIES 1/

	Total	Poor	Non Poor
Total number of families (5)	100.0	22.9	77.1
Average size of the family	5.7	6.6	5.4
Members of the economically active population per family	1.6	1.1	1.8
Rate of open unemployment (%)	6.0	14.0	4.0
Index of dependency	0.91	1.53	0.75
Rate of activity (%)	0.55	0.43	0.59

1/ Methodology II

Source: Academia de Centro América

B-2 Age structure and dependency index

3.15 Table 3.08 includes information concerning the index of dependency. It suggests that there is a marked difference between the age structures of the group of poor families and the group of non-poor families. Among the latter, for each four persons in age of working (from 15 years old to less than 65 years old) there are

other three persons younger or older (less than 15 years old or over 65 years of age); while among poor families for each four persons in age of working, there are six other persons younger or older. For this reason, the index of dependency for poor families (1.53) is twice that for non-poor families (0.75). This helps to explain why:

- i) among the poor families, for every 100 persons, 40 persons have an age between 15 and 65 years, while among the non-poor families, for every 100 persons, there are 57 persons in that age group, and why
- ii) while among the non-poor families there is an average of 1.8 persons in the economically active population, among the poor families there is an average of only 1.1 persons in the economically active population.

B-3 Fertility

3.16 Fertility, measured as the average number of children born alive according to the age of the mother, is significantly higher in the rural areas than in the urban areas and among mothers from poor families than among mothers from non-poor families. This is the case for the various age groups of the mothers, as shown in Table 3.09.

Table 3.09
 AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHILDREN BORN ALIVE PER MOTHER,
 ACCORDING TO THE AGE OF THE MOTHER

AGE OF THE MOTHER	URBAN AREA			RURAL AREA		
	Total	Non poor	Poor	Total	Non poor	Poor
From 15 to 19 years old	0.10	0.10	0.13	0.21	0.22	0.19
From 20 to 29 years old	1.22	1.11	2.11	2.15	1.81	2.98
From 30 to 39 years old	3.64	3.29	5.51	5.78	5.10	6.72
From 40 to 49 years old	5.01	4.76	6.62	7.94	7.67	8.47
From 50 to 59 years old	5.08	5.00	5.64	7.92	7.97	7.76
60 years old and older	4.97	4.99	4.86	7.45	7.51	7.36

Source: Academia de Centro América.

B-4 Migration

3.17 Among the total number of poor families, according to methodology II, only 15 percent are migrants. The following observations are relevant in this connection:

- i) Non-poor families have migrated to a larger extent than poor families (except those in Alajuela and Limón). This is much less the case with respect to the rural non poor, which migrate less than the non poor among other groups.
- ii) Migration among urban families is systematically lower than among rural families, except for San José and Guana-
caste.

- iii) The distribution of the migratory patterns by provinces highlights the fact that Limón and Heredia show a proportion of migrants among the poor rural population higher than the other provinces, while Cartago and Guanacaste are the provinces with the lowest proportion of migrants among poor rural families. In the case of Limón, almost one-half of the rural population, both poor and non-poor families, are migrants.
- iv) Poor farmers migrate less than non-poor farmers, but the difference is not very marked.
- v) Heads of the family are slightly older among non-migrant rural families. This characteristic is more accentuated in the case of non-poor families: the head of non-migrant families is considerably older than the head of migrant families in this category.
- vi) As it is also the case for the total population, the index of schooling is higher among the migrant urban families than among the migrant rural families. There seems to be no association between schooling and migration, for the several categories of poverty.

Table 3.10
PROPORTION OF MIGRANT FAMILIES, POOR AND NON POOR

PROVINCE	RURAL FAMILIES		URBAN FAMILIES	
	Poor	Non poor	Poor	Non poor
San José	0.12	0.15	0.19	0.17
Alajuela	0.17	0.17	0.10	0.08
Cartago	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.05
Heredia	0.21	0.25	0.17	0.11
Guanacaste	0.11	0.14	0.13	0.12
Puntarenas	0.20	0.21	0.10	0.11
Limón	0.46	0.43	0.13	0.14
Costa Rica	0.15	0.19	0.15	0.14

Source: Academia de Centro América.

C. ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS ^{1/}

C-1 Activity of the family

3.18 For the whole country, the economically active population represented 55 percent of the total population. This activity rate was lower in the case of the poor than in the case of the non poor, since while 59 percent of the non-poor population was in the economically active population, only 43 percent of the poor were included in it. Among

^{1/} This description of the economic characteristics is based on the information gathered during the second generation.

the poor, the rate of activity was higher in the case of the farmers (49 percent) than in the case of the non farmers, urban and rural together (41 percent).

According to sex, among the masculine population the urban poor had the lowest activity rate (66 per cent). In all the other cases this rate of activity was above 84 percent (urban non poor). This rate was at a maximum in the case of the rural non poor (95 percent) and in the case of poor farmers (93 percent). Among the feminine population, the lowest activity rate was observed with respect to poor farming families (6 percent) and the highest rate was observed with respect to urban non-poor families (35 percent).

3.19 With respect to the various provinces, the lowest activity rate was found in Guanacaste and in Alajuela (53 percent) and the highest activity rate was found in Limón (59 percent). In the latter province appeared the highest activity rate among the non poor (63 percent), while the highest activity rate among the poor was observed in Cartago (46 percent). Finally, among the poor, the lowest activity rate was found in Guanacaste and in San José (42 percent).

3.20 On the average, the economically active population of the whole country included 1.64 members of each family. Among the poor, however, only an average of 1.11 members per family were included, while in the case of the non poor an average of 1.81 members per

family were. A lower participation was found among the urban poor (0.89 members per family) and among the non-farming rural poor (1.02 members per family).

In the case of the masculine population included in the economically active population, a lower proportion (going from 40 percent, among the non-farming rural poor, to 44 percent, among the urban non poor) was of 30 years old or younger, in comparison with the feminine population (for which the proportion went from 56 percent, among the urban poor, up to 72 percent, among poor farmers).

C-2 Sector of activity of the head of the family

3.21 While 56 percent of the heads of non-poor urban families were classified as occupied in the terciary sector, only 30 percent of the heads of poor urban families were classified in this sector. Among the urban non poor 23 percent were occupied in the secondary sector and only 16 percent were looking for a job for the first time. On the other hand, among the urban poor, only 16 percent of the heads of family worked in the secondary sector, while 46 percent were looking for a job for the first time.

Among the rural non-farming families, 53 percent of the heads of poor families worked in the primary sector, but only 46 percent of the heads of non-poor families did. For this category, among the non poor 18 percent worked in the secondary sector and 25 percent in the terciary sector, while among the poor only 9 percent worked

in the secondary sector and 13 percent worked in the tertiary sector.

About 26 percent of the heads of poor non-farming rural families were looking for a job for the first time, but this percentage represented 11 percent among the non poor in the category.

Obviously, the greatest proportion of the heads of the farming families worked in the primary sector (71 percent among the poor and 70 percent among the non poor), while 10 percent among the non poor and 18 percent among the poor were looking for a job for the first time.

C-3 Unemployment

3.22 For all the country, the members of the economically active population who were unemployed represented 6 percent of it. However, this rate of unemployment was significantly lower among the non poor (4 percent) than among the poor (14 percent). Among the non poor, the rate of unemployment was the same in the urban areas as in the rural areas.

Among the poor, the highest rate of unemployment was observed in the urban areas (26 percent), followed by rural non farmers (16 percent). Poor farmers, instead, presented a rate of unemployment of only 5 percent. Unemployment was maximum among the poor urban masculine population (33 percent).

The rate of unemployment was not very different, with respect to the total economically active population, for the various provinces

of the country, since it fluctuated between 5 percent (San José) and 7 percent (Heredia). In the case of non-poor families, only in the latter province was the rate higher than in the rest of the country (5, instead of 4 percent). In the case of poor families, on the other hand, there were significant differences. The rate of unemployment fluctuated between 12 percent (Guanacaste) or 13 percent (Alajuela and Cartago) and 19 percent (Limón) or 20 percent (Heredia).

In the case of non-poor families, the rate of unemployment was inversely related to the formal level of education achieved. That is, the higher the level of formal education achieved, the lower the rate of unemployment. Exactly the opposite was the case with respect to poor families, for which the rate of unemployment was higher the higher the level of education.

- 3.23 In summary, the poor families of the country are characterized by a lower proportion of their members being in the economically active population in comparison with non-poor families. In addition, a smaller number of persons per family were active, on the average, in the case of poor families than in the case of non-poor families. In turn, of this smaller number, a greater proportion were unemployed in the case of poor families. In effect, a smaller proportion of the poor worked, in comparison with the non poor, both because their rate of activity was lower and because their rate of unemployment

was higher. These associations among poverty, activity and employment are some of the most marked found in the study.

C-4 Land tenure

- 3.24 There are no significant differences between poor and non-poor farmers with respect to land tenure. In effect, the proportions of land owned by the farmer and of land possessed according to other forms of tenure (e.g. renting) are very similar, as shown in the following table:

Table 3.11
LAND TENURE, AREA OF FARMS AND POVERTY 1/
(Percentages)

FORM OF TENURE	NUMBER OF FARMS		AREA	
	Poor	Non poor	Poor	Non poor
Owned	83.09	85.57	91.10	89.79
Rented	7.65	3.95	1.16	1.15
Combined	9.01	10.30	7.60	8.87
Others	0.25	0.18	0.15	0.18
TOTAL	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

1/ Methodology II

C-5 Land use and technology

3.25 There is a fairly different use of land in poor farms than in non-poor farms. In effect, the former devote to annual crops and to permanent crops one-half of the area, while non-poor farmers devote to this cultivation less than one-fifth of the area. On the other hand, non-poor farmers devote to pastures and woods almost three-quarters of the area of their farms. Poor farmers, instead, devote 40 percent of the area of their farms to these activities.

Table 3.12

USE OF LAND BY POOR AND NON-POOR FARMERS 1/

	Total	Non-poor farmers	Poor farmers
Total Area	100.0	100.0	100.0
Cultivation of annual crops	10.7	10.5	26.3
Permanent crops	6.4	6.2	24.1
Pastures	51.2	51.3	35.2
Woods	21.1	21.3	3.4
Other	10.7	10.7	11.0

1/ Methodology II

Source: Academia de Centro América

3.26 With respect to poor farmers it is worthwhile to mention:

- i) that the smaller the size of the farm, the greater is the proportion of the area devoted to permanent crops and the smaller is the proportion devoted to pastures; that
- ii) land cultivated in annual crops represents approximately one-third of the area of poor farms of less than 4 hectares. For larger sizes the proportion decreases dramatically; and that
- iii) in larger poor farms (between 4 and 9.9 hectares), the proportion of the area devoted to pastures is very similar to the proportion corresponding to non-poor farms.

3.27 Non-poor farmers employ "modern" technologies much more frequently than poor farmers, namely dusters and other forms of machinery, as well as irrigation and fertilizer. This is the case in all the provinces of the country. It is interesting to note, however, that one-fourth of the poor farmers use fertilizer and that about one-third of the area covered by small farms is fertilized.

C-6 Sources of income

3.29 With respect to the income of poor farmers it is important to notice that if a rent is imputed when they live in their own houses or in a house free of charge and if an income is imputed for free firewood, these two items would represent (in the case of methodology II) almost 40 percent of the total income of the poor farmers. A free

house would represent about 31 percent and free firewood would represent between 6 and 7 percent. This is the reason why the way in which these two items are computed is decisive in an estimation of income levels. For example, if both items were completely eliminated from the computation, the proportion of poor farmers would increase substantially.^{1/}

Other determinants, such as the selling price of agricultural products, do not seem to possess such a marked influence on income levels. In effect, an increase of five percent in the price of the products reduced the amount of poor farmers by only 5 percent.

3.29 With respect to the incomes earned by farmers outside of their farms, it is interesting to note that:

- i) both in the case of poor farmers and in the case of non-poor farmers, the wages earned outside of their farms are originated mostly in work performed outside of the agricultural sector;
- ii) in the case of poor farmers, the wages earned outside of the agricultural sector represent (methodology II) approximately 15 percent of their total incomes, while in the case of non-poor farmers this proportion was 6 percent, and

^{1/} See note in pag. 37.

iii) the wages earned outside of the farm but in the agricultural sector itself do not represent a very significant proportion of total income, both in the case of poor and of non-poor farmers.

3.30 In all types of farm, consumption on the farm seems to be not much significant. This reflects a high degree of integration of the farmers to the monetary economy, which is an important characteristic of Costa Rican agriculture. In the case of poor farmers consumption on the farm represents (methodology II) not more than 3 percent of total income and in the case of non-poor farmers this proportion not even reaches one percent. It is interesting to notice that the lower the income level of poor farmers, the greater is the relative importance of consumption on the farm. In effect, for the poorest farmers, consumption on the farm represents approximately 16 percent of their total income.

3.31 When the poor farmers are classified according to the main crop cultivated, it appears (methodology II) that the most important main crop is coffee (for more than one-quarter of the poor farmers) and beef cattle (for 10 to 15 percent). An important change is observed when methodologies I and II are compared, namely that with the former the activity of the largest amount of poor farmers was beef cattle, while with the second one, coffee occupies the first place. It is important to keep in mind that the previous statement

does not imply that a farmer is poor because he is devoted to cattle raising or to coffee production.

D. IMPACT OF PUBLIC EXPENDITURES

D-1 Illiteracy

3.32 Costa Rica has devoted an important proportion of public expenditures to formal education. It is interesting, therefore, to inquire if, despite the expenses incurred, there are still important disparities between the poor and the non poor in this connection. In effect, the proportion of illiterates is greater among the poor than among the non poor, since among the former 15 percent of the persons 10 years old and older are illiterate, while among the latter only 9 percent are. For the country as a whole the rate of illiteracy is 10 percent.

The rate of illiteracy is three times greater among the rural families than among the urban ones, as indicated in the following table:

Table 3.13

ILLITERACY RATE, BY SEX, URBAN AND RURAL AREA AND CONDITION OF POVERTY

	URBAN		RURAL	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Poor	0.08	0.10	0.18	0.17
Non poor	0.03	0.04	0.13	0.14
TOTAL	0.04	0.05	0.15	0.15

Source: Academia de Ciencias Agrícolas

The previous table also shows that the difference between the poor and the non poor, with respect to the illiteracy rate, is greater among the urban families than among the rural families.

D-2 Schooling

3.33 Another indicator of the impact of public expenditures in the field of education is the index of schooling. As shown in the following table, this index is greater for the urban families than for the rural families. That is, of the 11 years of formal studies (primary and secondary education) that a person could potentially have attended, the members of the rural families have attended four (not even completed primary education) while the members of urban families have attended, on the average, six.

Table 3.14
INDEX OF SCHOOLING, BY SEX, RURAL AND URBAN
AREA AND CONDITION OF POVERTY

	URBAN		RURAL	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Poor	0.55	0.50	0.38	0.39
Non poor	0.65	0.62	0.41	0.42
TOTAL	0.64	0.60	0.40	0.41

Source: Academia de Centro América.

The most conspicuous result is that the index of schooling tends to be similar for the whole rural population, both for the poor and for the non poor, but differs more markedly between the urban poor and non poor. The absence of a significant difference between the rural poor and non poor, in terms of their average schooling, might indicate a smaller association of poverty with differences in the level of formal education with respect to the agricultural tasks, than in the case of typically urban tasks.

3.34 With respect to farmers, both in the case of poor as in the case of non-poor families, a very high proportion of the heads of the families, namely 71 percent, had attended only a few grades of primary education. Only 4 percent of the non poor and 1 percent of the poor had attended school beyond the primary level. Finally, 25 percent of the non poor and 27 percent of the poor had not received any kind of formal education at all.

The similarity, in this respect, between poor and non-poor families is not maintained in the case of non-farming families, both rural and urban. While among poor urban families 13 percent of the heads of the families had not attended school at all, this was the case only with respect to 5 percent among non-poor urban families. Similarly, while among poor rural non-farming families 27 percent of the heads of the families had not attended school, this was the case only with respect to 18 percent of the non poor.

At the other end of the distribution, while 36 percent of the heads of non-poor urban families had attended school beyond the primary education, only 16 percent had done so in the case of the poor. Among rural non-farming families, the head of the family had attended school beyond the primary level in 11 percent of the instances, in the case of non-poor families, and in only 4 percent of the cases, if the family was poor.

In general there is a high correlation between attendance to school beyond primary education and the level of income of the family. This relationship, however, is not present in the case of farming families, both poor and non poor, and in the case of poor rural non-farming families.

D-3 Housing

- 3.35 Houses seem to be in better condition in the urban areas than in the rural areas. In effect, houses were in good condition in 64 percent of the cases in urban areas and in 46 percent of the cases in rural areas. In turn, the houses of the non poor seem to be in better condition than the houses of the poor. While 59 of the houses of the non poor were in good condition, only 37 percent of those of the poor were. On the other hand, only 12 percent of the houses of non-poor families were in bad condition, but this was the case with respect to 17 percent of the houses of poor families.

In this connection, the differences between the poor and the non poor are more marked in the urban areas. The urban poor possessed houses in bad condition in 25 percent of the cases, while the urban non poor were in these position in only 8 percent of the cases. The association becomes weaker in the rural areas; there are no significant differences between the poor and the non poor with respect to the percentage of houses in bad condition, but while 37 percent of the poor live in houses in good condition, this is the case for 50 percent of the non poor.

D-4 Overcrowding

3.36 The description of the condition of housing is complemented with the index of overcrowding in Table 3.15. Overcrowding tends to be higher in rural dwellings than in urban dwellings. In turn, overcrowding becomes higher as the condition of the house worsens. Overcrowding is also greater among poor rural non-farming families than among farmers.

While there are, on the average, 2.4 persons per bedroom, in the case of non-poor families, there are 3.4 persons per bedroom in the case of poor families. This index of overcrowding increases as one moves from houses in good condition to houses in fair condition and to houses in bad condition.

Table 3.15-

PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES ACCORDING TO THE CONDITION OF THE
HOUSE AND THE INDEX OF OVERCROWDING

Condition of the house and index of over- crowding	TOTAL			POOR			NON POOR		
	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural
<u>Condition of the house</u>									
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
In good condition	54	64	46	59	68	50	37	36	38
In fair condition	33	26	38	29	24	34	45	38	48
In bad condition	13	10	16	12	8	16	17	25	14
<u>Index of overcrowding</u>									
Total	2.7	2.2	3.0	2.4	2.1	2.8	3.4	3.0	3.6
In good houses	2.1	1.9	2.4	2.0	1.8	2.3	2.7	2.3	2.9
In fair houses	3.0	2.6	3.2	2.8	2.5	3.0	3.6	3.1	3.7
In bad houses	3.8	3.4	4.0	3.4	3.1	3.5	4.6	4.1	4.9

Source: Academia de Centro América.

D-5 Water, sewer and electricity

3.37 In the field of public investment with a social objective sewage systems, potable water and electricity have been given a high priority. The provision of these services has not been closely linked to the payment capacity of the beneficiary.

With respect to electricity, there is a clear difference between the urban and the rural areas. This difference, however, is not present between the poor and the non poor. Given an area, there is access to this service without differences according to income levels. The same is also true, to a greater extent, with respect to the provision of potable water and sewage systems.

Poor farming families had access to sewer and sewage systems in 47 percent of the cases, while poor urban families had access to these services in 85 percent of the cases. The difference is even more pronounced in the case of electricity, since only 29 percent of the poor farming families had access to this service, in comparison with 87 percent of the poor urban families.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. CONCLUSIONS

4.01 Among its purposes, the study attempted to construct a typology of poverty in Costa Rica, in the sense that it attempted to discover some of the demographic, social and economic characteristics which accompany the condition of poverty. In addition, an effort was made to obtain information which would allow an estimation of the degree of association linking each one of the variables studied and the level of family income per capita.

In this respect, the purpose of the study was to determine if there are significant differences in the values of the demographic, social and economic variables studied, in connection with the groups of the poor and of the non poor and in connection with any one of the various sub-groups of the poor.

It is worthwhile to insist that the existence of some association among these variables and the condition of poverty does not necessarily imply the existence of a relationship of causality among them and to remember that this study does not attempt to elaborate any model about the causes of poverty, in which case it would have been possible to make assertions about cause and effect.

4.02 The previous objective was not completely achieved, due to the

shortcomings mentioned which, outside of the control of the Academia, took place during the stages of programming and computation. In this respect, it is useful to make two observations:

- i) to our knowledge, the errors mentioned affected only the computation of the income of farming families, but not the computation of other incomes. As a result, a typology of urban poverty and a typology of the poverty of non-farming rural families, based on the information contained in this study, seem more reliable;
- ii) in view of the fact that there is a certain uniformity of the results obtained, in most cases, when the different methodologies were used (while at the same time these methodologies were affected by different errors of computation, with different biases), it seems that relative figures and ordinal data can be used, with the appropriate caution, since apparently they did not suffer drastic changes, due to the errors or to the changes in methodology.

4.03 In view of the previous considerations, a typology of poverty in Costa Rica would include the following characteristics:

- a. The poor in Costa Rica is more rural than urban. Three out of each four of the poor live in the rural areas. The proportion of the poor among rural families tends to be twice this proportion among urban families.

- b. The poor belongs to families with a larger number of members than the non poor.
- c. The poor mothers possess a greater fertility than the non poor mothers.
- d. The poor belongs to families with a greater proportion of their members between 15 years old and over 64 years of age, than in the case of the non poor. In effect, the dependency index is twice for poor families than for non poor.
- e. The poor belongs to families for which a smaller proportion of their members works.
- f. The poor have this characteristic due, in part, to the fact that they belong to families for which a smaller proportion of their members are in the economically active population. In effect, the rate of activity was 37 percent greater among non-poor families than among poor families.
- g. The poor who belong to the economically active population are, in turn, subject to a significantly higher degree of unemployment. The rate of unemployment was more than three-and-a-half times greater among the poor than among the non poor included in the economically active population.
- h. The poor was looking for a job for the first time, without finding one, in a greater proportion than the non poor.
- i. The poor is more rural than urban and consequently he is found with more frequency in the primary sector of the economy.

100

- i. The poor is illiterate in a greater proportion than the non poor. The rate of illiteracy is 66 percent higher among the poor than among the non poor.
- k. The poor has attended a smaller number of years of formal education, with respect to those that could have potentially been attended, in view of his age, than the non poor. In effect, the index of schooling is lower for the poor than for the non poor.
- l. The poor belongs to families whose head has not attended any formal education at all in a greater proportion than the non poor. In addition, the heads of poor families have attended studies beyond primary education in a smaller proportion than the non poor.
- m. The poor lives in houses in bad condition in a greater proportion than the non poor and in houses in good condition, in a smaller proportion than the non-poor.
- n. The poor lives with a greater number of persons in the same bedroom than the non poor. The index of overcrowding is 42 percent higher among the poor than among the non poor.
- o. The poor has less access than the non poor to the services of sewage systems, potable water and electricity.

4.04 The information obtained permits that a typology of urban poverty in Costa Rica be attempted. According to this typology, it could be asserted that:

- a. The urban poor, although he belongs to smaller families than the rural poor, belongs to larger families than the urban non poor.
- b. Poor urban mothers possess a lower fertility than poor rural mothers and a greater fertility than non-poor urban mothers.
- c. The index of dependency of poor urban families is lower than in the case of poor rural families and higher than in the case of non-poor urban families.
- d. The rate of activity of the urban poor is lower than the rate of activity of the rural poor and lower than the rate of activity of the urban non poor.
- e. The rate of unemployment among the urban poor is higher than among the urban non poor and lower than among the rural poor.
- f. The urban poor were looking for a job for the first time in a much greater proportion than any other group of the population
- g. The urban poor works mainly in the terciary sector.
- h. The urban poor is more illiterate than the urban non poor, but significantly less illiterate than the rural poor.
- i. The index of schooling is lower among the urban poor than among the urban non poor, but higher among the urban poor than among the rural poor. The difference between the urban poor and the rural poor is more marked than the difference between the urban poor and non poor.
- j. The urban poor lives, in a greater proportion than the rural

poor, in houses in bad condition, and, in a smaller proportion than the rural poor, in houses in good condition.

- k. The index of overcrowding is lower among the urban poor than among the rural poor, but higher among the urban poor than among the urban non poor.
- l. The urban poor has greater access to the services of potable water, electricity and sewage systems than the rural poor and this difference is much more marked than the difference between the urban poor and non poor.

4.05 The information obtained would also allow the determination of a typology of poverty for the rural non-farming families of Costa Rica. This typology would include the following elements:

- a. The non-farming poor represent a higher proportion than the poor farmers (about twice), with respect to the rural population of Costa Rica.
- b. The non-farming rural poor belongs to families slightly larger than poor farming families and significantly larger than non-farming rural non-poor families.
- c. The index of dependency of the poor non-farming rural families is higher than the index of dependency of the poor farming families. Moreover, this index is higher for the poor rural non-farming families than for any other group of the population.
- d. The rate of activity is lower among the rural non-farming poor

than among the poor farmers, but higher than among the urban poor.

- e. The rate of unemployment is higher in the case of the rural non-farming poor than in the case of any other group of the population.
- f. Second only to the urban poor, the rural non-farming poor are the group that in a higher proportion looked for a job for the first time without finding it.
- g. The rural non-farming poor and the poor farmers show the same rate of illiteracy and practically the same index of schooling. In turn, this index does not differ much from that corresponding to the rural non poor.
- h. The rural non-farming poor lives, in a greater proportion of the cases than the poor farmer, in houses in bad condition and, in a smaller proportion of the cases, in houses in good condition, but the differences are small when compared to those existing between the urban poor and the rural poor.

4.06 Implicit in the previous lists there are some of the components of a typology of rural poverty in Costa Rica. For this reason and since the information with respect to these families suffered the most as a result of the programming errors mentioned, it was considered appropriate not to include more observations than those already contained in the study.

4.07 In addition to an attempt to search for the components of a typology of poverty in Costa Rica, this study tried to investigate and to solve some of the more serious problems that are present in a research on poverty on the basis mainly of the census information. Chapter II described the methodologies employed and the nature of the attempts to overcome some of the difficulties that appeared in the course of the study. It is expected that even the purely methodological -and not substantive- comparison of the results will be useful, too. On the basis of the experience accumulated, the following section lists some recommendations methodological in character.

B. RECOMMENDATIONS

4.08 The following recommendations cover three aspects, namely: the elaboration of the census information, the focus of studies of poverty based on this type of information and some of the measures which could be taken in connection with the present study.

4.08 The available census information and that which might be collected in the future could be improved, from several points of view, in order to allow its more fruitfull use in investigations about proverty like the present one. Three considerations of interest are the following:

- i) The necessary measures could be adopted in order to more easily identify the various census units among the

different censuses. For example, in the last population and housing censuses of Costa Rica it is possible to exactly determine the family or families corresponding to each dwelling and vice versa. On the contrary, the population and agricultural censuses do not allow it, except through a very arduous manual task and the use of computers with a large memory. This problem, which in this study was called the census matching, should be solved in future censuses.

- ii) An effort could be made in order to clarify some of the concepts used in the census, in order to facilitate the classification and interpretation of the information. This is the case, for example, with respect to concepts such as: condition of the house, family, unemployment and rural population. It is evident that an improvement of these concepts implies additional costs, since it means, in general, that questions would have to be formulated in a more precise fashion and possibly the inclusion of additional questions. For this reason, the costs and benefits of such clarifications would have to be estimated.
- iii) Methodologies could be designed and applied in order to estimate the margin of error of the census information. In this way, the degree of confidence that could be attached to this information and to the analyses based on it could be determined.

4.10 Several aspects should be mentioned with respect to the focus of the studies on poverty:

- i) Studies about poverty in the country cannot be successfully attempted on the basis only of the census information. The censuses provide very valuable data, but it is necessary to complement them with other studies and surveys, which might be limited to the collection of information about specific aspects not worthwhile including in the censuses. This was the case, in the present study, with respect to the costs of the agricultural production.
- ii) In connection with the methodology used, it is important to consider the possibility to work on the basis of a sample of the census information, instead of with the whole census information. This would have the significant advantage to require smaller computers which, in turn, would make it possible to undertake the computation tasks in the country.
- iii) More than a precise determination and quantification of the magnitude of the problem of poverty, the focus of these studies should be an examination of the effects that the modification of certain variables would have on the levels of poverty. In effect, through a sensitivity analysis it would be possible to analyze the relative importance -the weight- that different factors have on the phenomenon under investigation.

The sensitivity analysis would be focused in three directions: first, towards a modification of the income levels used to classify the population of the country into poor and non-poor; second, towards a modification of the main components of the income of poor families; and third, towards a modification of the criterion of poverty, complementing income levels with another criteria such as the stock of assets (farm size), access to certain services and other aspects of the environment.

iv) It would be useful to more deeply undertake certain specific studies, among which the following might be considered important:

- Poor farmers (why are they poor ?);
- Unemployment and underemployment (seasonal, permanent, excess supply of labor according to farm size and type of crop);
- Migrations (who migrates, in what direction ?);
- Urban poverty (characteristics);
- Effects of public expenditures (do they reduce the disparities between the poor and the non poor ?); and
- Sources of income (wages, profits of agricultural exploitations, value of public services, etc.).

These specific studies will require, most of the time, surveys and other field investigations, in addition to the

census information, in order to accumulate the necessary data, which would allow a certain degree of detail in the analysis of the problems under study.

4.11 There are certain aspects in connection with the manner in which the present study was undertaken that suggest how it could and should be improved in order to reach more satisfactory results. It is useful to mention:

- i) That the prima facie analysis of the data, despite the errors of computation that make of little use some of the criteria of classification, reveals certain elements which do not deserve that additional efforts be devoted to their examination, when the investigation continues, since they seem to have relatively little importance in an attempt to typify or characterize poverty.
- ii) That it is indispensable to improve the computerized information obtained from the census data. Specifically, it is necessary a new computation of the income of farming families. Two considerations of importance are: first, that unless the errors of computation that affect the tabulated information are corrected, it would be very difficult to perform analysis sufficiently reliable to base decisions of social or economic policy upon them and second, that the additional effort and cost which would have to be

incurred in order to eliminate the existing mistakes is very small, compared to the magnitude of the job already performed.

- iii) That once the depuration of the available information is completed, the data would be useful for two types of analysis: first, different classifications of the main variables could be attempted and second, it would be possible to perform a series of statistical tests with the variables, such as correlations, regressions, analysis of variance, rank correlations, etc. None of these analyses would make much sense while the errors present in the tabulated information persist. On the other hand, if the depuration is achieved, several analyses could be performed which would substantially increase the information available about poverty.

APPENDIX A

GLOSSARY

ACTIVITY RATE: It is the gross rate of economic activity, namely, the percentage that the economically active population represents with respect to the total population.

ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION: From an administrative-political point of view, Costa Rica is divided into seven provinces (San José, Alajuela, Cartago, Heredia, Guanacaste, Puntarenas and Limón). In turn, each one of the provinces is divided into a number of cantones (counties). As of 1973 there were 79 cantones in the country. Table C-3 contains a list of these cantones. Finally, each cantón is divided into districts.

AGRICULTURAL YEAR: It is the year that went from May first, 1972, to April 30th, 1973.

AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME: It is the quotient of the total family income divided by the number of persons in the family.

CANTON: Any one of the administrative units into which each province of the country is divided. See administrative division.

COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION: It is the quotient of the standard deviation divided by the arithmetic mean.

APPENDIX A

GLOSSARY

ACTIVITY RATE: It is the gross rate of economic activity, namely, the percentage that the economically active population represents with respect to the total population.

ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION: From an administrative-political point of view, Costa Rica is divided into seven provinces (San José, Alajuela, Cartago, Heredia, Guanacaste, Puntarenas and Limón). In turn, each one of the provinces is divided into a number of cantones (counties). As of 1973 there were 79 cantones in the country. Table C-3 contains a list of these cantones. Finally, each cantón is divided into districts.

AGRICULTURAL YEAR: It is the year that went from May first, 1972, to April 30th, 1973.

AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME: It is the quotient of the total family income divided by the number of persons in the family.

CANTON: Any one of the administrative units into which each province of the country is divided. See administrative division.

COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION: It is the quotient of the standard deviation divided by the arithmetic mean.

CONSUMPTION ON THE FARM: It is the net value of the portion of the farm's output which, instead of being sold in the market, is used for consumption by the productive unit itself. It is equivalent to an income in kind. This portion of the farm's output was valued at the same prices used to compute the income originating in the portion that was sold in the market. In order to obtain its net value, the costs of materials, labor and transportation were deducted from its gross value.

DEPENDENCY INDEX: It is the proportion which results from a comparison of the population below 15 years old and above 64 years old with the population between 15 and 64 years old.

ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION: The economically active population includes all persons 15 years old and older who, during the week of the 7th to the 12th of May of 1973, either had a job or worked at least one hour or did not work during that week, either because they were looking for a job or because they believed that, had they looked for one, they would have not found one. The economically active population also includes those persons, in the corresponding age group, who were looking for a job for their first time.^{1/}

EXCESS SUPPLY OF LABOR: It is the difference between the amount of labor that a farming family can offer (availability) and the

^{1/} Dirección General de Estadística y Censos. Instructivo para el Enumerador. Censos Nacionales de 1973. San José. 1973, p. 46.

technical labor requirements necessary to produce the output of the farm (requirements). Both this demand and this supply of labor are measured in working days. The labor requirements were estimated on the basis of technical coefficients corresponding to the labor inputs applicable to each one of the agricultural products considered during the computation of the net income of the farm. The amount of labor supplied was estimated under the assumption that those members of the farming families who were not wage earners and who were members of the economically active population, were available to work at the farm a total of 280 working days per year. If the difference was positive (if the availability was greater than the requirements), there was an excess supply of labor. In the opposite case there was a deficit.

FAMILY: The family was the basic unit of analysis. The concept of family employed was predetermined by the definition used in the 1973 censuses. According to the latter, the census family was defined as "a group of persons, with or without ties as relatives, living together under a family regime. A family can consist of a person living alone. In general, the census family includes the head of the family, the relatives living with him or her and those persons who participate in the family's life because of their jobs: servants, helpers, and other farm workers. Other persons who share the house and take their meals with the family must be considered as members of the census family. Other persons who share the house, but who do not take their meals with the family,

must be considered as separate census families and must be enumerated in separate questionnaires." ^{1/}

FARM: It is any extension of land totally or partially devoted to agricultural production. It can consist of two or more lots or parcels, provided that they are worked under the same administration, possessing the same means of production such as labor, machinery and equipment. These parcels need not necessarily be adjacent, but they must be located in the same cantón or in neighboring cantones.

FARMS WITHOUT LAND: A poultry or cattle productive unit is considered as a census farm even if it does not have land. These units are called "farms without land". According to the agricultural census of 1973, among the 81,562 farms, 4,564 corresponded to farms without land, which represented 5.6 percent of the total. ^{2/}

FARMING FAMILY: Family for which any one of its members is an agricultural producer. It is a family which exploits a farm.

FERTILITY: It is defined either as the average number of children born alive per woman, by age groups, or as the average number of living children per woman, by age groups.

^{1/} Dirección General de Estadística y Censos. Instructivo para el Enumerador. Censos Nacionales de 1973. San José, 1973, pp. 34-35.

^{2/} Ibid, pp. 57-58.

GINI COEFFICIENT: The Gini coefficient G was computed in the following way:

$$G = 1 - \frac{\sum P_i (Q_{i-1} + Q_i)}{10,000}$$

where P_i represents the percentage of families included in each class and Q_i represents the accumulated percentage of the incomes received by all families up to the class i included. The coefficient tends to zero as the distribution comes closer to perfect equality and it tends to one, as the distribution becomes more concentrated.

HEAD OF THE FAMILY: It is the person judged as such by the other members of the census family.

HOUSE, CONDITION OF THE: At the time of the census, the interviewer classified each house as good, fair and bad, according to the following criteria:^{1/}

- a. Good: "House with no apparent deficiencies or failures".
- b. Fair: "House which requires repairs of some importance, due to damages or lack of floor, ceiling, or defects in the walls or roofs".
- c. Bad: "House in very deteriorated condition, due to sunken or broken foundations, fissures and cracks in the walls, deteriorated or unsafe roofs, etc."

^{1/} Dirección General de Estadística y Censos. Instructivo para el Enumerador. Censos Nacionales de 1973. San José, 1973, p. 24.

HOUSING: A house or dwelling is any premise or precinct arranged to lodge persons on a permanent or temporary basis. It can be an independent structure or it can be integrated to other ones and it could consist of a boat, a train wagon or any other kind of space conditioned for lodging at the time of the census. ^{1/} Houses are classified into individual and collective. The former lodge census families and the latter lodge those human groups living under the same roof for reasons of health, religious discipline, studies, etc. According to the form of tenure, houses are classified into:

- a. Rented: When one has to pay a rent to live in them;
- b. Owned : When they belong to the head or to some other member of the family, even when they are mortgaged or not completely paid; and
- c. Other : When they do not correspond to any of the previous categories. This group includes houses free of charge and those provided by employers to their workers and their families.

IMPUTED RENT: It is the rent that it has been estimated that otherwise the family would have had to pay, when it lived in its own house or in one free of charge. An average rent was assigned to each one of these houses, estimated according to its condition and location.

^{1/} Dirección General de Estadística y Censos. Instructivo para el Enumerador. Censos Nacionales de 1973. San José, 1973, p. 15.

IMPUTED FIREWOOD: It is the income which was imputed to those farming families which employed firewood free of charge as a fuel for cooking.

INACTIVE POPULATION: It consists of all persons 12 years old and older, except those included in the economically active population.

INDEX OF OVERCROWDING: It is the quotient of the total number of members of the families of a given category (urban, rural, farmers, etc.) divided by the number of bedrooms corresponding to the houses of those families.

INDEX OF SCHOOLING: It is the quotient that compares the number of years of formal education actually gained by all the members of the families, up to a maximum of 11 years per member, i.e. up to the completion of the secondary education, with the number of years that, according to their corresponding ages, these members could have potentially gained. As the index of schooling tends to one, a greater proportion of the members of the family have taken advantage of the educational opportunities (up to the last year of high school), according to their ages. The other extreme value of the index is zero, which would indicate that the members of the families have attended none of the year of school which, according to their ages, they could have potentially attended.

LABOR PRODUCTIVITY: It is the value of output minus the cost of the materials and of transportation, all divided by the number of working days required in the farm, according to the technical coefficients for the use of labor.

LAND TENURE: The legal rights according to which a producer exploits a farm allows their classification into:

- a. **Owned:** Those farms with respect to which the producer has a property title and therefore the right to transfer them. This is the case also of those farms which the producer exploits as if he was the owner, even though he does not have a property title yet.
- b. **Rented:** These are extensions of land used by the producer after a payment of a rent. This class includes those cases in which the rent is paid by delivering a portion of the production of the farm. Similarly, those lands used by the producer free of charge during certain periods are included in this class.
- c. **Other:** This class includes those farms that could not be classified in any of the two previous classes, such as lands occupied by squatters, lands in trust, etc.

- d. Mixed: Since a farm can consist of more than one parcel, the form of land tenure could differ from one parcel to another. When this is the case, the form of tenure is mixed.

LEVEL OF EDUCATION: The level of education (none, primary, beyond primary) indicates if a person has not gained any year of the formal education, has only gained some years of the primary education or has gained any level of education beyond primary school.

MAIN AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS: These are those products which, produced on the corresponding farm, represent the highest percentage of the total value of the output of that farm.

METROPOLITAN AREA: The Metropolitan Area has been defined as the cantón Central of the province of San José and the ten neighboring cantones in the immediate area of influence of the former, with the exception of those districts which, due to their topographic characteristics or to their excessive distance from the central nucleus, do not offer possibilities for the future expansion of the area. The ten cantones are: Escazú, Desamparados, Aserrí, Goicoechea, Alajuelita, Coronado, Tibás, Moravia, Montes de Oca and Curridabat.

MIGRANT FAMILY: It is a family whose head has been a migrant, according to the population census of 1973.

- d. Mixed: Since a farm can consist of more than one parcel, the form of land tenure could differ from one parcel to another. When this is the case, the form of tenure is mixed.

LEVEL OF EDUCATION: The level of education (none, primary, beyond primary) indicates if a person has not gained any year of the formal education, has only gained some years of the primary education or has gained any level of education beyond primary school.

MAIN AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS: These are those products which, produced on the corresponding farm, represent the highest percentage of the total value of the output of that farm.

METROPOLITAN AREA: The Metropolitan Area has been defined as the cantón Central of the province of San José and the ten neighboring cantones in the immediate area of influence of the former, with the exception of those districts which, due to their topographic characteristics or to their excessive distance from the central nucleus, do not offer possibilities for the future expansion of the area. The ten cantones are: Escazú, Desamparados, Aserrí, Goicoechea, Alajuelita, Coronado, Tibás, Moravia, Montes de Oca and Curridabat.

MIGRANT FAMILY: It is a family whose head has been a migrant, according to the population census of 1973.

NET INCOME OF THE FARM: It is the value of the output (sales plus consumption on the farm) minus the costs of the materials used, the value of labor employed (both imputed and hired) and the costs of transportation of the products, in the process of production and sale of the crops.

PRODUCER: It is the physical person or corporation who has the technical initiative and the economic responsibility in the exploitation of a farm. The producer could personally administer the farm or could do it through an administrator.

PRODUCTION OF THE FARM: The annual output of the farm consists of the products of vegetable origin collected or cropped during the year, the products of animal origin obtained during the year and the increment in the size and weight of the herd, as a result of the efforts of breeding, growing and fattening during the year.

RATE OF ILLITERACY: It is the percentage of illiterate persons among the population 10 years old and older. An illiterate is a person characterized by any of the following conditions:

- a. does not know how to read and write a simple paragraph;
- b. only knows how to read; or
- c. knew how to read and write, but has forgotten it.

RATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT: It is the percentage of the economically active population that did not work or that looked for a job for the first time.

122

ROOMS AND BEDROOMS: Room is any portion of the house used for lodging.

Dinning rooms, living rooms, kitchens, bedrooms, studies, recreation rooms and living quarters for the servants are rooms. Portches, vestibules, corridors, bathrocms and garages are not rooms. A bedroom is a room used mainly for sleeping.^{1/}

SECTOR OF ACTIVITY AND OCCUPATIONS: The classifications by sectors of activity and the corresponding occupations are based on the International Uniform Industrial Classification for All Economic Activities, according to the last version.

- a. **Primary sector:** Includes the following activities:
agriculture, hunting, forestry, fishing,
and the exploitation of mines and
quarries.
- b. **Secondary sector:** Includes the following activities:
manufacturing industries and construction.
- c. **Terciary sector:** Includes those activities not included
in the primary or the secondary sectors,
such as electricity, commerce, hotels
and restaurants, transportation, financial
institutions, community services, social
and personal services, etc.

^{1/} Dirección General de Estadística y Censos. Instructivo para el Enu-
merador. Censos Nacionales de 1973. San José, 1973, p. 24.

d. Sector No-sector: Includes the members of the economically active population who were looking for a job for the first time.

STANDARD DEVIATION: It is the square root of the quotient of the sums of the squares of the deviations with respect to the arithmetic mean, divided by the number of observations minus one.

TOTAL FAMILY INCOME: It is the sum of the incomes earned during the year by all the persons in the family group. It includes the wages and salaries of remunerated workers, the incomes of self-employed workers and employers, the imputed wages of the family members for their work on the farm, the net income of the farm, the value of free firewood used to cook meals and the imputed rent in the case of owned houses or houses free of charge.

URBAN POPULATION: It consists of all the inhabitants of those towns classified as urban in attention to a physical or urbanistic criterion, based on the existence of quarters, sewage systems, electricity, sidewalks, etc. In general, the administrative centers of the cantones of the country, namely, the first districts, constitute urban towns. The exceptions are a few first districts which were not classified as urban and others which, not being first districts, were classified as such.^{1/} The difference between the total population and the urban population is the rural population.

^{1/} Dirección General de Estadística y Censos. Instructivo para el Enumerador. Censos Nacionales de 1973. San José, 1973, p. 46.

WORKING DAY: It is equivalent to eight hours of work per day.

WAGES AND SALARIES: The annual income in the form of wages and salaries earned by the remunerated workers in the family was computed by multiplying by twelve the monthly income which, for the same concepts, appears in the population census of 1973. These wages and salaries do not consider the deductions corresponding to the worker as a result of social security contributions and other payments, such as the quota of the Banco Popular. The salaries of servants included in the census family were not included in the family's income, since these salaries in fact constituted an expenditure for the family. The wages earned by a group of families (e.g. urban families) are equal to the total income for concept of wages and salaries of all the persons which, within the group, worked, divided by the number of the latter.

APPENDIX B

COSTS OF PRODUCTION AND PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

AVOCADOS

Production technology

Two possible technologies are considered: the most advanced one, designated technology 2, involves the use of fertilizer, pesticides and fungicides and it is employed by farmers producing more than 5,000 avocados per hectare.

Costs of production

Inputs	Technology 1	Technology 2
LABOR		
Working days per hectare	68	68
Colones per hectare	810	810
Daily wages	12	12
MATERIALS		
Colones per hectare	101	510
TOTAL COST PER HECTARE	911	1,320

Selling price

The price was ₡ 0.20 per unit, at the farm gate.

Observations

Only production in compact plantings, but not from dispersed trees, is considered.

Sources

Banco Crédito Agrícola de Cartago. Manual de Costos Básicos de Actividades Agropecuarias 1973, s.n.t.

B A N A N A S

Production technology

It is assumed that the most advanced technology, designated as technology 2, is used by those farmers with an average production per hectare above 36 metric tons per year.

Costs of production

Inputs	Technology 1	Technology 2
LABOR		
Working days	153	314
Colones per hectare	4,244	8,701
Daily wages	.28	28
MATERIALS		
Colones per hectare	2,610	2,884
TOTAL COST PER HECTARE	6,854	15,585

Selling price

The price on the local or national market is estimated to have been \$220 per metric ton minus the costs of transportation. In the case of

the international market, the price was ¢ 386 per metric ton, at the farm gate.

Observations

Only compact farms are considered. It is assumed that the plantations using the advanced technology produced only for the international market.

Sources

Asociación Bananera Nacional. Estudio Comparativo de Costos para Siete Fincas Bananeras en la Zona Atlántica, 1973. San José, 1974.

González Vega, Claudio, Lizano P., Eduardo and Vogel, Robert Cross. The Marketing of Agricultural Products in Costa Rica. Associated Colleges of the Midwest and Institute of Economic Investigations, University of Costa Rica, 1970, p. 109.

Information from an interview with Manuel S. Benavides, of the Banco Central de Costa Rica.

B E A N S

Production technology

Two different technologies are considered. The one designated technology 2 is used by those farmers with a yield per hectare greater than the average yield per hectare in the cantón where the farm is located.

Production zones

Two production zones are considered: zone 1 includes the cantones

of the Valle Central Oriental (East Central Valley) and of the Valle Central Occidental (West Central Valley); zone 2 includes the cantones of the remaining agricultural regions, according to the classification contained in Table C-2.

Cost of production

Zones and inputs	Technology 1	Technology 2
<u>ZONE 1</u>		
LABOR		
Working days per hectare	30	38
Colones per hectare	396	495
Daily wages	13	13
MATERIALS		
Colones per hectare	186	394
TOTAL COST PER HECTARE	582	889
<u>ZONE 2</u>		
LABOR		
Working days per hectare	25	28
Colones per hectare	400	446
Daily wages	16	16
MATERIALS		
Colones per hectare	120	293
TOTAL COST PER HECTARE	520	739

Selling price

The price was ¢ 1.52 per kilo minus transportation costs.

Transportation costs

Transportation costs were estimated at ¢ 0.4782 per ton kilometer.

Sources

Banco Crédito Agrícola de Cartago. Op. cit., pp. 62 and 176.

Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería, Departamento de Economía y Estadísticas Agropecuarias. Costos de Producción de Frijol en la región Meseta Central Oriental, Zona de Puriscal, Agosto-Noviembre, 1972. San José, Agosto 1973.

Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería, Departamento de Economía y Estadísticas Agropecuarias. Costos de Producción de Frijol en la Región Meseta Central Occidental, Zona de San Rafael de Ojo de Agua, Setiembre-Diciembre, 1972. San José, Julio 1973.

B E E F

Volume of production

The volume of production is a function of several factors: the size of the herd and its age structure, the production technologies used, the breed of the animals and the geographic location of the ranch.

Moreover, this volume of production represents the net growth of the herd, both in terms of the number of animals and in terms of their weight, as a result of the process of production (and not as a result of purchases and sales of animals) during the year.

Following the study of Vigne ^{1/} it was possible to determine, for the various livestock-producing zones of the country, the average increase in the weight of the animals, by age and by sex, at the end of the year. Thus, for the different zones considered, the annual production of cattle on the hoof, measured in kilos, was computed as follows:

<u>Zone</u>	<u>Volume of Production</u>
Guanacaste	Output = 84 C + 122 M + 102 F
Northern	Output = 65 C + 140 M + 109 F
Southern	Output = 80 C + 50 M + 122 F
Atlantic	Output = 99 C + 51 M + 112 F

where,

C = Number of males and females of less than one year of age.

M = Number of animals, male and female, between one year and less than two years old

F = Number of animals of both sexes two years old and older.

Production technology

Three possible production technologies are considered. It is assumed that the employment of any one of them is very closely related to the quantity of pasture available at the ranch. It is assumed that technology

^{1/} Vigne, Alain. Costos de Producción de Ganado de Carne en Costa Rica, Agosto 1973-74. Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería. San José, 1974.

1 is used by ranches with less than 300 hectares of pastures; that technology 2 is used by those with pastures between 300 and 700 hectares and that technology 3 is used by producers with more than 700 hectares of pastures.

Production zones

With respect to beef, the country is divided into four livestock-producing zones. The zone of Guanacaste includes the cantones of the Dry Pacific (Pacífico Seco); the Northern zone includes the cantones of the Northern, East Central Valley and West Central Valley regions; the Southern zone includes the cantones of the Central Pacific and Southern Pacific regions and, finally, the Atlantic zone includes the entire Atlantic region. The term "region" corresponds to the division of the country into the agricultural regions defined in Table C-2.

Costs of production

Zone and inputs	TECHNOLOGY		
	1	2	3
<u>GUANACASTE ZONE</u>			
Working days per 100 kilos	5.96	3.76	2.47
Materials per 100 kilos	77	75	47
Total cost per 100 kilos	188	145	93
<u>NORTHERN ZONE</u>			
Working days per 100 kilos	6.38	4.08	2.79
Materials per 100 kilos	67	77	57
Total cost per 100 kilos	186	153	109
<u>SOUTHERN ZONE</u>			
Working days per 100 kilos	6.38	6.65	4.40
Materials per 100 kilos	92	76	49
Total cost per 100 kilos	211	200	131
<u>ATLANTIC ZONE</u>			
Working days per 100 kilos	9.44	6.81	3.43
Materials per 100 kilos	105	80	46
Total cost per 100 kilos	281	207	110

Selling price

Prices at the ranch, per kilo liveweight, are the following:

ZONE	Herd of 25 or more animals	Herd of less than 25 animals
Guanacaste	4.51	2.85
Northern	4.40	2.85
Southern	4.49	2.85
Atlantic	4.40	2.85

Sources

Vigne, Alain. Costos de Producción de Ganado de Carne en Costa Rica, Agosto 1973-1974. Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería, San José, 1974.

B E E T S

Production technology

The difference between the costs implied by technologies 1 and 2 is due to the different amounts of fertilizers, fungicides, insecticides and adherents used.

Production costs

Inputs	Technology 1	Technology 2
LABOR		
Working days per hectare	140	148
Colones per hectare	2,238	2,472
Daily wages	17	17
MATERIALS		
Colones per hectare	286	928
TOTAL COST PER HECTARE	2,524	3,400

Selling price

The price was ¢ 0.21 per unit at the farm gate.

Sources

Banco Crédito Agrícola de Cartago, Op. cit. p. 134.

C A B B A G E

Production technology

Technology 2 is used by producers who fertilize. In the case of technology 1, the cost of fertilizer is not considered.

Costs of production

Inputs	Technology 1	Technology 2
LABOR		
Working days per hectare	78	82
Colones per hectare	1,240	1,304
Daily wages	16	16
MATERIALS		
Colones per hectare	86	601
TOTAL COST PER HECTARE	1,326	1,905

Selling price

The average price of one kilo of cabbage at the farm gate was estimated as ¢ 0.18.

Sources

Banco Crédito Agrícola de Cartago. Op. cit., pp. 136-137.

González Vega, Claudio, Lizano F. Eduardo and Vogel, Robert Cross. Op. cit., p. 101.

C A C A O

Production technology

It is assumed that the technologies used are related to yields per hectare and different amounts of inputs are computed for each yield

level

Costs of production

Technology	LABOR		MATERIALS
	Working days per hectare	Colones per Hectare	Colones per hectare
1. Less than 230 kilos per hectare	15	275	90
2. From 230 to less than 550 kilos per hectare	49	881	468
3. 550 kilos per hectare and more	70	1,245	545

Selling price

The price of the product at the farm gate was ¢ 3,175 per metric ton.

Sources

Banco Crédito Agrícola de Cartago. Op. cit., pp. 26-30.

Britton R. Garrett. Posibilidades de Producción de: Cacao, Palma Africana, Plátano, Coco. San José, Febrero 1970.

C A R R O T S

Production technology

Two possible technologies are considered. Technology 1 is used by producers with a yield per hectare of 8,600 kilos or less and technology 2 is used by producers with a higher yield per hectare.

Costs of production

Inputs	Technology 1	Technology 2
LABOR		
Working days per hectare	120	140
Colones per hectare	1,848	2,156
Daily wages	15	15
MATERIALS		
Colones per hectare	338	1.083
TOTAL COST PER HECTARE	2,186	3,239

Selling price

It was ¢ 610 per ton minus transportation costs.

Transportation costs

They were ¢ 0.4782 per ton kilometer.

Sources

Banco Crédito Agrícola de Cartago. Op. cit., pp. 157-158.

González Vega, Claudio, Lizano F., Eduardo and Vogel, Robert Cross, Op. cit., p. 103.

C A S S A V A (YUCA)

Production technology

Two possible technologies are considered. Technology 1 is used by producers who get 7 tons or less per hectare and technology 2 is used

Costs of production

Inputs	Technology 1	Technology 2
LABOR		
Working days per hectare	48	63
Colones per hectare	912	1,199
Daily wages	19	19
MATERIALS		
Colones per hectare	56	205
TOTAL COST PER HECTARE	968	1,404

Selling price

A price of ¢ 390 per ton minus transportation costs was estimated.

Transportation costs

Transportation costs were ¢ 0.4782 per ton kilometer.

Sources

Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería, Departamento de Economía y Estadísticas Agropecuarias, Costos de Producción de Yuca en la Zona Norte, Zona de San Francisco de la Palmera, 1973. San José, 1974.

C O C O N T S

Production technology

Technology 2 is used by those producers with a yield of 4,800 coconuts or more per hectare, while technology 1 is used by producers

with less than 4,800 coconuts per hectare. The main difference between the two technologies is due to the use of insecticides and fertilizer.

Costs of production

Inputs	Technology 1	Technology 2
LABOR		
Working days per hectare	10	14
Colones per hectare	152	220
Daily wages	16	16
MATERIALS		
Colones per hectare	...	501
TOTAL COST PER HECTARE	152	721

Selling price

A price of ¢ 0.382 per unit at the farm gate was considered.

Observations

Only the production from compact plantations was taken into account.

Sources

Banco Crédito Agrícola de Cartago. Op. cit., pp. 51 and 176.

Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Agricultura y la Alimentación. La Situación del Coco. Roma, 1972.

C O F F E E

Production technology

The main difference between the two technologies considered is due to the use or not use of fertilizer.

Production zones

The country is divided into five zones, according basically to the zones defined by Marín in the study "Costos de Producción de Café en Cinco Zonas de Costa Rica, Cosecha 1973/1974". In turn, five levels or strata of production are distinguished for each zone. Each farm is classified in one of these strata, according to its volume of production. Table B-1 lists the cantones included in each one of the zones.

Costs of production

The costs of production for materials and for labor inputs appear in Tables B-2 through B-6.

Selling price

The prices received by the producer have been computed on the basis of the prices paid by each coffee processor (beneficio) in the country, according to the "Informe de Labores 1973" of the Oficina del Café. A weighted average price was computed for each processor, according to the proportions of ripe coffee or green coffee received. It was assumed that the producer delivered his coffee to the processor closest to his farm. The prices received by the producers are given in Table B-1.

Table B-1

COFFEE : CANTONES INCLUDED IN EACH ONE OF THE ZONES AND PRICES
RECEIVED BY THE PRODUCERS IN EACH CANTON

Cantón	Code	Colones per ton
<u>ZONE 1</u>		
Cartago	301	1,148
Paraíso	302	1,105
La Unión	303	1,193
Jiménez	304	1,212
Turrialba	305	1,121
Alvarado	306	1,148
Oreamuno	307	1,224
El Guarco	308	1,224
Limón	701	1,121
Pococí	702	1,121
Siquirres	703	1,121
Talamanca	704	1,121
Matina	705	1,121
Guácimo	706	1,121
<u>ZONE 2</u>		
San José	101	1,138
Escazú	102	1,204
Desamparados	103	1,109

Table B-1 Cont ...

Cantón	Code	Colones per ton
Puriscal	104	1,204
Mora	107	1,204
Santa Ana	109	1,240
Alajuelita	110	1,138
Acosta	112	1,069
Montes de Oca	115	1,348
Turrubares	116	1,204
Curridabat	118	1,148
Alajuela	201	1,185
San Ramón	202	1,144
Grecia	203	1,106
San Mateo	204	1,172
Atenas	205	1,172
Naranjo	206	1,175
Palmares	207	1,136
Poás	208	1,140
Orotina	209	1,172
San Carlos	210	931
Alfaro Ruiz	211	1,175
Valverde Vega	212	1,106
Upala	213	1,260
Los Chiles	214	1,260
Guatuso	215	1,260

142

Table B-1 Cont ...

Cantón	Code	Colones per ton
Liberia	501	1,100
Nicoya	502	1,100
Santa Cruz	503	1,100
Bagaces	504	1,260
Carrillo	505	1,100
Cañas	506	1,260
Abangares	507	1,260
Tilarán	508	1,260
Nandayure	509	1,140
La Cruz	510	1,100
Hojancha	511	1,100
Puntarenas	601	1,144
Esparta	602	1,144
Montes de Oro	604	1,144
<u>ZONE 3</u>		
Pérez Zeledón	119	1,054
Buenos Aires	603	1,054
Osa	605	1,054
Golfito	607	1,026
Coto Brus	608	1,026
<u>ONE 4</u>		
Goicoechea	108	928
Coronado	111	928

143

Table B-1 Cont ...

Cantón	Código	Colones per ton
Tibás	113	1,348
Moravia	114	928
Heredia	401	1,126
Barva	402	1,148
Santo Domingo	403	1,188
Santa Bárbara	404	1,284
San Rafael	405	1,157
San Isidro	406	1,157
Belén	407	1,137
Flores	408	1,284
San Pablo	409	1,121
Sarapiquí	410	1,148
ZONE 5		
Tarrazú	105	1,248
Aserrí	106	1,214
Dota	117	1,127
León Cortés	120	1,235
Aguirre	606	1,054
Parrita	609	1,026

Source: Oficina del Café, Informe de Labores 1973, Edición Especial

25 Aniversario. San José, 1974. pp. 43-47.

Table B-2

C O F F E E : REQUIREMENTS AND COSTS OF MATERIALS
AND LABOR IN ZONE ONE

TECHNOLOGY	STRATA ^{1/}				
	Less than 6 tons	From 6 to less than 12 tons	From 12 to less than 50 tons	From 50 to less than 130 tons	130 tons and more
TECHNOLOGY 1					
<u>Working days</u>					
Total number of working days	81	159	149	127	199
Harvesting	39	107	90	77	153
Other activities	42	52	59	51	46
<u>Daily wages</u>					
Harvesting	15	15	23	23	23
Other activities	13	13	13	13	13
<u>Materials</u>	77	328	263	555	270
Colones per hectare					
TECHNOLOGY 2					
<u>Working days</u>					
Total number of working days	84	162	153	138	208
Harvesting	39	107	90	77	153
Other activities	45	56	63	61	55
<u>Daily wages</u>					
Harvesting	15	15	23	23	23
Other activities	13	13	13	13	13
<u>Materials</u>	528	602	699	904	1,257
Colones per hectare					

^{1/} The strata are established according to the volume of production (in tons) of the farm.

Table B-3

C O F F E E : REQUIREMENTS AND COSTS OF MATERIALS
AND LABOR IN ZONE TWO

TECHNOLOGY	STRATA ^{1/}				
	Less than 6 tons	From 6 to less than 12 tons	From 12 to less than 50 tons	From 50 to less than 130 tons	130 tons and more
TECHNOLOGY 1					
<u>Working days</u>					
Total number of working days	77	134	154	166	150
Harvesting	37	77	93	110	93
Other activities	40	58	61	56	57
<u>Daily wages</u>					
Harvesting	22	22	24	20	25
Other activities	13	12	13	13	14
<u>Materials</u>	171	196	447	247	605
Colones per hectare					
TECHNOLOGY 2					
<u>Working days</u>					
Total number of working days	82	138	159	171	154
Harvesting	37	77	93	110	93
Other activities	45	61	66	61	61
<u>Daily wages</u>					
Harvesting	22	22	24	20	25
Other activities	13	12	13	13	14
<u>Materials</u>	622	660	1,122	1,025	1,137
Colones per hectare					

B-21

^{1/} The strata are established according to the volume of production (in tons) of the farm.

Table B-4

C O F F E E : REQUIREMENTS AND COSTS OF MATERIALS
AND LABOR IN ZONE THREE

TECHNOLOGY	STRATA ^{1/}				
	Less than 6 tons	From 6 to 12 tons	From 12 to 50 tons	From 50 to 130 tons	130 tons and more
TECHNOLOGY 1					
<u>Working days</u>					
Total number of working days	70	120	121	162	143
Harvesting	27	60	67	87	77
Other activities	43	60	54	75	66
<u>Daily wages</u>					
Harvesting	20	20	20	22	22
Other activities	12	12	12	13	13
<u>Materials</u>	121	211	153	340	347
Colones per hectare					
TECHNOLOGY 2					
<u>Working days</u>					
Total number of working days	73	123	124	166	146
Harvesting	27	60	67	87	77
Other activities	46	63	57	79	69
<u>Daily wages</u>					
Harvesting	20	20	20	22	22
Other activities	12	12	12	13	13
<u>Materials</u>	181	421	375	776	812
Colones per hectare					

^{1/} The strata are established according to the volume of production (in tons) of the farm.

147

Table B-5

C O F F E E : REQUIREMENTS AND COSTS OF MATERIALS
AND LABOR IN ZONE FOUR

TECHNOLOGY	STRATA ^{1/}				
	Less than 6 tons	From 6 to less than 12 tons	From 12 to less than 50 tons	From 50 to less than 130 tons	130 ton and more
TECHNOLOGY 1					
<u>Working days</u>					
Total number of working days	71	123	150	154	158
Harvesting	37	67	87	97	103
Other activities	34	56	64	57	55
<u>Daily wages</u>					
Harvesting	28	28	25	24	23
Other activities	15	16	16	15	16
<u>Materials</u>	171	344	435	629	543
Colones per hectare					
TECHNOLOGY 2					
<u>Working days</u>					
Total number of working days	82	127	155	158	163
Harvesting	37	67	87	97	103
Other activities	45	60	68	61	60
<u>Daily wages</u>					
Harvesting	28	28	25	24	23
Other activities	115	16	16	15	16
<u>Materials</u>	622	804	1,117	1,188	1,395
Colones per hectare					

B-23

1/ The strata are established according to the volume of production (in tons) of the farm

871

Table B-6

C O F F E E : REQUIREMENTS AND CO¹ MATERIALS
AND LABOR IN ZONE F1

TECHNOLOGY	STRATA ^{1/}				
	Less than 6 tons	From 6 to less than 12 tons	From 12 to less than 50 tons	From 50 to less than 130 tons	130 tons and more
TECHNOLOGY 1					
<u>Working days</u>					
Total number of working days	64	137	126	158	159
Harvesting	30	67	70	97	103
Other activities	34	70	56	61	55
<u>Daily wages</u>					
Harvesting	21	21	18	18	20
Other activities	13	13	12	12	12
<u>Materials</u>	152	369	314	366	392
Colones per hectare					
TECHNOLOGY 2					
<u>Working days</u>					
Total number of working days	69	145	131	165	168
Harvesting	30	67	70	97	103
Other activities	39	78	61	68	65
<u>Daily wages</u>					
Harvesting	21	21	18	18	20
Other activities	13	13	12	12	12
<u>Materials</u>	566	952	960	1,266	1,159
Colones per hectare					

B-24

^{1/} The strata are established according to the volume of production (in tons) of the farm.

149

Sources

Marín A., Edgar. Costos de Producción de Café en Cinco Zonas de Costa Rica, Cosecha 1973-1974. Oficina del Café, Departamento de Estudios Técnicos y Diversificación. San José, 1974.

Oficina del Café. Informe de Labores 1973. San José, 1974.
pp. 43-47.

Alfaro A., Gregorio. Costos de Producción de Café en Costa Rica. Ministerio de Agricultura y Oficina del Café, San José, 1968.

C O R N

Production technology

Technologies 1 and 2 are distinguished according to the use or not of fertilizer. In turn, with respect to those who use fertilizer, three levels are considered, with the corresponding different costs of materials and of labor.

Costs of production

Inputs	Tech- nology 1	TECHNOLOGY 2		
		Less than 1000 Kg Ha	1000 to kilos/ Ha.	Over 1300 Kilos/ Ha.
LABOR				
Working days per hectare	45	45	47	50
Colones per hectare	783	783	825	876
Daily wages	18	18	18	18
MATERIALS				
Colones per hectare	32	85	156	456
TOTAL COST PER HECTARE	815	868	981	1,332

Selling price.

Prices per ton received by the producers, in each canton, are given in Table B-7.

Sources

Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería, Departamento de Agronomía y Estadísticas Agropecuarias. Costos de Producción de Maíz en la Región Meseta Central Occidental, Zona de San Rafael de Ojo de Agua, Mayo-Diciembre de 1972. San José, julio de 1973.

Banco Crédito Agrícola de Cartago. Op. cit., p. 72.

Table B-7

PRICES RECEIVED BY THE PRODUCERS IN EACH CANTON
PER TON OF SUGAR CANE, CORN AND TOBACCO

Cantón	Sugar cane	Corn	Tobacco ^{1/}
San José	54.02	632	6,992
Escazú	52.10	629	6,988
Desamparados	51.62	630	6,990
Puriscal	35.37	612	6,972
Tarrazú	20.06	574	...
Aserrí	48.76	627	...
Mora	45.41	622	6,982
Goicoechea	52.06	596	...
Santa Ana	49.71	626	6,986
Alajuelita	51.62	630	6,990
Coronado	51.62	597	...

Table B-7 Cont .

Cantón	Sugar cane	Corn	Tobacco ^{1/}
Acosta	40.15	619	6,978
Tibás	55.45	596	...
Moravia	54.02	595	...
Turrubares	25.32	602	6,962
Dota	23.41	578	6,962
Curridabat	51.15	630	6,989
Pérez Zeledón	25.00	570	6,620
León Cortés	23.60	572	...
Montes de Oca	52.58	630	...
----- Alajuela	60.69	820	5,223
San Ramón	48.38	794	5,199
Grecia	60.20	810	5,214
San Mateo	39.17	798	5,202
Atenas	49.21	808	5,212
Naranjo	57.33	804	5,208
Palmares	51.11	798	5,233
Poás	60.24	813	5,218
Orotina	29.97	796	5,200
San Carlos	49.76	412	...
Alfaro Ruiz	36.85	398	...
Valverde Vega	60.20	806	5,210
Upala	45.02	347	...
Los Chiles	45.02	376	...

Table B-7 Cont ...

Cantón	Sugar cane	Corn	Tobacco ^{1/}
Guatuso	45.02	393	...
----- Cartago	48.94	598	...
Paraíso	48.43	595	...
La Unión	44.16	593	...
Jiménez	59.91	583	...
Turrialba	57.19	578	...
Alvarado	57.55	589	...
Oreamuno	50.86	596	...
El Guarco	47.51	596	...
- Heredia	59.28	820	5,228
Barva	57.84	818	5,226
Santo Domingo	57.36	818	5,230
Santa Bárbara	60.71	815	5,223
San Rafael	60.71	819	5,226
San Isidro	55.44	816	5,224
Belén	57.34	819	5,557
Flores	57.36	818	5,226
San Pablo	57.84	818	5,229
Sarapiquí	35.45	365	...
- Liberia	36.32	626	...
Nicoya	28.19	587	...
Santa Cruz	39.19	598	...
Bagaces	38.64	613	...

Table B-7 Cont ...

Cantón	Sugar cane	Corn	Tobacco ^{1/}
Carrillo	51.14	610	...
Cañas	49.16	602	...
Abangares	33.86	592	...
Tilarán	45.02	613	...
Nandayure	25.00	570	...
La Cruz	15.00	597	...
Hojancha	29.62	582	...
----- Puntarenas	36.66	525	...
Esparza	41.44	625	...
Buenos Aires	48.91	560	6,254
Montes de Oro	50.05	624	...
Osa	48.91	560	6,492
Aguirre	48.91	566	6,926
Golfito	48.91	560	6,457
Coto Brus	48.91	560	6,445
Parríta	48.91	578	6,938
----- Limón	57.19	598	...
Pococí	57.19	598	...
Siquirres	34.71	574	...
Talamanca	57.19	540	...
Matina	57.19	587	...
Guácimo	57.19	588	...

^{1/} When a price does not appear, the cantón did not produce tobacco.

CORN ON THE COB

Production technology

Since this product is nothing more than corn still partially immature and still on the cob, the costs of production considered in this case were the costs of production of corn minus the cost of shelling.

Only producers employing technology 2 use fertilizer, which is reflected in yields. Farmers using technology 1 obtain 25,000 or fewer units per hectare, while farmers using technology 2 produce more than 25,000 units per hectare.

Costs of production

Inputs	Technology 1	Technology 2
LABOR		
Working days per hectare	38	43
Colones per hectare	673	753
Daily wages	18	18
MATERIALS		
Colones per hectare	32	456
TOTAL COST PER HECTARE	705	1,209

Selling price

The price was estimated as ¢ 0.12 per unit minus the corresponding transportation costs.

Transportation costs

These costs were estimated at ¢ 0.4782 per ton kilometer. It was estimated that each unit of corn on the cob has an average weight of 230 grams.

Sources

Banco Crédito Agrícola de Cartago. Op. cit., pp. 59, 69, 74 and 176.

Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería, Departamento de Economía y Estadísticas Agropecuarias. Costos de Producción de Maíz en la Región Meseta Central Occidental, Zona de San Rafael de Ojo de Agua, Mayo-Diciembre de 1972. San José, julio de 1973.

E G G S

Production technology

Two possible levels of technology are considered. It is assumed that the employment of one or the other depends on the volume of production and that technology 2 is used by those producers with an annual production over 22,000 units.

Costs of production

Inputs	Technology 1	Technology 2
LABOR		
Working days per thousand	0.33	0.33
Colones per thousand	6.48	6.48
Dayly wages	17.75	17.75
MATERIALS		
Colones per thousand	85.00	170.00
TOTAL COST PER THOUSAND	91.48	176.48

Selling price

A price of ¢ 250 per thousand was considered (at the farm level).

Sources

Banco Crédito Agrícola de Cartago. Op. cit., pp. 172-174.

Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería, Departamento de Economía y Estadísticas Agropecuarias. Análisis Económico en Granjas de la Meseta Central. Información Técnica # 11. San José, 1975.

L E T T U C E

Production technology

Two different technologies are considered. The main difference between the two is that technology 2 implies the use of fertilizer.

Costs of production

Inputs	Technology 1	Technology 2
LABOR		
Working days per hectare	125	125
Colones per hectare	2,000	2,000
Daily wages	16	16
MATERIALS		
Colones per hectare	286	879
TOTAL COST PER HECTARE	2,286	2,879

Selling price

The price was estimated as ¢ 0.11 per unit minus transportation costs.

Transportation costs

It was estimated that transportation costs were ¢ 0.04 per kilometer per thousand units. Distances were considered with respect to San José.

Sources

Banco Crédito Agrícola de Cartago, Op. cit.

M I L K

Production technology

Only one production technology was considered.

Production zones

The country was divided into two major zones. Zone 1 includes the Valle Central Oriental (East Central Valley), Central Pacific and Southern Pacific regions, while zone 2 includes the Valle Central Occidental (West Central Valley), Northern, Dry Pacific and Atlantic regions.

Costs of production

Inputs	Zone 1	Zone 2
LABOR		
Working days per cow	29	27
Colones per cow	462	433
Daily wages	16	16
MATERIALS		
Colones per cow	1,147	594
TOTAL COST PER COW	1,609	1,027

Selling price

The price, at the farm level, was estimated as ¢ 1 per liter.

Sources

Soley, Alberto. Análisis Económico de la Producción de Leche en Costa Rica, 1973. Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería, Departamento de Planificación y Coordinación. San José, 1974.

Herrman, Louis F. Producción Potencial y Utilización de la Leche en Costa Rica. Oficina de Desarrollo Rural de la Agencia para el Desarrollo Internacional, San José, 1972.

O N I O N S

Production technology

In the case of this crop, a greater diversity among the possible technologies than with respect to other agricultural products was found and for this reason three technologies were considered. The cost differences among these technologies are due to the amounts and classes of materials employed. It was assumed that the type of technology used by the producer would be reflected in his volume of production. Thus, technology 1 corresponds to producers with a yield of less than 7 tons per hectare; technology 2 corresponds to producers obtaining between 7 and less than 18 tons per hectare and technology 3 corresponds to those producing 18 tons per hectare and more.

Costs of production

	TECHNOLOGY		
	1	2	3
LABOR			
Working days per hectare	331	373	502
Colones per hectare	5,720	6,472	8,680
Daily wages	17	17	17
MATERIALS			
Colones per hectare	2,003	4,167	5,419
TOTAL COST PER HECTARE	7,723	10,639	14,099

160

Selling price

The price was estimated as ¢ 1,850 per ton minus transportation costs.

Transportation cost

Transportation costs were ¢ 0.4782 per ton kilometer.

Sources

Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería, Departamento de Economía y Estadísticas Agropecuarias. Costos de Producción de Cebolla, junio 1973-abril 1974. Boletín Técnico N° 23, San José, 1974. p. 29.

Banco Crédito Agrícola de Cartago, Op. cit., p. 176.

Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería, Departamento de Economía y Estadísticas Agropecuarias. Costos de Producción de Cebollas en la Región Meseta Central Oriental, julio de 1973-enero de 1974. Boletín Técnico N° 12. San José, 1974.

O R A N G E S

Production technology

Statistics about the costs of production of oranges are not readily available. For this reason, it was not possible to consider cost differences on the basis of different technologies.

Costs of production

LABOR

Working days per hectare	66
Colones per hectare	1,060
Daily wages	16

MATERIALS

Colones per hectare	898
---------------------	-----

TOTAL COST PER HECTARE	1,958
------------------------	-------

Selling price

The price of the oranges at the farm gate was computed as ¢ 5.90 per hundred.

Observations

The costs considered for this product are referred to compact orange orchards.

Sources

Banco Crédito Agrícola de Cartago. Op. cit., pp. 85 and 86.

González Vega, Claudio, Lizano F., Eduardo and Vogel, Robert Cross. The Marketing of Agricultural Products in Costa Rica. San José, 1970. p. 110.

P A P A Y A

Production technology

The sources of information are very limited in this case. It was possible to consider only one technology, on the basis of information

obtained from interviews with technicians and with experienced farmers.

Costs of production

LABOR

Working days per hectare	33
Colones per hectare	558
Daily wages	17

MATERIALS

Colones per hectare	787
TOTAL COST PER HECTARE	1,345

Selling price

The selling price was ¢ 0.25 per kilo, received by the producer at the farm level in any part of the country.

Sources

González Vega, Claudio, Lizano F. Eduardo and Gogel, Robert Cross. Op. cit., p. 107.

Interviews with several technicians and with several papaya producers.

P I N E A P P L E

Production technology

The difference between technology 1 and technology 2 is due, mainly, to the different amount of fertilizers and pesticides used in

each case. Technology 2 is employed by those who produce 10,000 pineapples or more per hectare.

Costs of production

Inputs	Technology 1	Technology 2
LABOR		
Working days per hectare	85	93
Colones per hectare	1,156	1,258
Daily wages	11	14
MATERIALS		
Colones per hectare	451	1,043
TOTAL COST PER HECTARE	1,607	2,301

Selling price

It was estimated that the price received by the producers at the farm level was ¢ 0.65 per unit.

Sources

Banco Crédito Agrícola de Cartago. Op. cit., pp. 110 and 111.

P L A N T A I N

Production technology

The use of two possible technologies is considered, differentiated according to the amount of fertilizer applied. Technology 2 is employed

by producers with a yield per hectare above the average corresponding to the cantón where the plantation is located.

Costs of production

Inputs	Technology	Technology
LABOR		
Working days per hectare	70	79
Colones per hectare	1,120	1,260
Daily wages	16	16
MATERIALS		
Colones per hectare	350	1,000
TOTAL COST PER HECTARE	1,470	2,260

Selling price

It was estimated that the selling price received by the producer at the farm level was ¢ 0.25 per kilo.

Sources

Banco Crédito Agrícola de Cartago. Op. cit., pp. 125 and 128.

Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería. Departamento de Economía y Estadísticas Agropecuarias. Costo de Producción de Plátano en la Región de la Zona Norte, Zona de los Angeles, 1973. San José, 1974.

P L A N T A I' N (GUINEO)

Production technology

It was very difficult to obtain information concerning the technology used and the costs of production of this crop. The few data gathered do not make it possible to establish a difference between technologies. As a result, only one technology was considered.

Costs of production

LABOR

Working days per hectare	30
Colones per hectare	480
Daily wages	16

MATERIALS

Colones per hectare	186
---------------------	-----

TOTAL COST PER HECTARE	830
------------------------	-----

Selling price

A price of ¢ 100 per ton at the farm gate was considered.

Sources

Information from producers in the area of San Carlos.

P O T A T O E S

Production technology

The difference between technology 1 and technology 2 is due to the materials employed and, mainly, to the fact that the producers using technology 2 purchase the seed, while producers using technology

1 produce their own seed. Technology 2 is used by producers with a yield per hectare above the average for the cantón where the farm is located.

Production zones

Two zones are considered. The cantones included in each one of these zones are listed in Table B-8.

Table B-8

CANTONES INCLUDED IN EACH ONE OF THE POTATOE PRODUCING ZONES
AND PRICES RECEIVED BY THE PRODUCER

Cantón	Colones per ton	Cantón	Colones per ton
<u>ZONE 1</u>			
Alajuela	650	San Rafael	653
San Ramón	625	San Isidro	650
Grecia	641	Belén	654
San Mateo	628	Flores	653
Atenas	639	San Pablo	656
Naranjo	635	Sarapiquí	613
Palmares	628	Liberia	549
Poás	644	Nicoya	511
Orotina	627	Santa Cruz	522
San Carlos	612	Bagaces	561
Alfaro Ruiz	625	Carrillo	534
Valverde Vega	637	Cañas	572
Upala	547	Abangares	581
Los Chiles	576	Tilarán	561
Guatuso	593	Nandayure	493
Heredia	655	La Cruz	521

Table B-8 Cont ...

Cantón	Colones per ton	Cantón	Colones per ton
Barva	653	Hojancha	505
Santo Domingo	657	Puntarenas	600
Santa Bárbara	650	Esparta	609
<u>ZONE 2</u>			
San José	660	Cartago	649
Escazú	656	Paraíso	646
Desamparados	658	La Unión	654
Puriscal	639	Jiménez	653
Tarrazú	626	Turrialba	629
Aserrí	655	Alvarado	641
Mora	650	Oreamuno	648
Goicoechea	658	El Guarco	648
Santa Ana	654	Buenos Aires	564
Alajuelita	658	Osa	532
Coronado	655	Aguirre	594
Acosta	646	Golfito	497
Tibás	659	Coto Bus	485
Moravia	657	Parrita	605
Montes de Oca	659	Limón	580
Turrubares	629	Pococí	582
Dota	629	Siquirres	607
Curridabat	657	Talamanca	550
Pérez Zeledón	596	Matina	593
León Cortés	624	Guácimo	593

Costs of production

Zone and inputs	Technology 1	Technology 2
ZONE 1		
LABOR		
Working days per hectare	110	130
Colones per hectare	1,496	1,768
Daily wages	14	14
MATERIALS		
Colones per hectare	1,624	3,435
TOTAL COST PER HECTARE	3,120	5,203
ZONE 2		
LABOR		
Working days per hectare	186	206
Colones per hectare	2,530	2,802
Daily wages	14	1
MATERIALS		
Colones per hectare	2,550	6,640
TOTAL COST PER HECTARE	5,080	9,442

Selling price

The prices received by the producer at the farm level, in each cantón, appear in Table B-8. This table also indicates the cantones which comprise each of the two production zones.

Sources

Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería. Departamento de Economía y Estadísticas Agropecuarias. Costos de Producción de Papas, Zona de Zarcero, octubre 1972-marzo 1973. San José, 1973.

González Vega, Claudio, Lizano F. Eduardo and Vogel, Robert Cross. Op. cit., p. 74.

Banco Crédito Agrícola de Cartago. Op. cit., p. 95.

P O U L T R Y

Production technology

Two possible technologies are taken into account: technology 1 is used by producers with less than 200 birds and technology 2 is used by producers with 200 birds and over.

Costs of production

Inputs	Technology 1	Technology 2
LABOR		
Working days per bird	0.0119	0.0119
Colones per bird	0.1523	0.1809
Daily wages	12.80	15.20
MATERIALS		
Colones per bird	3.00	6.10
TOTAL COST PER BIRD	3.10	6.30

Sources

Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería. Departamento de Economía y Estadísticas Agropecuarias. Costos de Producción de Papas, Zona de Zarcero, octubre 1972-marzo 1973. San José, 1973.

González Vega, Claudio, Lizano F. Eduardo and Vogel, Robert Cross. Op. cit., p. 74.

Banco Crédito Agrícola de Cartago. Op. cit., p. 95.

P O U L T R Y

Production technology

Two possible technologies are taken into account: technology 1 is used by producers with less than 200 birds and technology 2 is used by producers with 200 birds and over.

Costs of production

Inputs	Technology 1	Technology 2
LABOR		
Working days per bird	0.0119	0.0119
Colones per bird	0.1523	0.1809
Daily wages	12.80	13.20
MATERIALS		
Colones per bird	3.00	6.10
TOTAL COST PER BIRD	3.10	6.30

Selling price

A price of ¢ 8.62 per bird, at the level of the producer, was estimated.

Sources

Soley, Alberto. Análisis Económico de Granjas Avícolas de la Meseta Central. Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería. San José, 1975.

Banco Crédito Agrícola de Cartago. Op. cit., p.170.

Ministerio de Economía, Industria y Comercio. Unpublished data corresponding to a sample of 10 producers located in the Central Plateau (Meseta Central).

R I C E (PADDY)

Production technology

Two technologies are considered. Technology 2 implies the use of fertilizers, herbicides, fungicides, insecticides and machinery.

Production zones

The country is divided into four production zones:

- Zona 1: Agricultural Region 1
Agricultural Region 2
- Zone 2: Agricultural Region 3
Agricultural Region 4
- Zone 3: Agricultural Region 5
- Zone 4: Agricultural Region 6
Agricultural Region 7

Table C-2 lists the cantones included in each one of these agricultural regions.

Costs of production

ZONE	Cost of materials (Colones per Hectare)		LABOR			
			Working days per hectare		Daily wages	
			TECHNOLOGY			
	1	2	1	2	1	2
1	132	428	42	18	17	44
2	171	616	42	8	17	44
3	149	631	42	21	17	44
4	143	545	42	18	17	44

Selling price

The price was ¢ 796 per metric ton minus transportation costs from the farm to the market place.

Transportation costs

The costs were ¢ 0.4782 per ton kilometer.

Sources

Banco Crédito Agrícola de Cartago. Op. cit., p. 176.

Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería. Departamento de Economía y Estadísticas Agropecuarias. Boletines Técnicos N° 6 (1971), 9 (1973), 10 (1973), 20 (1974) and 22 (1974).

Table C-2 lists the cantones included in each one of these agricultural regions.

Costs of production

ZONE	Cost of materials (Colones per Hectare)		L A B O R			
			Working days per hectare		Daily wages	
	-	2	T E C H N O L O G Y		1	2
		1	2			
1	132	428	42	18	17	44
2	171	616	42	8	17	44
3	149	631	42	21	17	44
4	143	545	42	18	17	44

Selling price

The price was ¢ 796 per metric ton minus transportation costs from the farm to the market place.

Transportation costs

The costs were ¢ 0.4782 per ton kilometer.

Sources

Banco Crédito Agrícola de Cartago. Op. cit., p. 176.

Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería. Departamento de Economía y Estadísticas Agropecuarias. Boletines Técnicos N° 6 (1971), 9 (1973), 10 (1973), 20 (1974) and 22 (1974).

S O R G H U M

Production technology

The two technologies, 1 and 2, differ in that technology 2 employs more fertilizers, herbicides and insecticides than technology 1.

Technology 2 is used by those producers with a yield per hectare above two tons.

Costs of production

Inputs	Technology 1	Technology 2
LABOR		
Working days per hectare	40	45
Colones per hectare	640	726
Daily wages	16	16
MATERIALS		
Colones per hectare	56	404
TOTAL COST PER HECTARE	696	1,130

Selling price

It was estimated that the producer received ¢ 409 per ton at the farm gate.

Sources

Consejo Nacional de Producción. Sorgo. Estudio para la Fijación de los Precios Mínimos en el Período 1972-1973. San José, 197

Banco Crédito Agrícola de Cartago, Op. cit., p. 108.

175

S T R I N G B E A N S

Production technology

Two possible technologies were considered. Technology 2 is used by those producers with a yield per hectare above 2,500 kilos.

Costs of production

Inputs	Technology 1	Technology 2
LABOR		
Working days per hectare	23	30
Colones per hectare	304	403
Daily wages	13	13
MATERIALS		
Colones per hectare	186	201
TOTAL COST PER HECTARE	490	797

Selling price

The price at the farm level was estimated as ¢ 0.56 per kilo.

Sources

Banco Crédito Agrícola de Cartago. Op. cit., p. 62.

Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería. Departamento de Economía y Estadísticas Agropecuarias. Costos de Producción de Frijoles en la Región de la Meseta Central Occidental, Set-Dic. 1972. San José, 1973.

176

SUGAR CANEProduction technology

The difference between technology 1 and technology 2 is in the amount of fertilizer used.

Costs of production

Inputs	Technology 1	Technology 2
LABOR		
Working days per hectare	61	81
Colones per hectare	1,044	1,400
Daily wages	17	17
MATERIALS		
Colones per hectare	260	733
TOTAL COST PER HECTARE	1,304	2,133

Selling price

The prices paid to the producers were estimated on the basis of the information provided by the Liga Agrícola Industrial de la Caña de Azúcar. The price computed for each cantón was equal to the average price paid by the sugar mill in that cantón. When more than one sugar mill was located in the cantón, a weighted average price was calculated. The weights used were the volume of production received by each sugar mill. In the case of cane-producing cantones where there were no sugar mills,

the price paid by the mill nearest to the cantón was considered. The list of prices appears in Table B-7.

Sources

Liga Agrícola Industrial de la Caña de Azúcar. Data corresponding to the period from October 1st. 1972 to September 30th. 1973. 1972-1973 Crop. Mimeograph notes.

Banco Crédito Agrícola de Cartago. Op. cit., pp. 43-44.

S W E E T P O T A T O E S

Production technology

The two technologies are distinguished on the basis of the amounts of materials used.

Costs of production

Inputs	Technology 1	Technology 2
LABOR		
Working days per hectare	55	55
Colones per hectare	1,039	1,039
Daily wages	19	19
MATERIALS		
Colones per hectare	887	1 059
TOTAL COST PER HECTARE	1.926	2,098

Selling price

The price was estimated as ¢ 326 per ton minus transportation costs.

Transportation costs

It was estimated as ¢ 0.4782 per ton kilometer.

Sources

Banco Crédito Agrícola de Cartago. Op. cit., pp. 38-39 and 176.

S W I N E

Volume of production

The volume of production, measured in kilos per live animal, depends upon the size of the herd, its age structure and the sex of the animals. Thus, the average increase in the weight of the animal, up to the moment of its sale (in the case of fattening), is related to the age and sex of the hog. In addition, it is necessary to estimate the annual increase in the weight of the herd as a result of reproduction. For all these reasons, the number of kilos produced, k , is computed in the following fashion:

$$k = 75 C + 25 M + 700 F + 25 P$$

were:

C represents the number of hogs of both sexes of less than six months of age.

M represents the number of males six months old and older.

F represents the number of females six months old and older, for reproduction.

P represents the number of females six months old and older, for meat.

The previous relationships imply the following: that all animals of less than six months of age increased their weight 75 kilos, on the average, per year. That the males older than six months and the females six months old and older, reserved for meat, increased their weight 25 kilos on the average and, finally, that for each female reserved for reproduction in the herd, production increased, due to reproduction and weight gains, 700 kilos per year.

Production technology

Production technologies are determined, mainly, by the size of the herd. Technology 1 is used in the case of herds of less than 10 animals, while technology 2 is used in the case of herds of 10 animals and more.

Costs of production

Inputs	Technology 1	Technology 2
LABOR		
Working days per kilo	0.030	0.032
Colones per kilo	0.420	0.444
Daily wages	14	14
MATERIALS		
Colones per kilo	2,126	1.622
TOTAL COST PER KILO	2.546	2.066

Selling price

A price of ¢ 4 per kilo at the farm level was considered.

Sources

Benavides S., Manuel. Análisis de los Precios de los Productos Básicos de Costa Rica. Comentarios sobre Asuntos Económicos N° 12, Banco Central de Costa Rica. San José. p. 161.

Banco Crédito Agrícola de Cartago. Op. cit., p. 179.

Interview with Ing. Alberto Soley of the Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería.

T O B A C C O

Production technology

Technology 2 is used by producers who employ fertilizer, which according to the Agricultural Census of 1973 constitute the mayor part of the producers of this crop.

Production zones

The tobacco producing regions are grouped into three zones, taking into account, in particular, the type of tobacco which predominates in each one. Zone 1 includes the cantones of the West Central Valley Region. Zone 2 includes the cantones of the Central Pacific Region and zone 3 includes those of the Southern Pacific region. Tobacco is not produced in the other cantones of the country.

Costs of production

<u>Inputs</u>	<u>Technology 1</u>	<u>Technology 2</u>
<u>ZONE 1</u>		
LABOR		
Working days per hectare	150	157
Colones per hectare	2,040	2,135
Daily wages	14	14
MATERIALS		
Colones per hectare	181	888
TOTAL COST PER HECTARE	2,221	3,023
<u>ZONE 2</u>		
LABOR		
Working days per hectare	184	194
Colones per hectare	2,502	2,638
Daily wages	14	14
MATERIALS		
Colones per hectare	1,783	2,725
TOTAL COST PER HECTARE	4,285	5,363
<u>ZONE 3</u>		
LABOR		
Working days per hectare	184	194
Colones per hectare	2,502	2,638
Daily wages	14	14
MATERIALS:		
Colones per hectare	939	2,067
TOTAL COST PER HECTARE	3,441	4,705

Selling price

The prices per ton received by the producer, according to the cantón where the farm is located, appear in Table B-7.

Sources

Junta de Defensa del Tabaco. Estudio de Costos de Producción de Tabaco Sol, Cosecha 1972-1973. San José, s.d. p. 2-8.

Junta de Defensa del Tabaco. Estudio de Costos de Producción de Tabaco Estufado, Cosecha 1972-1973. San José, s.d. p. 2-8.

Junta de Defensa del Tabaco. Estudio de Costos de Producción de Tabaco Burley, Cosecha 1972-1973. San José, s.d. p. 2-8.

Banco Crédito Agrícola de Cartago. Op. cit., p. 138.

T O M A T O E S

Production technology

Two technologies are considered. The difference between the two lies in the use or non use of fertilizer.

Costs of production

Inputs	Technology 1	Technology 2
LABOR		
Working days per hectare	200	232
Colones per hectare	3.200	3.712
Daily wages	16	16
MATERIALS		
Colones per hectare	4.655	6.954
TOTAL COST PER HECTARE	7.855	10.666

Selling price

A price of ¢ 1.40 per kilo, minus transportation costs, was considered.

Transportation costs

Transportation costs were ¢ 0.4782 per ton kilometer.

Sources

Banco Crédito Agrícola de Cartago. Op. cit., pp. 147-149.

González Vega, Claudio; Lizano F. Eduardo and Vogel, Robert Cross. Op. cit. p. 100.

APPENDIX C

OTHER DATA

Table C-1

EQUIVALENCES USED

<u>One unit of</u>	<u>is equivalent to</u>
Bag of paddy rice of 160 pounds	73.60 kilos of polished rice
Bottle	67 centilitres
Box of cacao	17.63 kilos
Box of tomatoes	12.88 kilos
Bunch of bananas	23.00 kilos
Bunch of plantain	16.10 kilos
Colón of 1969	1.139 colones of 1972
Colón of 1972	0.878 colones of 1969
Dollar of 1969	6.750 colones of 1969
Fanega of coffee	257.60 kilos or 20 cajuelas
Fanega of beans	294.40 kilos or 20 cajuelas
Fanega of corn	353.28 kilos or 24 cajuelas
Hectare	1.431 manzanas or 100 ares
Kilometer	0.621 miles
Load of potatoes	828 kilos
Manzana	69.89 ares or 0.699 hectares
Metric ton	1,000 kilos
Pound (Spanish)	460 grams

Table C-2

COSTA RICA: CANTONES INCLUDED IN EACH ONE OF THE
AGRICULTURAL REGIONS

Cantón	Code	Cantón	Code	Cantón	Code
<u>Region 1-EAST CENTRAL VALLEY</u>					
Tarrazú	105	El Guarco	308	San Rafael	405
Goicoechea	108	<u>Region 2-WEST CENTRAL VALLEY</u>		San Isidro	406
Coronado	111	Alajuela	201	Belén	407
Tibás	113	San Ramón	202	Flores	408
Moravia	114	Grecia	203	San Pablo	409
Montes de Oca	115	San Mateo	204	<u>Region 3 - NORTHERN</u>	
Dota	117	Atenas	205	San Carlos	210
León Cortés	120	Naranjo	206	Alfaro Ruiz	211
Cartago	301	Palmares	207	Upala	213
Paraiso	302	Poás	208	Los Chiles	214
La Unión	303	Orotina	209	Guatuso	215
Jiménez	304	Valverde Vega	212	Sarapiquí	410
Turrialba	305	Heredia	401	<u>Region 4 - DRY PACIFIC</u>	
Alvarado	306	Barva	402	Liberia	501
Oreamuno	307	Santo Domingo	403	Nicoya	502
		Santa Bárbara	404	Santa Cruz	503

Table C-2 Cont ...

Cantón	Code	Cantón	Code	Cantón	Code
Bagaces	504	<u>Region 5 - CENTRAL PACIFIC</u>		<u>Region 6 - SOUTHERN PACIFIC</u>	
Carrillo	505	San José	101	Pérez Zeledón	119
Cañas	506	Escazú	102	Buenos Aires	603
Abangares	507	Desamparados	103	Osa	605
Tilarán	508	Puriscal	104	Golfoito	607
Nandayure	509	Aserrí	105	Coto Brus	608
La Cruz	510	Mora	106	<u>Region 7 - ATLANTIC</u>	
Hojancha	511	Santa Ana	109	Limón	701
Puntarenas	601	Alajuelita	110	Pococí	702
Esparta	602	Acosta	112	Siquirres	703
Montes de Oro	604	Turrubares	116	Talamanca	704
		Curridabat	118	Matina	705
		Aguirre	606	Guácimo	706
		Parrita	609		

Source: Agricultural Census of 1973.

Table C-3

COSTA RICA: DISTANCES IN KILOMETERS BETWEEN THE CAPITAL OF EACH CANTON AND THE CITY OF SAN JOSE AND CANTONES INCLUDED IN EACH PROVINCE IN 1973

Code and name of the cantón	Dis- tance	Code and name of the cantón	Dis- tance	Code and name of the cantón	Dis- tance
1. <u>SAN JOSE</u>		115 Montes de Oca	3	209 Orotina	69
101 San José	..	116 Turrubares	64	210 San Carlos	101
102 Escazú	8	117 Dota	64	211 Alfaro Ruiz	73
103 Desamparados	5	118 Curridabat	6	212 Valverde Vega	48
104 Puriscal	43	119 Pérez Zeledón	134	213 Upala	236
105 Tarrazú	71	120 León Cortés	75	214 Los Chiles	175
106 Aserrí	11	2. <u>ALAJUELA</u>		215 Guatuso	140
107 Mora	22	201 Alajuela	20	3. <u>CARTAGO</u>	
108 Goicoechea	4	202 San Ramón	74	301 Cartago	22
109 Santa Ana	13	203 Grecia	40	302 Paraíso	29
110 Alajuelita	5	204 San Mateo	65	303 La Unión	12
111 Coronado	11	205 Atenas	44	304 Jiménez	53
112 Acosta	29	206 Naranjo	53	305 Turrialba	64
113 Tibás	3	207 Palmares	66	305 Alvarado	40
114 Moravia	6	208 Poás	34	307 Oreamuno	26
				308 El Guarco	25

Table C-3 Cont ...

Code and name of the cantón	Dis- tance	Code and name of the cantón	Dis- tance	Code and name of the cantón	Dis- tance
4. <u>HEREDIA</u>		502 Nicoya	312	603 Buenos Aires	201
401 Heredia	11	503 Santa Cruz	289	604 Montes de Oro	125
402 Barva	14	504 Bagaces	207	605 Osa	268
403 Santo Domingo	7	505 Carrillo	264	606 Aguirre	139
404 Santa Bárbara	20	506 Cañas	185	607 Golfito	341
405 San Rafael	14	507 Abangares	165	608 Coto Brus	366
406 San Isidro	19	508 Tilarán	208	609 Parrita	114
407 Belén	12	509 Nandayure	349	7. <u>LIMON</u>	
408 Flores	15	510 La Cruz	291	701 Limón	167
409 San Pablo	9	511 Hojancha	324	702 Pococí	162
410 Sarapiquí	98	6. <u>PUNTARENAS</u>		703 Siquirres	111
5. <u>GUANACASTE</u>		601 Puntarenas	126	704 Talamanca	231
501 Liberia	233	602 Esparta	106	705 Matina	140
				706 Guácimo	141

Source: Ministerio de Obras Públicas y Transportes. Departamento de Planificación (Ministry of Public Works and Transportation).

Table C-4.0

GEOGRAPHIC CONCENTRATION OF THE POOR

FAMILIES OF THE COUNTRY

PROVINCE	M E T H O D O L O G I E S .				
	I	II	III c	III m	III l
San José	0.28	0.29	0.28	0.29	0.30
Alajuela	0.21	0.20	0.20	0.19	0.19
Cartago	0.12	0.12	0.11	0.11	0.11
Heredia	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.06
Guanacaste	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.16	0.16
Puntarenas	0.11	0.10	0.13	0.13	0.13
Limón	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06

Source: Academia de Centro América.

Table C-4.1

GEOGRAPHIC CONCENTRATION OF THE POOR

URBAN FAMILIES OF THE COUNTRY

PROVINCE	M E T H O D O L O G I E S				
	I	II	III c	III m	III l
San José	0.45	0.45	0.47	0.48	0.49
Alajuela	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.13	0.13
Cartago	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11
Heredia	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.06
Guanacaste	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.08
Puntarenas	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.07
Limón	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.06

Source: Academia de Centro América.

Table C-4.2
 GEOGRAPHIC CONCENTRATION OF THE POOR RURAL
 NON-FARMING FAMILIES OF THE COUNTRY

PROVINCE	M E T H O D O L O G I E S				
	I	II	III c	III m	III l
San José	0.22	0.22	0.20	0.20	0.20
Alajuela	0.22	0.22	0.22	0.21	0.21
Cartago	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12
Heredia	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.07
Guanacaste	0.21	0.21	0.20	0.20	0.19
Puntarenas	0.11	0.11	0.12	0.12	0.12
Limón	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.05

Source: Academia de Centro América.

192

Table C-4.3
 GEOGRAPHIC CONCENTRATION OF THE POOR FARMING
 FAMILIES OF THE COUNTRY

PROVINCE	M E T H O D O L O G I E S				
	I	II	III c	III m	III l
San José	0.24	0.27	0.25	0.25	0.25
Alajuela	0.24	0.25	0.21	0.21	0.22
Cartago	0.11	0.13	0.09	0.09	0.09
Heredia	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.03
Guanacaste	0.17	0.15	0.17	0.17	0.17
Puntarenas	0.14	0.12	0.19	0.19	0.19
Limón	0.06	0.04	0.06	0.06	0.06

Source: Academia de Centro América.

193

C-9

Table C-5.0

DISTRIBUCION OF POVERTY: POOR FAMILIES AS A
PROPORTION OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES

PROVINCE	M E T H O D O L O G I E S				
	I	II	III c	III m	III l
COSTA RICA	0.24	0.23	0.36	0.44	0.51
San José	0.18	0.18	0.27	0.35	0.41
Alajuela	0.31	0.29	0.43	0.52	0.59
Cartago	0.28	0.28	0.39	0.49	0.57
Heredia	0.20	0.19	0.28	0.37	0.45
Guanacaste	0.36	0.33	0.51	0.61	0.69
Puntarenas	0.23	0.20	0.40	0.49	0.56
Limón	0.23	0.20	0.31	0.39	0.47

Source: Academia de Centro América.

C-10

194

Table C-5.1

DISTRIBUTION OF POVERTY: POOR URBAN FAMILIES AS
A PROPORTION OF THE URBAN FAMILIES

PROVINCE	M E T H O D O L O G I E S				
	I	II	III c	III m	III l
COSTA RICA	0.14	0.14	0.22	0.29	0.35
San José	0.11	0.11	0.18	0.24	0.30
Alajuela	0.18	0.18	0.29	0.37	0.43
Cartago	0.17	0.17	0.26	0.35	0.42
Heredia	0.11	0.11	0.21	0.27	0.34
Guanacaste	0.24	0.24	0.36	0.44	0.51
Puntarenas	0.19	0.19	0.27	0.35	0.42
Limón	0.20	0.20	0.26	0.32	0.39

Source: Academia de Centro América.

C-11

195

Table C-5.2

DISTRIBUTION OF POVERTY: POOR RURAL NON-FARMING FAMILIES AS
A PROPORTION OF THE RURAL NON-FARMING FAMILIES

PROVINCE	M E T H O D O L O G I E S				
	I	II	III c	III m	III l
COSTA RICA	0.34	0.34	0.44	0.54	0.63
San José	0.34	0.34	0.40	0.50	0.59
Alajuela	0.40	0.40	0.51	0.62	0.70
Cartago	0.36	0.36	0.46	0.59	0.68
Heredia	0.26	0.26	0.33	0.44	0.54
Guanacaste	0.42	0.42	0.55	0.66	0.74
Puntarenas	0.25	0.25	0.38	0.48	0.56
Limón	0.24	0.24	0.30	0.40	0.49

Source: Academia de Centro América.

199

Table C-5.3

DISTRIBUTION OF POVERTY: POOR FARMING FAMILIES AS A
PROPORTION OF THE FARMING FAMILIES

PROVINCE	M E T H O D O L O G I E S				
	I	II	III c	III m	III l
COSTA RICA	0.28	0.21	0.47	0.55	0.62
San José	0.27	0.23	0.50	0.58	0.65
Alajuela	0.28	0.22	0.42	0.50	0.57
Cartago	0.35	0.32	0.47	0.54	0.60
Heredia	0.24	0.19	0.34	0.40	0.45
Guanacaste	0.32	0.20	0.54	0.62	0.69
Puntarenas	0.22	0.14	0.51	0.59	0.66
Limón	0.24	0.13	0.40	0.49	0.55

Source: Academia de Centro América.

STATISTICAL ANNEX

Table 1-A-0. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART I).

COSTA RICA

INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS								
	ALL DECILES	LOWER HALF	FIRST UPPER HALF	SUBTOTAL	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	FIFTH	
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	140,815	7,041	7,041	14,082	14,082	14,082	14,082	14,082	
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	5.27	3.58	3.73	3.65	4.36	4.61	5.05	5.22	
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	3.03	1.61	1.68	1.64	2.17	2.33	2.66	2.83	
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	15,633	248	2,854	1,551	5,361	7,916	10,334	12,818	
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	1,104,656	1,728	1,992	3,720	3,036	2,328	2,592	2,504	
LOWER LIMIT	0	0	1,728	0	3,720	6,756	9,084	11,676	
UPPER LIMIT	1,104,656	1,728	3,720	3,720	6,756	9,084	11,676	14,280	
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	15,757	517	567	1,412	828	695	721	754	
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	1.01	2.09	0.20	0.91	0.15	0.09	0.07	0.06	
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.07	

199

Table 1-A-0. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART II).

COSTA RICA

INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS							
	SIXTH	SEVENTH	EIGHTH	NINTH	SUBTOTAL	TENTH : LOWER HALF	UPPER HALF	ALL DECILES
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	14,081	14,081	14,081	14,081	14,081	7,040	7,041	140,815
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	5.48	5.75	5.97	6.22	6.39	6.31	6.47	5.27
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	3.12	3.46	3.74	4.07	4.32	4.21	4.43	3.03
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	15,772	15,654	25,230	34,105	63,594	47,321	79,864	19,633
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	3,204	4,668	6,636	12,372	1,063,524	14,424	1,049,088	1,104,696
LOWER LIMIT	14,280	17,464	22,152	28,800	41,172	41,172	55,608	C
UPPER LIMIT	17,484	22,152	28,788	41,172	1,104,696	55,596	1,104,696	1,104,696
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	945	1,335	1,889	3,499	29,859	4,109	35,166	19,757
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.10	0.47	0.09	0.44	1.01
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	0.08	0.10	0.13	0.17	0.32	0.12	0.20	1.00

Table 1-A-0. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART II).

COSTA RICA

INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS							
	SIXTH	SEVENTH	EIGHTH	NINTH	SUBTOTAL	TENTH :		ALL DECILES
						LOWER HALF	UPPER HALF	
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	14,081	14,081	14,081	14,081	14,081	7,040	7,041	140,815
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	5.48	5.75	5.97	6.22	6.39	6.31	6.47	5.27
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMIL!	3.12	3.46	3.74	4.07	4.32	4.21	4.43	3.03
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	15,772	19,654	25,230	34,105	63,594	47,321	79,864	19,633
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	3,204	4,668	6,636	12,372	1,063,524	14,424	1,049,088	1,104,696
LOWER LIMIT	14,280	17,466	22,152	28,800	41,172	41,172	55,608	C
UPPER LIMIT	17,484	22,152	28,788	41,172	1,104,696	55,596	1,104,696	1,104,696
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	945	1,335	1,889	3,499	29,859	4,109	35,166	19,757
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.10	0.47	0.09	0.44	1.01
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	0.08	0.10	0.13	0.17	0.32	0.12	0.20	1.00

Table 1-A-1. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART I).

PROVINCE SAN JOSE

INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS								
	ALL DECILES	LOWER HALF	UPPER HALF	SUB-TOTAL	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	FIFTH	
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	80,787	4,039	4,040	8,079	8,079	8,079	8,079	8,079	8,079
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	5.21	3.40	3.72	3.56	4.06	4.61	4.89	5.23	
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	3.08	1.63	1.78	1.71	2.06	2.41	2.64	2.94	
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	22,012	354	3,528	1,961	6,274	8,893	11,650	14,453	
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	554,148	2,400	2,400	4,800	2,844	2,712	2,616	3,012	
LOWER LIMIT	0	0	2,400	0	4,800	7,644	10,356	12,972	
UPPER LIMIT	554,148	2,400	4,800	4,800	7,644	10,356	12,972	15,984	
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	21,046	771	721	1,735	782	783	777	893	
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	0.56	1.95	0.20	0.88	0.12	0.09	0.07	0.06	
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.07	

Table 1-A-1. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART II).

PROVINCE SAN JOSE

INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS								
	SIXTH	SEVENTH	EIGHTH	NINTH	SUBTOTAL	LOWER HALF	UPPER HALF	ALL DECILES	
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	8,079	8,079	8,078	8,078	8,078	4,039	4,039	80,787	
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	5.43	5.77	6.03	6.23	6.27	6.12	6.42	5.21	
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	3.21	3.59	3.87	4.15	4.26	4.16	4.36	3.08	
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	17,807	22,193	28,255	38,226	70,415	53,335	87,495	22,012	
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	3,636	5,316	7,344	13,956	507,888	16,044	491,844	554,148	
LOWER LIMIT	15,996	15,632	24,960	32,304	46,260	46,260	62,304	0	
UPPER LIMIT	19,632	24,548	32,304	46,260	554,148	62,304	554,148	554,148	
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	1,030	1,492	2,183	3,941	27,420	4,607	29,984	21,046	
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.10	0.39	0.09	0.34	0.96	
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	0.08	0.10	0.13	0.17	0.32	0.12	0.20	1.00	

293

Table 1-A-2. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART I).

PROVINCE ALAJUELA

INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS								
	ALL DECILES	LOWER HALF	FIRST UPPER HALF	SUBTOTAL	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	FIFTH	
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	14,767	735	736	1,471	1,471	1,471	1,471	1,471	
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	5.26	4.14	3.82	3.98	3.85	4.80	5.20	5.36	
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	2.55	1.71	1.69	1.70	1.84	2.44	2.75	2.85	
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	16,113	84	2,062	1,074	4,204	6,267	8,692	10,912	
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	281,004	1,164	1,860	3,024	1,980	2,652	2,136	2,220	
LOWER LIMIT	0	0	1,164	0	3,024	5,004	7,656	9,792	
UPPER LIMIT	281,004	1,164	3,024	3,024	5,004	7,656	9,792	12,012	
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	15,509	274	624	1,100	692	773	639	667	
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	0.96	3.26	0.30	1.02	0.16	0.12	0.07	0.06	
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.07	

100

Table 1-A-2. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART II).

PROVINCE ALAJUELA

INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS								
	SIXTH	SEVENTH	EIGHTH	NINTH	SUBTOTAL	TENTH LOWER HALF	UPPER HALF	ALL DECILES	
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	1,471	1,471	1,470	1,470	1,470	735	735	14,707	
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	5.53	5.67	5.88	5.99	6.35	6.18	6.52	5.26	
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	3.05	3.35	3.62	3.78	4.18	3.97	4.39	2.95	
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	13,252	16,395	21,175	28,558	50,632	38,193	63,071	16,113	
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	2,664	3,528	6,180	9,264	247,344	10,440	236,904	281,004	
LOWER LIMIT	12,012	14,676	18,204	24,384	33,660	33,660	44,100	0	
UPPER LIMIT	14,676	18,204	24,384	33,648	281,004	44,100	281,004	281,004	
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	815	1,012	1,779	2,591	21,547	3,004	24,695	15,509	
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	0.06	0.06	0.08	0.09	0.43	0.08	0.39	0.96	
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	0.08	0.10	0.13	0.18	0.31	0.12	0.20	1.00	

205

Table 1-A-3. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS. BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DEVISION (PART I).

PROVINCE CARTAGO

DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS									
ALL DECILES	LOWER HALF	UPPER HALF	SUB-TOTAL	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	FIFTH		
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	12,481	624	625	1,249	1,248	1,248	1,248	1,248	1,248
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	5.63	3.84	4.09	3.96	4.40	5.15	5.48	5.52	
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	3.11	1.65	1.80	1.73	2.11	2.52	2.72	2.81	
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	16,522	629	2,907	1,769	4,974	7,359	9,415	11,323	
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	1,104,656	2,112	1,980	4,092	2,124	2,184	1,920	1,956	
LOWER LIMIT	0	0	2,112	0	4,092	6,216	8,400	10,320	
UPPER LIMIT	1,104,656	2,112	4,092	4,092	6,216	8,400	10,320	12,276	
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	17,552	776	598	1,334	747	632	588	624	
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	1.06	1.23	0.21	0.75	0.15	0.09	0.06	0.06	
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.06	0.07	

206

Table 1-A-3. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART II).

PROVINCE CARTAGO

INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS								
	SIXTH	SEVENTH	EIGHTH	NINTH	SUBTOTAL	LOWER HALF	UPPER HALF	ALL DECILES	
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	1,248	1,248	1,248	1,248	1,248	624	624	12,481	
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	5.94	6.15	6.41	6.43	6.82	6.71	6.92	5.63	
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 To 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	3.19	3.46	3.93	4.07	4.55	4.47	4.64	3.11	
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	13,608	16,483	21,182	28,320	50,797	38,159	63,436	16,522	
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	2,568	3,480	5,904	9,348	1,071,096	10,272	1,060,824	1,104,696	
LOWER LIMIT	12,276	14,844	18,336	24,252	33,600	33,600	43,872	0	
UPPER LIMIT	14,844	18,324	24,240	33,600	1,104,696	43,872	1,104,696	1,104,696	
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	742	572	1,685	2,615	34,989	3,012	6,058	17,592	
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	0.05	0.06	0.08	0.09	0.69	0.08	0.73	1.06	
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	0.08	0.10	0.13	0.17	0.31	0.12	0.19	1.00	

Table 1-A-4. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART I).

PROVINCE HEREDIA

INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS								
	ALL DECILES	FIRST HALF			SUBTOTAL	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	FIFTH
		LOWER HALF	UPPER HALF						
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	8,857	443	443	886	886	886	886	886	
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	5.52	3.84	3.66	3.75	4.48	5.04	5.20	5.56	
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	3.22	1.88	1.79	1.83	2.24	2.59	2.86	3.08	
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	20,663	963	3,715	2,339	6,157	8,830	11,497	14,059	
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	212,804	2,832	1,836	4,668	2,616	2,904	2,448	2,856	
LOWER LIMIT	0	0	2,832	0	4,668	7,296	10,200	12,648	
UPPER LIMIT	212,804	2,832	4,668	4,668	7,284	10,200	12,648	15,504	
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	17,732	1,055	531	1,610	707	793	714	845	
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	0.66	1.10	0.14	0.69	0.11	0.09	0.06	0.06	
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.06	0.07	

808

Table 1-A-4. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART II).

PROVINCE HEREDIA

INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS								
	SIXTH	SEVENTH	EIGHTH	NINTH	SUBTOTAL	LOWER HALF	UPPER HALF	TENTH	ALL DECILES
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	886	886	885	885	885	442	443		8,857
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	5.71	6.05	6.32	6.32	6.78	6.51	7.05		5.52
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	3.34	3.69	3.99	4.08	4.48	4.22	4.74		3.22
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	17,323	21,625	27,513	36,223	61,136	48,247	73,996		20,663
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	3,656	5,004	6,720	12,024	170,820	12,000	158,712		213,804
LOWER LIMIT	15,504	15,200	24,216	30,936	42,984	42,984	55,092		0
UPPER LIMIT	19,200	24,204	30,936	42,960	213,804	54,984	213,804		213,804
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	1.124	1.483	1.971	3,493	19,190	3,425	19,823		17,732
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.10	0.31	0.07	0.27		0.86
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	0.08	0.10	0.13	0.18	0.30	0.12	0.18		1.00

10-2

Table 1-A-5. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART I).

PROVINCE GUANACASTE

INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS								
	ALL DECILES	LOWER HALF	FIRST UPPER HALF	SUBTOTAL	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	FIFTH	
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	7,408	370	371	741	741	741	741	741	
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	5.76	4.24	4.41	4.33	4.45	5.00	5.89	5.89	
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	3.03	1.68	1.65	1.67	2.01	2.34	2.73	2.92	
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	15,762	229	1,891	1,061	3,817	5,569	7,811	9,945	
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	1,104,120	956	1,488	2,484	2,268	1,848	2,292	2,100	
LOWER LIMIT	0	0	996	0	2,484	4,752	6,600	8,892	
UPPER LIMIT	1,104,120	956	2,484	2,484	4,752	6,600	8,892	10,992	
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	20,432	382	398	918	787	579	633	631	
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	1.30	1.67	0.21	0.87	0.21	0.10	0.08	0.06	
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.04	0.05	0.06	

016

Table 1-A-5. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART II).

PROVINCE	GUANACASTE								
INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS								
	SIXTH	SEVENTH	EIGHTH	NINTH	SUBTOTAL	TENTH -		ALL DECILES	
						LOWER HALF	UPPER HALF		
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	741	741	741	740	740	370	370	7,408	
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	5.85	6.25	6.55	6.48	6.94	6.68	7.19	5.76	
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	3.00	3.43	3.79	3.88	4.54	4.18	4.89	3.03	
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	12,259	15,556	20,093	27,822	53,715	38,840	68,596	15,762	
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	2,756	3,624	5,964	10,440	1,070,268	11,340	1,058,820	1,104,120	
LOWER LIMIT	10,952	13,788	17,412	23,400	33,852	33,852	45,300	0	
UPPER LIMIT	13,788	17,412	23,376	33,840	1,104,120	45,192	1,104,120	1,104,120	
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	714	1,028	1,763	2,912	44,592	3,237	59,397	20,432	
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	0.06	0.07	0.09	0.10	0.83	0.08	0.87	1.30	
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	0.08	0.10	0.13	0.18	0.34	0.15	0.22	1.00	

Table 1-A-6. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART I).

PROVINCE: PUNTARENAS

INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS								
	ALL	FIRST			SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	FIFTH	
	DECILES	LOWER	UPPER	SUB-TOTAL					
		HALF	HALF						
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	8,869	443	444	887	887	887	887	887	
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	4.93	3.45	3.53	3.49	4.05	4.43	4.83	4.89	
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	2.75	1.56	1.58	1.57	1.88	2.29	2.48	2.61	
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	14,450	0	1,944	973	3,807	6,302	8,430	10,200	
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	340,560	0	2,616	2,616	2,568	2,304	1,848	1,848	
LOWER LIMIT	0	0	0	0	2,616	5,184	7,488	9,336	
UPPER LIMIT	340,560	0	2,616	2,616	5,184	7,488	9,336	11,184	
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	14,172	0	563	1,051	684	696	541	524	
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	0.98	0.00	0.29	1.08	0.18	1.11	0.06	0.05	
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.03	1.04	0.06	0.07	

210

Table 1-A-6. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART II).

PROVINCE PUNTARENAS

INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS								
	SIXTH	SEVENTH	EIGHTH	NINTH	SUBTOTAL	LOWER HALF	UPPER HALF	ALL DECILES	
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	867	897	887	887	886	443	443	8,869	
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	4.95	5.29	5.64	5.74	6.01	5.79	6.23	4.93	
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	2.70	2.94	3.37	3.61	4.09	3.76	4.42	2.75	
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	12,182	14,656	18,351	24,265	45,368	32,736	58,000	14,450	
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	2,016	2,844	4,728	8,016	311,724	9,564	302,064	340,560	
LOWER LIMIT	11,184	13,200	16,056	20,784	28,836	28,836	38,456	0	
UPPER LIMIT	13,200	16,044	20,784	28,800	340,560	38,400	340,560	340,560	
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	571	861	1,362	2,242	22,612	2,685	26,396	14,172	
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	0.05	0.06	0.07	0.09	0.50	0.08	0.46	0.98	
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	0.08	0.10	0.13	0.17	0.31	0.11	0.20	1.00	

213

Table 1-A-7. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART I).

PROVINCE LIMON

INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS								
	ALL DECILES	LOWER HALF	FIRST UPPER HALF	SUBTOTAL	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	FIFTH	
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	7,706	385	386	771	771	771	771	771	
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	4.97	3.33	3.42	3.38	4.02	4.67	4.70	4.76	
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	2.44	1.33	1.38	1.36	1.78	2.32	2.34	2.47	
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	14,954	0	1,006	504	3,628	6,358	8,493	10,385	
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	1,023,144	0	2,040	2,040	2,892	2,628	2,028	1,800	
LOWER LIMIT	0	0	0	0	2,040	4,932	7,572	9,600	
UPPER LIMIT	1,023,144	0	2,040	2,040	4,932	7,560	9,600	11,400	
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	19,179	0	885	803	767	700	614	541	
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	1.28	C.C0	C.88	1.59	0.21	0.11	0.07	0.05	
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	1.00	C.C0	C.00	.00	0.02	0.04	C.06	C.07	

110

Table 1-A-7. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART II).

PROVINCE LIMON

INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS								
	SIXTH	SEVENTH	EIGHTH	NINTH	SUBTOTAL	LOWER HALF	UPPER HALF	TENTH	ALL DECILES
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	771	770	770	770	770	385	385		7,706
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	4.93	5.27	5.65	5.84	6.52	6.46	6.58		4.97
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	2.53	2.84	3.25	3.43	4.32	3.96	4.67		2.44
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	12,428	15,044	18,917	25,220	48,647	34,549	62,746		14,956
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME									
LOWER LIMIT	2,364	2,868	4,968	8,352	1,053,156	10,176	1,042,980		1,083,144
UPPER LIMIT	11,400	13,764	16,632	21,600	29,988	29,988	40,164		0
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	13,764	16,632	21,600	29,952	1,083,144	40,164	1,083,144		1,083,144
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	623	802	1,427	2,318	43,995	2,927	58,858		19,179
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	0.05	0.05	0.08	0.09	0.90	0.09	0.94		1.28
	0.08	0.10	0.13	0.17	0.33	0.12	0.21		1.00

518

Table 1-B-0. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN RURAL AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART I).

COSTA RICA

INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN RURAL AREAS								
	ALL DECILES	LOWER HALF	UPPER HALF	SUBTOTAL	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	FIFTH	
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	125,533	6,477	6,477	12,954	12,954	12,954	12,953	,953	
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	5.73	4.06	3.91	3.99	4.92	5.21	5.33	5.40	
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	2.79	1.49	1.46	1.48	2.11	2.26	2.27	2.40	
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	10,381	555	1,340	968	3,364	4,901	6,131	,043	
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	3,420,504	956	1,032	2,028	2,208	1,308	972	,188	
LOWER LIMIT	0	0	996	0	2,028	4,236	5,544	,516	
UPPER LIMIT	3,420,504	996	2,028	2,028	4,236	5,544	6,516	,704	
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	18,481	382	228	488	579	356	280	332	
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	1.78	0.64	0.17	0.50	0.17	0.07	0.05	0.05	
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.05	0.06	0.07	

9/10

Table 1-B-0. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN RURAL AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART II).

COSTA RICA

INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN URBAN AREAS								
	SIXTH	SEVENTH	EIGHTH	NINTH	SUBTOTAL	TENTH LOWER HALF	UPPER HALF	ALL DECILES	
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	12,953	12,953	12,953	12,953	12,953	6,476	6,477	129,533	
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	5.46	5.51	6.35	6.90	7.82	7.57	8.07	5.73	
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	2.54	2.84	3.20	3.80	4.97	4.48	5.46	2.79	
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	8,431	10,109	12,428	16,411	34,027	22,334	45,719	10,381	
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	1,404	2,196	2,628	5,568	3,401,004	6,456	3,394,548	3,420,504	
LOWER LIMIT	7,704	9,108	11,304	13,932	19,500	19,500	25,956	0	
UPPER LIMIT	9,108	11,304	13,932	19,500	3,420,504	25,956	3,420,504	3,420,504	
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	430	632	733	1,622	51,092	1,835	70,313	18,481	
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.10	1.50	0.08	1.54	1.78	
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME	0.08	0.10	0.12	0.16	0.33	0.11	0.22	1.00	

Table 1-B-1. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN RURAL AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART I).

PROVINCE SAN JOSE

INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN RURAL AREAS								
	ALL DECILES	LOWER HALF	UPPER HALF	SUBTOTAL	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	FIFTH	
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	28,736	1,437	1,437	2,874	2,874	2,874	2,874	2,874	
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	5.67	3.86	3.64	3.75	4.81	5.28	5.25	5.36	
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	2.80	1.40	1.33	1.36	2.06	2.55	2.34	2.43	
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	10,455	559	1,262	911	2,874	4,607	6,058	7,077	
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	314,456	1,044	396	1,440	2,304	1,620	1,152	1,260	
LOWER LIMIT	0	0	1,044	0	1,440	3,744	5,364	6,516	
UPPER LIMIT	314,456	1,044	1,440	1,440	3,744	5,364	6,516	7,776	
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	11,069	443	96	476	632	485	359	387	
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	1.06	0.79	0.08	0.52	0.22	0.11	0.06	0.05	
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.06	0.07	

218

Table 1-B-1. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN RURAL AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART II).

PROVINCE SAN JOSE

INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN RURAL AREAS								
	SIXTH	SEVENTH	EIGHTH	NINTH	SUBTOTAL	TENTH LOWER HALF	UPPER HALF	ALL DECILES	
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	2,874	2,873	2,873	2,873	2,873	1,436	1,437	28,736	
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	5.46	5.87	6.25	6.90	7.76	7.57	7.95	5.67	
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	2.57	2.88	3.24	3.92	4.86	4.59	5.13	2.80	
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	6,525	10,268	12,833	17,372	34,033	23,696	44,364	10,455	
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	1,404	2,304	3,060	6,204	293,748	6,804	286,944	314,496	
LOWER LIMIT	7,776	9,180	11,484	14,544	20,748	20,748	27,552	0	
UPPER LIMIT	9,180	11,484	14,544	20,748	314,496	27,552	314,496	314,496	
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	447	665	927	1,749	19,828	1,904	23,854	11,069	
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	0.05	0.06	0.07	0.10	0.58	0.08	0.54	1.06	
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	0.08	0.10	0.12	0.17	0.33	0.11	0.21	1.00	

169

Table 1-B-2. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN RURAL AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART I).

PROVINCE ALAJUELA

INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN RURAL AREAS								
	ALL DECILES	LOWER HALF	UPPER HALF	SUBTOTAL	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	FIFTH	
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	24,558	1,230	1,230	2,460	2,460	2,460	2,460	2,460	
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	5.74	4.09	3.91	4.00	4.54	5.09	5.28	5.46	
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	2.77	1.51	1.50	1.51	1.88	2.23	2.28	2.39	
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	8,750	590	1,294	942	2,878	4,280	5,241	6,207	
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	1,050,056	1,008	624	1,632	2,112	1,020	972	876	
LOWER LIMIT	0	0	1,008	0	1,632	3,744	4,764	5,736	
UPPER LIMIT	1,050,056	1,008	1,632	1,632	3,744	4,764	5,736	6,612	
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	14,828	392	215	473	571	252	269	236	
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	1.69	0.66	0.17	0.50	0.20	0.07	0.05	0.04	
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.05	0.06	0.07	

Table 1-B-2. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN RURAL AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART II).

PROVINCE ALAJUELA

INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN RURAL AREAS								
	SIXTH	SEVENTH	EIGHTH	NINTH	ISUBTOTAL	LOWER HALF	UPPER HALF	ALL DECILES	
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	2,460	2,460	2,460	2,459	2,459	1,229	1,230	24,598	
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	5.60	5.81	6.38	7.23	7.98	7.70	8.25	5.74	
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	2.52	2.75	3.22	4.00	4.96	4.56	5.35	2.77	
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	7,114	8,510	10,434	13,892	28,014	19,262	36,758	8,750	
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	1,164	1,536	2,556	4,932	1,073,256	5,844	1,067,388	1,090,056	
LOWER LIMIT	6,612	7,776	9,312	11,868	16,800	16,800	22,668	0	
UPPER LIMIT	7,776	9,312	11,868	16,800	1,090,056	22,644	1,090,056	1,090,056	
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	352	447	768	1,441	40,729	1,664	56,230	14,828	
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	0.05	0.05	0.07	0.10	1.45	0.09	1.53	1.69	
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	0.08	0.10	0.12	0.16	0.32	0.11	0.21	1.00	

18

Table 1-B-3. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN RURAL AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART I).

PROVINCE CARTAGO

INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN RURAL AREAS								
	ALL DECILES	LOWER HALF	UPPER HALF	SUBTOTAL	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	FIFTH	
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	15,238	762	762	1,524	1,524	1,524	1,524	1,524	1,524
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	6.07	4.70	4.45	4.58	4.88	5.18	5.43	5.68	
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	2.91	1.50	1.75	1.83	2.03	2.19	2.29	2.44	
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	5,942	722	1,980	1,351	4,135	4,943	5,888	6,976	
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	3,420,504	1,212	2,160	3,372	1,296	576	1,236	972	
LOWER LIMIT	0	0	1,212	0	3,372	4,668	5,244	6,460	
UPPER LIMIT	3,420,504	1,212	3,372	3,372	4,668	5,244	6,480	7,452	
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	30,330	425	755	878	404	170	380	301	
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	3.05	0.59	0.38	0.65	0.10	0.03	0.06	0.04	
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.05	0.06	0.07	

200

Table 1-B-3. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN RURAL AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART II).

PROVINCE CARTAGO

INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN RURAL AREAS								
	SIXTH	SEVENTH	EIGHTH	NINTH	SUBTOTAL	TENTH LOWER HALF	UPPER HALF	ALL DECILES	
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	1,524	1,524	1,524	1,523	1,523	761	762	15,238	
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	6.03	6.06	6.84	7.59	8.48	8.38	8.59	6.07	
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	2.67	2.84	3.44	4.12	5.28	4.91	5.65	2.91	
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	8,066	9,454	11,640	15,238	31,750	20,715	42,771	9,942	
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	1,320	1,620	2,580	5,244	3,402,288	5,724	3,396,564	3,420,504	
LOWER LIMIT	7,452	8,772	10,392	12,972	18,216	18,216	23,940	0	
UPPER LIMIT	8,772	10,352	12,972	18,216	3,420,504	23,940	3,420,504	3,420,504	
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	409	485	724	1,528	92,394	1,611	125,720	30,330	
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.10	2.91	0.08	3.03	3.05	
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	0.08	0.10	0.12	0.15	0.32	0.10	0.22	1.00	

406

Table 1-B-4. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN RURAL AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART I).

PROVINCE HEREDIA

INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN RURAL AREAS								
	ALL DECILES	LOWER HALF	UPPER HALF	SUB-TOTAL	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	FIFTH	
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	10,868	543	544	1,087	1,087	1,087	1,087	1,087	
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	5.95	3.56	4.51	4.24	4.91	5.19	5.27	5.44	
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	3.07	1.55	1.91	1.73	2.13	2.36	2.50	2.55	
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	12,305	615	2,088	1,352	4,570	5,972	7,368	8,655	
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	214,092	948	2,772	3,720	1,440	1,380	1,596	1,104	
LOWER LIMIT	0	0	948	0	3,732	5,172	6,552	8,148	
UPPER LIMIT	214,092	948	3,720	3,720	5,172	6,552	8,148	9,252	
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	11,505	421	936	1,034	369	406	443	277	
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	0.54	0.68	0.45	0.76	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.03	
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.05	0.06	0.07	

2014

Table 1-B-4. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN RURAL AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART II).

PROVINCE HEREDIA

INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN RURAL AREAS								ALL DECILES
	SIXTH	SEVENTH	EIGHTH	NINTH	SUBTOTAL	LOWER HALF	UPPER HALF	TENTH	
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	1,067	1,067	1,087	1,086	1,086	543	543	10,868	
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	5.87	6.12	6.84	7.58	8.07	8.06	8.08	5.95	
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	2.84	3.08	3.71	4.44	5.35	5.10	5.59	3.07	
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	10,052	12,053	15,023	20,059	37,932	27,109	48,756	12,305	
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	1,752	2,292	3,804	6,720	190,272	7,764	182,508	214,092	
LOWER LIMIT	5,252	11,004	13,296	17,100	23,820	23,820	31,584	0	
UPPER LIMIT	11,004	13,256	17,100	23,820	214,092	31,584	214,092	214,092	
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	486	658	1,079	1,877	18,192	2,227	20,563	11,505	
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	0.05	0.05	0.07	0.09	0.48	0.08	0.42	0.54	
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	0.08	0.10	0.12	0.16	0.31	0.11	0.20	1.00	

2015

Table 1-B-5. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN RURAL AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART I).

PROVINCE	GUANACASTE								
INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN RURAL AREAS								
	ALL DECILES	LOWER HALF	FIRST UPPER HALF	SUBTOTAL	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	FIFTH	
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	21,832	1,092	1,092	2,184	2,184	2,183	2,183	2,183	
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	6.23	4.28	4.38	4.33	5.34	5.72	5.45	5.91	
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	2.88	1.40	1.55	1.47	2.18	2.40	2.12	2.44	
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	9,693	675	1,162	918	2,904	4,540	6,049	6,541	
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	1,051,616	900	564	1,464	2,184	1,836	768	576	
LOWER LIMIT	0	0	900	0	1,464	3,648	5,484	6,252	
UPPER LIMIT	1,051,616	900	1,464	1,464	3,648	5,484	6,252	6,828	
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	21,387	235	163	316	643	535	211	176	
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	2.21	0.35	0.14	0.34	0.22	0.12	0.03	0.03	
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.05	0.06	0.07	

9/26

Table 1-B-5. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN RURAL AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART II).

PROVINCE GUANACASTE

INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN RURAL AREAS								ALL DECILES
	SIXTH	SEVENTH	EIGHTH	NINTH	SUBTOTAL	LOWER HALF	UPPER HALF	TENTH	
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	2,123	2,123	2,183	2,183	2,183	1,091	1,092	21,832	
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	5.27	6.35	7.03	7.78	8.52	8.24	8.81	6.23	
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	2.61	2.89	3.37	4.14	5.18	4.68	5.67	2.82	
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	7,413	9,126	11,572	14,924	32,894	20,400	45,376	9,693	
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	1,476	1,952	2,076	5,472	1,073,772	5,616	1,068,156	1,091,616	
LOWER LIMIT	6,828	8,304	10,296	12,372	17,844	17,844	23,460	0	
UPPER LIMIT	8,304	10,256	12,372	17,644	1,091,616	23,460	1,091,616	1,091,616	
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	510	560	562	1,825	61,833	1,907	85,621	21,387	
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.12	1.68	0.09	1.89	2.21	
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	0.08	0.09	0.12	0.15	0.34	0.11	0.23	1.00	

220

Table 1-B-6. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN RURAL AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART I).

PROVINCE PUNTARENAS

INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN RURAL AREAS								
	ALL DECILES	LOWER HALF	FIRST UPPER HALF	SUBTOTAL	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	FIFTH	
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	18,371	919	919	1,838	1,837	1,837	1,837	1,837	
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	5.15	3.83	4.24	4.03	4.75	4.86	4.57	4.93	
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	2.51	1.48	1.70	1.59	2.10	2.19	1.94	2.33	
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	11,189	684	1,844	1,264	4,080	5,726	6,965	8,283	
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	1,223,484	1,260	1,740	3,000	1,812	1,632	912	1,752	
LOWER LIMIT	0	0	1,260	0	3,000	4,812	6,444	7,356	
UPPER LIMIT	1,223,484	1,260	3,000	3,000	4,812	6,444	7,356	9,106	
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	16,953	421	516	747	488	507	298	536	
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	1.52	0.62	0.28	0.59	0.12	0.09	0.04	0.06	
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	1.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.07	

228

Table 1-B-6. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN RURAL AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART II).

PROVINCE PUNTARENAS

INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN RURAL AREAS								
	SIXTH	SEVENTH	EIGHTH	NINTH	SUBTOTAL	TENTH LOWER HALF	UPPER HALF	ALL DECILES	
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	1,837	1,837	1,837	1,837	1,837	918	919	18,371	
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	5.08	5.40	5.40	5.96	6.48	6.23	6.74	5.15	
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	2.38	2.55	2.62	3.18	4.18	3.67	4.70	2.51	
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	9,860	11,541	13,379	16,953	33,844	22,403	45,274	11,189	
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	1,524	1,836	2,160	4,920	1,203,924	6,660	1,197,216	1,223,484	
LOWER LIMIT	9,108	10,644	12,480	14,640	19,560	19,560	26,268	0	
UPPER LIMIT	10,632	12,480	14,640	19,560	1,223,484	26,220	1,223,484	1,223,484	
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	469	508	616	1,442	45,961	1,879	62,925	16,953	
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.09	1.36	0.08	1.39	1.52	
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	0.09	0.10	0.12	0.15	0.30	0.10	0.20	1.00	

100

Table 1-B-7. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN RURAL AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART I).

PROVINCE LIMON

INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN RURAL AREAS								
	ALL DECILES	LOWER HALF	UPPER HALF	SUBTOTAL	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	FIFTH	
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	9,850	454	495	989	989	989	989	589	
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	5.07	3.38	3.42	3.40	4.27	4.57	4.61	4.31	
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	2.59	1.16	1.28	1.22	1.97	2.04	2.16	1.92	
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	12,304	358	1,109	734	3,986	5,921	6,938	8,230	
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	748,416	656	1,248	1,944	3,252	1,152	1,296	1,092	
LOWER LIMIT	0	0	696	0	1,944	5,196	6,360	7,668	
UPPER LIMIT	748,416	656	1,944	1,944	5,196	6,348	7,656	8,760	
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	21,059	252	326	487	840	322	364	306	
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	1.65	0.81	0.29	0.66	0.21	0.05	0.05	0.04	
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	1.03	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.03	0.05	0.05	0.06	

130

Table 1-B-7. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN RURAL AREAS, BY DECILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION (PART II)

PROVINCE LIMON

INDICATORS	DECILES OF NON-FARMING FAMILIES IN RURAL AREAS								
	SIXTH	SEVENTH	EIGHTH	NINTH	SUBTOTAL	LOWER HALF	UPPER HALF	ALL DECILES	
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	589	589	89	989	989	494	465	9,390	
AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE	4.55	5.22	5.42	6.10	7.88	6.87	8.88	5.07	
AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONS 15 TO 64 YEARS OLD PER FAMILY	2.30	2.55	2.70	3.29	5.75	4.10	7.39	2.55	
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	5,608	11,505	14,503	18,688	47,531	25,871	65,147	12,804	
RANGE OF FAMILY INCOME	2,004	2,364	3,060	6,252	725,964	8,628	717,336	748,416	
LOWER LIMIT	8,760	10,776	13,140	16,200	22,452	22,452	31,080	0	
UPPER LIMIT	10,764	13,140	16,200	22,452	748,416	31,080	748,416	748,416	
STANDARD DEVIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	603	666	849	1,750	53,550	2,363	69,227	21,099	
COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION OF FAMILY INCOME	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.09	1.13	0.09	1.00	1.65	
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL FAMILY INCOME CORRESPONDING TO EACH DECILE	0.08	0.09	0.11	0.15	0.37	0.10	0.27	1.00	

231

Table 2-A-0. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-POOR NON-FARMING FAMILIES, BY URBAN-RURAL AREA, QUANTILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION.

COSTA RICA

INDICATORS	URBAN AREA					RURAL AREA				
	SUB-TOTAL	QUARTILE				SUB-TOTAL	QUARTILE			
		FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH		FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
		I	I	I	I		I	I	I	I
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	121,364	30,341	30,341	30,341	30,341	65,669	21,418	21,417	21,417	21,417
AVERAGE SIZE OF THE FAMILY	5.15	3.46	5.09	5.78	6.25	5.18	3.02	4.40	5.65	7.41
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	22,194	7,035	13,156	21,235	47,351	13,411	5,257	6,505	12,469	27,413
STANDARD DEVIATION OF THE FAMILY INCOME	20,978	2,142	1,770	3,205	25,475	22,005	1,392	925	1,415	40,555
PERCENTAGE OF THE FAMILY INCOMES CORRESPONDING TO EACH QUARTILE	1.00	0.08	0.15	0.24	0.53	1.00	0.10	0.16	0.23	0.51
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SIZE	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
FROM 1 TO 4 MEMBERS	0.47	0.74	0.46	0.36	0.29	0.47	0.85	0.53	0.35	0.37
FROM 5 TO 7 MEMBERS	0.36	0.24	0.37	0.39	0.44	0.21	0.15	0.41	0.37	0.21
8 MEMBERS AND OVER	0.17	0.02	0.17	0.24	0.26	0.20	0.00	0.05	0.26	0.43
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY AGE OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
LESS THAN 25 YEARS OLD	0.07	0.12	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.13	0.20	0.12	0.10	0.10
BETWEEN 25 AND 34 YEARS OLD	0.24	0.24	0.27	0.23	0.22	0.29	0.32	0.36	0.27	0.20
BETWEEN 35 AND 44 YEARS OLD	0.34	0.18	0.27	0.25	0.26	0.21	0.14	0.22	0.26	0.23
45 YEARS OLD AND OLDER	0.44	0.46	0.36	0.46	0.48	0.37	0.34	0.29	0.39	0.47
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATION OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
NONE	0.05	0.08	0.05	0.04	0.02	0.19	0.22	0.18	0.20	0.14
PRIMARY	0.60	0.71	0.69	0.51	0.37	0.71	0.74	0.75	0.72	0.64
BEYOND PRIMARY	0.36	0.21	0.25	0.35	0.62	0.11	0.04	0.07	0.08	0.23
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SECTOR OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
PRIMARY SECTOR	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.05	0.03	0.46	0.61	0.39	0.47	0.37
SECONDARY SECTOR	0.23	0.25	0.27	0.23	0.20	0.18	0.12	0.20	0.21	0.13
TERCIARY SECTOR	0.56	0.41	0.56	0.60	0.67	0.25	0.13	0.30	0.24	0.53
NO SECTOR	0.16	0.27	0.13	0.13	0.10	0.11	0.14	0.10	0.08	0.11

232

Table 2-A-1. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-POOR NON-FARMING FAMILIES, BY URBAN-RURAL AREA, QUARTILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION.

PROVINCE SAN JOSE

INDICATORS	URBAN AREA					RURAL AREA				
	SUB-TOTAL	QUARTILE				SUB-TOTAL	QUARTILE			
		FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH		FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
		I	I	I	I		I	I	I	I
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	72.096	18.024	18.024	18.024	18.024	19.054	4.764	4.764	4.763	4.763
AVERAGE SIZE OF THE FAMILY	5.14	3.53	5.08	5.76	6.19	5.23	3.03	4.53	5.56	7.38
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	24.251	7.540	14.300	23.254	51.510	13.653	5.206	2.702	12.907	27.770
STANDARD DEVIATION OF THE FAMILY INCOME	21.156	2.247	1.964	3.522	24.955	12.189	1.581	940	1.654	17.105
PERCENTAGE OF THE FAMILY INCOMES CORRESPONDING TO EACH QUARTILE	1.00	0.08	0.15	0.24	0.54	1.00	0.10	0.16	0.24	0.51
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SIZE	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
FROM 1 TO 4 MEMBERS	0.47	0.74	0.47	0.37	0.29	0.49	0.85	0.52	0.33	0.21
FROM 5 TO 7 MEMBERS	0.37	0.24	0.37	0.40	0.46	0.33	0.15	0.43	0.40	0.34
8 MEMBERS AND OVER	0.17	0.03	0.16	0.23	0.25	0.19	0.00	0.05	0.28	0.45
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY AGE OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
LESS THAN 25 YEARS OLD	0.07	0.12	0.08	0.05	0.03	0.12	0.21	0.14	0.05	0.05
BETWEEN 25 AND 34 YEARS OLD	0.24	0.25	0.25	0.22	0.22	0.30	0.32	0.38	0.26	0.20
BETWEEN 35 AND 44 YEARS OLD	0.25	0.19	0.28	0.25	0.27	0.23	0.14	0.24	0.22	0.26
45 YEARS OLD AND OLDER	0.45	0.44	0.40	0.46	0.46	0.35	0.33	0.24	0.35	0.49
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATION OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
NONE	0.04	0.06	0.04	0.03	0.01	0.11	0.20	0.08	0.10	0.07
PRIMARY	0.56	0.68	0.67	0.57	0.31	0.74	0.74	0.81	0.75	0.55
BEYOND PRIMARY	0.41	0.26	0.29	0.41	0.62	0.15	0.06	0.11	0.15	0.38
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SECTOR OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
PRIMARY SECTOR	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.20	0.44	0.10	0.14	0.13
SECONDARY SECTOR	0.24	0.27	0.26	0.24	0.21	0.29	0.19	0.33	0.34	0.28
TERCIARY SECTOR	0.57	0.43	0.57	0.61	0.68	0.41	0.22	0.49	0.42	0.47
NO SECTOR	0.16	0.27	0.14	0.13	0.05	0.11	0.15	0.07	0.10	0.10

Handwritten signature or initials

Table 2-A-2. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-POOR NON-FARMING FAMILIES, BY URBAN-RURAL AREA, QUARTILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION.

PROVINCE ALAJUELA

INDICATORS	URBAN AREA					RURAL AREA				
	I SUB-TOTAL	I QUARTILE				I SUB-TOTAL	I QUARTILE			
		I FIRST	I SECOND	I THIRD	I FOURTH		I FIRST	I SECOND	I THIRD	I FOURTH
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	12.032	3.001	3.001	3.000	3.000	14.771	3.693	3.693	3.693	3.692
AVERAGE SIZE OF THE FAMILY	5.06	3.28	5.11	5.71	6.13	5.03	2.76	4.09	5.56	7.51
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	18.926	6.193	11.741	18.456	35.272	11.623	4.552	7.412	10.250	23.653
STANDARD DEVIATION OF THE FAMILY INCOME	15.785	2.034	1.437	2.773	18.833	18.426	1.256	790	1.378	32.795
PERCENTAGE OF THE FAMILY INCOMES CORRESPONDING TO EACH QUARTILE	1.00	0.08	0.16	0.24	0.52	1.00	0.10	0.16	0.23	0.51
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SIZE	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
FROM 1 TO 4 MEMBERS	0.49	0.78	0.44	0.39	0.30	0.52	0.93	0.60	0.35	0.21
FROM 5 TO 7 MEMBERS	0.36	0.21	0.40	0.32	0.45	0.30	0.07	0.40	0.41	0.32
8 MEMBERS AND OVER	0.16	0.01	0.16	0.23	0.25	0.18	0.00	0.01	0.24	0.47
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY AGE OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
LESS THAN 25 YEARS OLD	0.06	0.09	0.07	0.05	0.03	0.12	0.21	0.14	0.08	0.07
BETWEEN 25 AND 34 YEARS OLD	0.24	0.24	0.27	0.22	0.24	0.30	0.32	0.32	0.30	0.19
BETWEEN 35 AND 44 YEARS OLD	0.24	0.16	0.27	0.25	0.27	0.19	0.11	0.18	0.24	0.23
45 YEARS OLD AND OLDER	0.46	0.51	0.39	0.48	0.46	0.39	0.36	0.30	0.38	0.51
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATION OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
NONE	0.05	0.09	0.06	0.05	0.02	0.18	0.23	0.17	0.16	0.15
PRIMARY	0.55	0.74	0.73	0.66	0.45	0.74	0.74	0.77	0.77	0.67
BEYOND PRIMARY	0.30	0.17	0.21	0.29	0.53	0.08	0.03	0.05	0.07	0.18
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SECTOR OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
PRIMARY SECTOR	0.36	0.08	0.07	0.05	0.04	0.45	0.63	0.48	0.34	0.35
SECONDARY SECTOR	0.24	0.22	0.30	0.23	0.20	0.20	0.09	0.21	0.26	0.22
TERCIARY SECTOR	0.52	0.35	0.51	0.59	0.66	0.24	0.11	0.22	0.30	0.34
NO SECTOR	0.18	0.35	0.13	0.15	0.05	0.11	0.17	0.05	0.10	0.09

102

Table 2-A-3. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-POOR NON-FARMING FAMILIES, BY URBAN-RURAL AREA, QUARTILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION.

PROVINCE CARTAGO

INDICATORS	URBAN AREA					RURAL AREA				
	QUARTILE					QUARTILE				
	SUB-TOTAL	FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	SUB-TOTAL	FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	10.410	2.603	2.603	2.602	2.602	9.835	2,459	2,459	2,459	2,459
AVERAGE SIZE OF THE FAMILY	5.40	3.53	5.25	6.17	6.55	5.39	3.01	4.41	6.06	8.30
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	18,920	6,593	11,859	18,273	36,923	12,634	5,052	8,031	11,045	25,816
STANDARD DEVIATION OF THE FAMILY INCOME	18,276	2,129	1,388	2,691	24,250	37,416	1,115	805	1,411	73,114
PERCENTAGE OF THE FAMILY INCOMES CORRESPONDING TO EACH QUARTILE	1.00	0.39	0.16	0.24	0.51	1.00	0.10	0.16	0.23	0.51
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SIZE	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
FROM 1 TO 4 MEMBERS	0.44	0.72	0.43	0.33	0.22	0.48	0.90	0.53	0.30	0.17
FROM 5 TO 7 MEMBERS	0.36	0.26	0.40	0.39	0.40	0.31	0.10	0.44	0.40	0.29
8 MEMBERS AND OVER	0.20	0.02	0.17	0.29	0.33	0.22	0.00	0.03	0.30	0.53
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY AGE OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
LESS THAN 25 YEARS OLD	0.06	0.12	0.07	0.04	0.02	0.12	0.23	0.14	0.07	0.06
BETWEEN 25 AND 34 YEARS OLD	0.25	0.26	0.28	0.23	0.22	0.29	0.34	0.16	0.25	0.17
BETWEEN 35 AND 44 YEARS OLD	0.24	0.17	0.28	0.28	0.23	0.21	0.12	0.21	0.27	0.24
45 YEARS OLD AND OLDER	0.45	0.46	0.37	0.46	0.52	0.38	0.31	0.27	0.41	0.54
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATION OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
NONE	0.06	0.10	0.05	0.04	0.02	0.15	0.19	0.15	0.15	0.12
PRIMARY	0.58	0.75	0.76	0.69	0.51	0.77	0.77	0.80	0.79	0.71
BEYOND PRIMARY	0.26	0.15	0.19	0.26	0.46	0.08	0.04	0.05	0.07	0.17
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SECTOR OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
PRIMARY SECTOR	0.10	0.15	0.10	0.08	0.07	0.42	0.60	0.43	0.35	0.31
SECONDARY SECTOR	0.25	0.24	0.30	0.24	0.20	0.22	0.13	0.21	0.22	0.24
TERCIARY SECTOR	0.50	0.35	0.49	0.55	0.62	0.26	0.12	0.28	0.27	0.35
NO SECTOR	0.16	0.27	0.17	0.13	0.11	0.11	0.15	0.08	0.09	0.10

56

Table 2-A-3. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-POOR NON-FARMING FAMILIES, BY URBAN-RURAL AREA, QUARTILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION.

PROVINCE CARTAGO

INDICATORS	URBAN AREA					RURAL AREA					
	SUB-TOTAL	QUARTILE				SUB-TOTAL	QUARTILE				
		FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH		FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH	
		I	I	I	I		I	I	I	I	
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	10.410	2.603	2.603	2.602	2.602	9.235	2,459	2,459	2,459	2,459	2,459
AVERAGE SIZE OF THE FAMILY	5.40	3.53	5.25	6.17	6.55	5.39	3.01	4.41	6.06	8.30	8.30
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	12.920	6.593	11.355	18.273	36.923	12.634	5.052	2.531	11.645	25.216	25.216
STANDARD DEVIATION OF THE FAMILY INCOME	12.276	2.129	1.388	2.691	26.850	37.416	1.115	805	1.411	73.114	73.114
PERCENTAGE OF THE FAMILY INCOMES CORRESPONDING TO EACH QUARTILE	1.00	0.39	0.16	0.24	0.51	1.00	0.10	0.16	0.23	0.51	0.51
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SIZE	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
FROM 1 TO 4 MEMBERS	0.44	0.72	0.43	0.33	0.22	0.48	0.90	0.53	0.30	0.17	0.17
FROM 5 TO 7 MEMBERS	0.36	0.26	0.40	0.39	0.40	0.31	0.10	0.44	0.40	0.29	0.29
8 MEMBERS AND OVER	0.20	0.02	0.17	0.29	0.33	0.22	0.00	0.03	0.30	0.53	0.53
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY AGE OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
LESS THAN 25 YEARS OLD	0.06	0.12	0.07	0.04	0.02	0.12	0.23	0.14	0.07	0.06	0.06
BETWEEN 25 AND 34 YEARS OLD	0.25	0.26	0.28	0.23	0.22	0.29	0.34	0.36	0.25	0.17	0.17
BETWEEN 35 AND 44 YEARS OLD	0.24	0.17	0.28	0.28	0.23	0.21	0.12	0.21	0.27	0.24	0.24
45 YEARS OLD AND OLDER	0.45	0.46	0.37	0.46	0.52	0.38	0.31	0.27	0.41	0.54	0.54
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATION OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
NONE	0.06	0.10	0.05	0.04	0.02	0.15	0.19	0.15	0.15	0.12	0.12
PRIMARY	0.58	0.75	0.76	0.69	0.51	0.77	0.77	0.80	0.79	0.71	0.71
BEYOND PRIMARY	0.26	0.15	0.19	0.26	0.46	0.08	0.04	0.05	0.07	0.17	0.17
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SECTOR OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
PRIMARY SECTOR	0.10	0.15	0.10	0.08	0.07	0.42	0.60	0.43	0.35	0.31	0.31
SECONDARY SECTOR	0.25	0.24	0.30	0.24	0.20	0.22	0.13	0.21	0.22	0.24	0.24
TERCIARY SECTOR	0.50	0.35	0.49	0.55	0.62	0.26	0.12	0.28	0.27	0.35	0.35
NO SECTOR	0.16	0.27	0.17	0.13	0.11	0.11	0.15	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.10

236

Table 2-A-4. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-POOR NON-FARMING FAMILIES, BY URBAN-RURAL AREA, QUARTILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION.

PROVINCE HEREDIA

INDICATORS	URBAN AREA					RURAL AREA				
	SUB-TOTAL	QUARTILE				SUB-TOTAL	QUARTILE			
		FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH		FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
		I	I	I	I		I	I	I	I
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	7.858	1.965	1.965	1.964	1.964	9.099	2.025	2.025	2.025	2.024
AVERAGE SIZE OF THE FAMILY	5.41	3.67	5.38	6.03	6.54	5.62	3.44	4.87	6.35	7.80
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	22,759	7,386	14,004	22,200	46,856	14,699	6,112	9,583	14,085	29,822
STANDARD DEVIATION OF THE FAMILY INCOME	17.717	2.332	1.825	3.415	16.481	12.138	1.351	1.16	1.839	15.959
PERCENTAGE OF THE FAMILY INCOMES CORRESPONDING TO EACH QUARTILE	1.00	0.08	0.15	0.25	0.51	1.00	0.10	0.16	0.24	0.50
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SIZE	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
FROM 1 TO 4 MEMBERS	0.44	0.71	0.43	0.35	0.27	0.43	0.78	0.46	0.29	0.19
FROM 5 TO 7 MEMBERS	0.36	0.26	0.37	0.40	0.44	0.34	0.22	0.44	0.38	0.32
8 MEMBERS AND OVER	0.20	0.03	0.20	0.26	0.29	0.23	0.00	0.10	0.33	0.49
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY AGE OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
LESS THAN 25 YEARS OLD	0.06	0.09	0.07	0.04	0.02	0.12	0.18	0.12	0.08	0.09
BETWEEN 25 AND 34 YEARS OLD	0.24	0.23	0.24	0.24	0.23	0.29	0.33	0.34	0.26	0.18
BETWEEN 35 AND 44 YEARS OLD	0.23	0.17	0.26	0.25	0.24	0.23	0.18	0.24	0.26	0.24
45 YEARS OLD AND OLDER	0.48	0.51	0.43	0.47	0.50	0.37	0.31	0.27	0.40	0.49
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATION OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
NONE	0.03	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.01	0.11	0.12	0.11	0.11	0.08
PRIMARY	0.52	0.75	0.74	0.50	0.38	0.76	0.80	0.80	0.78	0.68
BEYOND PRIMARY	0.35	0.20	0.23	0.37	0.61	0.13	0.08	0.09	0.11	0.24
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SECTOR OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
PRIMARY SECTOR	0.06	0.10	0.05	0.05	0.03	0.32	0.35	0.33	0.33	0.28
SECONDARY SECTOR	0.25	0.28	0.24	0.24	0.19	0.25	0.25	0.28	0.27	0.21
TERCIARY SECTOR	0.52	0.33	0.51	0.56	0.67	0.30	0.25	0.30	0.30	0.37
NO SECTOR	0.17	0.29	0.15	0.15	0.11	0.12	0.15	0.09	0.10	0.14

257

Table 2-A-5. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-POOR NON-FARMING FAMILIES, BY URBAN-RURAL AREA, QUANTILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION.

PROVINCE GUANACASTE

INDICATORS	URBAN AREA					RURAL AREA				
	SUB-TOTAL	QUANTILE				SUB-TOTAL	QUANTILE			
		FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH		FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	5.613	1.404	1.403	1.403	1.403	12.698	3.175	3.175	3.174	3.174
AVERAGE SIZE OF THE FAMILY	5.45	3.31	5.39	6.34	6.73	5.62	3.11	4.57	6.47	6.32
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	19.485	6.066	11.642	18.542	41.655	13.363	5.385	8.135	12.127	27.210
STANDARD DEVIATION OF THE FAMILY INCOME	22.147	2.008	1.473	2.769	34.826	27.342	1.350	1.013	1.159	51.825
PERCENTAGE OF THE FAMILY INCOMES CORRESPONDING TO EACH QUANTILE	1.00	0.08	0.15	0.24	0.53	1.00	0.10	0.15	0.23	0.52
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SIZE	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
FROM 1 TO 4 MEMBERS	0.43	0.76	0.40	0.32	0.26	0.43	0.82	0.49	0.25	0.15
FROM 5 TO 7 MEMBERS	0.34	0.23	0.39	0.34	0.41	0.33	0.18	0.46	0.39	0.28
8 MEMBERS AND OVER	0.22	0.01	0.21	0.34	0.33	0.25	0.00	0.05	0.37	0.57
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY AGE OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
LESS THAN 25 YEARS OLD	0.08	0.12	0.07	0.05	0.07	0.09	0.15	0.09	0.05	0.07
BETWEEN 25 AND 34 YEARS OLD	0.24	0.23	0.25	0.22	0.26	0.23	0.29	0.30	0.12	0.13
BETWEEN 35 AND 44 YEARS OLD	0.23	0.16	0.25	0.25	0.27	0.21	0.14	0.23	0.25	0.22
45 YEARS OLD AND OLDER	0.45	0.50	0.42	0.48	0.40	0.48	0.42	0.38	0.52	0.52
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATION OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
NONE	0.09	0.17	0.10	0.08	0.03	0.26	0.26	0.24	0.29	0.25
PRIMARY	0.64	0.69	0.73	0.65	0.48	0.68	0.72	0.72	0.64	0.62
BEYOND PRIMARY	0.27	0.14	0.17	0.28	0.49	0.06	0.02	0.04	0.07	0.13
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SECTOR OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
PRIMARY SECTOR	0.13	0.19	0.14	0.10	0.04	0.67	0.70	0.66	0.70	0.62
SECONDARY SECTOR	0.19	0.19	0.25	0.17	0.13	0.08	0.05	0.07	0.09	0.09
TERCIARY SECTOR	0.52	0.31	0.49	0.51	0.66	0.12	0.07	0.15	0.10	0.18
NO SECTOR	0.17	0.32	0.11	0.12	0.12	0.13	0.19	0.11	0.11	0.11

238

Table 2-A-6. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-POOR NON-FARMING FAMILIES, BY URBAN-RURAL AREA, QUANTILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION.

PROVINCE PUNTARENAS

INDICATORS	URBAN AREA					RURAL AREA				
	SUB-TOTAL	QUANTILE				SUB-TOTAL	QUANTILE			
		FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH		FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
		I	I	I	I		I	I	I	I
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	7.211	1.803	1.803	1.803	1.803	13.720	3.430	3.430	3.430	3.430
AVERAGE SIZE OF THE FAMILY	4.72	3.10	4.56	5.38	5.87	4.56	2.92	4.22	5.27	6.23
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	16.678	6.072	10.947	16.317	24.594	13.503	5.713	6.348	12.812	26.139
STANDARD DEVIATION OF THE FAMILY INCOME	14.510	2.036	1.185	2.175	19.144	18.991	1.459	992	1.110	34.645
PERCENTAGE OF THE FAMILY INCOMES CORRESPONDING TO EACH QUARTILE	1.00	0.09	0.16	0.24	0.51	1.00	0.11	0.17	0.24	0.45
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SIZE	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
FROM 1 TO 4 MEMBERS	0.53	0.90	0.54	0.43	0.37	0.56	0.84	0.56	0.45	0.78
FROM 5 TO 7 MEMBERS	0.32	0.20	0.34	0.36	0.39	0.28	0.16	0.36	0.33	0.29
8 MEMBERS AND OVER	0.14	0.00	0.12	0.21	0.24	0.16	0.00	0.08	0.22	0.31
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY AGE OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
LESS THAN 25 YEARS OLD	0.10	0.13	0.11	0.03	0.05	0.18	0.22	0.17	0.14	0.13
BETWEEN 25 and 34 YEARS OLD	0.24	0.23	0.29	0.24	0.22	0.31	0.29	0.36	0.32	0.26
BETWEEN 35 and 44 YEARS OLD	0.25	0.20	0.27	0.27	0.26	0.21	0.14	0.22	0.26	0.23
45 YEARS OLD AND OLDER	0.40	0.44	0.33	0.42	0.42	0.30	0.34	0.24	0.28	0.33
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATION OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
NONE	0.11	0.16	0.12	0.19	0.06	0.25	0.30	0.25	0.27	0.17
PRIMARY	0.35	0.70	0.71	0.67	0.50	0.54	0.67	0.68	0.65	0.56
BEYOND PRIMARY	0.25	0.14	0.17	0.22	0.44	0.12	0.04	0.07	0.08	0.27
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SECTOR OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
PRIMARY SECTOR	0.14	0.12	0.15	0.14	0.14	0.62	0.63	0.61	0.71	0.53
SECONDARY SECTOR	0.19	0.21	0.22	0.19	0.16	0.05	0.08	0.10	0.09	0.09
TERCIARY SECTOR	0.54	0.45	0.54	0.58	0.60	0.20	0.13	0.23	0.15	0.28
NO SECTOR	0.13	0.22	0.09	0.10	0.10	0.09	0.16	0.06	0.05	0.10

Table 2-A-7. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF NON-POOR NON-FARMING FAMILIES, BY URBAN-RURAL AREA, QUANTILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION.

PROVINCE LIMON

INDICATORS	URBAN AREA					RURAL AREA				
	SUB-TOTAL	QUANTILE				SUB-TOTAL	QUANTILE			
		FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH		FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	6.174	1.544	1.544	1.543	1.543	7.492	1.873	1.873	1.873	1.873
AVERAGE SIZE OF THE FAMILY	4.82	3.11	4.58	5.41	6.18	5.77	2.82	4.01	5.16	7.10
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	17.886	6.383	11.319	16.542	26.504	15.644	5.811	9.125	13.550	24.053
STANDARD DEVIATION OF THE FAMILY INCOME	20.332	2.099	1.202	2.257	23.748	23.478	1.393	983	1.516	41.450
PERCENTAGE OF THE FAMILY INCOMES CORRESPONDING TO EACH QUANTILE	1.00	0.09	0.16	0.24	0.52	1.00	0.09	0.15	0.22	0.54
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SIZE	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
FROM 1 TO 4 MEMBERS	0.52	0.78	0.53	0.41	0.35	0.56	0.85	0.61	0.46	0.32
FROM 5 TO 7 MEMBERS	0.33	0.21	0.35	0.38	0.38	0.27	0.15	0.33	0.21	0.29
8 MEMBERS AND OVER	0.15	0.01	0.11	0.21	0.27	0.17	0.00	0.06	0.23	0.38
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY AGE OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
LESS THAN 25 YEARS OLD	0.11	0.16	0.11	0.09	0.10	0.19	0.20	0.17	0.14	0.25
BETWEEN 25 AND 34 YEARS OLD	0.27	0.23	0.31	0.28	0.26	0.29	0.29	0.35	0.28	0.23
BETWEEN 35 AND 44 YEARS OLD	0.23	0.17	0.25	0.25	0.26	0.21	0.17	0.22	0.27	0.21
45 YEARS OLD AND OLDER	0.39	0.44	0.33	0.39	0.38	0.30	0.33	0.27	0.31	0.31
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATION OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
NONE	0.08	0.12	0.08	0.07	0.04	0.24	0.28	0.24	0.26	0.19
PRIMARY	0.68	0.76	0.74	0.70	0.52	0.64	0.69	0.72	0.55	0.57
BEYOND PRIMARY	0.24	0.11	0.19	0.23	0.44	0.11	0.03	0.04	0.19	0.24
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SECTOR OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
PRIMARY SECTOR	0.09	0.11	0.09	0.07	0.05	0.69	0.90	0.66	0.73	0.57
SECONDARY SECTOR	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.16	0.15	0.06	0.05	0.07	0.06	0.07
TERCIARY SECTOR	0.62	0.51	0.63	0.65	0.66	0.14	0.09	0.17	0.15	0.17
NO SECTOR	0.12	0.21	0.10	0.08	0.05	0.10	0.06	0.11	0.06	0.20

chc

Best Available Document

Table 2-B-0. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF POOR NON-FARMING FAMILIES, BY URBAN-RURAL AREA, QUARTILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION.

COSTA RICA

INDICATORS	URBAN AREA					RURAL AREA				
	SUB-TOTAL	QUARTILE				SUB-TOTAL	QUARTILE			
		FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH		FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
		I	I	I	I		I	I	I	I
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	19,451	4,863	4,863	4,863	4,862	43,864	10,966	10,966	10,966	10,966
AVERAGE SIZE OF THE FAMILY	6.25	3.57	4.50	6.43	9.69	5.31	4.17	5.85	7.45	9.72
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	3,654	0	1,772	4,450	8,354	4,464	860	3,209	5,374	8,413
STANDARD DEVIATION OF THE FAMILY INCOME	3,776	0	994	782	3,531	3,147	443	771	632	2,738
PERCENTAGE OF THE FAMILY INCOMES CORRESPONDING TO EACH QUARTILE	1.00	0.00	0.12	0.30	0.57	1.00	0.05	0.15	0.30	0.47
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SIZE	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
FROM 1 TO 4 MEMBERS	0.37	0.73	0.58	0.15	0.00	0.24	0.63	0.32	0.01	0.00
FROM 5 TO 7 MEMBERS	0.34	0.21	0.30	0.50	0.24	0.36	0.26	0.44	0.55	0.17
8 MEMBERS AND OVER	0.30	0.06	0.11	0.25	0.76	0.40	0.11	0.24	0.42	0.82
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY AGE OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
LESS THAN 25 YEARS OLD	0.03	0.14	0.09	0.06	0.02	0.06	0.10	0.09	0.03	0.02
BETWEEN 25 AND 34 YEARS OLD	0.19	0.18	0.18	0.24	0.10	0.25	0.17	0.32	0.32	0.17
BETWEEN 35 AND 44 YEARS OLD	0.26	0.14	0.20	0.20	0.41	0.31	0.16	0.27	0.34	0.44
45 YEARS OLD AND OLDER	0.47	0.54	0.54	0.40	0.40	0.39	0.58	0.32	0.27	0.35
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATION OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
NONE	0.13	0.05	0.17	0.13	0.12	0.27	0.27	0.25	0.36	0.26
PRIMARY	0.71	0.61	0.69	0.74	0.73	0.69	0.65	0.69	0.72	0.72
BEYOND PRIMARY	0.16	0.30	0.14	0.13	0.05	0.04	0.08	0.03	0.02	0.02
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SECTOR OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
PRIMARY SECTOR	0.02	0.02	0.07	0.11	0.12	0.52	0.20	0.45	0.58	0.59
SECONDARY SECTOR	0.16	0.06	0.06	0.19	0.30	0.09	0.03	0.05	0.11	0.15
TERCIARY SECTOR	0.30	0.18	0.28	0.24	0.40	0.13	0.12	0.10	0.12	0.12
NO SECTOR	0.46	0.73	0.57	0.35	0.17	0.26	0.65	0.20	0.09	0.00

112
Best Available Document

Table 2-B-1. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF POOR NON-FARMING FAMILIES, BY URBAN-RURAL AREA, QUANTILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION.

PROVINCE SAN JOSE

INDICATORS	URBAN AREA					RURAL AREA				
	SUB-TOTAL	QUANTILE				SUB-TOTAL	QUANTILE			
		FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH		FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
		I	I	I	I		I	I	I	I
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	8,691	2,173	2,173	2,173	2,172	9,622	2,421	2,421	2,420	2,420
AVERAGE SIZE OF THE FAMILY	5.77	3.41	3.92	6.10	5.67	6.53	3.97	5.57	7.15	4.45
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	3,436	0	1,147	4,247	6,355	4,161	830	2,722	4,512	3,101
STANDARD DEVIATION OF THE FAMILY INCOME	4,231	0	1,109	841	5,275	3,398	476	718	764	3,861
PERCENTAGE OF THE FAMILY INCOMES CORRESPONDING TO EACH QUANTILE	1.00	0.00	0.08	0.31	0.61	1.00	0.05	0.16	0.30	0.49
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SIZE	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
FROM 1 TO 4 MEMBERS	0.41	0.77	0.58	0.19	0.00	0.28	0.65	0.38	0.07	0.00
FROM 5 TO 7 MEMBERS	0.33	0.18	0.25	0.60	0.25	0.36	0.26	0.42	0.56	0.22
8 MEMBERS AND OVER	0.26	0.05	0.17	0.21	0.71	0.36	0.09	0.20	0.37	0.78
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY AGE OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
LESS THAN 25 YEARS OLD	0.09	0.14	0.10	0.07	0.04	0.07	0.03	0.10	0.05	0.02
BETWEEN 25 AND 34 YEARS OLD	0.23	0.17	0.18	0.26	0.15	0.25	0.15	0.33	0.30	0.20
BETWEEN 35 AND 44 YEARS OLD	0.25	0.14	0.16	0.25	0.40	0.31	0.15	0.25	0.35	0.34
45 YEARS OLD AND OLDER	0.46	0.55	0.55	0.38	0.37	0.38	0.56	0.32	0.28	0.35
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATION OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
NONE	0.09	0.07	0.10	0.10	0.05	0.25	0.25	0.32	0.35	0.20
PRIMARY	0.68	0.59	0.61	0.74	0.78	0.70	0.56	0.55	0.72	0.77
BEYOND PRIMARY	0.23	0.34	0.29	0.17	0.13	0.05	0.10	0.03	0.03	0.03
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SECTOR OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
PRIMARY SECTOR	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.06	0.41	0.13	0.61	0.53	0.37
SECONDARY SECTOR	0.18	0.07	0.09	0.23	0.33	0.13	0.04	0.05	0.17	0.25
TERCIARY SECTOR	0.32	0.20	0.30	0.35	0.42	0.19	0.14	0.12	0.20	0.25
NO SECTOR	0.46	0.73	0.59	0.35	0.18	0.28	0.69	0.22	0.10	0.03

242
Best Available Document

Table 2-B-2. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF 1968 NON-FARMING FAMILIES, BY URBAN-RURAL AREA, QUANTILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION.

PROVINCE ALAJUELA

INDICATORS	URBAN AREA					RURAL AREA				
	SUB-TOTAL	QUANTILE				SUB-TOTAL	QUANTILE			
		FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH		FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	2,705	677	70	676	676	5,627	2,457	2,457	2,457	2,456
AVERAGE SIZE OF THE FAMILY	6.16	4.15	4.74	6.19	9.57	5.80	4.20	5.93	7.35	9.72
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	3,631	6	2,073	4,329	8,122	4,432	560	3,338	5,210	8,219
STANDARD DEVIATION OF THE FAMILY INCOME	3,374	64	730	662	2,887	2,996	494	665	557	2,591
PERCENTAGE OF THE FAMILY INCOMES CORRESPONDING TO EACH QUANTILE	1.00	0.00	0.14	0.30	0.56	1.00	0.05	0.19	0.29	0.46
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SIZE	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
FROM 1 TO 4 MEMBERS	0.34	0.61	0.57	0.17	0.00	0.24	0.63	0.33	0.01	0.00
FROM 5 TO 7 MEMBERS	0.36	0.28	0.29	0.61	0.27	0.36	0.26	0.43	0.57	0.19
8 MEMBERS AND OVER	0.30	0.11	0.14	0.21	0.73	0.39	0.11	0.24	0.41	0.81
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY AGE OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
LESS THAN 25 YEARS OLD	0.06	0.13	0.06	0.04	0.03	0.05	0.09	0.08	0.02	0.01
BETWEEN 25 AND 34 YEARS OLD	0.19	0.21	0.17	0.22	0.14	0.25	0.17	0.33	0.33	0.17
BETWEEN 35 AND 44 YEARS OLD	0.27	0.18	0.18	0.30	0.41	0.31	0.16	0.27	0.37	0.44
45 YEARS OLD AND OLDER	0.48	0.48	0.59	0.44	0.42	0.39	0.58	0.33	0.28	0.38
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATION OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
NONE	0.14	0.12	0.17	0.13	0.13	0.26	0.24	0.28	0.28	0.25
PRIMARY	0.74	0.59	0.72	0.75	0.75	0.71	0.70	0.70	0.73	0.73
BEYOND PRIMARY	0.12	0.19	0.11	0.12	0.08	0.03	0.06	0.02	0.01	0.02
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SECTOR OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
PRIMARY SECTOR	0.10	0.03	0.08	0.12	0.17	0.54	0.19	0.63	0.73	0.62
SECONDARY SECTOR	0.14	0.04	0.05	0.17	0.29	0.07	0.03	0.05	0.10	0.16
TERCIARY SECTOR	0.26	0.12	0.24	0.29	0.39	0.11	0.10	0.09	0.11	0.15
NO SECTOR	0.50	0.80	0.62	0.42	0.16	0.26	0.67	0.23	0.06	0.07

Best Available Document

243

Table 2-B-3. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF POOR NON-FARMING FAMILIES, BY URBAN-RURAL AREA, QUANTILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION.

PROVINCE CARTAGO

INDICATORS	URBAN AREA					RURAL AREA				
	SUB-TOTAL	QUARTILE				SUB-TOTAL	QUARTILE			
		FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH		FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	2,071	518	518	518	517	5,403	1,351	1,351	1,351	1,350
AVERAGE SIZE OF THE FAMILY	6.77	4.10	5.34	7.97	10.29	7.32	4.79	5.59	7.58	10.24
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	4,457	407	2,958	5,330	9,184	5,042	1,218	4,295	5,714	8,924
STANDARD DEVIATION OF THE FAMILY INCOME	3,449	638	737	786	2,065	3,014	782	486	596	2,098
PERCENTAGE OF THE FAMILY INCOMES CORRESPONDING TO EACH QUARTILE	1.00	0.02	0.17	0.30	0.51	1.00	0.06	0.21	0.28	0.44
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SIZE	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
FROM 1 TO 4 MEMBERS	0.28	0.64	0.43	0.05	0.00	0.17	0.57	0.11	0.00	0.00
FROM 5 TO 7 MEMBERS	0.35	0.29	0.42	0.60	0.09	0.38	0.28	0.59	0.57	0.09
8 MEMBERS AND OVER	0.37	0.08	0.16	0.35	0.91	0.45	0.15	0.30	0.43	0.91
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY AGE OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
LESS THAN 25 YEARS OLD	0.06	0.11	0.05	0.04	0.01	0.04	0.09	0.06	0.03	0.01
BETWEEN 25 AND 34 YEARS OLD	0.19	0.20	0.22	0.24	0.11	0.27	0.20	0.38	0.33	0.15
BETWEEN 35 AND 44 YEARS OLD	0.31	0.17	0.25	0.39	0.44	0.36	0.19	0.35	0.42	0.46
45 YEARS OLD AND OLDER	0.44	0.51	0.49	0.33	0.44	0.33	0.52	0.21	0.22	0.38
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATION OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
NONE	0.15	0.16	0.16	0.13	0.13	0.21	0.23	0.21	0.22	0.29
PRIMARY	0.76	0.70	0.72	0.60	0.81	0.75	0.70	0.77	0.76	0.78
BEYOND PRIMARY	0.10	0.14	0.12	0.27	0.06	0.03	0.07	0.02	0.02	0.02
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SECTOR OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
PRIMARY SECTOR	0.15	0.07	0.15	0.19	0.18	0.55	0.26	0.74	0.64	0.50
SECONDARY SECTOR	0.18	0.09	0.09	0.24	0.30	0.11	0.05	0.07	0.16	0.17
TERCIARY SECTOR	0.28	0.18	0.23	0.34	0.30	0.14	0.15	0.09	0.13	0.20
NO SECTOR	0.40	0.66	0.54	0.24	0.15	0.19	0.53	0.10	0.07	0.07

Best Available Document

hfh

Table 2-B-4. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF POOR NON-FARMING FAMILIES, BY URBAN-RURAL AREA, QUARTILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION.

PROVINCE HEREDIA

INDICATORS	URBAN AREA					RURAL AREA				
	SUB-TOTAL	QUARTILE				SUB-TOTAL	QUARTILE			
		FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH		FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
		I	I	I	I		I	I	I	I
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	999	250	250	250	249	2,769	693	692	692	692
AVERAGE SIZE OF THE FAMILY	6.43	4.01	4.93	7.06	9.75	6.54	3.98	6.04	7.58	10.16
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	4,178	104	2,581	5,134	8,913	4,719	717	3,439	5,558	9,129
STANDARD DEVIATION OF THE FAMILY INCOME	3,504	320	706	860	2,366	3,375	425	1,102	621	2,428
PERCENTAGE OF THE FAMILY INCOMES CORRESPONDING TO EACH QUARTILE	1.00	0.01	0.15	0.31	0.53	1.00	0.04	0.18	0.36	0.42
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SIZE	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
FROM 1 TO 4 MEMBERS	0.32	0.66	0.55	0.08	0.00	0.24	0.65	0.22	0.00	0.03
FROM 5 TO 7 MEMBERS	0.34	0.27	0.29	0.59	0.19	0.33	0.23	0.45	0.57	0.10
8 MEMBERS AND OVER	0.34	0.07	0.16	0.33	0.51	0.43	0.11	0.27	0.43	0.70
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY AGE OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
LESS THAN 25 YEARS OLD	0.06	0.12	0.06	0.04	0.03	0.06	0.11	0.07	0.02	0.02
BETWEEN 25 AND 34 YEARS OLD	0.17	0.18	0.14	0.22	0.14	0.22	0.16	0.29	0.29	0.14
BETWEEN 35 AND 44 YEARS OLD	0.29	0.16	0.22	0.35	0.40	0.23	0.16	0.28	0.40	0.46
45 YEARS OLD AND OLDER	0.48	0.54	0.58	0.36	0.43	0.40	0.56	0.35	0.29	0.39
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATION OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
NONE	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.11	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.17
PRIMARY	0.76	0.65	0.77	0.81	0.81	0.72	0.72	0.79	0.79	0.81
BEYOND PRIMARY	0.16	0.27	0.15	0.12	0.08	0.05	0.11	0.03	0.04	0.02
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SECTOR OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
PRIMARY SECTOR	0.13	0.06	0.10	0.16	0.17	0.41	0.17	0.54	0.49	0.45
SECONDARY SECTOR	0.17	0.03	0.09	0.26	0.32	0.13	0.05	0.09	0.19	0.21
TERCIARY SECTOR	0.26	0.16	0.23	0.31	0.35	0.19	0.13	0.16	0.20	0.27
NO SECTOR	0.44	0.75	0.58	0.25	0.16	0.27	0.64	0.22	0.12	0.08

Table 2-B-5. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF POOR NON-FARMING FAMILIES, BY URBAN-RURAL AREA, QUARTILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION.

INDICATORS	URBAN AREA					RURAL AREA				
	SUB-TOTAL	QUARTILE				SUB-TOTAL	QUARTILE			
		FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH		FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
		I	I	I	I		I	I	I	I
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	1.795	449	449	449	448	5.134	2.294	2.264	2.283	2.283
AVERAGE SIZE OF THE FAMILY	6.75	4.32	5.40	7.33	9.96	7.08	4.49	6.30	7.72	9.62
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	4.121	428	2.575	4.556	8.534	4.892	952	3.304	5.662	8.471
STANDARD DEVIATION OF THE FAMILY INCOME	3.222	563	661	899	2.075	3.647	340	612	650	2.323
PERCENTAGE OF THE FAMILY INCOMES CORRESPONDING TO EACH QUARTILE	1.00	0.03	0.16	0.30	0.52	1.00	0.05	0.18	0.31	0.46
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SIZE	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
FROM 1 TO 4 MEMBERS	0.26	0.59	0.41	0.03	0.00	0.20	0.57	0.25	0.00	0.00
FROM 5 TO 7 MEMBERS	0.36	0.27	0.41	0.59	0.17	0.35	0.30	0.44	0.53	0.16
8 MEMBERS AND OVER	0.38	0.14	0.19	0.38	0.83	0.43	0.13	0.29	0.47	0.84
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY AGE OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
LESS THAN 25 YEARS OLD	0.07	0.12	0.08	0.05	0.02	0.04	0.07	0.07	0.02	0.01
BETWEEN 25 AND 34 YEARS OLD	0.17	0.20	0.20	0.19	0.10	0.22	0.15	0.21	0.27	0.14
BETWEEN 35 AND 44 YEARS OLD	0.26	0.19	0.20	0.28	0.35	0.30	0.15	0.28	0.36	0.41
45 YEARS OLD AND OLDER	0.49	0.49	0.52	0.48	0.44	0.44	0.63	0.33	0.35	0.44
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATION OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
NONE	0.21	0.25	0.23	0.17	0.20	0.29	0.29	0.26	0.30	0.31
PRIMARY	0.70	0.62	0.68	0.73	0.76	0.69	0.65	0.73	0.69	0.63
BEYOND PRIMARY	0.09	0.13	0.08	0.10	0.04	0.03	0.06	0.02	0.02	0.07
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SECTOR OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
PRIMARY SECTOR	0.12	0.07	0.17	0.23	0.24	0.03	0.23	0.20	0.73	0.76
SECONDARY SECTOR	0.12	0.03	0.07	0.13	0.25	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.06	0.07
TERCIARY SECTOR	0.23	0.16	0.24	0.23	0.26	0.07	0.09	0.04	0.07	0.09
NO SECTOR	0.47	0.73	0.52	0.40	0.22	0.25	0.65	0.14	0.14	0.10

246
Best Available Document

Table 2-B-6. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF POOR NON-FARMING FAMILIES, BY URBAN-RURAL AREA, QUANTILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION.

INDICATORS	URBAN AREA					RURAL AREA				
	SUB-TOTAL	QUANTILE				SUB-TOTAL	QUANTILE			
		FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH		FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
		I	I	I	I		I	I	I	I
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	1.658	415	415	414	414	4.651	1.163	1.163	1.163	1.162
AVERAGE SIZE OF THE FAMILY	5.91	3.44	4.49	6.14	9.17	6.59	4.06	5.67	7.16	9.46
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	3.457	0	1.828	4.631	7.972	4.363	829	3.041	5.255	8.332
STANDARD DEVIATION OF THE FAMILY INCOME	3.169	0	830	636	2.681	2.529	471	991	700	1.864
PERCENTAGE OF THE FAMILY INCOMES CORRESPONDING TO EACH QUANTILE	1.00	0.00	0.14	0.29	0.57	1.00	0.05	0.17	0.30	0.48
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SIZE	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
FROM 1 TO 4 MEMBERS	0.39	0.73	0.57	0.25	0.60	0.25	0.63	0.35	0.62	0.30
FROM 5 TO 7 MEMBERS	0.32	0.20	0.33	0.50	0.25	0.33	0.26	0.45	0.41	0.19
8 MEMBERS AND OVER	0.29	0.07	0.10	0.25	0.75	0.37	0.11	0.20	0.37	0.82
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY AGE OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
LESS THAN 25 YEARS OLD	0.09	0.15	0.10	0.06	0.04	0.08	0.13	0.10	0.05	0.03
BETWEEN 25 AND 34 YEARS OLD	0.19	0.21	0.17	0.23	0.16	0.23	0.19	0.31	0.36	0.21
BETWEEN 35 AND 44 YEARS OLD	0.25	0.16	0.19	0.28	0.38	0.29	0.16	0.23	0.34	0.43
45 YEARS OLD AND OLDER	0.46	0.48	0.53	0.43	0.41	0.26	0.52	0.31	0.26	0.34
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATION OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
NONE	0.19	0.14	0.22	0.22	0.15	0.28	0.37	0.40	0.26	0.39
PRIMARY	0.69	0.70	0.68	0.68	0.72	0.58	0.54	0.57	0.62	0.58
BEYOND PRIMARY	0.11	0.16	0.10	0.10	0.08	0.04	0.10	0.03	0.02	0.02
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SECTOR OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
PRIMARY SECTOR	0.11	0.03	0.10	0.13	0.15	0.55	0.19	0.51	0.74	0.66
SECONDARY SECTOR	0.13	0.08	0.10	0.12	0.24	0.05	0.02	0.04	0.06	0.09
TERCIARY SECTOR	0.32	0.25	0.24	0.36	0.41	0.13	0.13	0.12	0.13	0.15
NO SECTOR	0.44	0.65	0.55	0.38	0.16	0.27	0.67	0.23	0.07	0.10

Table 2-B-7. INDICATORS RELATED TO THE ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME OF POOR NON-FARMING FAMILIES, BY URBAN-RURAL AREA, QUARTILES AND ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION.

PROVINCE LIMON

INDICATORS	URBAN AREA					RURAL AREA				
	SUB-TOTAL	QUARTILE				SUB-TOTAL	QUARTILE			
		FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH		FIRST	SECOND	THIRD	FOURTH
TOTAL NUMBER OF FAMILIES	1,532	383	383	283	383	2,358	600	600	599	599
AVERAGE SIZE OF THE FAMILY	5.59	3.34	4.05	5.99	8.97	6.61	3.35	4.54	7.05	9.10
AVERAGE FAMILY INCOME	3,150	0	1,063	3,219	7,720	3,931	426	2,016	5,225	2,064
STANDARD DEVIATION OF THE FAMILY INCOME	3,228	0	960	706	2,151	3,145	305	1,076	752	1,742
PERCENTAGE OF THE FAMILY INCOMES CORRESPONDING TO EACH QUARTILE	1.00	0.00	0.08	0.30	0.61	1.00	0.03	0.13	0.33	0.51
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SIZE	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
FROM 1 TO 4 MEMBERS	0.42	0.75	0.63	0.29	0.60	0.34	0.72	0.56	0.56	0.00
FROM 5 TO 7 MEMBERS	0.31	0.17	0.27	0.48	0.30	0.32	0.21	0.30	0.57	0.22
8 MEMBERS AND OVER	0.27	0.08	0.09	0.22	0.70	0.34	0.07	0.14	0.37	0.78
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY AGE OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
LESS THAN 25 YEARS OLD	0.38	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.64	0.08	0.12	0.11	0.05	0.04
BETWEEN 25 AND 34 YEARS OLD	0.20	0.13	0.19	0.25	0.21	0.23	0.13	0.23	0.35	0.21
BETWEEN 35 AND 44 YEARS OLD	0.24	0.16	0.19	0.24	0.37	0.28	0.13	0.22	0.34	0.44
45 YEARS OLD AND OLDER	0.48	0.61	0.52	0.41	0.38	0.41	0.62	0.45	0.26	0.31
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATION OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
NONE	0.17	0.16	0.18	0.15	0.18	0.25	0.40	0.31	0.35	0.35
PRIMARY	0.73	0.70	0.71	0.74	0.75	0.61	0.55	0.63	0.64	0.64
BEYOND PRIMARY	0.11	0.13	0.11	0.11	0.07	0.04	0.05	0.06	0.01	0.02
PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES, BY SECTOR OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY OF THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
PRIMARY SECTOR	0.08	0.02	0.05	0.09	0.16	0.58	0.28	0.51	0.41	0.74
SECONDARY SECTOR	0.10	0.04	0.04	0.13	0.16	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.05
TERCIARY SECTOR	0.35	0.21	0.30	0.37	0.51	0.11	0.13	0.12	0.02	0.14
NO SECTOR	0.47	0.73	0.60	0.42	0.15	0.27	0.58	0.36	0.56	0.08

248
Best Available Document

Table 3-0 - NUMBER OF FAMILIES AND DEPENDENCY INDEX OF THE POOR URBAN POPULATION
COSTA RICA

	FAMILIES		Dependency Index
	Nuclei	Members	
1) POOR	19,451	117,598	1.36
Less than 100 colones	5,691	21,020	1.17
From 100 to 299 colones	766	6,036	1.73
From 300 to 499 colones	1,807	12,853	1.53
From 500 to 699 colones	2,899	20,201	1.43
From 700 to 899 colones	3,722	25,885	1.40
From 900 to 1099 colones	4,566	31,303	1.29
2) NON POOR	124,524	642,984	0.65
3) TOTAL <u>1/</u>	144,523	764,135	0.74

1/ Includes urban farmers which could not be classified as poor or as non poor, namely 546 families.

Table 3-1 - NUMBER OF FAMILIES AND DEPENDENCY INDEX OF THE POOR URBAN POPULATION
 PROVINCE OF SAN JOSE

	FAMILIES		Dependency
	<u>Nuclei</u>	<u>Members</u>	<u>Index</u>
1) POOR	8,691	50,168	1.30
Less than 100 colones	3,146	10,869	1.02
From 100 to 299 colones	212	1,871	1.62
From 300 to 499 colones	627	4,531	1.52
From 500 to 699 colones	1,171	8,292	1.43
From 700 to 899 colones	1,594	10,885	1.39
From 900 to 1099 colones	1,941	13,720	1.31
2) NON POOR	72,999	375,891	0.63
3) Total <u>1/</u>	81,809	426,827	0.69

1/ Includes urban farmers which could not be classified as poor or as non poor, namely 117 families.

Table 3-2 - NUMBER OF FAMILIES AND DEPENDENCY INDEX OF THE POOR URBAN POPULATION
 PROVINCE OF ALAJUELA

	FAMILIES		Dependency Index
	<u>Nuclei</u>	<u>Members</u>	
1) POOR	2,705	16,664	1.33
Less than 100 colones	673	2,859	1.45
From 100 to 299 colones	155	1,305	1.46
From 300 to 499 colones	264	1,808	1.46
From 500 to 699 colones	446	2,946	1.34
From 700 to 899 colones	551	3,707	1.28
From 900 to 1099 colones	616	4,039	1.19
2) NON POOR	12,557	63,826	0.67
3) TOTAL <u>1/</u>	15,327	80,866	0.78

1/ Includes urban farmers which could not be classified as poor or as non poor,
 namely 65 families.

Table 3-3 - NUMBER OF FAMILIES AND DEPENDENCY INDEX OF THE POOR URBAN POPULATION
PROVINCE OF CARTAGO

	FAMILIES		Dependency Index
	Nuclei	Members	
1) POOR	2,071	14,027	1.45
Less than 100 colones	366	1,709	1.39
From 100 to 299 colones	84	650	1.89
From 300 to 499 colones	216	1,538	1.63
From 500 to 699 colones	349	2,483	1.49
From 700 to 899 colones	492	3,573	1.47
From 900 to 1099 colones	564	4,074	1.32
2) NON POOR	10,777	58,456	0.69
3) TOTAL <u>1/</u>	12,914	72,942	0.80

1/ includes urban farmers which could not be classified as poor or as non poor, namely 66 families.

252

Table 3-4 - NUMBER OF FAMILIES AND DEPENDENCY INDEX OF THE POOR URBAN POPULATION
 PROVINCE OF HEREDIA

	FAMILIES		Dependency Index
	<u>Nuclei</u>	<u>Members</u>	
1) POOR	999	6,428	1.29
Less than 100 colones	227	939	0.97
From 100 to 299 colones	35	281	1.65
From 300 to 499 colones	83	612	1.34
From 500 to 699 colones	174	1,179	1.33
From 700 to 899 colones	191	1,380	1.47
From 900 to 1099 colones	289	2,037	1.26
2) NON POOR	8,194	44,293	0.65
3) TOTAL <u>1/</u>	9,220	50,858	0.71

1/ Includes urban farmers which could not be classified as poor or as non poor, namely 27 families.

253

Table 3-5 - NUMBER OF FAMILIES AND DEPENDENCY INDEX OF THE POOR URBAN POPULATION
 PROVINCE OF GUANACASTE

	FAMILIES		Dependency Index
	Nuclei	Members	
1) POOR	1,795	12,117	1.48
Less than 100 colones	282	1,247	1.48
From 100 to 299 colones	147	1,120	2.02
From 300 to 499 colones	266	1,917	1.57
From 500 to 699 colones	322	2,362	1.53
From 700 to 899 colones	362	2,671	1.41
From 900 to 1099 colones	416	2,800	1.28
2) NON POOR	6,205	34,376	0.75
3) TOTAL <u>1/</u>	8,187	47,765	0.90

1/ Includes urban farmers which could not be classified as poor or as non poor, namely 187 families.

Table 3-6 - NUMBER OF FAMILIES AND DEPENDENCY INDEX OF THE POOR URBAN POPULATION
 PROVINCE OF PUNTARENAS

	FAMILIES		Dependency Index
	Nuclei	Members	
1) POOR	1,658	9,633	1.39
Less than 100 colones	454	1,571	1.21
From 100 to 299 colones	69	552	1.86
From 300 to 499 colones	207	1,427	1.50
From 500 to 699 colones	247	1,667	1.49
From 700 to 899 colones	289	1,956	1.41
From 900 to 1099 colones	392	2,460	1.29
2) NON POOR	7,463	35,628	0.68
3) TOTAL <u>1/</u>	9,173	45,597	0.79

1/ Includes urban farmers which could not be classified as poor or as non poor, namely 52 families.

Table 3-7 - NUMBER OF FAMILIES AND DEPENDENCY INDEX OF THE POOR URBAN POPULATION

	FAMILIES		Dependency Index
	<u>Nuclei</u>	<u>Members</u>	
1) POOR	1,632	8,561	1.54
Less than 100 colones	541	1,826	1.54
From 100 to 299 colones	64	557	2.06
From 300 to 499 colones	144	1,020	1.71
From 500 to 699 colones	190	1,272	1.42
From 700 to 899 colones	243	1,713	1.57
From 900 to 1099 colones	348	2,173	1.41
2) NON POOR	6,329	30,514	0.73
3) TOTAL <u>1/</u>	7,893	39,240	0.86

1/ Includes urban farmers which could not be classified as poor or as non poor, namely 32 families.

Table 4 - ACTIVITY OF THE POOR URBAN POPULATION BETWEEN 15 AND 64 YEARS OF AGE.
COSTA RICA

	<u>Total</u>	A C T I V E				<u>Inactive</u>
		<u>Sub- Total</u>	<u>Worked</u>	<u>Did not work</u>	<u>Was looking for a job</u>	
1) POOR	49,782	17,235	12,742	3,117	1,376	32,547
Less than 100 colones	9,665	1,195	28	987	180	8,470
From 100 to 299 colones	2,321	715	427	180	108	1,606
From 300 to 499 colones	5,072	1,745	1,140	431	174	3,327
From 500 to 699 colones	8,310	3,197	2,405	534	258	5,113
From 700 to 899 colones	10,771	4,414	3,629	474	311	6,357
From 900 to 1099 colones	13,643	5,969	5,113	511	345	7,674
2) NON POOR	388,544	225,317	215,680	6,048	3,589	163,227
3) TOTAL <u>1/</u>	439,983	243,247	229,045	9,221	4,981	196,736

1/ Includes 2,613 members of urban farming families which could not be classified as poor or as non poor.

Table 5 - COMPOSITION OF THE ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION, BY AGE GROUP AND BY SEX. URBAN POPULATION (POOR AND NON POOR) AND POOR NON-FARMING RURAL POPULATION. COSTA RICA

	U R B A N				POOR NON-FARMING RURAL	
	NON POOR		POOR		Men	Women
	Men	Women	Men	Women		
TOTAL	153,016	72,301	12,498	4,737	42,681	4,697
From 15 to 19 years old	18,364	12,695	2,654	1,272	8,375	1,779
From 20 to 29 years old	49,514	28,804	2,848	1,371	8,620	1,184
From 30 to 39 years old	34,763	15,775	2,996	1,161	12,483	1,039
From 40 to 49 years old	26,853	9,516	2,530	605	8,567	496
From 50 to 64 years old	23,522	5,511	1,470	328	4,636	199

858

Table 6 - RATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT OF THE ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION, BY LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATION AND BY SEX. URBAN POPULATION (POOR AND NON POOR) AND POOR NON-FARMING RURAL POPULATION.
COSTA RICA

<u>Level of education</u>	RATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT					
	U R B A N				POOR NON-FARMING RURAL	
	NON POOR		POOR		Men	Women
Men	Women	Men	Women			
ALL LEVELS	0.05	0.02	0.33	0.09	0.16	0.12
None	0.11	0.04	0.32	0.06	0.13	0.12
Primary	0.06	0.02	0.31	0.08	0.17	0.11
Beyond primary	0.03	0.02	0.43	0.16	0.32	0.19

259

Table 7-0 - INDEX OF SCHOOLING OF THE URBAN POPULATION 7 YEARS OLD AND OLDER, ILLITERACY RATE OF THE URBAN POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OLDER AND RATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT OF THE URBAN ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION.
COSTA RICA

	INDEX OF SCHOOLING OF THE POPULATION 7 YEARS OLD AND OLDER		ILLITERACY RATE OF THE POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OLDER		RATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT OF THE ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
1) POOR	0.55	0.51	0.08	0.10	0.33	0.09
Less than 100 colones	0.61	0.52	0.10	0.10	0.99	0.88
From 100 to 299 colones	0.52	0.46	0.19	0.13	0.67	0.05
From 300 to 499 colones	0.54	0.48	0.10	0.11	0.52	0.06
From 500 to 699 colones	0.54	0.49	0.08	0.11	0.33	0.07
From 700 to 899 colones	0.54	0.50	0.07	0.09	0.22	0.06
From 900 to 1099 colones	0.54	0.52	0.07	0.08	0.17	0.06
2) NON POOR	0.65	0.62	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.02
3) TOTAL <u>1/</u>	0.64	0.60	0.04	0.05	0.07	0.03

1/ Includes 546 urban farming families which could not be classified as poor or as non poor.

0.02

Table 7-1 INDEX OF SCHOOLING OF THE URBAN POPULATION 7 YEARS OLD AND OLDER, ILLITERACY RATE OF THE URBAN POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OLDER AND RATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT OF THE URBAN ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION.
PROVINCE OF SAN JOSE

	INDEX OF SCHOOLING OF THE POPULATION 7 YEARS OLD AND OLDER		ILLITERACY RATE OF THE POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OLDER		RATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT OF THE ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
1) POOR	0.59	0.54	0.07	0.08	0.34	0.10
Less than 100 colones	0.69	0.57	0.08	0.08	1.00	0.97
From 100 to 299 colones	0.56	0.45	0.17	0.10	0.62	0.07
From 300 to 499 colones	0.58	0.51	0.08	0.09	0.50	0.05
From 500 to 699 colones	0.57	0.52	0.06	0.08	0.33	0.08
From 700 to 899 colones	0.57	0.52	0.05	0.08	0.26	0.06
From 900 to 1099 colones	0.56	0.55	0.05	0.07	0.17	0.07
2) NON POOR	0.68	0.63	0.02	0.03	0.05	0.02
3) TOTAL <u>1/</u>	0.67	0.62	0.03	0.04	0.07	0.03

1/ Includes 117 urban farming families which could not be classified as poor or as non poor.

Table 7-2 INDEX OF SCHOOLING OF THE URBAN POPULATION 7 YEARS OLD AND OLDER, ILLITERACY RATE OF THE URBAN POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OLDER AND RATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT OF THE URBAN ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION.
PROVINCE OF ALAJUELA

	INDEX OF SCHOOLING OF THE POPULATION 7 YEARS OLD AND OLDER		ILLITERACY RATE OF THE POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OLDER		RATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT OF THE ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
1) POOR	0.53	0.50	0.10	0.10	0.32	0.07
Less than 100 colones	0.55	0.50	0.10	0.11	0.99	0.92
From 100 to 299 colones	0.51	0.49	0.28	0.15	0.73	0.06
From 300 to 499 colones	0.53	0.47	0.09	0.11	0.47	0.08
From 500 to 699 colones	0.52	0.49	0.10	0.11	0.33	0.04
From 700 to 899 colones	0.53	0.51	0.07	0.08	0.21	0.03
From 900 to 1099 colones	0.54	0.51	0.08	0.08	0.16	0.06
2) NON POOR	0.62	0.61	0.03	0.04	0.06	0.01
3) TOTAL <u>1/</u>	0.61	0.59	0.05	0.05	0.08	0.02

1/ Includes 65 urban farming families which could not be classified as poor or as non poor.

Table 7-3 INDEX OF SCHOOLING OF THE URBAN POPULATION 7 YEARS OLD AND OLDER, ILLITERACY RATE OF THE URBAN POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OLDER AND RATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT OF THE URBAN ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION.
PROVINCE OF CARTAGO

	INDEX OF SCHOOLING OF THE POPULATION 7 YEARS OLD AND OLDER		ILLITERACY RATE OF THE POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OLDER		RATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT OF THE ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
1) POOR	0.53	0.49	0.09	0.13	0.28	0.07
Less than 100 colones	0.48	0.49	0.18	0.22	0.98	0.35
From 100 to 299 colones	0.50	0.45	0.14	0.17	0.77	0.00
From 300 to 499 colones	0.55	0.48	0.08	0.12	0.53	0.04
From 500 to 699 colones	0.53	0.48	0.09	0.14	0.31	0.04
From 700 to 899 colones	0.53	0.50	0.08	0.11	0.20	0.10
From 900 to 1099 colones	0.55	0.52	0.06	0.08	0.13	0.04
2) NON POOR	0.61	0.60	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.02
3) TOTAL <u>1/</u>	0.60	0.58	0.05	0.06	0.08	0.02

1/ Includes 66 urban farming families which could not be classified as poor or as non poor.

203

Table 7-4 INDEX OF SCHOOLING OF THE URBAN POPULATION 7 YEARS OLD AND OLDER, ILLITERACY RATE OF THE URBAN POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OLDER AND RATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT OF THE URBAN ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION.
PROVINCE OF HEREDIA

	INDEX OF SCHOOLING OF THE POPULATION 7 YEARS OLD AND OLDER		ILLITERACY RATE OF THE POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OLDER		RATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT OF THE ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
1) POOR	0.54	0.52	0.07	0.07	0.34	0.11
Less than 100 colones	0.58	0.56	0.07	0.06	1.00	1.00
From 100 to 299 colones	0.51	0.51	0.13	0.14	0.78	0.13
From 300 to 499 colones	0.54	0.51	0.07	0.08	0.54	0.05
From 500 to 699 colones	0.50	0.47	0.09	0.10	0.43	0.12
From 700 to 899 colones	0.55	0.53	0.04	0.04	0.16	0.09
From 900 to 1099 colones	0.53	0.53	0.08	0.07	0.20	0.03
2) NON POOR	0.66	0.64	0.02	0.03	0.06	0.03
3) TOTAL <u>1/</u>	0.65	0.63	0.03	0.03	0.08	0.03

1/ Includes 27 urban farming families which could not be classified as poor or as non poor.

798
794

Table 7-5 INDEX OF SCHOOLING OF THE URBAN POPULATION 7 YEARS OLD AND OLDER, ILLITERACY RATE OF THE URBAN POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OLDER AND RATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT OF THE URBAN ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION.
PROVINCE OF GUANACASTE

	INDEX OF SCHOOLING OF THE POPULATION 7 YEARS OLD AND OLDER		ILLITERACY RATE OF THE POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OLDER		RATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT OF THE ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
1) POOR	0.50	0.46	0.11	0.13	0.23	0.07
Less than 100 colones	0.55	0.45	0.12	0.15	0.94	0.67
From 100 to 299 colones	0.54	0.44	0.12	0.15	0.62	0.05
From 300 to 499 colones	0.47	0.44	0.14	0.14	0.44	0.08
From 500 to 699 colones	0.52	0.47	0.10	0.13	0.19	0.07
From 700 to 899 colones	0.48	0.46	0.12	0.15	0.10	0.07
From 900 to 1099 colones	0.49	0.49	0.09	0.10	0.15	0.06
2) NON POOR	0.60	0.58	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.01
3) TOTAL <u>1/</u>	0.58	0.55	0.06	0.08	0.08	0.02

1/ Includes 187 urban farming families which could not be classified as poor or as non poor.

212

Table 7-6 INDEX OF SCHOOLING OF THE URBAN POPULATION 7 YEARS OLD AND OLDER, ILLITERACY RATE OF THE URBAN POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OLDER AND RATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT OF THE URBAN ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION.
PROVINCE OF PUNTARENAS

	INDEX OF SCHOOLING OF THE POPULATION 7 YEARS OLD AND OLDER		ILLITERACY RATE OF THE POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OLDER		RATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT OF THE ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
	1) POOR	0.47	0.44	0.11	0.13	0.41
Less than 100 colones	0.47	0.41	0.10	0.15	0.99	1.00
From 100 to 299 colones	0.52	0.47	0.07	0.07	0.58	0.04
From 300 to 499 colones	0.48	0.44	0.13	0.13	0.68	0.07
From 500 to 699 colones	0.46	0.44	0.10	0.14	0.42	0.08
From 700 to 899 colones	0.45	0.43	0.12	0.13	0.24	0.04
From 900 to 1099 colones	0.49	0.45	0.10	0.13	0.20	0.07
2) NON POOR	0.54	0.52	0.06	0.09	0.06	0.03
3) TOTAL <u>1/</u>	0.53	0.50	0.07	0.10	0.10	0.04

1/ Includes 52 urban farming families which could not be classified as poor or as non poor.

Table 7-7 INDEX OF SCHOOLING OF THE URBAN POPULATION 7 YEARS OLD AND OLDER, ILLITERACY RATE OF THE URBAN POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OLDER AND RATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT OF THE URBAN ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION
PROVINCE OF LIMON

	INDEX OF SCHOOLING OF THE POPULATION 7 YEARS OLD AND OLDER		ILLITERACY RATE OF THE POPULATION 10 YEARS OLD AND OLDER		RATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT OF THE ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
1) POOR	0.51	0.48	0.08	0.10	0.35	0.08
Less than 100 colones	0.54	0.47	0.09	0.09	0.97	0.86
From 100 to 299 colones	0.35	0.39	0.20	0.20	0.72	0.03
From 300 to 499 colones	0.56	0.51	0.08	0.08	0.47	0.04
From 500 to 699 colones	0.54	0.51	0.07	0.10	0.38	0.11
From 700 to 899 colones	0.53	0.49	0.06	0.09	0.22	0.07
From 900 to 1099 colones	0.49	0.47	0.08	0.12	0.22	0.05
2) NON POOR	0.57	0.56	0.04	0.07	0.05	0.02
3) TOTAL <u>1/</u>	0.56	0.54	0.05	0.08	0.08	0.03

1/ Includes 32 urban farming families which could not be classified as poor or as non poor.

267

Tab. 8 - PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION ACCORDING TO THE CONDITION OF THE HOUSE AND THE COEFFICIENT OF
 OVERCROWDING OF THE URBAN POPULATION
 COSTA RICA

	H O U S I N G C O N D I T I O N					
	G O O D		F A I R		B A D	
	Percentage	Over-crowding index	Percentage	Over-crowding index	Percentage	Over-crowding index
1) POOR	0.36	2.29	0.38	3.13	0.25	4.08
Less than 100 colones	0.42	1.44	0.35	2.03	0.23	3.09
From 100 to 299 colones	0.16	3.25	0.35	3.94	0.49	4.21
From 300 to 499 colones	0.29	2.69	0.39	3.49	0.31	4.24
From 500 to 699 colones	0.32	2.60	0.41	3.38	0.27	4.18
From 700 to 899 colones	0.36	2.64	0.39	3.43	0.25	4.37
From 900 to 1099 colones	0.39	2.58	0.39	3.42	0.22	4.48
2) NON POOR	0.68	1.82	0.24	2.46	0.08	3.12
3) TOTAL <u>1/</u>	.64	1.85	0.26	2.58	0.10	3.42

1/ Includes 546 urban farming families which could not be classified as poor or as non poor.

292

Table 9 - PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION ACCORDING TO THE FORMS OF TENURE OF THE HOUSE AND THE COEFFICIENT OF OVERCROWDING OF THE URBAN POPULATION.
COSTA RICA

	H O U S E					
	O W N E D		R E N T E D		O T H E R	
	Percentage	Over-crowding index	Percentage	Over-crowding index	Percentage.	Over-crowding index
1) POOR	0.30	2.72	0.63	3.27	0.06	4.06
Less than 100 colones	0.00	7.07	1.00	2.31	0.00	8.00
From 100 to 299 colones	0.44	3.47	0.45	5.20	0.11	4.76
From 300 to 499 colones	0.45	2.88	0.45	4.03	0.10	4.10
From 500 to 699 colones	0.44	2.62	0.47	4.05	0.08	4.22
From 700 to 899 colones	0.43	2.63	0.49	3.96	0.08	4.11
From 900 to 1099 colones	0.41	2.67	0.50	3.83	0.09	3.79
2) NON POOR	0.57	1.85	0.37	2.41	0.07	2.27
3) TOTAL <u>1/</u>	0.53	1.91	0.40	2.57	0.07	2.47

1/ Includes 546 urban farming families which could not be classified as poor or as non poor.

269

Table 10 - FERTILITY (AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHILDREN BORN ALIVE), BY AGE GROUP OF THE URBAN POPULATION.
COSTA RICA

	AVERAGE NUMBER OF CHILDREN BORN ALIVE PER WOMAN					
	A G E					
	From 15 to 19	From 20 to 29	From 30 to 39	From 40 to 49	From 50 to 59	60 and over
1) POOR	0.13	2.13	5.52	6.61	5.61	4.83
Less than 100 colones	0.18	1.82	4.03	3.80	3.84	3.57
From 100 to 299 colones	0.17	2.64	6.37	7.46	6.50	4.43
From 300 to 499 colones	0.14	2.18	6.05	7.29	7.17	6.45
From 500 to 699 colones	0.12	2.19	5.77	7.25	6.48	5.71
From 700 to 899 colones	0.12	2.29	5.91	7.42	5.95	5.48
From 900 to 1099 colones	0.11	2.15	5.73	7.23	6.37	5.68
2) NON POOR	0.10	1.11	3.29	4.76	5.00	4.99
3) TOTAL <u>1/</u>	0.10	1.22	3.64	5.01	5.08	4.97

1/ Includes 546 urban farming families which could not be classified as poor or as non poor.

270

Table 11 - FERTILITY (AVERAGE NUMBER OF LIVING CHILDREN), BY AGE GROUP OF THE URBAN POPULATION.
COSTA RICA

	AVERAGE NUMBER OF LIVING CHILDREN PER WOMAN					
	A G E					
	From 15 to 19	From 20 to 29	From 30 to 39	From 40 to 49	From 50 to 59	60 and over
1) POOR	0.12	1.96	4.93	5.63	4.42	3.34
Less than 100 colones	0.16	1.67	3.54	3.36	3.10	2.59
From 100 to 299 colones	0.16	2.40	5.60	6.34	5.07	3.17
From 300 to 499 colones	0.13	2.01	5.30	5.99	5.25	4.25
From 500 to 699 colones	0.11	2.02	5.14	6.09	5.05	3.82
From 700 to 899 colones	0.11	2.12	5.36	6.33	4.72	3.71
From 900 to 1099 colones	0.10	1.98	5.16	6.21	5.13	3.89
2) NON POOR	0.09	1.05	3.05	4.25	4.19	3.76
3) TOTAL <u>1/</u>	0.10	1.15	3.34	4.44	4.22	3.69

1/ Includes 546 urban farming families which could not be classified as poor or as non poor.

271

Table 12 - AVERAGE ANNUAL WAGES OF THE MEMBERS OF THE ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION WITH
A JOB. NON-FARMING FAMILIES, BY URBAN-RURAL AREA.
COSTA RICA

	AVERAGE ANNUAL WAGES OF THE ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE POPULATION			
	URBAN		RURAL	
	<u>Wages earned</u>	<u>Imputed wages</u>	<u>Wages earned</u>	<u>Imputed wages</u>
POOR	3,790	6,334	3,441	5,740
Less than 100 colones	2,089	...	893	...
From 100 to 299 colones	1,701	...	1,736	5,544
From 300 to 499 colones	2,417	5,450	2,471	5,340
From 500 to 699 colones	3,234	5,755	3,137	5,520
From 700 to 899 colones	3,530	6,269	3,593	5,748
From 900 to 1099 colones	4,510	6,564	3,965	5,835
NON POOR	11,211	10,560	7,036	6,257

272

JIMENEZ & TANZI LTDA.
San José, Costa Rica

273