

**PRICE WATERHOUSE / ESA CONSULTORES**

**USAID HONDURAS CONTRACT  
522-09106-C-00-2023-04**

**MAY 1993**

**UPDATE OF BASELINE STUDY OF HONDURAN  
EXPORT PROCESSING ZONES**

**FINAL REPORT**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

# **UPDATE OF BASELINE STUDY OF HONDURAN EXPORT PROCESSING ZONES**

**MAY 1993**

## **CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION**

### *(i) The purpose of the study*

In March 1993, USAID contracted Price Waterhouse to update the 1992 Baseline Study of population affected by private sectors export processing zones, returning to the same households which were interviewed in 1992 to see what changes have occurred in their social and economic conditions over the last year, and taking a fresh sample of 200 EPZ workers from the expanded worker population, to see how the composition and characteristics of the workforce have changed. The interviews were carried out in the months of March and April 1993. The following sections report the results of the new surveys, and comment on the changes observable over the period 1992/93.

### *ii) The growth of the EPZ sector, 1992-93*

Over the period March 1992- March 1993, investment and employment growth in the EPZs has continued apace. The number of factory shells completed, which stood at 50 in March 1992, had risen to 60 by December 1992. The pipeline of planned investment increased in the same period from 163 factory shells to 226, so that the projected final total number of shells was 287 in December 1992.

Between March 1992 and March 1993, the number of firms operating in the EPZs rose from 38 to 50, and the number of jobs rose by 43 per cent, to 22,342. EPZ employment in the municipality of Choloma (comprising the following parks: ZIP Choloma, CHIP Choloma, INHDELVA, Parque Galaxy and ZIP San Miguel) rose from 13,239 in 1992 to 16,865 in 1993, an increase of 27 per cent. As expected, a significant part of the employment growth has been concentrated in the Villanueva area: ZIP Búfalo and ZIP Villanueva created 2,522 new jobs in the year March 1992-March 1993, increasing the number of EPZ jobs in the municipality by 217 per cent.

### *(iii) The organization of this report*

In Chapter 2, we detail the new survey methodology developed for the workforce survey, which was made necessary by the increasing complexity of the universe, in general, and by the growth of employment in EPZs outside the Choloma area, in particular. In Chapter 3, we report the results of the workforce survey and comment on the changes observable since 1992. In Chapter 4, we report the data for socioeconomic conditions in Choloma and Villanueva gathered in the

community survey. In Chapter 5, we discuss the evidence from both our surveys on labor market conditions and comment on changes observable over the last year. In Chapter 6, we report data on family planning behavior among both the workforce and community samples. Finally, we update the summary indicators defined in the 1992 report. For ease of comparison, this chapter structure follows that of the 1992 report, except that the numbering is slightly changed (so that Part I Chapter 2 of the 1992 report becomes simply chapter 3 of the 1993 report, Part I Chapter 3 becomes Chapter 4, and so on).

## CHAPTER 2 – SURVEY METHODOLOGY

### (i) *Samples*

The sample methodology for the community survey was identical to that used in 1992: we returned to the same households identified in the sample drawn last year. The methodology is described in detail in the 1992 report. However, for the workforce survey, the 1992 sample methodology was improved, since access problems in 1992 limited the survey to two EPZs in Choloma (ZIP Choloma and INHDELVA) and one in Villanueva (ZIP Búfalo). This sample frame would be inadequate now that employment in other EPZs has grown considerably. We therefore developed a methodology to produce a representative sample of the whole of the worker population in the private sector EPZs. This methodology is described in detail in Chapter 2 of the main report.

## CHAPTER 3 – BASIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EPZ WORKFORCE

### *Age, sex and family structure*

Women made up 71.5 per cent of the 1993 sample of 200 EPZ workers, which is considerably less than the 84 per cent observed in the 1992 sample. This difference might reflect improvements in the sampling methodology, leading to the inclusion of more firms which prefer to recruit male workers. But it might also be the result of firms finding it increasingly difficult to recruit young women and turning to young men as an alternative. Women aged 30 or under are 68% of the sample – also somewhat down from the figure of 75% observed in the 1992 sample. Basic labor (direct and indirect) is 80% of the total workforce – very close to the 78% observed last year.

The overall age structure in the 1993 sample is somewhat younger than that for the 1992 sample, with 45.5% aged 20 or under, compared with 34.8% last year, and correspondingly fewer workers in their twenties. This year, we found three workers (1.5% of the total) aged under 15, the minimum legal working age, which suggests that under-aged working is not a serious problem.

Looking at the breakdown of employment category by sex we see that women are 73.4% of basic direct labor, compared with 86% observed in the 1992 sample, and 67.6% of intermediate

labor, compared with 74% in 1992. Men tend to predominate in the categories of basic indirect labor (warehousing, security etc), and once again, 100% of mechanics are men.

The data for family structure in this year's sample are very similar to those for 1992. Only 28.4% of the women are either married or have a common law spouse, against 30% last year. The proportion of men who are married or have a common law spouse is 31.% this year, suggesting that the 21.9% observed in last year's sample may have been an underestimate.

Fifty eight percent of the women and 79% of the men in the 1993 sample were childless compared with 48% and 67% in 1992. This is a sharp increase for both groups, and is almost certainly linked to the younger age structure in the 1993 sample, already commented on. Nevertheless, 42% of the women in the 1993 sample are mothers, so the 1992 study's conclusion that it is not true that only childless young women work in the EPZs remains apposite.

The average number of dependents for workers in the 1993 workforce survey was 1.6, which is much lower than the 2.5 found in 1992. For women, the 1993 figure was 1.8 (0.9 children and 0.9 adults); for men, it was 1.2 (0.6 children and 0.6 adults). In 1992, the women in our sample had an average of 2.6 dependents (1.6 children and 1.0 adults) while men had 2.16 (1.2 children and 0.96 adults). The difference is consistent with the younger average age of the 1993 sample.

#### *Indicators of instability in family structure*

There were 26 single mothers in the 1993 workforce sample, out of a total of 60 mothers, so that 18% of all women and 43% of mothers in the sample are single mothers. This is lower than the figures of 28% and 55%, respectively, observed in 1992. The 41 children of single mothers are 39% of the total of children of female EPZ workers in the 1993 sample (105). We found fewer children separated from their mother than in the 1992 sample: the figure was 5% of women workers' children in 1993, against 19% in 1992. We also found less evidence of family instability as indicated by the number of families with more than one father. Last year, 38% of women with children reported more than one father. This year, the figure was down to 20% (12 cases) (data not tabulated).

We found considerably fewer female heads of household in the 1993 sample than we found in 1992. Once again, this is clearly related to the younger age structure of the sample. Just 10.5% of women were heads of households against 18.5% last year. For men, on the other hand, the figure was up from 25% observed last year to 40.4% in 1993, leaving the overall total almost the same (19.6% in 1992; 19.0% in 1993).

#### *Education*

The 1993 survey confirms the 1992 finding that virtually all EPZ workers are literate and have at least primary education. However, the proportion with secondary education found in the 1993 sample is lower than for 1992 (33.5% against 41%), and the proportion with no prior technical training is also higher (68% against 44%). Once again, these differences are likely to be linked to the difference in age structure between the two samples, and suggest that the EPZ sector is

happy to recruit very young workers with proven aptitude (as measured by completion of primary education) and then train them itself for the specific tasks required.

#### *Stability of EPZ employment*

The data for length of time in the company generated by the 1993 survey suggest that the sector is capable of offering stable employment, with 11.6% of the sample registering over two years of service, compared with 0.5% in 1992, when very few factories had been operating more than two years.

The proportion of workers with under a year's service fell from 73% in 1992 to 53.8% in 1993. This figure is somewhat more than can be accounted for by the 43% growth in the sector's total employment over the same period, and suggests an average labor turnover rate of 28%.

However, this is a very moderate turnover rate for such a new sector, confirming that the EPZs are likely to offer stable employment to those workers who wish to have it. This further undermines the idea that Honduran EPZ employers deliberately seek to maintain a high turnover to avoid paying social overhead costs such as vacation pay and pregnancy leave. If this turnover rate were to be maintained, average length of service in "steady state" (i.e. when the sector stops growing) would be 3.5 years. To avoid "social overheads" in Honduras, a worker must be fired within 60 days.

#### *Travel time to work*

The pattern of travel time to work in the 1993 sample is largely similar to that reported in 1992. Fifty three per cent of workers live within half an hour of work (1992: 46%). However, this year we found more workers who travel over an hour in each direction (15.5% against 5% last year). This could be an indication of growing labor market tightness in the immediate surroundings of the EPZs. The bus remains the main means of travel to work (60%, against 65% last year), followed by walking (24.5%, down from 30% last year). More workers now report using bicycles (11% against 4.5% last year) and, for the first time, there is a small number using private cars (4.5%).

Transport costs remain very moderate for most workers, with 41.5% paying nothing at all (a figure which must include some who use company buses provided free of charge, since it is greater than the sum of walkers and cyclists) and a further 28% paying under 2 lempiras a day for the two-way journey. A big difference observed between the 1992 and 1993 samples is that this year, only one respondent said they pay over 5 lempiras a day to travel, against the 20% recorded last year. We think that the 1993 figure is probably more reliable.

#### *Working hours*

A surprisingly large proportion of the workforce (32%) had apparently worked less than 40 hours in the previous week, once the data had been corrected to exclude the lunch break. Only 20 percent of workers had worked over 50 hours.

### *Childcare*

Once again, family members emerged as the main source of support with childcare, accounting for 81% of care arrangements (exactly the same figure reported last year. The workers's mother was the carer in 54.4% of cases, their partner, in 7.4% and other family members, in 19.1% of cases. The proportion using paid child minders also remained identical, at 12%, but this year we also identified a further 1.5% using private day care. This group was probably buried in "other" last time around.

### *Earnings of EPZ workers*

We have improved the data set on earnings in this year's survey, by collecting information on base salaries and on real earnings in the last pay period. To establish base salaries, we asked a general question (how much are you paid?) linked to a question about the payment basis.

We found average wages for the whole sample of L.663 per month. For men, the figure was L.678 and for women, L.657. The 95% confidence intervals for each of these averages are acceptably narrow. For the total, the interval is just plus-or-minus 3.7% of the reported average. These figures for base salaries suggest that the EPZ sector generally respects the labor code provisions, which required a minimum wage (for a 44 hour week) of L.570 per month (or L.19 per day) at the time of the survey. The frequency count shows that only 41 workers (21% of the total) reported their base pay at under the legal minimum. Virtually all these cases can be accounted for, on inspection of individual records, by short weeks or by legal social security deductions which take their earnings just below the minimum.

To establish earnings in the last pay period, we asked how much the worker earned last week. This was then converted to a monthly equivalent using the formula  $(30x/7)$ , where x is daily earnings. This procedure follows Honduran labor code norms for payment systems. We found average earnings of L.743, with the average for men at L.802 and that for women at L.719. Once again, the confidence intervals for these averages are comfortably narrow. For the total, the 95% interval is plus-or-minus 3.8% of the reported average. An inspection of the cases which reported earnings equivalents under the minimum wage shows that 85% of these cases can be explained by working a short week. Only 4 cases (two per cent of the sample) had both worked over 44 hours and earned under the statutory minimum wage.

Average earnings in the last pay period were 10.7% up from the 1992 survey for the total sample. This compares with retail price inflation of 7.9% in the 13 month interval separating the two surveys (from January 1992 to February 1993), according to Central Bank data, suggesting that average real wages in the EPZ sector rose 2.8% over the period.

The 1993 survey generated more detailed information on overtime working than that for 1992. We found that 113 workers had done overtime in the previous week (56% of the total sample) and that this group had worked an average of 9 hours overtime. This suggests that overtime is an important source of additional income for EPZ workers.

Average earnings for basic labor were L.704.5, which is 10.8% up on the figure of L.635.7 recorded last year. For intermediate labor the figure was L.871.9 (up 9.5%). The frequency counts show that 24% of intermediate workers earn over L.1,000 a month; in fact, the three highest earners in our sample were intermediate workers. Nevertheless, the moderate overall increase in wages for this sector of workers over the last year suggests that reports of a generalized shortage of skilled workers and supervisors in the apparel sector may be exaggerated.

#### *Importance of EPZ workers' income*

The number of EPZ workers who are their household's only earner is lower in the 1993 sample than that observed in 1992: 17% of the total, against 27% last year. Once again, this is likely to be related to the different age structures of the two samples: 1993's younger sample includes a higher proportion of people with parents or older brothers and sisters working. The slight tendency for more men to be the only earner in their households which we observed in 1992 is much more marked in the 1993 sample: 25% of men are the only earner, against only 13.7% of women EPZ workers.

As in the 1992 sample, we found that just over half the 1993 sample (52.5%) said they were the main earner in their household, compared with 56% last year. However, there is a more marked difference between men and women this year, and the difference is in the inverse direction from that observed last year: 45% of women are the main earner, against 73% for men. In 1992, the respective figures were 53% and 57%. We think the 1993 data are likely to be more reliable on this point, as the number of men in the sample is considerably bigger.

Once again, we found that very few EPZ workers have any other source of personal income apart from their factory earnings: the total with alternative incomes was 9.5%, compared with 18.5% in 1992. The most important source of other income, once again, is maintenance payments to women from the father of their children. Three women report receiving government social compensation bonds, which proves that they are committing fraud, since there is supposedly an income ceiling in the qualifying rules for the bonds, set well below EPZ earnings levels.

The big difference made to household incomes by EPZ earnings is best underlined by table 3.19, which compares average household incomes for households where there is an EPZ worker and those where there is none. The former have average incomes of L1,532, fully 50% above the L.1,008 recorded by the latter. This proportionate difference is even greater than the 35% advantage registered by EPZ workers' households in 1992.

#### *Social security and medical services*

The confusion among the workforce about their relationship with the Instituto Hondureño de Seguro Social (IHSS), which we observed in 1992, was still noticeable in 1993. However, as the result of changes in the questionnaire format, we could establish that workers think of the IHSS principally in terms of medical insurance and other short term cover, and that those who have this cover are generally very aware of it.

In fact, by law, all the workforce of the EPZs is covered by long term IHSS insurance. On the other hand, the situation for medical cover varies from EPZ to EPZ, and from municipality to municipality, depending whether the EPZ has established the Sistema Medico de Empresa (SME) or (alternatively) whether the IHSS offers medical cover (either optionally or compulsorily) in the area where the EPZ is located.

Overall, we found that 52% of the sample believed themselves to be inscribed in IHSS, but the figure varied widely between parks which fell in our sample. In ZIP Choloma, the figure was 98%, in INHDELVA, 8%, in CHIP, zero, in Búfalo, 67% and in Villanueva, 100%. It is clear that workers in the EPZs which have access to IHSS medical cover (ZIP Choloma, Zip Búfalo and ZIP Villanueva) tend to say they are covered by IHSS; those who only have "long term" cover, for invalidity, old age and death (in CHIP and INHDELVA) tend to say that they are not covered by the IHSS.

The EPZs which do not have access to IHSS cover generally offer a private on-site medical service. When asked if a medical service is available at work, 91% of respondents said yes, with the percentage varying over a relatively narrow range, from 83% in Búfalo to 98% in ZIP Choloma.

The EPZ workforce is relatively untroubled by illness, as one would expect of a group of young people. Only 45% of the workforce had lost any work time through illness in the last six months, and only 16% had lost more than two days. This may in part be the result of the very generalization of workplace medical services, which allow the employers to sift out malignancy and also cut out the loss of work time through travel to off-site IHSS clinics and hospitals for diagnosis.

Interestingly, three quarters of workers with access to workplace medical services believe that their employer provides the service, although in fact, it is as often as not linked to the IHSS through the SME. This suggests that EPZ employers can get considerable benefits in the form of workforce "goodwill" from participating in the SME.

#### *Social integration and organization of EPZ workers*

The 1993 data on social integration are almost identical to those from the 1992 survey. Religion is the only form of social activity which is generalized throughout the sample, involving 52% of respondents. Sport involves 22% (higher than the 18% found last year, probably due to the higher proportion of men in the sample). As in the 1992 survey, no-one admitted to involvement in unions, but once again, since the interview took place in the factory in work time with the employers' blessing, this may not be a very reliable indicator.

## CHAPTER 4 – SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN CHOLOMA AND VILLANUEVA

The data presented in this chapter are drawn mainly from our community survey. As in the 1992, report, we start by describing the sample population and then present data for general social and economic conditions of the households, commenting on points of difference between the data for 1993 and those for 1992.

### *Housing conditions and access to public services*

The average number of inhabitants per household reported for Choloma in 1993 is 5.7 people, slightly up from the 5.6 reported last year, and consistent with reports of growing housing shortage in the community. The figure reported for Villanueva is 4.8, which is considerably lower than the 5.3 observed last year, and also observed in the 1988 Census.

Since we returned to the same households, the data show the same pattern of housing tenure observed last year: the vast majority still live in individual houses and brick is the main construction material.

Owner occupiers are 65% of households in Choloma and 59% in Villanueva; 22% rent their homes in Choloma and 31% rent in Villanueva. There is evidence that housing costs have risen in real terms, especially for renters in Choloma: average rents rose by 63% in real terms in Choloma and 33% for Villanueva. These increases are greater than the 95% confidence intervals reported for the statistics reported in 1992. These data are consistent with widespread reports of shortage of low-cost housing in the Choloma area.

The data on water supply, electricity supply, fuel for cooking and sanitary arrangements for 1993 are broadly similar to those for 1992; where differences arise, they are likely to result from the small changes in the sample due to the use of substitute households where sampled households were not available, or from improvement in data collection due to the combination of experience and better training. In general, where there are inconsistencies between the 1992 and 1993 data, the latter are likely to be more reliable.

The data on IHSS cover suggest that the proportion of households where at least one person has IHSS cover fell from 42% to 36% in Choloma between 1992 and 1993, while the proportion for Villanueva rose from 35% to 48%.

There are no very striking differences between the pattern of artefact tenure between 1992 and 1993, for either of the two communities. This is not surprising, as one would expect the effects of higher income to feed through only slowly into asset holdings, especially where access to credit is relatively limited (or very costly, via the informal market).

### *Opinions on public services and EPZs*

The pattern of opinions registered in the 1993 sample among the Choloma and Villanueva communities regarding the quality of their public services is largely unaltered from that reported in 1992. In both places, electricity and street lighting get good ratings and the health center gets

a relatively good rating. The water supply and sewage system in Villanueva is clearly better than that of Choloma in residents' opinion, but opinions of the Choloma water supply have improved markedly from 1992 to 1993.

Correspondingly, the priority assigned to improvements in the water supply by Choloma residents has fallen (from an index number of 42 in 1992 to 27 in 1993) – but this is still the main concern, followed by improved street drains, sewers and street lighting. In Villanueva, the priority attached to improved water services has also fallen (from 50 to 25). In both communities, a desire for better health center facilities registers much more clearly in 1993 than in 1992 (possibly as a result of more careful questioning).

We found broadly the same pattern of community opinion regarding the overall impact of the EPZs as was observed in 1992. In Choloma, 82% of the community think the EPZs have a good or very good overall impact; in Villanueva, the figure is 79%. However, within these totals, there is a clear shift away from "very good" towards "good". As in 1992, we found that the source of positive opinions is the employment impact of the EPZs; for all the other factors which we mentioned (crime, alcoholism, prostitution and pollution) recorded a negative balance.

#### *Personal and household incomes in Choloma and Villanueva*

In 1993 we found average personal incomes (excluding the cases which report no income figure) of L.723 in Choloma and L.596 in Villanueva, compared with L.614 and L.624, respectively, in 1992. As in 1992, the 95% confidence intervals for the data are reasonably narrow (plus or minus 10% of the reported average, in each case). If we correct these figures for the 8% increase in the retail price index observed between the two survey dates, real average personal incomes register an increase of 10% in Choloma, and a reduction of 12% in Villanueva.

The increase in real average personal incomes in Choloma is not likely to be the result of increased earnings rates on the EPZs (as we found in our Workforce Survey that real earnings in the EPZs did not rise significantly, but rather the result of increased employment, and possibly the result of non EPZ earnings rates rising in real terms as other employers strove to retain labor.

Turning to household incomes, we found average household income of L.1,333 in Choloma and L.1,005 in Villanueva, compared (respectively) with L.1,025 and L.931 in 1993. Correcting for inflation, this gives an increase in real average household incomes of 22% in Choloma and zero in Villanueva. Once again, the Villanueva figure is likely to have been depressed somewhat by the seasonal impact of the sugar harvest (present in 1992, absent in 1993). The increase for Choloma is particularly marked, suggesting that the EPZ employment boom is feeding into a strong increase in real incomes.

The average household incomes for households with an EPZ worker observed in 1993 was L.1,532, fully 50% above the L.1,008 registered for non-EPZ households. This compares with a 35% average disparity between the two groups observed in 1992, and further reinforces the conclusion that it is EPZ incomes which are pulling up the community's average real incomes.

### *Spending patterns of EPZ communities and workers' households*

The household expenditure patterns observed in Choloma and Villanueva in the 1993 community survey are very similar to those reported in 1992. Food accounts for 60% of total spending in each community; paying off debts is the second spending item (11.5% in Choloma and 9.6% in Villanueva). In third place is education (6.1% and 8.7% respectively). Housing is a relatively small part of average expenditure (4% and 5.6% respectively), so that the sharp increases in housing costs registered on page 32 above will not have affected real incomes very greatly, on average. Saving is once again a very small part of household expenditure (under 2% in each community).

A comparison of spending patterns in EPZ workers' households and non EPZ workers' households for 1993 shows only three points of difference: firstly, EPZ households apparently spend more of their incomes on food; secondly, they spend more on education (8.4% versus 5.7%); and thirdly, they spend considerably less paying debts (6.3% versus 14.6%). Since EPZ households' incomes are generally higher than non EPZ households' incomes, these differences suggest that the income elasticity of demand for food and education is greater than unity, while that for debt is less than unity. This latter conclusion is the opposite of what we found in 1992.

### *Savings of the communities and of EPZ workers*

We found no evidence in 1993 of a marked increase in savings either among the EPZ workers or among the surrounding communities. Average savings stocks for all Choloma households in 1993 were L.115 and for Villanueva, L.172. Each figure is somewhat below that observed last year, but the difference is not statistically significant in either case. The fall is the product of a reduced number of households in sample reporting savings of any kind (the number fell from 39 to 22) combined with an increase in the average savings of households with savings (up from L.1,461 in 1992 to L.1,884 in 1993).

As in 1992, we found that just half the EPZ workers sample said they had savings of any kind. However, in 1993, the average amount of savings was considerably higher than that observed last year: L.804 per person, compared with L.579. Bank accounts and savings and loan accounts remained the most important types of asset.

### *Education of the workforce in Choloma and Villanueva*

The 1993 data for the education of the population of working age in Choloma and Villanueva are very similar to those recorded in 1992. The proportion of the population without completed primary education is 36% in Villanueva and 33% in Choloma; the figures observed in 1992 were, respectively, 31% and 34%. However, in both communities, the percentage of illiterates is below that observed in 1992 (at around 12% instead of 15% to 17%). This change is too great to reflect a real change in the population, and probably arises from improvements in the data. The proportion of the population aged 5-29 in education of any type is 47% in Choloma and 53% in Villanueva, which is almost the same as the figures observed in 1992. However, in each case the proportion in primary education is somewhat higher, and that in secondary education, somewhat lower, than that observed last year.

The 1993 data on technical education of the Choloma and Villanueva communities show a lower proportion of the labor force with any type of technical education than we observed in 1992 (16% against 23%). The main difference is that many fewer people said they had training in sewing.

## CHAPTER 5 – EPZ DEVELOPMENT, LABOR SUPPLY AND MIGRATION

### a) Projected EPZ labor demand in the Sula Valley and beyond

In our 1992 report, we highlighted the likelihood of labor market tensions in the Sula Valley if the EPZ sector were to continue the exponential growth path recorded in 1989–92. We have already seen in Chapter I that the growth continues unabated, with 43% employment growth in 1992–93.

The pipeline of future jobs has widened even faster: the total projected number of factory shells in EPZs already approved, which stood at 163 at the end of 1991, had risen to 287 by the end of 1993. This suggests that the jobs pipeline has swollen from 60,000 in 1992 to 105,000 in 1993 (assuming the average number of jobs per shell stays the same).

Almost all the EPZ jobs created to date are still located in the Sula Valley. However, this pattern is likely to change somewhat in the future, with a significant part of future growth projected for sites outside the Valley. In particular, the giant ZIP Comayagua will account for 61 shells (twenty percent of total projected EPZ factory space) and 20% of total projected employment. A number of other parks which are still on the drawing board (and are not included in the above projections) will also be sited outside the Sula Valley – among them ZIP Tegucigalpa, ZIP FIA (in Tegucigalpa), and ZIP San Lorenzo (in Valle), which between them will total a further 63 shells.

Nevertheless, the majority of projected EPZ employment is still in the Sula Valley. Total projected EPZ jobs in the valley have risen from the 60,000 reported in 1992 to some 83,000 at the end of 1992. So the final expected total is still almost four times the existing Sula Valley EPZ employment of 22,342.

### b) The age and sex composition of the EPZ workforce

In 1992, we found that 75% of the existing EPZ workforce was constituted of women aged 30 or under. Using population projections based on the 1988 census, we demonstrated that the EPZs' labor demands could not be met by natural population growth among this section of the population, so that there would have to be a shift to either male labor or older labor, or an increase in the labor participation rates of young women, or an increase in immigration, if the expansion of the sector were not to be halted by labor shortage problems.

As we commented in chapter 2, the evidence of the 1993 survey suggests that the age and sex composition of the workforce is shifting. This year's average EPZ worker is younger, with an increase in under 21s from 35% to 46%, and the proportion of women is lower (down from 84% to 72%). Women under 31 were 75% of the workforce in 1992 and 68% in 1993. While we cannot be entirely sure that this difference arises from changes in the study universe (rather than from sampling differences) it is suggestive of employers moving into new labor market segments, in the face of growing difficulty recruiting women in their twenties.

c) Evidence on participation and unemployment rates

In 1992, we reported an overall female labor market participation rate in the Choloma community survey of 48%, which was already well above the figure of 26% observed in the 1988 census. In Villanueva the figure had also risen strikingly, from 11% to 33%. This was unsurprising, since it is well known that labor force participation rates are a strong function of work availability.

In 1993, we found that the female participation rate had stabilized at 50% in Choloma, but it had leapt once again in Villanueva, from 33% to 51%. We found that male participation rates remained stable in both communities, at 73% in Choloma and 69% in Villanueva.

This year, we also made a separate analysis of the labor force participation of women under 30. These figures suggest that the projections we made last year for the under-31 female labor supply in the Sula Valley, on the assumption of participation rates of 50%, may have been a little conservative.

Rising female participation rates, combined with immigration (see below) continued to be sufficient to offset the rise in EPZ labor demand over the last year. The overall unemployment rate in Choloma among the population aged ten and over in the 1993 community sample was 25%, compared with 23% in 1992. The female unemployment rate apparently rose in Choloma, to 32% (1992: 25%) and fell markedly in Villanueva, to 29% (1992: 40%).

The observation that female unemployment rates rose in Choloma, although female participation rates did not rise much there, while employment certainly did rise sharply, is obviously somewhat contradictory. Possible explanations include new migration to the zone or an increase in the proportion of workers who travel to work in Choloma, from homes outside the zone. Either of these factors might allow the female labor supply to grow ahead of demand, in spite of stable participation rates. But we already observed that there was little apparent change in travel to work patterns among the EPZ workforce in 1992-1993. We return to the migration question in section c) below.

d) Projected EPZ labor supply-demand balance, 1992-1996

In spite of the continued existence labor market slack in Choloma and Villanueva in 1993, the medium term prospect is for growing labor shortages. If we assume that women under 31 continue to make up 68% of the EPZ labor force, and that the EPZ employment growth rate of 40% observed in 1992-93 continues until the total projected employment of 83,000 for the Sula

Valley is reached (which would be in four years time, at the end of 1996), this would suggest that total demand EPZ for female labor aged under 31 would reach 61,400 in 1996.

We estimated the total supply of female labor aged 15-29 at 53,000 in 1992, assuming a participation rate of 50%. If the participation rate were 65%, the 1992 supply would have been 69,000. Since the male participation rate is only 72%, it is likely that the female participation rate will level off between 65% and 70%, so future labor force growth will depend on vegetative population increase plus immigration.

If we set the sum of these factors at the relatively high level of 5% a year, this would give a total supply of female labor aged under 30 of 64,400 in 1996. On these projections, the EPZ sector's absorption of this segment of the labor supply would rise from 32% in 1993 to 73% in 1995. This analysis confirms the conclusion of our 1992 study, to the effect that the EPZs in the Sula valley are likely to confront growing labor market tensions if the growth rates presently projected for the sector materialize, unless the age or sex structure of the workforce changes significantly.

e) Migration and the EPZs

We have information on migratory history from both the community and workforce surveys. However, since the sample for the community survey is very similar to the sample taken in 1992, we would not expect to observe important differences in the migratory pattern recorded. Differences between the two years are more likely to be ascribable to improved data collection than to real changes. For this reason, we will concentrate our analysis on the workforce survey data.

In 1992, we found that 20% of the 200 EPZ workers in our sample had moved to the zone especially to work in the EPZs. This year, we found the much higher proportion of 38%. However, the main reason for this difference is that we picked up many more people this year who migrated within the Department of Cortés (15% of the total sample this year, against 3.5% last year). It is probable that this figure was under-reported in 1992. The proportion of the workforce which has migrated from outside Cortés is 23% in 1993, against 17% in 1992. This suggests that there is growing migration to the zone as a result of EPZ employment, but that local migration (especially from San Pedro Sula to Choloma and within Choloma itself) is the most important single population flow generated by the EPZ development so far.

f) Previous employment and earnings of EPZ workers, and motives for moving to the EPZs

The 1993 data for the EPZ workforce show that 47% were unemployed before starting work in the EPZ: exactly the same proportion encountered in 1992. This is consistent with our finding, reported above, that there is still no clear evidence of labor market tension in the sector (in a tighter market one would expect a higher proportion to have been employed previously).

An analysis of the 1993 data for the industrial origin of other EPZ employees who were previously elsewhere employed shows that 25% of them came from the state sector, 35% from industry and the rest from private sector services. As in 1992, some 20% of female EPZ workers

(11% of all workers) who were previously employed came from domestic service jobs. We found that 16% of those previously employed came from another EPZ, which indicates that there is now considerable movement of workers within the sector. Among the workers who were previously unemployed, the reason universally given for beginning to work is the need for the income (data not tabulated). Among those who moved from other work, higher income is the motive for 42%, followed by better conditions (23%), proximity to home (12%) and increased job security (8%).

We found that the average previous earnings of the EPZ workers who had been employed elsewhere before coming to the EPZ were L.531, which is well below present average earnings in the EPZs of L.743, reported in Chapter 3 above. If we exclude the workers who had transferred within the EPZ sector, average previous earnings fall to just over L.500 a month (data not tabulated). The "grapevine" of contacts with friends remains the major channel for recruitment of EPZ workers: some 60% of workers had heard of their job by this method, against 6% who had seen newspaper adverts.

## CHAPTER 6 – FAMILY PLANNING AMONG EPZ WORKERS AND THEIR COMMUNITIES

In the 1993 community sample, we found that 49 per cent of women of reproductive age (15 to 44) were sexually inactive and 47 per cent were sexually active, compared with 42 per cent and 58 per cent, respectively, reported in 1992. In the 1993 workforce survey, 45 per cent were sexually inactive and 55 per cent were sexually active. This latter figure is higher than the 51 per cent reported last year, in spite of the generally younger age range of the workforce sample this year compared with last.

The 47 per cent of women who were sexually active in the community survey divided between 26 per cent who use some form of family planning, and 20 per cent (42.5 per cent of the set of sexually active women) who do not. In 1992, we found that a much higher proportion (65 per cent) of the sexually active in the community survey did not plan.

In the 1993 workforce survey, the 55 per cent who were sexually active are divided between 31.5 per cent who use some planning method and 23.5 per cent (43 per cent of the set of sexually active women) who use none. The comparable 1992 figure for the proportion of the sexually active women in the workforce survey who did not plan was 47 per cent. This latter figure suggests that sexual health and family planning advice programs oriented to the EPZ workforce may be making some impact.

However, the figures for pregnancy rates in our 1993 survey are less encouraging. We found that 6.5 per cent of the women of childbearing age in the EPZ workforce were pregnant, against 4.6 per cent in the surrounding community (data not tabulated). One possible explanation for the persistent high pregnancy rate among the EPZ workforce is the availability of very strong maternity rights under the Honduran labor code (including 14 weeks' paid maternity leave, regardless of whether a worker has IHSS cover). In addition, EPZ workers are more likely than non EPZ workers to have IHSS medical cover for maternity. These two factors would explain

a positive statistical correlation between EPZ employment and pregnancy rates, in spite of growing knowledge about and use of family planning methods by the EPZ workforce. It is important to remember that women who plan may still become pregnant by choice.

Among the reasons given by sexually active women for not planning in the 1993 community survey, the most frequent is fear for health (25%) followed by 20% with religious or moral objections (much higher than observed last year) and 15% who were pregnant. No-one mentioned difficulty in getting contraception and only 4% said they had no knowledge of planning methods. These figures are somewhat different from those reported in 1992, when moral objections scarcely figured among the reasons for not planning. We believe the 1993 data are more reliable on this point, due to improvements in interviewer training. Also of interest is the fact that 13 per cent of the sexually active EPZ workers who do not plan (three per cent of the total workforce) are trying to get pregnant.

In 1993 as in 1992, we found that the best known family planning methods are the condom and the pill, followed by the coil (or IUD) and female sterilization, and that most used method is the pill, followed by the coil. Among the planners in the community survey, most women get their contraceptives in ten health center or pharmacy; among the EPZ workforce, the pharmacy is the main source, followed by ASHONPLAFA, workplace clinics, and the IHSS.

In 1993, we found that 52% the EPZ workforce who plan said they took the decision themselves, while 11% said their partner decided and 37% said it was a joint decision. In the community, 31% decided themselves, and 66% said it was a joint decision.

The proportion of workers in the EPZs who said in 1993 that they had received talks on family planning (44%) and had heard of sexually transmitted disease (93%) is almost identical to the figures reported in 1992. In the community, both figures are much higher than those reported last year (67% and 86%, versus 47% and 65%, respectively, last year).

Most women among both the community and workforce samples (around 50 per cent in each case) think that the ideal time to start a family is in their early twenties. However, once again, we observed the interesting phenomenon that older women think one should start younger, while younger women think one should start older or do not have any opinion. In relation to the ideal family size, once again,, we found that most women think that two or three children is the right number, and only 20% think that family of four or more is ideal. This offers hope for lower fecundity in the EPZ areas as family planning techniques become more widely known and available.

Summary indicators of EPZ impact, at May 1993

**A. EPZ EMPLOYMENT AND EARNINGS**

**Source:**

**1 Total employment, by municipality and EPZ**

FIDE  
(at March  
1993)

La Lima:		<u>2,025</u>
	ZIP Continental	2,025
Villanueva:		<u>3,452</u>
	ZIP Villanueva	1,475
	ZIP Búfalo	1,977
Choloma:		<u>16,865</u>
	INHDELVA	3,200
	ZIP Choloma	7,241
	Parque Galaxy	2,165
	CHIP	3,681
	ZIP San Miguel	<u>578</u>
<b>Total:</b>		<b>22,342</b>

**2 Employment structure in the EPZs**

Workforce  
survey

Men 28.5% Women 71.5%  
Under 31 95.5%  
Basic labor 80%  
Intermediate labor 18%  
Managerial labor 2%

**3 Average monthly earnings of EPZ workers compared with averages in surrounding communities**

Workforce &  
Community  
surveys

	<u>EPZ</u>	<u>Av.Chol.</u>	<u>Av.V/nueva</u>
Total:	L.743	723	596
Men:	L.802	729	604
Women:	L.720	715	586

**4 Average household incomes for households with and without EPZ workers present**

ditto

With EPZ worker: L.1,532  
Without EPZ worker: L.1,008

/continued

Source:

5 IHSS cover of EPZ workers (percentages)

Medical System of the company	32%
Sickness and Maternity	15%
Handicapped, Elderly and Death	53%

Interviews  
with  
EPZ owners

**B. SOCIAL CONDITIONS IN EPZ AREAS**

1 Average household size

Choloma: 5.7                      Villanueva: 4.8

Community  
survey

2 Indicators of social needs

	Chol.V/nueva	
a. Population not living in individ.house/apartment	3%	11%
b. Households without:		
piped water	4%	10%
electricity	0%	13%
flushing toilet	45%	73%
connexion to sewer	55%	89%
c. Proportion of average total spending used for food	61%	60%

Community  
survey

/continued

Source:

**3. Wealth indicators**

ditto

**a. Assets:**

% of households with:

	Chol	V/N	EPZ	Non-EPZ
sewing machine	21	18	16	20
stove	65	53	49	53
push bike	44	29	37	33
fridge	29	27	24	25
TV	76	58	67	60
Radio	79	81	72	69

**b. Savings**

% of h/holds with any savings:

	Chol	V/N
% of h/holds with any savings:	8	7
Av. savings (L.) of h/holds with savings:	1,667	2,463

Av. savings (L.) of

h/holds with savings:

**c. Education**

% of popln aged 10 + with:

	Chol	V/N
-No education	13	14
-Primary only	68	60
-Secondary	17	23
-Higher	1	2½

**C. LABOR MARKET INDICATORS**

**1 Participation and unemployment rates**

Community survey

	Chol	V/N
<u>Participation</u>		
Men	73	69
Women	50	51
<u>Unemployment</u>		
Men	19	25
Women	32	29

**2 Migration**

Proportion of EPZ workforce who migrated to work in EPZ: 38%

Workforce survey

**3 Previous occupation of EPZ workers**

Unemployed:	47.5%
Employed:	52.5%

Workforce survey

Both surveys

**D. FAMILY PLANNING INDICATORS**

	Chol	V/N	EPZ Workforce
Proportion of sexually active women who plan:	56%	51%	58%

PNAC 3/7/93

**PRICE WATERHOUSE**  
**USAID HONDURAS CONTRACT**  
**522-09106-C-00-2023-04**  
**MAY 1993**

**PRICE WATERHOUSE / ESA CONSULTORES**

**USAID HONDURAS CONTRACT  
522-09106-C-00-2023-04**

**MAY 1993**

**UPDATE OF BASELINE STUDY OF HONDURAN  
EXPORT PROCESSING ZONES**

**PRICE WATERHOUSE**

**USAID / HONDURAS**

**MAY 1993**

**CONTENTS**

Chapter 1	<b><u>INTRODUCTION</u></b>	1 - 4
Chapter 2	<b><u>SURVEY METHODOLOGY</u></b>	5 - 10
Chapter 3	<b><u>BASIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EPZ WORKFORCE</u></b>	11 - 30
Chapter 4	<b><u>SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN CHOLOMA AND VILLANUEVA</u></b>	31 - 46
Chapter 5	<b><u>EPZ DEVELOPMENT, LABOR SUPPLY AND MIGRATION</u></b>	47 - 55
Chapter 6	<b><u>FAMILY PLANNING AMONG EPZ WORKERS AND THEIR COMMUNITIES</u></b>	56 - 60
	<b><u>SUMMARY INDICATORS OF EPZ IMPACT, AT MAY 1993</u></b>	61 - 63

**ANNEXES**

- 1 THE DESIGNED SAMPLE FOR THE WORKFORCE SURVEY
- 2 INTERVIEW FORM = WORKFORCE SURVEY
3. INTERVIEW FORM = COMMUNITY SURVEY
4. AGE AND SEX STRUCTURE OF SAMPLE POPULATION IN COMMUNITY SURVEY

## LIST OF TABLES

1.1	Actual and planned investment in EPZ's, December 1992	2
1.2	Number of firms and jobs by park	3
2.1	Characteristics of the universe	6
2.2	Characteristics of the designed sample	7
2.3	Workforce survey sample by firm size and nationality	8
2.4	Comparison of the universe with the final sample	9
3.1	EPZ workforce by age and sex	11
3.2	EPZ employees sample by job type	12
3.3	Marital status of EPZ workers	13
3.4	Number of children of EPZ workers	13
3.5	Dependents of EPZ workers	14
3.5a	Single mothers among the EPZ workforce	14
3.6	EPZ workers relationship to their head of household	15
3.7	Education of EPZ workforce	16
3.8	Length of time in company, 1993	17
3.9	Travel time to work of EPZ employees	18
3.10	Means of travel to work of EPZ employees	18
3.11	Cost of transport for EPZ workers, 1993	19
3.12	Hours of work of EPZ employees, 1993	19
3.13	Child care arrangements for under 13s, 1993	20
3.14	Earnings of EPZ workers based on their base salaries, 1993	22
3.14a	Earnings of EPZ workers based on last week's pay	23
3.14b	Overtime working	23
3.14c	Workers with less than minimum wages	24
3.15	Earnings of EPZ workers by job category	24
3.15a	Earnings of EPZ workers by job category	25
3.16	Number of earners in EPZ workers households, 1993	26
3.17	Importance of EPZ worker's income to household, 1993	26
3.18	Other sources of income of EPZ workers	27
3.19	Incomes in households with EPZ and without EPZ workers	27
3.20	EPZ workers' and IHSS, 1993	28
3.21	Workplace medical services in the EPZs, 1993	28
3.22	Use of workplace medical services, 1993	29
3.23	Work days lost through illness, 1993	29
3.24	Social integration of EPZ workers, 1993	30

4.1	Age structures of sample populations, 1993	31
4.2	Average household size in the community sample	33
4.3	Type of house, 1993	33
4.4	Material of walls, 1993	33
4.5	Housing tenure and cost, 1993	34
4.5a	Percentage change in housing costs, 1992-93	34
4.6	Water supply, 1993	34
4.7	Origin of water, 1993	35
4.8	Electricity supply, 1993	35
4.9	Fuel used for cooking, 1993	35
4.10	Type of sanitary facility, 1993	35
4.11	Connexion to sewage disposal, 1993	36
4.12	Households where some members have IHSS cover	36
4.13	Artefacts, 1993	36
4.14	Opinions on quality of basic services, 1993	37
4.15	Priorities for improvements in public services	37
4.16	Opinions of the impact of the EPZs	38
4.17	Personal incomes in Choloma and Villanueva, 1993	40
4.18	Household incomes in Choloma and Villanueva	41
4.19	Household expenditure patterns, 1993	42
4.19a	Household expenditure patterns	42
4.20	EPZ workers' expenditure patterns, 1993	43
4.21	Stocks of savings - community sample	43
4.22	Savings stocks of EPZ workers who have savings, 1993	43
4.23	Education of population of working age, 1993	45
4.24	Proportion of population aged 5-29 in education	46
4.25	Technical education in Choloma and Villanueva	46
5.1	Employment and participation rates of population aged 10 and over, Choloma and Villanueva	48
5.2	Economically active women by age range	49
5.3	Projected supply and EPZ demand for female labor aged under 31 in the Sula Valley, 1992-1996 (Year end figures)	50
5.4	Migration in Villanueva and Choloma, 1993	52
5.5	Migration to work in EPZ	52
5.6	Previous occupation of EPZ workers	53
5.7	Motives for deciding to work in EPZ, 1993	53
5.8	Average previous earnings by present job, 1993	54
5.9	How workers heard about EPZ job opportunities	54

23

6.1	Sexual activity and family planning in the Choloma and Villanueva communities and among EPZ workers	58
6.2	Reasons for not planning among the sexually active	58
6.3	Family planning methods known and used	59
6.4	Where users get their contraceptives	59
6.5	Who decides to plan	59
6.6	Proportion who have had talks on reproductive health	60
6.7	Women's opinions on the ideal age to start a family and ideal number of children	60

# **UPDATE OF BASELINE STUDY OF HONDURAN EXPORT PROCESSING ZONES**

**MAY 1993**

## **CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION**

### **(i) *The purpose of the study***

In 1992, under USAID contract 522-9106-C-00-2023-00, Price Waterhouse undertook an extensive study of the social impacts of the growth of private sector export processing zones (EPZs) in the Sula Valley in northern Honduras.

The purpose of the study was twofold: firstly, to establish "baseline" information, against which to measure the continuing impact of free zone employment growth over the coming years, and secondly, to diagnose the existing state of social and economic infrastructures in the area, in an effort to give an "early warning" of possible points of tension, or bottlenecks, which might lead to problems if they were not tackled in time.

The study was based on surveys of 200 workers in three EPZs, plus 300 households in the municipalities of Choloma and Villanueva, carried out in February 1992, along with a wide range of interviews of EPZ owners and factory managers, plus experts on the various social and economic services relevant to the EPZ workers and to the firms which have invested in the EPZs, carried out between December 1991 and June 1992.

Choloma and Villanueva were chosen as the sites for the community survey to represent, in the first case, a community already heavily affected by the growth of EPZ employment, and in the second, a community likely to be heavily affected in the immediate future.

In March 1993, USAID contracted Price Waterhouse to update the Baseline Study, returning to the same households which were interviewed in 1992 to see what changes have occurred in their social and economic conditions over the last year, and taking a fresh sample of 200 EPZ workers from the expanded worker population, to see how the composition and characteristics of the workforce have changed. The interviews were carried out in the months of March and April 1993. In this opportunity, Price Waterhouse sub-contracted the firm ESA Consultores who did the social and economic analysis. The following sections report the results of the new surveys, and comment on the changes observable over the period 1992/93.

### **ii) *The growth of the EPZ sector, 1992-93***

Over the period March 1992- March 1993, investment and employment growth in the EPZs has continued apace. The number of factory shells completed, which stood at 50 in March 1992 (Price Waterhouse, 1992:Table 1.3), had risen to 60 by December 1992 (Table 1.1). The pipeline

of planned investment increased in the same period from 163 factory shells (PW 1993: Table 1.2) to 226, so that the projected final total number of shells was 287 in December 1992.<sup>1</sup>

In dollar terms, total accumulated investment to date in the development of the private sector EPZs (not including the machinery and fitments installed by the companies operating in them) stood at \$40 million in December 1992 (Table 1.1), up from \$30.9 million in December 1991, and the projected total investment in free zones which were already authorized was estimated by FIDE at \$233 million, compared with a projected total of \$45.6 mn at December 1991.<sup>2</sup>

TABLE 1.1 - ACTUAL AND PLANNED INVESTMENT  
IN EPZS, DECEMBER 1992

	Factory Shells		Investment (to nearest \$ mn.)	
	(a)	(b)	(a)	(b)
<b>ZIPS:</b>				
Choloma	20	20	10	10
Búfalo	6	35	6	22
Villanueva	6	12	5	22
San Miguel	3	18	2	7
Continental	8	43	4	n/d
Buнавista	0	28	0	17
Choloma II	1	4	0	2
Comayagua	0	61	1	120
El Forvenir	0	24	0	16
Corona	0	11	0	1
<b>FREE ZONE EXTNS:</b>				
CHIP	6	6	3	3
INHDELVA	6	20	7	n/d
Galaxy	5	5	2	2
<b>TOTAL/1</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>233</b>

(a) = Completed to date (b) = Projected final total

/1 The total investment figure includes only investment to date for the two EPZs where no data is available for the projected final total.

**Source:** Reworked from data provided by FIDE

Between March 1992 and March 1993, the number of firms operating in the EPZs rose from 38 to 50, and the number of jobs rose by 43 per cent, to 22,342 (Table 1.2). EPZ employment in

<sup>1</sup> This total does not include the seven EPZs which were still in planning stage at December 1992.

<sup>2</sup> The figures for dollars investment to date and projected total investment at December 1991 are based on lempira figures for the years 1989-91, provided by FIDE, and reported in PW (1992: Table 1.1). The lempira total at that time was L.122.5 mn. We have converted this to dollars using the following average nominal exchange rates for the relevant years, calculated from quarterly data supplied by the IMF: 1989 Lps 2.00 = \$1; 1990 Lps 3.66; 1991 Lps 5.32.

the municipality of Choloma (comprising the following parks: ZIP Choloma, CHIP Choloma, INHDELVA, Parque Galaxy and ZIP San Miguel) rose from 13,239 in 1992 to 16,865 in 1993, an increase of 27 per cent.

As expected, a significant part of the employment growth has been concentrated in the Villanueva area: ZIP Búfalo and ZIP Villanueva created 2,522 new jobs in the year March 1992–March 1993, increasing the number of EPZ jobs in the municipality by 217 per cent. This growth will continue as neither of these parks is yet full, and a third major park, ZIP Buenavista (which is owned by the company which runs ZIP Choloma) started operations in Villanueva in the second quarter of 1993.

TABLE 1.2 - NUMBER OF FIRMS AND JOBS BY PARK

	(March of each year)				
	1992		1993		% inc.
EPZ:	Firms	Jobs	Firms	Jobs	
CHIP Choloma	6	3,794	6	3,681	- 3
ZIP Villanueva	1	160	5	1,475	+ 820
ZIP Búfalo	2	770	7	1,977	+ 157
ZIP Choloma	11	5,365	10	7,241	+ 35
INHDELVA	6	2,242	8	3,200	+ 43
ZIP Continental	5	1,451	6	2,025	+ 40
ZIP San Miguel	1	110	3	578	+ 425
Parque Galaxy	5	1,728	5	2,165	+ 25
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>15,620</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>22,342</b>	<b>+ 43</b>

Source: Data provided by FIDE, dated 27/3/92 and 16/3/93

(iii) *The organization of this report*

In Chapter 2, we detail the new survey methodology developed for the workforce survey, which was made necessary by the increasing complexity of the universe, in general, and by the growth of employment in EPZs outside the Choloma area, in particular. In Chapter 3, we report the results of the workforce survey and comment on the changes observable since 1992. In Chapter 4, we report the data for socioeconomic conditions in Choloma and Villanueva gathered in the community survey. In Chapter 5, we discuss the evidence from both our surveys on labor market conditions and comment on changes observable over the last year. In Chapter 6, we report data on family planning behavior among both the workforce and community samples. Finally, we update the summary indicators defined in the 1992 report. For ease of comparison, this chapter structure follows that of the 1992 report, except that the numbering is slightly changed (so that Part I Chapter 2 of the 1992 report becomes simply chapter 3 of the 1993 report, Part I Chapter 3 becomes Chapter 4, and so on).

Within each chapter, we present tables in the same order used in 1992. Although the chapter numbers have been changed slightly, the table numbers within the chapters are generally the same

as last year. Where we have presented additional tabulations this year, they are usually given an insertion number, such as 14b instead of 15, in order to leave unchanged the enumeration of the subsequent tables.

## CHAPTER 2 – SURVEY METHODOLOGY

### (i) *Samples*

The sample methodology for the community survey was identical to that used in 1992: we returned to the same households identified in the sample drawn last year. The methodology is described in detail in the 1992 report.<sup>3</sup> However, for the workforce survey, the 1992 sample methodology was improved, since access problems in 1992 limited the survey to two EPZs in Choloma (ZIP Choloma and INHDELVA) and one in Villanueva (ZIP Búfalo). This sample frame would be inadequate now that employment in other EPZs has grown considerably. We therefore developed a methodology to produce a representative sample of the whole of the worker population in the private sector EPZs.

The Scope of Work for the study required us to interview 200 workers in 16 factories and in as many as possible of the 8 private sector EPZs presently operational. We designed a sample of 200 workers in 16 factories in six different EPZs; in the event, we failed to achieve access in some of the factories and EPZs included in the sample, so that the final sample was constituted of 200 workers in 13 factories in five EPZs. In the following sections, we explain the methodology used for the sampling and present the original sample and the final sample.

#### a. Sample design

We were constrained for budgetary purposes to sixteen different firms and 200 interviews. The study universe is defined as: all workers in the private sector free zones, known as ZIPs. We could follow either of two basic sampling methodologies:

##### (1) *Direct random sampling from the universe*

(2) *Cluster methodology*: whereby the universe is first separated into clusters whose members a-priori, are thought likely to have similar characteristics, and the total sample is distributed between the cluster according to their size. Within each clusters, sampling is then done on a random basis.

We first undertook an exercise to draw a direct random sample of 200 from the universe of all EPZ workers, which is a total of 22,342 workers spread over 50 companies in eight private sector ZIPs. The resulting sample covered 40 different companies. We therefore rejected this approach for reasons of survey economy.

---

<sup>3</sup> Details on survey methodology were presented in Part II, Chapter 1 of the 1992 report (pp 8-11).

This left us with option (2) the pre-stratification of the universe into clusters. We considered two different types of cluster: i) by firm and ii) by nationality of firm. In the first case, there would be 50 clusters, of which 16 would be selected for the sample by random digits. In the second, there would be three clusters: workers in US owned firms, workers in Asian owned firms and workers in Honduran owned firms.

With this sort of methodology, ideally, the sample for each individual cluster should be big enough to give statistically reliable indicators of the cluster's population means and proportions. However, given the standard deviations we found for the key variable of wages for the whole sample population in the 1992 Baseline Study, it would be necessary to have a sample of 180 in each cluster to be 95% confident that the population mean for salary would be within 5% of the real figure. Given that we are limited to a total sample of 200, this is obviously impossible.

As a result, we developed a sampling methodology in which we sampled by cluster but then adjusted the sample to match parameters of the universe and of the nationality cluster-sub universes. The aim of this procedure was to generate a worker sample which is representative of the universe as a whole, within the constraint of a 16 company, 200 worker sample. Fortunately, we had available to us detailed information on the universe as a whole, and on the characteristics of the two potential cluster groups (firms and owner nationality), which made this procedure possible.

We first simplified the owner nationality category by defining three sets: US influenced, Asian influenced and Honduran influenced, and assigning firms with joint ownership as follows:

- all firms with a Honduran presence of any sort were classified as Honduran influenced.
- all firms with an Asian presence were classified as Asian influenced.
- all other firms (i.e. those with no Honduran and no Asian presence) were classified as US influenced.

On the basis of this simplification, we made the following analysis of the universe and of the three nationality clusters:

TABLE 2.1 - CHARACTERISTICS OF THE UNIVERSE					
	EMPLOYMENT	%	FIRMS	%	AV SIZE
TOTAL	22,342	100	50	100	447
-US	6,573	29	19	38	346
-HONDURAN	2,901	13	6	12	484
-ASIAN	12,868	58	25	50	515

We used this table to allocate the sixteen firm sample, as follows. First, we grouped the firms by nationality and assigned serial numbers within each group. We then split the sample of 16

companies as nearly as possible in accordance with the proportions of firms within the universe: 6 US, 8 Asian, and 2 Honduran firms. We selected the given number of firms within each group using random digits; we also selected substitute firms in each group, to be used in case of access difficulties. We allocated the total sample of 200 between the selected firms, in proportion to their size (by employment).

We analyzed the sample population, comparing the share of total employment by firm nationality with that of the population universe, and checking average firm size for the sample as a whole and for the nationality groups against the universe data. We discovered that our sample matched the universe very well for the Honduran and US firms selected, but that the Asian firms' average size and their weighting in total sample employment were both a little low. We therefore removed the smallest firm from that set and replaced it with a firm from the substitute list, which was the nearest to the size required to bring the sample proportions into line with the universe proportions.

The employment pattern in the designed sample is very similar to that in the universe, both by firm size and nationality of employer. These are two of the three independent variables which we expect to have an impact on the labor market variables which we are analyzing in the present study. The third factor which may be an important influence is the EPZ in which firms are placed. Since the sample chosen covered six of the eight ZIPs, it should also capture this factor.

**TABLE 2.2 - CHARACTERISTICS OF THE DESIGNED SAMPLE**

	EMPLOYMENT	%	FIRMS	%	AV SIZE
TOTAL	6,936	100	16	100	433
-US	1,548	22	6	38	258
-HONDURAN	950	14	2	12	475
-ASIAN	4,438	64	8	50	555

For each firm, we drew random numbers within the size of its payroll, up to the size of the sample for that firm, to determine which workers would fall in the sample. The workers were chosen by taking the list of payroll numbers, renumbering sequentially, excluding ex-employees, and selecting the numbers in the sample. We drew additional numbers to act as substitutes in the case of absence or non-availability of a sampled worker. A full listing of the designed sample is included as Annex I to the present report.

b. The final sample

Inevitably, it proved impossible to gain access to all the firms which had been chosen in the designed sample. The survey team was supplied with a list of substitute firms, and had instructions to replace firms which fell out by another firm of the same nationality and as near as possible the same size. The final sample of firms where interviews were undertaken is described in Table 2.3.

TABLE 2.3 WORKFORCE SURVEY SAMPLE BY FIRM SIZE AND NATIONALITY

Company	EPZ	Employment	No. inter- viewed	Percent of total sample
<b>HONDURAN</b>				
Protexa	INHDELVA	500	14	
Exportex	INHDELVA	450	13	
SUB TOTAL		950	27	13%
<b>USA</b>				
Golden Eagle*	INHDELVA	250	7	
Perry	ZIP Choloma	100	3	
Trueform	ZIP Choloma	670	19	
M. Fine	ZIP Búfalo	200	6	
Wrangler	ZIP V/nueva	218	6	
SUB TOTAL		1,438	41	21%
<b>ASIAN</b>				
Kiljin	INHDELVA	550	19	
Seolim	INHDELVA	750	22	
Monty	ZIP Choloma	2,200	56	
Wong Chang*	CHIP Chol.	550	16	
Wons	ZIP Búfalo	110	3	
Hyup Sun*	ZIP Búfalo	550	16	
SUB TOTAL		4,710	132	66%

\* = Firms where the worker sample was not taken using random numbers applied to the payroll

c. Comparison of the sample with the study universe

Table 2.4 compares the firm size and employer nationality characteristics of the universe of EPZ employees with those of the firms included in the final sample used in our study.

Compared with the study universe, the sample population over-represents employees of Asian firms somewhat (66 per cent of the sample, against 58 per cent of the universe) and correspondingly under-represents those of US-owned firms (21 per cent against 29 per cent). The weight of employees of Honduran firms is spot on, at 13 per cent. The weighing of Asian firms in the sample was raised by the inclusion of the giant Hong Kong firm, Monty, as a substitute for another company, where it proved impossible to gain access. Over 25 per cent of the sample is drawn from Monty.

substitute for another company, where it proved impossible to gain access. Over 25 per cent of the sample is drawn from Monty.

However, the nationality spread of the sample in the 1993 study is a better match with the universe than that of the 1992 study, which was not based on a pre-stratification of the universe. In that study, employees of US owned firms were heavily over-represented, with 46 per cent of the sample, while those of Asian firms, with 45 per cent, and those of Honduran firms, with 9 per cent, were both somewhat under-represented.

TABLE 2.4 - COMPARISON OF THE UNIVERSE WITH THE FINAL SAMPLE

COMPANY NATIONALITY	EMPLOYMENT				AV. FIRM SIZE	
	Universe		Sample		Universe	Sample
	Total	%	Total	%		
US	6,573	29	1,438	21	346	258
HONDURAN	2,901	13	900	13	484	475
ASIAN	12,868	58	4,710	66	515	555
TOTAL	22,342	100	7,108	100	447	546

The average firm size for the 1993 sample, at 546, is somewhat higher than the average size in the universe (447). The same is true for the sub groups of Asian and US firms. Once again, the main reason for this divergence in the inclusion in the sample of Monty as a substitute for smaller firms which refused to participate. The Honduran firms' average size in the sample is very close to that for the universe. The sample covers the whole range of firm sizes in the EPZ sector, from 100 to 2,200.

d. Sampling within the selected firms

In three of the thirteen firms in the final sample, it proved impossible to use the systematic random number tables generated in the sampling process to select the individual workers for interview. These firms are indicated with an asterisk in Table 2.3. However, they account for under 20 per cent of the total sample, so the resulting distortion of the sample characteristics is not likely to be significant.

ii. Revision of the survey instruments

The survey instruments for the two surveys are largely the same as the ones used in 1992, in order to ensure compatibility of the results. However, we made a number of improvements on the basis of our experience in 1992, and on the basis of a piloting exercise which was carried out before the full surveys got underway. The revised questionnaires are included as Annexes II and III of the present report.

Among the improvements we made were the inclusion of more detailed questions on the migratory history of the respondents to the community survey, and the inclusion of separate questions on basic pay and actual pay in the last pay period for the survey of EPZ workers. We also included an explicit question on actual hours worked in the last pay period to complement the revised earnings question.

## CHAPTER 3 - BASIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EPZ WORKFORCE<sup>4</sup>

### *Age, sex and family structure (Tables 3.1 to 3.6)*

Women made up 71.5 per cent of the 1993 sample of 200 EPZ workers (Table 3.1), which is considerably less than the 84 per cent observed in the 1992 sample (PW 1992: Table 2.1).<sup>5</sup> This difference might reflect improvements in the sampling methodology, leading to the inclusion of more firms which prefer to recruit male workers.<sup>6</sup> But it might also be the result of firms finding it increasingly difficult to recruit young women and turning to young men as an alternative. Women aged 30 or under are 68% of the sample - also somewhat down from the figure of 75% observed in the 1992 sample (PW 1992: Table 2.1). Basic labor (direct and indirect) is 80% of the total workforce (Table 3.2) - very close to the 78% observed last year (PW 1992: Table 2.2).

TABLE 3.1 EPZ WORKFORCE BY AGE AND SEX

Age:	Women	Men	Total	Percent
14	3		3	1.5
15 to 20	63	25	88	44.0
21 to 25	49	26	75	37.5
26 to 30'	21	4	25	12.5
31 to 35	4	2	6	3.0
36 to 40	2		2	1.0
41 to 45	1		1	0.5
TOTAL: No.	143	57	200	100.0
Percent	71.5	28.5	100	

#### AVERAGE AGES OF WORKFORCE, 1993:

	Average	Std. Dev.	Confidence Interval Low	High
Men	21.4	3.8	20.38	22.42
Women	<u>21.7</u>	<u>5.2</u>	<u>20.87</u>	<u>22.6</u>
TOTAL	21.6	4.9	20.9	22.3

Source: Workforce survey

<sup>4</sup> This section is based principally on the workforce survey. We also have data on 144 EPZ workers encountered in the households visited in our community survey. Unlike the workforce survey, this survey was not designed to be representative of the EPZ workforce. Nevertheless, we report the pertinent data as footnotes throughout the section to provide an additional source of information.

<sup>5</sup> As a result of the considerable increase in the number of the men in the 1993 sample, to 57, compared with 32 in 1992, the data we report this year on the characteristics of the male labor force for 1993 are likely to be more reliable than those for last year, and significant differences between the two years' data on the subset of men are more likely to arise from improved reliability of the data than from big changes in the characteristics of the universe.

<sup>6</sup> One large firm in the sample, Monty in ZIP Choloma, accounts for 60 percent of the male employees in the sample. Excluding Monty the percentage of women employees in the sample rises to 81 percent of the total.

35

The overall age structure in the 1993 sample (Table 3.1) is somewhat younger than that for the 1992 sample, with 45.5% aged 20 or under, compared with 34.8% last year (PW 1992: Table 2.1), and correspondingly fewer workers in their twenties. This year, we found three workers (1.5% of the total) aged under 15, the minimum legal working age, which suggests that under-aged working is not a serious problem.<sup>7</sup> The average age of the total workforce this year was 21.6; women 21.7 and men 21.4. This compares with 22.9 for the whole sample in 1992 (women 23 and men 22.2).

Looking at the breakdown of employment category by sex (Table 3.2) we see that women are 73.4% of basic direct labor, compared with 86% observed in the 1992 sample, and 67.6% of intermediate labor, compared with 74% in 1992 (PW 1992: Table 2.2). Men tend to predominate in the categories of basic indirect labor (warehousing, security etc), and once again, 100% of mechanics are men.

TABLE 3.2 EPZ EMPLOYEES SAMPLE BY JOB TYPE

Job Type:	Women		Men		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>1. Basic direct labor:</b>						
Machine operator	80	71.4	32	29.0	112	100
Cloth Cutter/Ironing	7	70.0	3	30.0	10	100
Line feeder/packer	23	85.2	4	14.8	27	100
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>73.8</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>26.2</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>2. Basic indirect labor</b>						
Cleaning, security						
Warehouse, concierge	6	54.5	5	45.5	11	100
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>54.5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>45.5</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>3. Intermediate labor:</b>						
Supervisor/Instructor	8	80.0	2	20.0	10	100
Quality Control	15	71.4	6	28.6	21	100
Mechanics	0	0.0	3	100.0	3	100
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>67.6</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>32.4</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>4. Administrative labors:</b>						
Secretary/other admin	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	100
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>5. Managerial Labor</b>						
Accountant	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	100
Manager	2	66.7	1	33.3	3	100
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Grand TOTAL</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>71.5</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>28.5</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: Workforce survey

<sup>7</sup> It is possible that these workers had permission from the Labor Ministry.

The data for family structure in this year's sample are very similar to those for 1992. Only 28.4% of the women are either married or have a common law spouse (Table 3.3), against 30% last year (PW 1992: Table 2.3). The proportion of men who are married or have a common law spouse is 31.% this year, suggesting that the 21.9% observed in last year's sample may have been an underestimate.

Fifty eight percent of the women and 79% of the men in the 1993 sample were childless (Table 3.4) compared with 48% and 67% in 1992 (PW 1992: Table 2.4). This is a sharp increase for both groups, and is almost certainly linked to the younger age structure in the 1993 sample, already commented on. Nevertheless, 42% of the women in the 1993 sample are mothers, so the 1992 study's conclusion that it is not true that only childless young women work in the EPZs remains apposite (PW 1992: 14).

TABLE 3.3 MARITAL STATUS OF EPZ WORKERS

	Women		Men		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Single	94	65.0	39	68.0	133	66.5
Divorced	3	2.0	0		3	1.5
Separated	5	3.4	0		5	2.5
Widowed	0		0		0	0.0
Married	20	13.9	5	8.7	25	12.5
Common law spouse	21	14.6	13	22.8	34	17.0
	143	98.9	57	99.5	200	100.0

Source: Workforce survey

TABLE 3.4 NUMBER OF CHILDREN OF EPZ WORKERS

Number of Children	Women		Men		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	83	58.0	45	78.9	128	64.0
1	30	21.0	8	14.0	38	19.0
2	19	13.3	2	3.5	21	10.5
3	9	6.3	1	1.8	10	5.0
4	1	0.7	1	1.8	2	1.0
5	0	0.0		0.0	0	0.0
6	1	0.7		0.0	1	0.5
Total	143	100.0	57	100.0	200	100.0

Source: Workforce survey

The average number of dependents for workers in the 1993 workforce survey was 1.6, which is much lower than the 2.5 found in 1992. For women, the 1993 figure was 1.8 (0.9 children and 0.9 adults); for men, it was 1.2 (0.6 children and 0.6 adults). In 1992, the women in our sample had an average of 2.6 dependents (1.6 children and 1.0 adults) while men had 2.16 (1.2 children and 0.96 adults). The difference is consistent with the younger average age of the 1993 sample (Table 3.5 and PW 1992:Table 2.5).

**TABLE 3.5 DEPENDENTS OF EPZ WORKERS**

**Average number of child and adult dependents**

<u>EPZ workers:</u>			
<u>Dependents:</u>	Women	Men	Total
Children	0.9	0.6	0.8
Adults	0.9	0.6	0.8
Total	1.8	1.2	1.6
<b>No. of cases:</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>197</b>

Source: Workforce survey, 1993

*Indicators of instability in family structure*

There were 26 single mothers in the 1993 workforce sample, out of a total of 60 mothers, so that 18% of all women and 43% of mothers in the sample are single mothers (Table 3.5A). This is lower than the figures of 28% and 55%, respectively, observed in 1992 (PW 1992:14). The 41 children of single mothers are 39% of the total of children of female EPZ workers in the 1993 sample (105). We found fewer children separated from their mother than in the 1992 sample: the figure was 5% of women workers' children in 1993, against 19% in 1992. We also found less evidence of family instability as indicated by the number of families with more than one father. Last year, 38% of women with children reported more than one father (PW 1992:15). This year, the figure was down to 20% (12 cases) (data not tabulated).

**TABLE 3.5a SINGLE MOTHERS AMONG THE EPZ WORKFORCE**

No. of Children	Single mothers	Total of children
1	17	17
2	4	8
3	4	12
4	1	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>41</b>

Source: Workforce survey, 1993

We found considerably fewer female heads of household in the 1993 sample than we found in 1992. Once again, this is clearly related to the younger age structure of the sample. Just 10.5% of women were heads of households (Table 3.6) against 18.5% last year (PW 1992: Table 2.6). For men, on the other hand, the figure was up from 25% observed last year to 40.4% in 1993, leaving the overall total almost the same (19.6% in 1992; 19.0% in 1993).

**TABLE 3.6 EPZ WORKERS RELATIONSHIP TO THEIR HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD**

	Head of household is your:						
	Self	Partner	Father	Mother	Brother	Sister	Other
<b>Women</b>							
No.	15	27	62	32	1	2	4
% of tot.	7.5	13.5	31.0	16.0	0.5	1.0	2.0
% of women	10.5	18.9	43.4	22.4	0.7	1.4	2.8
<b>Men</b>							
No.	23	0	21	8	1	1	3
% of tot.	11.5	0.0	10.5	4.0	0.5	0.5	1.5
% of men	40.4	0.0	36.8	14.0	1.8	1.8	5.3
<b>Total</b>							
No.	38	27	83	40	2	3	7
% of tot.	19.0	13.5	41.5	20.0	1.0	1.5	3.5

Source: Workforce survey

#### *Education (Table 3.7)*

The 1993 survey confirms the 1992 finding that virtually all EPZ workers are literate and have at least primary education (Table 3.7 and PW 1992: Table 2.7). However, the proportion with secondary education found in the 1993 sample is lower than for 1992 (33.5% against 41%), and the proportion with no prior technical training is also higher (68% against 44%). Once again, these differences are likely to be linked to the difference in age structure between the two samples, and suggest that the EPZ sector is happy to recruit very young workers with proven aptitude (as measured by completion of primary education) and then train them itself for the specific tasks required.

#### *Stability of EPZ employment (Table 3.8)*

The data for length of time in the company generated by the 1993 survey suggest that the sector is capable of offering stable employment, with 11.6% of the sample registering over two years of service, compared with 0.5% in 1992 (Table 3.8 and PW 1992: Table 2.8), when very few factories had been operating more than two years.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup> The data on time in the job for the 144 EPZ workers encountered in the community survey in 1993 show a similar pattern to those from the workforce survey, with 10% of the EPZ workers in the Choloma area already registering over 2 years' employment.

TABLE 3.7 EDUCATION OF EPZ WORKFORCE

	Women No.	Men No.	Total No.	% %	% 1992
Can't read or write	4	1	5	2.5	1.5
Level of schooling:					
No schooling	1	0	1	0.5	0.5
Primary	87	39	126	63.3	52
Secondary	50	17	67	33.7	41
Higher no univ	3	1	4	2.0	2
University	1	0	1	0.5	2.5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>98</b>
Technical training:					
None	93	43	136	68.0	44
Mechanic	0	2	2	1.0	0.5
Soldering	2	0	2	1.0	0.5
Seamstress	34	0	34	17.0	38
Beauty parlor	8	0	8	4.0	2
Plumbing	0	0	0	0.0	1
Electricity	0	1	1	0.5	2
Cook	1	1	2	1.0	0
Other	5	10	15	7.5	12
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100</b>
Attending an educational center:	20	5	25	12.5	

Source: Workforce survey, 1993 and 1992

TABLE 3.8 LENGTH OF TIME IN COMPANY, 1993

(A) EPZ workforce survey:					
	Women	Men	Total	%	1992 %
3 months or less	29	14	43	21.6	14.5
4-6 months	9	5	14	7.0	32
7-9 months	17	11	28	14.1	16.5
10-12 months	16	6	22	11.1	10
13-18 months	25	14	39	19.6	10.5
19-24 months	26	4	30	15.1	14
25-36 months	21	2	23	11.6	0.5
Over 3 years	0	0	0	0.0	0.5
TOTAL	143	56	199	100.0	98.5
1 case unknown					

Source: Workforce survey

(B) EPZ workers in the Choloma and Villanueva communities:

	Choloma %	Villanueva %	Total %	Total 1992 (%)
< year	38.9	80	46.0	51
1 - 2 years	48.6	12	44.0	12
2 - 3 years	9.7	4	8.9	7
3 - 5 years	1.4	0	1.2	7
5 - 10 years	0	0	0.0	10
>10 years	0	0	0.0	12
No. data	2	4		
	100	100	100.0	99
Total cases	144	25	171	

Source: Community survey

The proportion of workers with under a year's service fell from 73% in 1992 to 53.8% in 1993. This figure is somewhat more than can be accounted for by the 43% growth in the sector's total employment over the same period (Table 1.2 above), and suggests an average labor turnover rate of 28%.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup> We found that almost 54% of workers had been recruited over the last year. If there were zero labor turnover, then the real increase of 43% in employment in the sector (as recorded in Table 1.2 above) would imply that 30% of the new total workforce (6,702 workers) would have less than 12 months' service ( $43/143=0.30$ ). The remaining 24% (an absolute figure of 5,362) must be attributable to labor turnover. If the employment growth was smooth during the 12 month period, average employment during the year was 18,981; that would put average labor turnover at 28% ( $5,362/18,961*100$ ). This figure includes turnover resulting from movement between firms within the sector.

41

However, this is a very moderate turnover rate for such a new sector, confirming that the EPZs are likely to offer stable employment to those workers who wish to have it. This further undermines the idea that Honduran EPZ employers deliberately seek to maintain a high turnover to avoid paying social overhead costs such as vacation pay and pregnancy leave. If this turnover rate were to be maintained, average length of service in "steady state" (i.e. when the sector stops growing) would be 3.5 years. To avoid "social overheads" in Honduras, a worker must be fired within 60 days.

*Travel time to work (Tables 3.9 - 3.11)*

The pattern of travel time to work in the 1993 sample is largely similar to that reported in 1992. Fifty three per cent of workers live within half an hour of work (1992: 46%). However, this year we found more workers who travel over an hour in each direction (15.5% against 5% last year). This could be an indication of growing labor market tightness in the immediate surroundings of the EPZs. The bus remains the main means of travel to work (60%, against 65% last year), followed by walking (24.5%, down from 30% last year). More workers now report using bicycles (11% against 4.5% last year) and, for the first time, there is a small number using private cars (4.5%).

TABLE 3.9 TRAVEL TIME TO WORK OF EPZ EMPLOYEES

	Women	Men	Total	%	1992 %
Under 15 mins	14	14	28	14.0	16
15-29 mins	53	25	78	39.0	30
30-44 mins	43	9	52	26.0	25
45-59 mins	10	1	11	5.5	24
1 hr or more	23	8	31	15.5	5
TOTAL	143	57	200	100.0	100

Source: Workforce surveys 1992 and 1993

TABLE 3.10 MEANS OF TRAVEL TO WORK OF EPZ EMPLOYEES

	Women	Men	Total	%	1992 %
Bus (1)	94	26	120	60.0	65
Private car	8	1	9	4.5	0
Bicycle	6	16	22	11.0	5
On foot	35	14	49	24.5	30
TOTAL	143	57	200	100.0	100

(1) Includes company bus

Source: Workforce surveys 1992 and 1993

Transport costs remain very moderate for most workers, with 41.5% paying nothing at all (a figure which must include some who use company buses provided free a charge, since it is greater than the sum of walkers and cyclists) and a further 28% paying under 2 lempiras a day for the two-way journey. A big difference observed between the 1992 and 1993 samples is that this year, only one respondent said they pay over 5 lempiras a day to travel, against the 20% recorded last year. We think that the 1993 figure is probably more reliable.

**TABLE 3.11 COST OF TRANSPORT FOR EPZ WORKERS, 1993**

Daily Cost:	No.	%	1992 %
Nothing	83	41.5	49
Less than 2 Lempiras	56	28.0	32
2-5 Lempiras	60	30.0	20
Over 5 lempiras	1	0.5	0
	200	100.0	100

Source: Workforce surveys 1992 and 1993

**Working hours (Table 3.12)**

A surprisingly large proportion of the workforce (32%) had apparently worked less than 40 hours in the previous week, once the data had been corrected to exclude the lunch break. Only 20 percent of workers had worked over 50 hours.

**TABLE 3.12 - HOURS OF WORK OF EPZ EMPLOYEES, 1993**

Excluding lunch hour, based on hours worked last week

A: ALL WORKERS	Women		Men		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
HOURS WORKED:						
Less than 40	52	36.4	12	21.1	64	32.0
40-44 hours	35	24.5	14	24.6	49	24.5
45-49	31	21.7	17	29.8	48	24.0
50-54	12	8.4	9	15.8	21	10.5
55-59	8	5.6	2	3.5	10	5.0
>59	5	3.5	3	5.3	8	4.0
TOTAL	143	100.0	57	100.0	200	100.0
B: WORKERS WHO EARNED LESS THAN L.570						
HOURS WORKED:						
Less than 40	13		3		16	61.5
40-44	2		3		5	19.2
45-49	3		1		4	15.4
50-54	0		1		1	3.8
55-59	0		0		0	0.0
TOTAL	18		8		26	100.0

Source: Workforce survey

**TABLE 3.13 CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS FOR UNDER 13s, 1993**

(For workers with children under 13)	1993		1992
	Number	Percent	Percent
Cared for by:			
Partner	5	7.4	9
Mother/Mother-in-law	37	54.4	n.d./1
Paid childminder	8	11.8	12
Other family	13	19.1	72
Private day care	1	1.5	0
Not necessary /2	3	4.4	2
Other arrangements	1	1.5	5
	68	100.0	100

**Notes:**

/1 The 1992 data do not separate mothers/mothers in law from "other family".

/2 Of the respondents who stated in 1993 that it was not necessary to look after children, 2 answered they could look after themselves and 1 said the child was at school.

**Source:** Workforce surveys 1992 and 1993

*Childcare (Table 3.13)*

Once again, family members emerged as the main source of support with childcare, accounting for 81% of care arrangements, exactly the same figure reported last year (Table 3.13 and PW 1992: Table 2.13). The workers's mother was the carer in 54.4% of cases, their partner, in 7.4% and other family members, in 19.1% of cases. The proportion using paid child minders also remained identical, at 12%, but this year we also identified a further 1.5% using private day care. This group was probably buried in "other" last time around.

*Earnings of EPZ workers (Tables 3.14, 3.14a, 3.14b and 3.15)*

We have improved the data set on earnings in this year's survey, by collecting information on base salaries and on real earnings in the last pay period. To establish base salaries, we asked a general question (how much are you paid?) linked to a question about the payment basis.

The results of this question are reported in table 3.14. We found average wages for the whole sample of L.663 per month. For men, the figure was L.678 and for women, L.657. The 95% confidence intervals for each of these averages are acceptably narrow. For the total, the interval is just plus-or-minus 3.7% of the reported average. These figures for base salaries suggest that the EPZ sector generally respects the labor code provisions, which required a minimum wage (for a 44 hour week) of L.570 per month (or L.19 per day) at the time of the survey. The frequency count shows that only 41 workers (21% of the total) reported their base pay at under the legal minimum. Virtually all these cases can be accounted for, on inspection of individual records, by short weeks or by legal social security deductions which take their earnings just below the minimum.

To establish earnings in the last pay period, we asked how much the worker earned last week. This was then converted to a monthly equivalent using the formula  $(30x/7)$ , where  $x$  is daily earnings. This procedure follows Honduran labor code norms for payment systems. The results are reported in Table 3.14 (a). We found average earnings of L.743, with the average for men at L.802 and that for women at L.719. Once again, the confidence intervals for these averages are comfortably narrow. For the total, the 95% interval is plus-or-minus 3.8% of the reported average. An inspection of the cases which reported earnings equivalents under the minimum wage shows that 85% of these cases can be explained by working a short week. Only 4 cases (two per cent of the sample) had both worked over 44 hours and earned under the statutory minimum wage (Table 3.14c).

Average earnings in the last pay period were 10.7% up from the 1992 survey for the total sample (Table 3.14 (a) and PW 1992, Table 2.14). This compares with retail price inflation of 7.9% in the 13 month interval separating the two surveys (from January 1992 to February 1993), according to Central Bank data, suggesting that average real wages in the EPZ sector rose 2.8% over the period.

The 1993 survey generated more detailed information on overtime working than that for 1992. We found that 113 workers had done overtime in the previous week (56% of the total sample) and that this group had worked an average of 9 hours overtime. This suggests that overtime is an important source of additional income for EPZ workers (Table 3.14b).<sup>10</sup>

Average earnings for basic labor were L.704.5 (Table 3.15a), which is 10.8% up on the figure of L.635.7 recorded last year (PW 1992: Table 2.15). For intermediate labor the figure was L.871.9 (up 9.5%). The frequency counts show that 24% of intermediate workers earn over L.1,000 a month; in fact, the three highest earners in our sample were intermediate workers. Nevertheless, the moderate overall increase in wages for this sector of workers over the last year suggests that reports of a generalized shortage of skilled workers and supervisors in the apparel sector may be exaggerated.

Average earnings for managerial staff in the 1993 sample were L.1,132.9. This figure is lower than the figure reported last year, but neither figure has any degree of inferential value since there were only three observations for managerial staff in each sample.

---

<sup>10</sup> 113 workers reported having worked overtime hours in the previous week (Table 3.14b). This is considerably more than the 87 who said, in response to a different question, that they had worked over 44 hours, which is the standard working week (data reported in Table 3.12 above). The discrepancy between these two figures could be explained by workers missing a day or more during the week, but then doing overtime hours on the days when they were at work, in an effort to make up their weekly total income.

TABLE 3.14 EARNINGS OF EPZ WORKERS BASED ON  
THEIR BASE SALARIES, 1993

Monthly earnings	Women	Men	Total		1992
	No.	No.	No.	%	%
400 or less	1	0	1	0.5	3.6
401-500	4	1	5	2.5	9.9
500-569	27	8	35	17.7	n.d.
570-600	43	24	67	33.8	28.1
601-700	31	5	36	18.2	25.5
701-800	14	7	21	10.6	13.5
801-1000	15	10	25	12.6	12.5
1001-1200	6	1	7	3.5	3.6
1201-1500	0	1	1	0.5	1.6
1501-2000	0	0	0	0.0	1.6
TOTAL	141	57	198	100.0	99.9

There are two missing cases

AVERAGE MONTHLY EARNINGS:

	Cases	Mean	Std. Dev.	95% Conf. interval	
				low	high
				Men	57
Women	141	657.04	148.79	632.26	681.81
TOTAL	198	663.05	154.29	641.43	689.67

Source: Workforce survey

**TABLE 3.14a EARNINGS OF EPZ WORKERS BASED ON LAST WEEK'S PAY**

Monthly earnings	Women	Men	Total	
	No.	No.	No.	%
400 or less	5	2	7	3.6
401-500	2	2	4	2.1
500-569	11	4	15	7.7
570-600	17	1	18	9.2
601-700	35	13	48	24.6
701-800	31	7	38	19.5
801-1000	27	18	45	23.1
1001-1200	11	5	16	8.2
1201-1500	1	2	3	1.5
1501-2000	0	1	1	0.5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>100</b>

There are 5 missing cases

**AVERAGE MONTHLY EARNINGS:**

	Cases	Mean	Std. Dev.	Confidence Interval	
				low	high
Men	55	802.12	249.80	734.58	869.67
Women	140	719.55	176.00	690.03	749.07
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>742.84</b>	<b>202.60</b>	<b>714.20</b>	<b>771.49</b>

Source: Workforce survey

**TABLE 3.14b OVERTIME WORKING**

Did not work overtime:	87			
Worked overtime:	113			
No of hours overtime:		Women	Men	Total
0-4		21	8	29
5-9		24	11	35
>9		34	15	49
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>79</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>113</b>

Average overtime hours worked by those who did any overtime: 9.07

Source: Workforce survey

**TABLE 3.14c WORKERS WITH LESS THAN MINIMUM WAGES**

Based on last week earnings and last week hours worked:

	Women	Men	Total	Percent
Workweek				
Less than 40	13	3	16	61.5
40-44	3	3	6	23.1
45-49	2	1	3	11.5
50-54	0	1	1	3.8
55-59	0	0	0	0.0
TOTAL	18	8	26	100.0

Source: Workforce survey

**TABLE 3.15 EARNINGS OF EPZ WORKERS BY JOB CATEGORY**

Based on base salary

Monthly earnings	Basic		Intermediate		Managerial	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
400 or less	1	0.6				
401-500	5	3.2				
500-569	33		2			
570-600	57	36.1	10	26.3		
601-700	29	18.4	7	18.4		
701-800	13	8.2	8	21.1		
801-1000	18	11.4	6	15.8	1	33.3
1001-1200	2	1.3	3	7.9	2	66.7
1201-1500			1	2.6		
1501-2000			1	2.6		
TOTAL	158	100.0	38	100.0	3	100.0

There is 1 missing case

AVERAGES PER JOB CATEGORY:

	N	Mean	Std.dev.	95% Confidence interval		
				Low	High	
Basic	158	636.79	126.32	616.94	656.64	± 3%
Intermediate	37	745.1	192.01	681.08	809.12	± 9%
Management	3	1034.3	206.48	521.38	547.27	± 50%

Source: Workforce survey

48

**TABLE 3.15a EARNINGS OF EPZ WORKERS BY JOB CATEGORY**

Based on last week earnings

Monthly earnings	Basic Labor		Intermediate		Managerial	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
400 or less	7	4.5				
401-500	4	2.6				
500-569	14	9.0	1	2.7		
570-600	17	11.0	1	2.7		
601-700	43	27.7	5	13.5		
701-800	30	19.4	8	21.6		
801-1000	32	20.6	13	35.1		
1001-1200	7	4.5	6	16.2	3	100
1201-1500	1		2	5.4		
1501-2000			1	2.7		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100</b>

There is 1 missing case

**AVERAGES PER JOB CATEGORY**

	No.	Mean	Std.dev.	95% Confidence Interval			
				Low	High	1992 mean	
Basic	155	704.48	177.02	676.39	732.57	+4%	635.7
Inter.	37	871.91	226.66	796.33	947.48	+9%	795.9
Manag.	3	1132.85	40.5	1032.23	1233.48	+9%	1,666.6

Basic Labor: machine operators, ironing, packing, cleaning etc.

Intermediate labor: mechanics, supervisors, quality control, book keeper

**Source:** Workforce survey

*Importance of EPZ workers' income (Tables 3.16, 3.17 and 3.18 and 3.19)*

The number of EPZ workers who are their household's only earner is lower in the 1993 sample than that observed in 1992: 17% of the total, against 27% last year (Table 3.16 and PW 1992: Table 2.16). Once again, this is likely to be related to the different age structures of the two samples: 1993's younger sample includes a higher proportion of people with parents or older brothers and sisters working. The slight tendency for more men to be the only earner in their households which we observed in 1992 is much more marked in the 1993 sample: 25% of men are the only earner, against only 13.7% of women EPZ workers.

As in the 1992 sample, we found that just over half the 1993 sample (52.5%) said they were the main earner in their household (Table 3.17), compared with 56% last year (PW 1992: Table 2.17) However, there is a more marked difference between men and women this year, and the difference is in the inverse direction from that observed last year: 45% of women are the main earner, against 73% for men. In 1992, the respective figures were 53% and 57%. We think the 1993 data are likely to be more reliable on this point, as the number of men in the sample is considerably bigger.

Once again, we found that very few EPZ workers have any other source of personal income apart from their factory earnings: the total with alternative incomes was 9.5% (Table 3.18), compared with 18.5% in 1992 (PW 1992: Table 2.18). The most important source of other income, once again, is maintenance payments to women from the father of their children. Three women report receiving government social compensation bonds, which proves that they are committing fraud, since there is supposedly an income ceiling in the qualifying rules for the bonds, set well below EPZ earnings levels.

The big difference made to household incomes by EPZ earnings is best underlined by table 3.19, which compares average household incomes for households where there is an EPZ worker and those where there is none. The former have average incomes of L1,532, fully 50% above the L.1,008 recorded by the latter. This proportionate difference is even greater than the 35% advantage registered by EPZ workers' households in 1992.

TABLE 3.16 NUMBER OF EARNERS IN EPZ WORKERS HOUSEHOLDS, 1993

No. of earners	Sex of respondent:				Total		1992
	Women		Men		No.	%	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	%
1	19	13.7	14	25.0	33	16.9	27
2	66	47.5	18	32.1	84	43.1	39
3	32	23.0	13	23.2	45	23.1	22
4	12	8.6	4	7.1	16	8.2	7.5
5	6	4.3	6	10.7	12	6.2	2.5
6	2	1.4	0	0.0	2	1.0	2.5
7	2	1.4	1	1.8	3	1.5	0
Total	139	100	56	100	195	100	100

There were 5 missing cases

Source: Workforce survey

TABLE 3.17 IMPORTANCE OF EPZ WORKER'S INCOME TO HOUSEHOLD, 1993

Number whose wage is the main household income	Women	Men	All	Tot.in range	Percent	Percent
						1992
Basic	53	30	83	158	52.5	57
Intermediate	11	9	20	39	51.3	54
Managerial	1	1	2	3	66.7	0
Total	65	40	105	200	52.5	56
Total Survey	145	55	200			

Source: Workforce survey

TABLE 3.18 OTHER SOURCES OF INCOME OF EPZ WORKERS

	Women No.	Men No.	Total No.	%
Maintenance payment (1) from father of child	10	0	10	5.0
Government bonds (2)	3	0	3	1.5
Other income by self (3)	3	1	4	2.0
Other	2	0	2	1.0
TOTAL	18	1	19	9.5

Notes:

1 The average contribution was L.395

2 The bonds are L.20 a month

3 The man earned L.2400, the women L.20, 60 and 200, respectively

Source: Workforce survey

TABLE 3.19 INCOMES IN HOUSEHOLDS WITH EPZ  
AND WITHOUT EPZ WORKERS

Household income last month, Lps.	With EPZ workers			Without EPZ workers		
	No.	%	Percent ex. zeros	No.	%	Percent ex. zeros
0	8	7.8		60	32.8	
less than 100	1	1.0	1.1	5	2.7	4.1
101-200	1	1.0	1.1	2	1.1	1.6
201-400	0	0.0	0.0	13	7.1	10.6
401-600	16	15.7	17.0	23	12.6	18.7
601-800	6	5.9	6.4	22	12.0	17.9
801-1200	20	19.6	21.3	29	15.8	23.6
1201-2000	28	27.5	29.8	19	10.4	15.4
Over 2000	22	21.6	23.4	10	5.5	8.1
TOTAL	102	100.0	100.0	183	100.0	100.0

Averages:

	N	Mean	SD	95% Confidence Interval		
				Low	High	
HH without EPZ	123	1007.7	864.5	853.5	1162.1	±15%
HH with EPZ	94	1531.9	1028	1321.4	1742.5	±14%

Source: Workforce survey

*Social security and medical services (Tables 3.19 – 3.22)*

The confusion among the workforce about their relationship with the Instituto Hondureño de Seguro Social (IHSS), which we observed in 1992 (PW 1992:23-24), was still noticeable in 1993. However, as the result of changes in the questionnaire format, we could establish that workers think of the IHSS principally in terms of medical insurance and other short term cover, and that those who have this cover are generally very aware of it.

In fact, by law, all the workforce of the EPZs is covered by long term IHSS insurance. On the other hand, the situation for medical cover varies from EPZ to EPZ, and from municipality to municipality, depending whether the EPZ has established the Sistema Medico de Empresa (SME) or (alternatively) whether the IHSS offers medical cover (either optionally or compulsorily) in the area where the EPZ is located.<sup>11</sup>

Overall, we found that 52% of the sample believed themselves to be inscribed in IHSS, but the figure varied widely between parks which fell in our sample. In ZIP Choloma, the figure was 98%, in INHDELVA, 8%, in CHIP, zero, in Búfalo, 67% and in Villanueva, 100% (Table 3.20). It is clear that workers in the EPZs which have access to IHSS medical cover (ZIP Choloma, Zip Búfalo and ZIP Villanueva) tend to say they are covered by IHSS; those who only have "long term" cover, for invalidity, old age and death (in CHIP and INHDELVA) tend to say that they are not covered by the IHSS (Table 3.20).

**TABLE 3.20 EPZ WORKERS AND IHSS, 1993**

No. and percentage of workers who say they are inscribed in IHSS												
	INHDELVA		ZIP Chol		ZIP Chol		ZIP Búfalo		Villa Nueva		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Inscribed	6	8	78	98			16	67	4	100	104	52
Not inscribed	66	87	2	3	14	88	6	25			88	44
Don't know	4	5			2	13	1	4			7	4
Total cases	76	100	80	100	16	100	24	100	4	100	200	100

Source: Workforce survey

**TABLE 3.21 WORKPLACE MEDICAL SERVICES IN THE EPZS, 1993**

No. and % of workers who answered each question as indicated												
	INHDELVA		ZIP Chol		ZIP Chol		ZIP Bufalo		Villa Nueva		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Is there a medical service?												
yes	65	85	78	98	14	88	20	83	4	100	181	91
no	9	12	2	3	2	13	3	13			16	8
Don't know	2	3					1	4			3	2
Total cases	76	100	80	100	16	100	24	100	4	100	200	100
Who provides it?												
Firm	57	75	68	85	14	88	13	54	1	25	153	77
IHSS	1	1	6	8			3	13	1	25	11	6
Don't know	18	24	4	5			4	17	2	50	17	9
Total cases	76	100	80	100	16	100	24	100	4	100	200	100
Your opinion?												
Very bad/bad	8	11			4	25	1	4			13	7
Regular	29	38	17	21	4	25	3	13	1	33	54	27
Good/very good	17	22	52	65	1	6	12	50	2	67	82	41
Total cases	76	100	80	100	16	100	24	100	4	100	200	100

Source: Workforce survey

<sup>11</sup> See PW (1992:Part 3, Section 4.4) for more institutional detail on the scope of IHSS cover in the EPZ areas.

52

The EPZs which do not have access to IHSS cover generally offer a private on-site medical service. When asked if a medical service is available at work, 91% of respondents said yes, with the percentage varying over a relatively narrow range, from 83% in Búfalo to 98% in ZIP Choloma (Table 3.21).

The EPZ workforce is relatively untroubled by illness, as one would expect of a group of young people. Only 45% of the workforce had lost any work time through illness in the last six months, and only 16% had lost more than two days (Table 3.23). This may in part be the result of the very generalization of workplace medical services, which allow the employers to sift out malignancy and also cut out the loss of work time through travel to off-site IHSS clinics and hospitals for diagnosis.

Interestingly, three quarters of workers with access to workplace medical services believe that their employer provides the service, although in fact, it is as often as not linked to the IHSS through the SME. This suggests that EPZ employers can get considerable benefits in the form of workforce "goodwill" from participating in the SME.

**TABLE 3.22 USE OF WORKPLACE MEDICAL SERVICES, 1993**

Times used:	Total	Women	Men
None	57	39	18
1-4	106	75	31
5-9	12	10	2
>10	1	1	0

Source: Workforce survey

**TABLE 3.23 WORK DAYS LOST THROUGH ILLNESS, 1993  
(Last 6 months)**

Days lost:	Women	Men	Total	
			No.	%
0	75	34	109	55
1	18	12	30	15
2	21	6	27	14
3	7	3	10	5
4	6	0	6	3
5-10	11	1	12	6
> 10	3	1	4	2
Total cases:	141	57	198	100

Source: Workforce survey

*Social integration and organization of EPZ workers (Table 3.24)*

The 1993 data on social integration are almost identical to those from the 1992 survey (PW 1992: Table 2.22). Religion is the only form of social activity which is generalized throughout the sample, involving 52% of respondents. Sport involves 22% (higher than the 18% found last year, probably due to the higher proportion of men in the sample). As in the 1992 survey, no-one admitted to involvement in unions, but once again, since the interview took place in the factory in work time with the employers' blessing, this may not be a very reliable indicator.

**TABLE 3.24 SOCIAL INTEGRATION OF EPZ WORKERS, 1993**

Workers who were active or semi-active in:			Total	1992
	Women	Men	%	%
Sport	10.5	45.0	21.0	22.0
Political parties	2.8	3.5	3.0	3.0
Social clubs	4.9	7.1	5.5	4.5
Patronato	4.2	3.5	4.0	7.5
Church/religion	59.5	33.4	52.0	61.0
Trades union	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Women's group	7.0	0.0	6.0	4.0

Source: Workforce survey

54

## CHAPTER 4 – SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN CHOLOMA AND VILLANUEVA

The data presented in this chapter are drawn mainly from our community survey. As in the 1992, report, we start by describing the sample population and then present data for general social and economic conditions of the households, commenting on points of difference between the data for 1993 and those for 1992. The results we report in the following sections are probably good indicators of the social conditions of the respective universes, for two reasons:

Firstly, as required in the scope of work for the present study, the Community Survey was based on the same sample of households defined for the 1992 survey<sup>12</sup>. It is not surprising, therefore, that the population structure of the sampled population (Table 4.1) is very similar to that found last year (PW 1992: Table 3.1 and Annex 5). This means that differences observed between 1992 and 1993 arise almost entirely from real changes in the social conditions of the households which fall in the samples, and do not arise from sampling differences.

Secondly, the age structures of our sample population in the two communities of Choloma and Villanueva in both the 1992 and 1993 samples are very similar to those reported for the urban areas of these two communities in the 1988 Census. This means that in each year, we can be reasonably confident that the social conditions encountered in the households in the sample are a good approximation to the social conditions in the respective universes.

**TABLE 4.1 AGE STRUCTURES OF SAMPLE POPULATIONS, 1993**

	Percentages:			
	Choloma - Urban		Villanueva - Urban	
	Our sample	1988 census	Our sample	1988 census
Under 5	13	16	16	16
5-14	28	30	24	28
15-19	12	10	13	11
20-29	17	16	16	16
30-44	16	16	17	16
45-59	8	7	10	7½
60+	6	5	5	5

Sources: Annex 4, and 1988 census

<sup>12</sup> The sampling procedure defines first choice households and substitute households to be used in the cases where there are access problems. As a result, the households actually interviewed in 1992 and 1993 are not strictly equal sets; however, the overlap between them is extremely big and the differences in the population structure of the two samples are very slight. We should add that a part of that difference may be attributable to real changes in the relevant universes, due to aging over the last year.

55

Taken together, these two conditions mean that the differences in social conditions observed in the two surveys are largely attributable to real changes in the two universes under study (the Choloma and Villanueva urban communities, respectively). In this sense, the community survey is a more reliable indicator of social change than the workforce survey, where the 1993 sample was completely redrawn and sampling differences may therefore be an important factor of divergence between the data sets for the respective years.<sup>13</sup>

*Housing conditions and access to public services (Tables 4.2 - 4.11)*

The average number of inhabitants per household reported for Choloma in 1993 is 5.7 people, slightly up from the 5.6 reported last year, and consistent with reports of growing housing shortage in the community (Table 4.2). The figure reported for Villanueva is 4.8, which is considerably lower than the 5.3 observed last year, and also observed in the 1988 Census.

Tables 4.3 - 4.13 present data on housing conditions and access to public services in Choloma and Villanueva, comparable with the data presented in Tables 3.3 through 3.13 in PW (1992). Since we returned to the same households, the data show the same pattern of housing tenure observed last year: the vast majority still live in individual houses and brick is the main construction material.

Owner occupiers are 65% of households in Choloma and 59% in Villanueva; 22% rent their homes in Choloma and 31% rent in Villanueva (Table 4.5).<sup>14</sup> There is evidence that housing costs have risen in real terms, especially for renters in Choloma: average rents rose by 63% in real terms in Choloma and 33% for Villanueva (Table 4.5a). These increases are greater than the 95% confidence intervals reported for the statistics reported in 1992. These data are consistent with widespread reports of shortage of low-cost housing in the Choloma area.

The data on water supply, electricity supply, fuel for cooking and sanitary arrangements for 1993 (Tables 4.6 to 4.11) are broadly similar to those for 1992; where differences arise, they are likely to result from the small changes in the sample due to the use of substitute households where sampled households were not available, or from improvement in data collection due to the combination of experience and better training. In general, where there are inconsistencies between the 1992 and 1993 data, the latter are likely to be more reliable.

---

<sup>13</sup> However, at a number of points in the analysis of the 1993 data set, we observed changes which are either too big to have occurred in the one year time span which separates the two surveys, or which are inconsistent with other observations. Where this happens, we comment on the incongruencies in the data and indicate which data we think are most reliable, and why.

<sup>14</sup> The small differences in the proportions of owner occupation and renting between the two years' samples are probably, in large part, ascribable to improvements in the data collection in 1993, due to better interviewer training for this section of the survey.

The data on IHSS cover suggest that the proportion of households where at least one person has IHSS cover fell from 42% to 36% in Choloma between 1992 and 1993, while the proportion for Villanueva rose from 35% to 48%.<sup>15</sup>

There are no very striking differences between the pattern of artefact tenure between 1992 and 1993, for either of the two communities (Table 4.13 and PW,1992:Table 3.13). This is not surprising, as one would expect the wealth effects of higher income to feed through only slowly into asset holdings, especially where access to credit is relatively limited (or very costly, via the informal market).

TABLE 4.2 AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE IN THE COMMUNITY SAMPLE

	Choloma	Villanueva
1992	5.6	4.8
1993	5.7	5.3

Source: Community survey

TABLE 4.3 - TYPE OF HOUSE, 1993

	Choloma		Villanueva	
	No.	%	No.	%
Individual house	192	97	80	89
"Rancho"			3	3
Room	6	3	6	7
Improvised house			<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
TOTAL	198	100	90	100

TABLE 4.4 MATERIAL OF WALLS, 1993

	Choloma		Villanueva	
	No.	%	No.	%
Brick	153	77.3	47	52.2
Adobe (mud blocks)	7	3.5	9	10.0
Wood	34	17.2	29	32.2
Bahareque (wood/leaf)	<u>4</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5.6</u>
TOTAL	198	100.0	90	100.0

<sup>15</sup> Once again, we cannot be entirely sure that these differences are not ascribable to improved data collection in 1993. The 1992 finding of a higher proportion of cover in Choloma than in Villanueva (PW 1992: Table 3.12) ran contrary to the institutional spread of the IHSS, since in Villanueva the provision IHSS health insurance has been compulsory for some time in all employment, whereas in Choloma it only became optional for the first time in 1992.

TABLE 4.5 HOUSING TENURE AND COST, 1993

	Choloma		Villanueva	
	No.	%	No.	%
Owners				
- fully paid	129	65.2	53	58.9
- with mortgage /1	16	8.1	5	5.6
Renting /2	43	21.7	28	31.1
Occupying w/o payment	10	5.1	4	4.4
TOTAL CASES	198	100.0	90	100.0

/1 Average monthly payment: 95% Confidence Interval

	No.	Mean	SD	Low	High		Min	Max
Choloma	16	58.6	51.3	31	86	±47%	13	150
Villanueva	5	170.0	27.4	136	204	±20%	150	200
/2 Average monthly rent:								
Choloma	43	178.0	104.8	146	210	±18%	40	500
Villanueva	28	123.5	91.6	88	159	±29%	25	400

N= Number of cases SD= Standard deviation High= Higher end of 95% conf. interval Low= Lower end of the same Min= Minimum value Max= Maximum value

TABLE 4.5a PERCENTAGE CHANGE IN HOUSING COSTS, 1992-93

	Nominal	Real/1
Choloma		
Rents	+71	+63
Mortgages	-10	-18
Villanueva		
Rents	+41	+33
Mortgages	+63	+55

Note:

/1 Real change = nominal change less inflation of 8%

TABLE 4.6 WATER SUPPLY, 1993

	Choloma		Villanueva	
	No.	%	No.	%
Piped water:				
Public supply	176	88.9	81	90.0
Private/collective	14	7.1		
Well	1	0.5	4	4.4
River	5	2.5	1	1.1
Other	2	1.0	2	2.2
No information			2	2.2
TOTAL	198	100.0	90	100.0

58

TABLE 4.7 ORIGIN OF WATER, 1993

	Choloma		Villanueva	
	No.	%	No.	%
Within dwelling	76	38.4	42	46.7
Within property	115	58.1	45	50.0
Beyond property	7	3.5	3	3.3
TOTAL	198	100.0	90	100.0

TABLE 4.8 ELECTRICITY SUPPLY, 1993

	Choloma		Villanueva	
	No.	%	No.	%
ENEE	190	96.0	78	86.7
Private-collective	3	1.5		0.0
Private-individual	5	2.5		0.0
No supply		0.0	12	13.3
TOTAL	198	100.0	90	100.0

TABLE 4.9 FUEL USED FOR COOKING, 1993

	Choloma		Villanueva	
	No.	%	No.	%
Electricity	18	9.1	10	11.1
Kerosene	94	47.5	33	36.7
Bottled gas	30	15.2	12	13.3
Wood	53	26.8	34	37.8
Don't cook	3	1.5	1	1.1
TOTAL	198	100.0	90	100.0

TABLE 4.10 TYPE OF SANITARY FACILITY, 1993

	Choloma		Villanueva	
	No.	%	No.	%
Flushing toilet	109	55.1	24	26.7
Latrine	87	43.9	59	65.6
None	2	1.0	5	5.6
No data			2	2.2
TOTAL	198	100.0	90	100.0
Individual	180	90.9	72	80.0
Collective	15	7.6	10	11.1
No data	3	1.5	8	8.9
TOTAL	198	100.0	90	100.0

54

TABLE 4.11 CONNEXION TO SEWAGE DISPOSAL, 1993

	Choloma		Villanueva	
	No.	%	No.	%
Public sewer pipe	89	44.9	10	11.1
Septic tank	22	11.1	18	20.0
Unsanitary sink	85	42.9	53	58.9
No data	2	1.0	9	10.0
TOTAL	198	100.0	90	100.0

TABLE 4.12 HOUSEHOLDS WHERE SOME MEMBERS HAVE IHSS COVER

Percentage of households where at least one member has IHSS cover

Cases	1992		1993	
	Choloma	V/nueva	Choloma	V/nueva
	42	35	36	48
198	90	202	88	

TABLE 4.13 ARTEFACTS, 1993

Percentage of each household which has item

	EPZ			Non EPZ
	Choloma	V/nueva	H/H	H/H
Radio	79.3	81.1	71.8	68.6
Electric iron	75.8	56.7	64.1	59.0
Black and white television	52.5	41.1	49.5	41.0
Color television	23.2	16.7	17.5	18.6
Telephone	8.1	10.0	5.8	7.4
Sound system	19.7	23.3	18.4	18.1
Bicycle	43.9	28.9	36.9	33.0
Stove	64.6	53.3	48.5	53.2
Washing machine	2.5	0.0	2.9	1.1
Fridge	28.8	26.7	24.3	24.5
Shower heater	2.0	2.2	2.9	1.1
Private car	10.1	8.9	5.8	9.0
Sewing machine	21.2	17.8	15.5	19.7
Motorbike	3.0	5.6	3.9	2.7
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Community survey

TABLE 4.14 OPINIONS ON QUALITY OF BASIC SERVICES, 1993

Percentage of respondents with each opinion, 1993

	No ser- vice	Very bad	Indiff- erent	Good or very good	1992 Good or very good
<b>CHOLOMA</b>					
Water	4.0	21.7	32.8	41.4	28
Street drains	55.1	6.6	8.6	29.8	34
Sewers	56.9	5.6	7.6	29.9	36
Street lightning	10.7	5.6	19.8	64.0	50
Electricity	6.1	2.5	13.1	78.3	80
Phone	89.3	0.0	1.5	9.2	6.5
Pavements	93.9	1.0	3.5	1.5	2.5
Garbage disposal	25.4	13.5	32.6	28.5	27
Health Center	62.8	1.2	8.5	27.4	42
Fam. Planning Clinic	84.7	0.0	5.6	9.7	21
Day care	87.1	0.0	2.7	10.2	0
Primary school	29.5	2.3	8.1	60.1	0
<b>VILLANUEVA</b>					
Water	2.2	20.0	25.6	52.2	45
Street drains	72.2	5.6	6.7	15.6	1
Sewers	75.6	3.3	5.6	15.6	0
Street lightning	7.8	10.0	21.1	61.1	48
Electricity	9.1	4.5	20.5	65.9	79
Phone	86.5	1.1	2.2	10.1	2
Pavements	96.6	1.1	1.1	1.1	1
Garbage disposal	51.7	2.2	20.2	25.8	20
Health Center	53.1	4.9	12.3	29.6	56
Fam. Planning Clinic	86.7	1.3	4.0	8.0	7
Day care	86.8	1.3	2.6	9.2	0
Primary school	25.6	3.8	6.4	64.1	0

Source: Community survey

TABLE 4.15 PRIORITIES FOR IMPROVEMENTS IN PUBLIC SERVICES

Respondents were asked their priorities for improvements in services. We have summed the responses into a single index, giving 4 points to priority one, down to one point for priority 4. The resulting index numbers are expressed as percentages.

	Choloma		Villanueva	
	1993	1992	1993	1992
Water	27	42	25	50
Street drains	17	20	18	19
Sewers	12	19	12	16
Street lightning	7	14	7	15
Health Center	11	5	12	0

Source: Community survey

61

TABLE 4.16 OPINIONS OF THE IMPACT OF THE EPZS

	Choloma		Villanueva	
	1993 %	1992 %	1993 %	1992 %
<b>OVERALL IMPACT</b>				
Very bad	1.5	0.5	0.0	2.5
Bad	3.0	1.0	6.7	0.0
Indifferent	11.6	22.0	8.9	13.0
Good	78.3	24.0	62.2	22.0
Very good	5.1	52.0	16.7	63.0
<b>EMPLOYMENT</b>				
Decreased	2.0	5.0	0.0	2.0
Same	1.0	6.0	1.1	5.0
Increased	94.4	86.0	90.0	91.0
<b>CRIME</b>				
Increased	27.3	54.0	0.0	38.0
Same	55.6	36.0	50.0	45.0
Decreased	7.1	8.0	6.7	12.0
<b>ALCOHOLISM</b>				
Increased	23.2	67.0	12.2	54.0
Same	66.2	24.0	66.7	30.0
Decreased	2.5	6.0	4.4	10.0
<b>PROSTITUTION</b>				
Increased	23.2	65.0	14.4	46.0
Same	62.6	24.0	52.2	40.0
Decreased	3.0	6.0	17.8	10.0
<b>POLLUTION</b>				
Increased	38.9	44.0	52.2	41.0
Same	45.5	50.0	27.8	45.0
Decreased	2.0	3.0	2.2	5.0

**Note:**

Percentages were calculated from the total number of cases, and do not add to 100 where some respondents had no opinion.

**Source:** Community survey

*Opinions on public services and EPZs (Tables 4.14 - 4.16)*

The pattern of opinions registered in the 1993 sample among the Choloma and Villanueva communities regarding the quality of their public services is largely unaltered from that reported in 1992 (Table 4.14). In both places, electricity and street lighting get good ratings and the health center gets a relatively good rating. The water supply and sewage system in Villanueva is clearly better than that of Choloma in residents' opinion, but opinions of the Choloma water supply have improved markedly from 1992 to 1993.

Correspondingly, the priority assigned to improvements in the water supply by Choloma residents has fallen (from an index number of 42 in 1992 to 27 in 1993) - but this is still the main

62

concern, followed by improved street drains, sewers and street lighting (Table 4.15). In Villanueva, the priority attached to improved water services has also fallen (from 50 to 25). In both communities, a desire for better health center facilities registers much more clearly in 1993 than in 1992 (possibly as a result of more careful questioning).

We found broadly the same pattern of community opinion regarding the overall impact of the EPZs as was observed in 1992. In Choloma, 82% of the community think the EPZs have a good or very good overall impact; in Villanueva, the figure is 79%. However, within these totals, there is a clear shift away from "very good" towards "good". As in 1992, we found that the source of positive opinions is the employment impact of the EPZs; for all the other factors which we mentioned (crime, alcoholism, prostitution and pollution) recorded a negative balance (Table 4.16).

*Personal and household incomes in Choloma and Villanueva (Tables 4.17 - 4.18)*

In 1993 we found average personal incomes (excluding the cases which report no income figure) of L.723 in Choloma and L.596 in Villanueva, compared with L.614 and L.624, respectively, in 1992 (table 4.17). As in 1992, the 95% confidence intervals for the data are reasonably narrow (plus or minus 10% of the reported average, in each case). If we correct these figures for the 8% increase in the retail price index observed between the two survey dates, real average personal incomes register an increase of 10% in Choloma, and a reduction of 12% in Villanueva.

This latter reduction may be linked to the seasonal effect of the sugar harvest, which boosts incomes in the Villanueva area, and which was in full swing during the 1992 interviewing (in February) but had passed its peak by the time of the 1993 interviewing (late March). The increase in real average personal incomes in Choloma is not likely to be the result of increased earnings rates in the EPZs (as we found in our Workforce Survey that real earnings in the EPZs did not rise significantly - see Table 3.14 above) but rather the result of increased employment, and possibly the result of non EPZ earnings rates rising in real terms as other employers strove to retain labor.

Turning to household incomes (Table 4.18D), we found average household income of L.1,333 in Choloma and L.1,005 in Villanueva<sup>16</sup>, compared (respectively) with L.1,025 and L.931 in 1992. Correcting for inflation, this gives an increase in real average household incomes of 22% in Choloma and zero in Villanueva. Once again, the Villanueva figure is likely to have been depressed somewhat by the seasonal impact of the sugar harvest (present in 1992, absent in 1993). The increase for Choloma is particularly marked, suggesting that the EPZ employment boom is feeding into a strong increase in real incomes.

The average household incomes for households with an EPZ worker observed in 1993 was L.1,532, fully 50% above the L.1,008 registered for non-EPZ households (Table 3.19). This compares with a 35% average disparity between the two groups observed in 1992 (PW 1992:

---

<sup>16</sup> This average for 1993 is calculated excluding one "outlying case".- That of a bus company owner living in Choloma, who did not appear in the 1992 sample, and whose presence raises average income in Choloma by L170 (Table 4.18C) reports the average including this case.

57), and further reinforces the conclusion that it is EPZ incomes which are pulling up the community's average real incomes.

*Spending patterns of EPZ communities and workers' households (Table 4.19 and 4.20)*

The household expenditure patterns observed in Choloma and Villanueva in the 1993 community survey are very similar to those reported in 1992. Food accounts for 60% of total spending in each community; paying off debts is the second spending item (11.5% in Choloma and 9.6% in Villanueva). In third place is education (6.1% and 8.7% respectively). Housing is a relatively small part of average expenditure (4% and 5.6% respectively), so that the sharp increases in housing costs registered on page 32 above will not have affected real incomes very greatly, on average. Saving is once again a very small part of household expenditure (under 2% in each community).

A comparison of spending patterns in EPZ workers' households and non EPZ workers' households for 1993 (Table 4.19a) shows only three points of difference: firstly, EPZ households apparently spend more of their incomes on food; secondly, they spend more on education (8.4% versus 5.7%); and thirdly, they spend considerably less paying debts (6.3% versus 14.6%). Since EPZ households' incomes are generally higher than non EPZ households' incomes, these differences suggest that the income elasticity of demand for food and education is greater than unity, while that for debt is less than unity. This latter conclusion is the opposite of what we found in 1992 (PW 1992:33 and Table 3.19).

**TABLE 4.17 - PERSONAL INCOMES IN CHOLOMA AND VILLANUEVA, 1993**

	TOTAL SAMPLE	Percentages					
		Men	Choloma		Villanueva		All
			Women	All	Men	Women	All
<b>INCOME RANGE:</b>							
L.100 or less	3.8	1.2	2.6	1.7	1.7	6.4	3.8
L.101-200	7.5	1.8	6.1	3.6	1.7	14.9	7.5
L.201-400	14.2	11.1	6.1	9	22	4.3	14.2
L.401-600	37.7	42.1	48.7	44.7	32.2	44.7	37.7
L.601-800	18.9	22.2	23.5	22.7	18.6	19.1	18.9
L.801-1200	14.2	15.8	7.8	12.7	22	4.3	14.2
L.1201-2000	3.7	3.4	2.6	3.1	1.7	6.4	3.8
L. >2000	0	2.3	2.6	2.4	0	0	0
	100.0	99.9	100.0	99.9	99.9	100.1	100.1
<b>Averages:</b>							
Mean	688.9	728.7	715	723.2	604.4	586.4	596.4
SD	560.5	479.8	789.6	621.9	276.9	388.1	329.3
Min	51.5	51.5	60	51.5	90	100.0	90
Max	7000.0	4000.0	7000.0	7000.0	1300.0	2000.0	2000.0
Cases	392	171	115	286	59	47	106
95% conf.int.	± 8%	±10%	±20%	±10%	±12%	±19%	±10%

Source: Community survey

64

TABLE 4.18 - HOUSEHOLD INCOMES IN CHOLOMA AND VILLANUEVA

A) Household income last month, Lps.	Choloma			V/nueva		
	No.	%	% ex 0	No.	%	% ex 0
0	47	23.6		21	24.4	
less than 100	3	1.5	2.0	3	3.5	4.6
101-200	2	1.0	1.3	1	1.2	1.5
201-400	8	4.0	5.3	5	5.8	7.7
401-600	25	12.6	16.4	14	16.3	21.5
601-800	21	10.6	13.8	7	8.1	10.8
801-1200	32	16.1	21.1	17	19.8	26.2
1201-2000	35	17.6	23.0	12	14.0	18.5
Over 2000	26	13.1	17.1	6	7.0	9.2
TOTAL	199	100.0	100.0	86	100.0	100.0

Note:

The first percentage column in each case is calculated including the cases which reported no income. The second is calculated excluding those cases.

B) Averages: including HH which reported no income

	No.	Mean	SD	Confidence Interval 95%		%	Min	Max
				Low	High			
Choloma	200	1149.1	2144.6	850.1	1448.3	26	0	27,200
Villanueva	85	768.51	733.2	610.36	926.67	21	0	3,400

C) Averages: excluding HH which reported no income

	No.	Mean	SD	Low	High	%	Min	Max
Choloma	153	1502	2342.7	1128	1876	25	75	27,200
Villanueva	65	1004.9	681.37	836.1	1173.8	17	90	3,400

D) Averages: excluding HH which reported no income, and excluding the bus company owner in the Choloma sample.

	No.	Mean	SD	Low	High	%	Min	Max
Choloma	152	1333.1	1059.4	1163.3	1502.9	13	75	7,000
Villanueva	65	1004.9	681.37	836.1	1173.8	17	90	3,400

Source: Community survey

TABLE 4.19 HOUSEHOLD EXPENDITURE PATTERNS

	Choloma				Villanueva			
	L.	%	C.I.	95%	L.	%	C.I.	95%
Food	557	60.7		10	393	59.1		16
Housing	37	4.0		31	37	5.6		45
Cloths	45	4.9		42	32	4.8		83
Water/el/phone	54	5.9		21	52	7.8		46
Transport	39	4.2		25	15	2.3		50
Education/1	56	6.1		39	58	8.7		41
Entertainment	7	0.8		81	5	0.8		111
Debts	106	11.5		63	64	9.6		94
Saving	17	1.9		78	9	1.4		91
TOTAL	918	100.0			665	100.0		

/1 Education is slightly higher due to the bus company owner who spends 1080Lps per month on private schools

Source: Community survey

TABLE 4.19a HOUSEHOLD EXPENDITURE PATTERNS

For households with and without EPZ workers

	HH with EPZ worker				HH w/o EPZ worker			
	L.	%	C.I.	95%	438	%	C.I.	95%
Food	631	63.0		12	438	58.1		12
Housing	44	4.4		35	33	4.4		36
Cloths	59	5.9		61	32	4.2		47
Water/el/phone	48	4.8		27	57	7.6		27
Transport	49	4.9		30	22	2.9		32
Education/1	84	8.4		50	43	5.7		31
Entertainment	1	0.1		174	9	1.2		72
Debts	63	6.3		39	110	14.6		69
Saving	23	2.3		110	10	1.3		57
	1002	100			754	100		

Source: Community survey

66

TABLE 4.20 - EPZ WORKERS' EXPENDITURE PATTERNS, 1993

	No.	Mean	%	SD	95% Confidence Interval		
					Low	High	± %
Food	200	68.6	44.1	43.5	62.6	74.7	9
Transport	200	20.8	13.4	40.3	15.1	26.4	27
Housing	199	8.2	5.3	25.3	1.8	4.7	43
Education	198	2	1.3	9	0.74	3.3	65
Entertainment	199	11	7.1	38.9	5.6	16.5	50
Paying debts	198	27	17.4	66.5	17.7	36.3	34
Savings	200	18	11.6	33.4	13.4	22.7	26

Source: Workforce survey

TABLE 4.21 STOCKS OF SAVINGS (LPS) - COMMUNITY SAMPLE

Choloma		Villanueva		Total	
All	Savers	All	Savers	All	Savers
114.9	1666.6	171.8	2463.3	154	1884
110	111	139	162	86	82
199	1365	233	1740	290	1461
95	48	56	87	50	40

Source: Community survey

TABLE 4.22 - SAVINGS STOCKS OF EPZ WORKERS WHO HAVE SAVINGS, 1993

Amount of savings (Lempiras)	Percent of workers (99 cases)
100 or less	16.2
101-500	28.3
501-1000	35.4
1001-1500	10.1
1501-2000	4
>2000	6.1
Average savings by type of asset:	Lps.
Cash	99.6
Bank account	203.3
Saving and loan	448.2
Other	52.5
TOTAL	803.6

Source: Workforce survey

*Savings of the communities and of EPZ workers (Tables 4.21 and 4.22)*

We found no evidence in 1993 of a marked increase in savings either among the EPZ workers or among the surrounding communities. Average savings stocks for all Choloma households in 1993 were L.115 and for Villanueva, L.172 (Table 4.21). Each figure is somewhat below that observed last year, but the difference is not statistically significant in either case. The fall is the product of a reduced number of households in sample reporting savings of any kind (the number fell from 39 to 22) combined with an increase in the average savings of households with savings (up from L.1,461 in 1992 to L.1,884 in 1993).

As in 1992, we found that just half the EPZ workers sample said they had savings of any kind. However, in 1993, the average amount of savings was considerably higher than that observed last year: L.804 per person, compared with L.579. Bank accounts and savings and loan accounts remained the most important types of asset (Table 4.22 and PW,1992:Table 3.22)

*Education of the workforce in Choloma and Villanueva (Table 4.23 - 4.25)*

The 1993 data for the education of the population of working age in Choloma and Villanueva (Table 4.23) are very similar to those recorded in 1992. The proportion of the population without completed primary education is 36% in Villanueva and 33% in Choloma; the figures observed in 1992 were, respectively, 31% and 34%. However, in both communities, the percentage of illiterates is below that observed in 1992 (at around 12% instead of 15% to 17%). This change is too great to reflect a real change in the population, and probably arises from improvements in the data. The proportion of the population aged 5-29 in education of any type is 47% in Choloma and 53% in Villanueva, which is almost the same as the figures observed in 1992. (Table 4.24). However, in each case the proportion in primary education is somewhat higher, and that in secondary education, somewhat lower, than that observed last year.

The 1993 data on technical education of the Choloma and Villanueva communities show a lower proportion of the labor force with any type of technical education than we observed in 1992 (16% against 23%). The main difference is that many fewer people said they had training in sewing.

TABLE 4.23 - EDUCATION OF POPULATION OF WORKING AGE, 1993

CHOLOMA										
Age	Highest level of education reached									Row total
	Ilit.	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	
10-19	10	9	0	46	176	55	10	1	0	297
20-29	6	8	0	21	113	21	25	0	2	190
30-44	25	25	0	41	78	10	17	0	5	176
45-59	29	29	0	29	21	3	2	0	0	84
Over 59	32	32	0	21	5	0	1	0	1	60
TOTAL	102	103	0	158	393	89	55	1	8	807
Percent	12.6	12.8	0.0	19.6	48.7	11.0	6.8	0.1	1.0	100
1988 Census		21		21	43	8	7		1	
1992 %	17	15	0	19	48	11	6	0.2	0.8	

VILLANUEVA										
10-19	5	5	0	31	45	16	10	0	0	107
20-29	6	9	0	6	25	6	18	1	1	66
30-44	10	10	0	14	24	4	10	1	2	65
45-59	10	10	2	8	15	1	0	0	1	37
Over 59	9	8	0	5	5	0	2	0	1	21
TOTAL	40	42	2	64	114	27	40	2	5	296
Percent	11.9	14.2	0.7	21.6	38.5	9.1	13.5	0.7	1.7	592
1988 Census		26		15	38	9	10		1	
1992%	15	13	0	18	37	16	12	1.5	2	

Ilit. People who can't read nor write

A= None/pre-primary

B=Literary course

C=Primary 1-3 years

D= Primary 4-6

E= Secondary/Technical 1-3 years

F= Secondar/Technical 4-6 years

G= Superior 1-3 years

H= Superior 4-7 years

1988 Census= 1988 census figures for urban areas of Choloma and Villanueva

/1 Row percentages exclude the illiteracy figures

Source: Community survey

TABLE 4.24 - PROPORTION OF POPULATION AGED 5-29 IN EDUCATION

Percent of each age range attending an educational course:

Age:	Choloma		Villanueva		Total	
	1993	1992	1993	1992	1993	1992
5 - 9	76	69	75	86	76	75
10 - 14	87	78	89	80	88	79
15 - 19	25	27	43	44	30	33
20 - 29	6	10	15	17	8	12
TOTAL %	47	44	53	53	47	47
TOTAL NUMBER	(306)	(263)	(114)	(156)	(420)	(419)
POPLN. 5-29	(652)	(602)	(216)	(292)	(868)	(894)
1988 Census %	44	44	40	40		

Note:

The figures in brackets are absolute numbers; all other figures are percentages. The 1988 census percentages are reported for the purpose of comparison with the TOTAL % figures for both 1993 and 1992.

Source: Community survey

TABLE 4.25 TECHNICAL EDUCATION IN CHOLOMA AND VILLANUEVA

No. and percent with each type of training:

	1993		1992	
	No.	%	No.	%
Sewing and similar	52	4	105	9
Tailors	13	1	10	1
Mechanics	26	2	24	2
Beauty	6	½	12	1
Building trades	37	3	36	3
Drivers	25	2	12	1
Others	48	4	67	6
Total	207	16	266	23
Valid cases	1315		1136	100

Note:

All percentages are given as a proportion of valid cases

Source: Community survey

## CHAPTER 5 – EPZ DEVELOPMENT, LABOR SUPPLY AND MIGRATION

### a) Projected EPZ labor demand in the Sula Valley and beyond

In our 1992 report, we highlighted the likelihood of labor market tensions in the Sula Valley if the EPZ sector were to continue the exponential growth path recorded in 1989–92. We have already seen in Chapter I that the growth continues unabated, with 43% employment growth in 1992–93 (Table 1.2 above).<sup>17</sup>

The pipeline of future jobs has widened even faster: the total projected number of factory shells in EPZs already approved, which stood at 163 at the end of 1991, had risen to 287 by the end of 1993 (Table 1.1 above). This suggests that the jobs pipeline has swollen from 60,000 in 1992 to 105,000 in 1993 (assuming the average number of jobs per shell stays the same).

Almost all the EPZ jobs created to date are still located in the Sula Valley. However, this pattern is likely to change somewhat in the future, with a significant part of future growth projected for sites outside the Valley. In particular, the giant ZIP Comayagua will account for 61 shells (twenty percent of total projected EPZ factory space) and 20% of total projected employment. A number of other parks which are still on the drawing board (and are not included in the above projections) will also be sited outside the Sula Valley -- among them ZIP Tegucigalpa, ZIP FIA (in Tegucigalpa), and ZIP San Lorenzo (in Valle), which between them will total a further 63 shells.

Nevertheless, the majority of projected EPZ employment is still in the Sula Valley. Total projected EPZ jobs in the valley have risen from the 60,000 reported in 1992 (PW 1992:4) to some 83,000 at the end of 1992. So the final expected total is still almost four times the existing Sula Valley EPZ employment of 22,342.

### b) The age and sex composition of the EPZ workforce

In 1992, we found that 75% of the existing EPZ workforce was constituted of women aged 30 or under. Using population projections based on the 1988 census, we demonstrated that the EPZs' labor demands could not be met by natural population growth among this section of the population, so that there would have to be a shift to either male labor or older labor, or an increase in the labor participation rates of young women, or an increase in immigration, if the expansion of the sector were not to be halted by labor shortage problems (PW 1992:39–42).

As we commented in chapter 2, the evidence of the 1993 survey suggests that the age and sex composition of the workforce is shifting. This year's average EPZ worker is younger, with an increase in under 21s from 35% to 46%, and the proportion of women is lower (down from

---

<sup>17</sup> That a large part of this employment growth is concentrated in the communities of Choloma and Villanueva is confirmed by the findings of our community survey in 1993. Within our sample of 200 households we encountered 144 EPZ workers, compared with 110 last year – an increase of 30%.

84% to 72%). Women under 31 were 75% of the workforce in 1992 and 68% in 1993 (Table 3.1). While we cannot be entirely sure that this difference arises from changes in the study universe (rather than from sampling differences) it is suggestive of employers moving into new labor market segments, in the face of growing difficulty recruiting women in their twenties.

c) Evidence on participation and unemployment rates (Table 5.1)

In 1992, we reported an overall female labor market participation rate in the Choloma community survey of 48%, which was already well above the figure of 26% observed in the 1988 census. In Villanueva the figure had also risen strikingly, from 11% to 33% (PW 1992:Table 4.2 and Annex 6). This was unsurprising, since it is well known that labor force participation rates are a strong function of work availability.

In 1993, we found that the female participation rate had stabilized at 50% in Choloma, but it had leapt once again in Villanueva, from 33% to 51% (Table 5.1). We found that male participation rates remained stable in both communities, at 73% in Choloma and 69% in Villanueva.

**TABLE 5.1 - EMPLOYMENT AND PARTICIPATION RATES OF POPULATION AGED 10 AND OVER, CHOLOMA AND VILLANUEVA**

	1993									1992								
	Total 10+ in sample			Economical- ly active			Partic. rate/1			Unemp. rate /2			Partic. rate			Unemp. rate		
	Tot	♂	♀	Tot	♂	♀	Tot	♂	♀	Tot	♂	♀	Tot	♂	♀	Tot	♂	♀
Choloma No.	808	376	432	490	275	215				122	53	69						
%	100	47	53				61	73	50	25	19	32	60	74	48	23	22	25
V/nueva No.	292	134	158	173	93	80				43	20	23						
%	100	46	54				59	69	51	25	22	29	50	67	33	27	19	40
Total No.	1100	510	590	663	368	295				165	73	92						
%	100	46	54				60	72	50	25	20	31	56	72	44	24	21	29

/1 Participation rate= [Economically active / total in age range]\*100

/2 Unemployed = [Economically active - employed]

**Note:**

Economically active is defined as working or having looked for work over the last month, or stating a desire to work immediately. Unemployed includes all the economically active who were not working, but does not include the underemployed. We found a total of 17 people who were underemployed in the sense that they both worked under 36 hours a week and expressed a desire to work more hours.

**Source:** Community survey

72

TABLE 5.2 - ECONOMICALLY ACTIVE WOMEN BY AGE RANGE

Age:	Total			Choloma			Villanueva		
	Total in sample	E.A. No.	%	Pop.	E.A. No.	%	Pop.	E.A. No.	%
10-14	80	20	25	68	18	26	12	2	17
15-19	104	64	62	68	44	65	36	20	56
20-30	157	107	68	117	83	71	40	24	60
Over 30	244	104	42	179	70	39	70	34	49
TOTAL	510	295	58	364	215	59	100	80	55

This year, we also made a separate analysis of the labor force participation of women under 30, finding a rate of 65% in one sample as a whole - 69% in Choloma and 58% in Villanueva (this analysis was not done in 1992). These figures suggest that the projections we made last year for the under-31 female labor supply in the Sula Valley, on the assumption of participation rates of 50%, may have been a little conservative (Table 5.2 and PW 1992:Table 4.2B).

Rising female participation rates, combined with immigration (see below) continued to be sufficient to offset the rise in EPZ labor demand over the last year. The overall unemployment rate in Choloma among the population aged ten and over<sup>18</sup> in the 1993 community sample was 25%, compared with 23% in 1992 (Table 5.1). The female unemployment rate apparently rose in Choloma, to 32% (1992: 25%) and fell markedly in Villanueva, to 29% (1992: 40%).

The observation that female unemployment rates rose in Choloma, although female participation rates did not rise much there, while employment certainly did rise sharply, is obviously somewhat contradictory. Possible explanations include new migration to the zone or an increase in the proportion of workers who travel to work in Choloma, from homes outside the zone. Either of these factors might allow the female labor supply to grow ahead of demand, in spite of stable participation rates. But we already observed (table 3.9 above) that there was little apparent change in travel to work patterns among the EPZ workforce in 1992-1993. We return to the migration question in section c) below.

d) Projected EPZ labor supply-demand balance, 1992-1996 (Table 5.3)

In spite of the continued existence labor market slack in Choloma and Villanueva in 1993 identified in Table 5.2, the medium term prospect is for growing labor shortages. If we assume that women under 31 continue to make up 68% of the EPZ labor force, and that the EPZ employment growth rate of 40% observed in 1992-93 continues until the total projected employment of 83,000 for the Sula Valley is reached (which would be in four years time, at the end of 1996), this would suggest that total demand EPZ for female labor aged under 31 would reach 61,400 in 1996.

<sup>18</sup> The legal minimum working age in Honduras is 15, but in the rural economy it is normal to work from ten onwards, so that the employment statistics of the Honduran Dirección General de Estadísticos y Censos (DGEC) define the economically active population on the basis of those aged ten and above who express a desire to work. We have followed this procedure here, to provide for comparability; however, the reader should note that the unemployment rate is somewhat inflated as a result.

73

**TABLE 5.3 - PROJECTED SUPPLY AND EPZ DEMAND FOR FEMALE LABOR AGED UNDER 31 IN THE SULA VALLEY, 1992-1996 (Year end figures)**

Year	Supply/1 EPZ	demand/2 EPZ	demand as % of supply
1992	69,000	15,980	23
1993	72,300	22,370	31
1994	76,000	31,320	41
1995	79,800	43,850	55
1996	83,700	61,390	73

**Notes:**

/1 Assumes a 65% labor force participation rate for women aged under 31 and a total growth rate of 5% per year for this population segment.

/2 Assumes 40% a year total EPZ employment growth and a constant 68% share of total EPZ employment of women aged under 31.

**Source:** our calculations based on real EPZ employment levels and growth rates 1992-1993, on the employment structure in the 1993 Workforce Survey, on participation rates observed in the 1993 Community Survey, and on baseline population data taken from 1988 census.

We estimated the total supply of female labor aged 15-29 at 53,000 in 1992, assuming a participation rate of 50% (PW 1992:41). If the participation rate were 65% (as suggested in Table 5.2 above), the 1992 supply would have been 69,000. Since the male participation rate is only 72%, it is likely that the female participation rate will level off between 65% and 70%, so future labor force growth will depend on vegetative population increase plus immigration.

If we set the sum of these factors at the relatively high level of 5% a year, this would give a total supply of female labor aged under 30 of 64,400 in 1996. On these projections, the EPZ sector's absorption of this segment of the labor supply would rise from 32% in 1993 to 73% in 1995 (Table 5.3). This analysis confirms the conclusion of our 1992 study, to the effect that the EPZs in the Sula valley are likely to confront growing labor market tensions if the growth rates presently projected for the sector materialize, unless the age or sex structure of the workforce changes significantly.

**e) Migration and the EPZs (Tables 5.4 and 5.5)**

We have information on migratory history from both the community and workforce surveys (Tables 5.4 and 5.5). However, since the sample for the community survey is very similar to the sample taken in 1992, we would not expect to observe important differences in the migratory pattern recorded. Differences between the two years are more likely to be ascribable to improved data collection than to real changes. For this reason, we will concentrate our analysis on the workforce survey data (Table 5.5).<sup>19</sup>

<sup>19</sup> In fact, the 1993 survey data for the proportion of the Choloma community which had immigrated to the zone are rather different from those reported in 1992. This year, we found that only 24% of the population aged 5 and over in our community sample were immigrants to the zone (Table 5.4). Last year, we found that half the population were immigrants (PW 1992: Table 4.4). Obviously, one of the data sets is unreliable. We believe the

74

In 1992, we found that 20% of the 200 EPZ workers in our sample had moved to the zone especially to work in the EPZs. This year, we found the much higher proportion of 38% (Table 5.5). However, the main reason for this difference is that we picked up many more people this year who migrated within the Department of Cortés (15% of the total sample this year, against 3.5% last year). It is probable that this figure was under-reported in 1992. The proportion of the workforce which has migrated from outside Cortés is 23% in 1993, against 17% in 1992. This suggests that there is growing migration to the zone as a result of EPZ employment, but that local migration (especially from San Pedro Sula to Choloma and within Choloma itself) is the most important single population flow generated by the EPZ development so far.

f) Previous employment and earnings of EPZ workers, and motives for moving to the EPZs (Tables 5.6 - 5.9)

The 1993 data for the EPZ workforce show that 47% were unemployed before starting work in the EPZ: exactly the same proportion encountered in 1992 (Table 5.6 and PW 1992: Table 4.6). This is consistent with our finding, reported above, that there is still no clear evidence of labor market tension in the sector (in a tighter market one would expect a higher proportion to have been employed previously).

---

1993 data are better than those for 1992, due to improved survey design and improved interviewer training. The data for Villanueva do not show such a disparity: in 1993 we found 24% were immigrants, against 27% in 1992.

The historic pattern of immigration found in 1993 is similar in both communities to that observed in 1992. Around half the immigrants arrived in the last three years, and half came from within the Department of Cortés, with Santa Barbara supplying almost 20% in the case of Choloma.

TABLE 5.4 - MIGRATION IN VILLANUEVA AND CHOLOMA, 1993

	Choloma		(Individuals aged 5 and over)		Total	1992 %	
	No.	%	Villanueva No.	%		Chol.	V/N
Total population >5	985	100.0	375	100.0	1360	100	100
Non immigrants	734	74.5	216	57.6	950		
Immigrants - total	240	24.4	121	32.3	361	49	27
Time in the community:							
Under 1 year	66	27.5	32	26.4	98	9	4
1 - 3 years	72	30.0	24	19.8	96	13	7
4 to 5 years	19	7.9	14	11.6	33	3	2
6 to 10 years	40	16.7	24	19.8	64	15	5
over 10 years	43	17.9	24	19.8	67	9	9
no data	0		3	2.5	3		
TOTAL	240	100.0	121	100.0			
Where they came from:							
Atlántida	9	3.8	1	0.8	10	4	1
Colón	7	2.9	2	1.7	9	2	0
Comayagua	1	0.4	2	1.7	3	1	2
Copán	5	2.1	4	3.3	9	3	2
Cortés	121	50.4	60	49.6	181	64	65
Choluteca	0	0.0	1	0.8	1	2	0
El Paraíso	0	0.0	7	5.8	7	2	5
Francisco Morazán	18	7.5	2	1.7	20	0.5	0
Gracias a Dios	4	1.7	1	0.8	5	3	0
Intibucá	3	1.3	2	1.7	5	1	0
Islas de la Bahía	0	0.0	6	5.0	6	0.5	0
La Paz	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	2	0
Lempira	1	0.4	1	0.8	2	0.5	0
Ocotepeque	6	2.5	3	2.5	9	1	2
Olancho	4	1.7	0	0.0	4	4	1
Santa Bárbara	45	18.8	5	4.1	50	9	12
Valle	1	0.4	5	4.1	6	3	0
Yoro	10	4.2	9	7.4	19	2	0
México			1		1		0
No Data	5		9		14		
TOTAL	240	100.0	121	100.0	361	100.0	100

Source: Community survey

TABLE 5.5 - MIGRATION TO WORK IN EPZ

	1993		1992	
	No.	%	No.	%
Migrants	76	38	41	20
Non Migrants	124	62	139	80
Where they came from:				
Cortés	30	39.5	7	17
Santa Barbara	8	10.5	12	29
Yoro	8	10.5	4	10
Copan	4	5.3	5	12
Atlantida	6	7.9	3	7
Other	20	26.3	10	24
TOTAL	76	100.0	41	100

Source: Workforce survey

TABLE 5.6 PREVIOUS OCCUPATION OF EPZ WORKERS

	Women	Men	Total	Percent	1992
(A) Previously employed:	53	52	105	52.5	53.5
Domestic servant	12	0	12	6	8
Other ZIP /1	12	4	16	8	(1)
Other job /2	29	46	75	37.5	45.5
Not specified	0	2	2	1	(1)
(B) Previously not employed (total)	90	5	95	47.5	46.5
Housewife	36	0	36	18	20.5
Student	33	4	37	18.5	13
Unemployed	21	1	22	11.0	9.5
TOTAL	143	57	200	100.0	100.0

(1) Included in the previous figure

Source: Workforce survey

TABLE 5.7 - MOTIVES FOR DECIDING TO WORK IN EPZ, 1993

(Percentage who were previously employed who mentioned each motive)

	Women	Men	Total
Better salary	45	38	42
Better conditions	23	24	23
Closer to home	14	10	12
To be with friends	3	1	1.5
More job security	5	11	8
Other	10	16	13
	100	100	100

Source: Workforce survey

TABLE 5.8 - AVERAGE PREVIOUS EARNINGS BY PRESENT JOB, 1993

	Cases	Mean	SD	95% Conf. Interval:		%	Min	Max
				Low	High			
All EPZ workers	99	531.2	318.1	466.4	596	12	100	1800
Women	51	455.9	255.5	383.3	528.6	16	100	1071
Men	48	614.9	360.5	506.6	723.2	18	160	1800
Operators								
Women	32	417.8	206.9	343.3	492.5	18	100	857
Men	27	553.6	300	434.8	672.3	21	160	1800
Basic Labor (160 cases)								
Women	47	409.2	219.9	339.7	478.6	17	100	857
Men	36	602.9	326.7	492.4	713.4	18	160	1300
Intermediate labor (37)								
Women	7	603	318.6	308.3	897.7	49	250	1071
Men	8	707	509.3	281.3	1132.	60	257	1800
Management (3)								
Women	20	900	*	*	*	*	*	*
Men	1	309	*	*	*	*	*	*
For people who came from another EPZ:								
Women	12	568	220	420.4	716.8	26	133	1071
Men	4	1054	582	128	1980	88	544	1800

\*: Due to few cases, no information available

Source: Workforce survey

TABLE 5.9 - HOW WORKERS HEARD ABOUT EPZ JOB OPPORTUNITIES

% who mentioned:	Women	Men
Newspaper	8.5	3.5
Friend	65	60
Publicity leaflets	2	3.5
Other	24	35

Source: Workforce survey

An analysis of the 1993 data for the industrial origin of other EPZ employees who were previously elsewhere employed shows that 25% of them came from the state sector, 35% from industry and the rest from private sector services. As in 1992, some 20% of female EPZ workers (11% of all workers) who were previously employed came from domestic service jobs. We found that 16% of those previously employed came from another EPZ, which indicates that there is now considerable movement of workers within the sector. Among the workers who were previously unemployed, the reason universally given for beginning to work is the need for the income (data not tabulated). Among those who moved from other work, higher income is the

motive for 42%, followed by better conditions (23%), proximity to home (12%) and increased job security (8%) (Table 5.7).

We found that the average previous earnings of the EPZ workers who had been employed elsewhere before coming to the EPZ were L.531 (Table 5.8), which is well below present average earnings in the EPZs of L.743, reported in Chapter 3 above. If we exclude the workers who had transferred within the EPZ sector, average previous earnings fall to just over L.500 a month (data not tabulated). The "grapevine" of contacts with friends remains the major channel for recruitment of EPZ workers: some 60% of workers had heard of their job by this method, against 6% who had seen newspaper adverts (Table 5.9).

## CHAPTER 6 – FAMILY PLANNING AMONG EPZ WORKERS AND THEIR COMMUNITIES (Tables 6.1 – 6.7)

In the 1993 community sample, we found that 49 per cent of women of reproductive age (15 to 44) were sexually inactive and 47 per cent were sexually active (Table 5.1)<sup>20</sup>, compared with 42 per cent and 58 per cent, respectively, reported in 1992 (PW 1992:Table 5.1). In the 1993 workforce survey, 45 per cent were sexually inactive and 55 per cent were sexually active. This latter figure is higher than the 51 per cent reported last year, in spite of the generally younger age range of the workforce sample this year compared with last.

The 47 per cent of women who were sexually active in the community survey divided between 26 per cent who use some form of family planning, and 20 per cent (42.5 per cent of the set of sexually active women) who do not. In 1992, we found that a much higher proportion (65 per cent) of the sexually active in the community survey did not plan (PW, 1992:Table 5.1).

In the 1993 workforce survey, the 55 per cent who were sexually active are divided between 31.5 per cent who use some planning method and 23.5 per cent (43 per cent of the set of sexually active women) who use none (Table 6.1). The comparable 1992 figure for the proportion of the sexually active women in the workforce survey who did not plan was 47 per cent. This latter figure suggests that sexual health and family planning advice programs oriented to the EPZ workforce may be making some impact.

However, the figures for pregnancy rates in our 1993 survey are less encouraging. We found that 6.5 per cent of the women of childbearing age in the EPZ workforce were pregnant, against 4.6 per cent in the surrounding community (data not tabulated).<sup>21</sup> One possible explanation for the persistent high pregnancy rate among the EPZ workforce is the availability of very strong maternity rights under the Honduran labor code (including 14 weeks' paid maternity leave, regardless of whether a worker has IHSS cover). In addition, EPZ workers are more likely than non EPZ workers to have IHSS medical cover for maternity. These two factors would explain a positive statistical correlation between EPZ employment and pregnancy rates, in spite of growing knowledge about and use of family planning methods by the EPZ workforce. It is important to remember that women who plan may still become pregnant by choice.

Among the reasons given by sexually active women for not planning in the 1993 community survey (Table 6.2), the most frequent is fear for health (25%) followed by 20% with religious or moral objections (much higher than observed last year) and 15% who were pregnant (Table 6.2). No-one mentioned difficulty in getting contraception and only 4% said they had no knowledge of planning methods. These figures are somewhat different from those reported in 1992, when moral objections scarcely figured among the reasons for not planning. We believe the 1993 data are more reliable on this point, due to improvements in interviewer training. Also

---

<sup>20</sup> These figures do not add to 100%, due to missing cases.

<sup>21</sup> We did not report this data in 1992.

of interest is the fact that 13 per cent of the sexually active EPZ workers who do not plan (three per cent of the total workforce) are trying to get pregnant.

In 1993 as in 1992, we found that the best known family planning methods are the condom and the pill, followed by the coil (or IUD) and female sterilization, and that most used method is the pill, followed by the coil (Table 6.3). Among the planners in the community survey, most women get their contraceptives in the health center or pharmacy; among the EPZ workforce, the pharmacy is the main source, followed by ASHONPLAFA, workplace clinics, and the IHSS (Table 6.4).

In 1993, we found that 52% the EPZ workforce who plan said they took the decision themselves, while 11% said their partner decided and 37% said it was a joint decision. In the community, 31% decided themselves, and 66% said it was a joint decision (Table 6.5).

The proportion of workers in the EPZs who said in 1993 that they had received talks on family planning (44%) and had heard of sexually transmitted disease (93%) is almost identical to the figures reported in 1992. In the community, both figures are much higher than those reported last year (67% and 86%, versus 47% and 65%, respectively, last year) (Table 6.6).

Most women among both the community and workforce samples (around 50 per cent in each case) think that the ideal time to start a family is in their early twenties. However, once again, we observed the interesting phenomenon that older women think one should start younger, while younger women think one should start older or do not have any opinion (Table 6.7). In relation to the ideal family size, once again, we found that most women think that two or three children is the right number, and only 20% think that family of four or more is ideal (Table 6.7). This offers hope for lower fecundity in the EPZ areas as family planning techniques become more widely known and available.

**TABLE 6.1 - SEXUAL ACTIVITY AND FAMILY PLANNING IN THE CHOLOMA AND VILLANUEVA COMMUNITIES AND AMONG EPZ WORKERS**

	Choloma		Villanueva		Total		Workforce	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No./1	%
Total in sample /2	279	100.0	87	100.0	366	100.0	200	100
ages 15-19	69	24.7	31	35.6	100	27.3	83	42
20-29	11	3.9	36	41.4	47	12.8	103	52
30-44	101	36.2	36	41.4	137	37.4	14	7
Sexually inactive	135	48.4	43	49.4	178	48.6	90	45
ages 15-19	55	19.7	22	25.3	77	21.0	42	21
20-29	52	18.6	11	12.6	63	17.2	34	17
30-44	28	10.0	10	11.5	38	10.4	4	2
Sexually active who:	130	46.6	41	47.1	171	46.7	110	55
Plan (total)	73	26.2	21	24.1	94	25.7	63	32
ages 15-19	2	0.7	0	0.0	2	0.5	18	9
20-29	27	9.7	10	11.5	37	10.1	38	19
30-44	44	15.8	11	12.6	55	15.0	7	4
Don't plan (total)	54	19.4	20	23.0	74	20.2	47	24
ages 15-19	4	1.4	1	1.1	5	1.4	12	6
20-29	26	9.3	10	11.5	36	9.8	32	16
30-44	24	8.6	9	10.3	33	9.0	3	2

**Notes:**

/1 The workforce data include three 14 year olds who are included in the 15-19 range and are all sexually inactive.

/2 Column percentages do not add to 100 due to missing cases.

**Source:** Community and Workforce surveys

**TABLE 6.2 - REASONS FOR NOT PLANNING AMONG THE SEXUALLY ACTIVE**

Reasons:	Choloma		Villanueva		Total		Workforce	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Economic	1	1.6	0	0.0	1	1.2	1	2.3
Health	17	27.9	3	15.0	20	24.7	2	4.5
Religion/Moral	15	24.6	1	5.0	16	19.8	11	25.0
No knowledge	3	4.9	0	0.0	3	3.7	2	4.5
Can't get methods	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.5
Fear	0	0.0	3	15.0	3	3.7	3	6.8
Partner opposed	3	4.9	1	5.0	4	4.9	2	4.5
Careful	1	1.6	1	5.0	2	2.5	6	13.6
Pregnant	11	18.0	1	5.0	12	14.8	4	9.1
Want children							6	13.6
Other	10	16.4	10	50.0	20	24.7	5	11.4
Number of cases	61	100.0	20	100.0	81	100.0	44	100.0

**Source:** Community and Workforce surveys

82

TABLE 6.3 - FAMILY PLANNING METHODS KNOWN AND USED

	CHOLOMA		VILLANUEVA		TOTAL		WORKFORCE	
	Know	Use	Know	Use	Know	Use	Know	Use
Pill	58	14	54	9	56	12	73	8
Condom	67	1	57	0	62	1	78	6
IUD/coil	40	5	30	4	35	5	0	0
Female ster.	22	6	24	3	23	5	0	0
Male ster.	15	0	14	0	14	0	0	0
Injection	15	0	14	0	14	0	16	0
Foam	9	0	11	0	10	0	11	0
Rhythm	8	0	11	1	10	1	17	1
Retiring	5	0	9	0	7	0	12	2
Cases (100%)	281	281	103	103	384	384	200	200

Source: Community and Workforce surveys

TABLE 6.4 - WHERE USERS GET THEIR CONTRACEPTIVES

	Choloma		Villanueva		Workforce	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Private hospital					3	5
Private medic	4	3	4	10	2	3
IHSS Hospital	4	3	4	10	7	11
Hospital Min. of Health	5	4	0	0	1	2
ASHONPLAFAA	7	6	3	7	11	17
Health Center	15	12	4	10	5	8
Pharmacy	21	17	3	7	22	35
Clinic at work	3	2	2	5	9	14
Other	2	2	0	0	2	3
No data	10	8	0	0	1	2
CASES (100%)	127	100	42	100	63	100

Source: Community and Workforce surveys

TABLE 6.5 - WHO DECIDES TO PLAN

	Choloma	V/nueva	Total	Workforce
Herself	32	28	31	52
Partner	0	5	1	11
Jointly	66	67	66	37
Cases (100%)	127	42	169	63

Source: Community and Workforce surveys

83

TABLE 6.6 - PROPORTION WHO HAVE HAD TALKS ON REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH

	Choloma	V/nueva	Total	Workforce
Talks on family planning	65	74	67	44
Have heard of sexually transmitted diseases	85	92	86	93
CASES (100%)	281	103	384	200

Source: Community and Workforce surveys

TABLE 6.7 - WOMEN'S OPINIONS ON THE IDEAL AGE TO START A FAMILY AND IDEAL NUMBER OF CHILDREN

	Ideal age to start:							
	15-19		20-24		25+		No data	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Community sample 1993								
Age now:								
15-19	13	13	51	49	2	2	38	37
20-29	32	20	71	45	15	10	39	25
30-44	36	27	67	50	15	11	17	13
TOTAL 1993	81	20	189	48	32	8	94	24
(1992)		(23)		(39)		(10)		(29)
Workforce sample 1993								
Women	28	20	80	56	30	21	3	2
Men	11	19	29	51	17	30	0	0
(1992: Women)		(20)		(62)		(17)		(0.5)
(1992: Men)		(6)		(44)		(50)		
	Ideal number of children:							
	1	2	3	4	5	>5	Total	
Age now:								
15-19	2	37	15	5	2	0	43	104
20-29	5	49	40	19	3	2	39	157
30-44	2	22	46	28	6	8	23	135
	Percentages:							
15-19	2	36	14	5	2	0	41	100
20-29	3	31	25	12	2	1	25	100
30-44	1	16	34	21	4	6	17	100
Whole sample	3	28	27	14	3	3	22	100
(1992)	(3)	(19)	(28)	(14)	(3)	(4)	(29)	(100)

Source: Community and Workforce surveys

84

**A. EPZ EMPLOYMENT AND EARNINGS**

**Source:**

**1 Total employment, by municipality and EPZ**

FIDE  
(at March  
1993)

La Lima:		<u>2,025</u>
	ZIP Continental	2,025
Villanueva:		<u>3,452</u>
	ZIP Villanueva	1,475
	ZIP Búfalo	1,977
Choloma:		<u>16,865</u>
	INHDELVA	3,200
	ZIP Choloma	7,241
	Parque Galaxy	2,165
	CHIP	3,681
	ZIP San Miguel	<u>578</u>
<b>Total:</b>		<b>22,342</b>

**2 Employment structure in the EPZs**

Workforce  
survey

Men	28.5%	Women	71.5%
Under 31	95.5%		
Basic labor	80%		
Intermediate labor	18%		
Managerial labor	2%		

**3 Average monthly earnings of EPZ workers compared with averages in surrounding communities**

Workforce &  
Community  
surveys

	<u>EPZ</u>	<u>Av.Chol.</u>	<u>Av.V/nueva</u>
Total:	L.743	723	596
Men:	L.802	729	604
Women:	L.720	715	586

**4 Average household incomes for households with and without EPZ workers present**

ditto

With EPZ worker:	L.1,532
Without EPZ worker:	L.1,008

/continued

85

Source:

5 IHSS cover of EPZ workers (percentages)

Medical System of the Company	32%
Sickness and Maternity	15%
Handicapped, Elderly and Death	53%

Interviews  
with  
EPZ owners

**B. SOCIAL CONDITIONS IN EPZ AREAS**

1 Average household size  
Choloma: 5.7                      Villanueva: 4.8

Community  
survey

<u>2 Indicators of social needs</u>	Chol.V/nueva	
a. Population not living in individ.house/apartment	3%	11%
b. Households without:		
piped water	4%	10%
electricity	0%	13%
flushing toilet	45%	73%
connexion to sewer	55%	89%
c. Proportion of average total spending used for food	61%	60%

Community  
survey

/continued

96

Source:

3. Wealth indicators<sup>22</sup>

ditto

a. **Assets:**

% of households with:	Chol	V/N	EPZ	Non-EPZ
sewing machine	21	18	16	20
stove	65	53	49	53
push bike	44	29	37	33
fridge	29	27	24	25
TV	76	58	67	60
Radio	79	81	72	69

b. **Savings**

% of h/holds with any savings:	Chol	V/N
	8	7
Av. savings (L.) of h/holds with savings:	1,667	2,463

c. **Education**

% of popln aged 10 + with:	Chol	V/N
-No education	13	14
-Primary only	68	60
-Secondary	17	23
-Higher	1	2½

C. **LABOR MARKET INDICATORS**

1 Participation and unemployment rates

Community survey

	Chol	V/N
<u>Participation</u>		
Men	73	69
Women	50	51
<u>Unemployment</u>		
Men	19	25
Women	32	29

2 Migration

Proportion of EPZ workforce who migrated to work in EPZ: 38%

Workforce survey

3 Previous occupation of EPZ workers

Unemployed:	47.5%
Employed:	52.5%

Workforce survey

Both surveys

D. **FAMILY PLANNING INDICATORS**

	Chol	V/N	EPZ Workforce
Proportion of sexually active women who plan:	56%	51%	58%

<sup>22</sup> Chol = all households in Choloma sample; V/N = all in Villanueva sample; EPZ = all h/holds with an EPZ worker member; Non EPZ = all h/holds with no EPZ worker member

87

ANNEX I - THE DESIGNED SAMPLE FOR THE WORKFORCE SURVEY

EPZ	FIRM/ EMPT. NATIONALITY/ SAMPLE SIZE	PAYROLL NUMBERS:	SAMPLE ----- SUBSTITUTES
ZIP CHOLOMA	BESTFORM / 670 US / 19	432, 314, 249, 579, 415, 593,	
		591, 603, 618, 160, 552, 286, 494, 442,	
		198, 413, 191, 426, 294	
		643, 521, 138, 397, 258, 474, 114, 207	
PERRY / 100 US / 3		11, 27, 87	
		64, 45, 03	
INHDELVA	PROTEXSA / 500 HON / 14	475, 458, 184, 382, 267, 494,	
		346, 57, 189, 449, 181, 496, 349, 151	
		349, 270, 472, 440, 483, 17, 463	
EXPORTEX / 450 HON / 13		346, 367, 358, 370, 168, 70,	
		26, 138, 144, 107, 425, 240, 312	
		181, 222, 321, 369, 33, 01	
GOLDEN EAGLE / US / 7		250	197, 11, 143, 226, 223, 187,
			136
		217, 33, 243, 53	
CHIP	SUNNY / 750 AS / 22	705, 369, 284, 555, 706, 505,	
		244, 563, 110, 719, 590, 111, 367, 402,	
		650, 252, 68, 169, 80, 443, 24, 660	
		285, 469, 468, 520, 679, 610, 600, 669,	
		101, 225	
NOW / 658 AS / 19		131, 500, 702, 631, 504, 99,	
		525, 147, 302, 541, 263, 81, 506, 651, 123,	
		417, 267, 622, 378	
		423, 410, 113, 284, 112, 445, 632, 373, 647	

EPZ	FIRM/EMPT. NATIONALITY/ SAMPLE SIZE	PAYROLL NUMBERS: SAMPLE ----- SUBSTITUTES
CHIP	SP HONDURAS / 900	742, 680, 384, 49, 184, 266,
	AS / 26	693, 513, 462, 453, 295, 317, 522, 282, 545, 164, 221, 79, 191, 521, 83, 268, 149, 54, 163, 303
		-----
		771, 65, 435, 705, 108, 813, 553, 180, 207, 657
		-----
	WONGCHANG / 550	354, 523, 334, 497, 332, 154,
	AS / 16	220, 124, 121, 323, 472, 153, 548, 217, 499, 415
		-----
		293, 264, 454, 97, 393, 261, 487, 68
BUFALO	HYUP SUNG / 550	176, 14, 57, 296, 160, 290,
	AS / 16	263, 328, 364, 484, 345, 539, 182, 467, 96, 528
		-----
		338, 172, 243, 4, 478, 3, 285, 404
		-----
	KING STAR / 430	410, 297, 126, 254, 55, 246,
	AS / 12	214, 62, 358, 100, 332, 385
		-----
		24, 37, 189, 293, 413, 280
		-----
	M.FINE / 200	118, 70, 99, 63, 169, 103
	US / 6	-----
		149, 39, 139, 68, 18
		-----
	WONS HONDURAS /110	38, 91, 22
	US / 3	-----
		31, 3, 51
		-----
	STRONG PROGRESS/200	100, 172, 116, 151, 51, 174
	AS / 6	-----
		161, 118, 103, 85
VILLANUEVA	WRANGLER / 218	117, 180, 139, 152, 51, 126
	US / 6	-----
		134, 84, 132, 69, 157
GALAXY	COSMOS APPAREL/400	353, 196, 338, 254, 121, 89,
	AS / 12	193, 63, 357, 340, 254, 8
		-----
		90, 194, 266, 84, 303

**(A) SUBSTITUTES FOR US COMPANIES:**

1. MS MART	- ZIP CONTINENTAL	- 250 WORKERS
2. MAINTA	- INHDELVA	- 250 WORKERS
3. OFFSHORE	- SAN MIGUEL	- 140 WORKERS
4. GRAL. S.WEAR	- BUFALO	- 50 WORKERS
5. HANE.		
OS CHOL.	- ZIP CHOLOMA	- 1,200 WORKERS
6. US SHOE	- VILLANUEVA	- 167 WORKERS
7. BIG YANK	- ZIP CHOLOMA	- 270 WORKERS

**(B) SUBSTITUTES FOR ASIAN COMPANIES:**

1. MANUF. MAXIMA	- CHIP	- 200 WORKERS
2. AVENTO FASHION	- GALAXY	- 400 WORKERS
3. AURORA MIKWAY	- CONTINENTAL	- 450 WORKERS
4. MONTY	- Z.CHOLOMA	- 2,200 WORKERS
5. FENIX	- GALAXY	- 524 WORKERS
6. KILJIN	- INHDELVA	- 550 WORKERS
7. SEOLIM	- INHDELVA	- 750 WORKERS

**(C) SUBSTITUTES FOR HONDURAN COMPANIES:**

1. MAELCA	- ZIP CHOLOMA	- 160 WORKERS
2. CHOLTEX	- ZIP CHOLOMA	- 650 WORKERS
3. INVASA	- INHDELVA	- 250 WORKERS

**PROCEDURE FOR SUBSTITUTING A FIRM:**

1. IDENTIFY THE NATIONALITY AND EMPLOYMENT SIZE OF THE FIRM WHICH WE CANNOT GAIN ENTRY TO.
2. CHOSE THE FIRST FIRMS OF THE SAME NATIONALITY FROM THE RESERVE LIST, WHICH HAS A SIMILAR EMPLOYMENT LEVEL TO THE INACCESSIBLE FIRM. IF NO FIRM HAS A SIMILAR LEVEL, CHOSE MORE THAN ONE FIRM, TO MAKE UP THE SAME EMPLOYMENT LEVEL.
3. SELECT A SAMPLE OF THE SAME SIZE AS THAT GIVEN FOR THE NON-ACCESSIBLE FIRM, USING THE SAME PAYROLL NUMBERS GIVEN FOR THAT FIRM. IF YOU ARE USING MORE THAN ONE SUBSTITUTE FIRM, START THE PAYROLL NUMBERING FOR THE SECOND FIRM AT THE POINT REACHED BY THE NUMBERING FOR THE FIRST FIRM.

**PARA TRABAJADORES DE LOS ZIP**

NUMERO ENCUESTA \_\_\_\_\_ PARQUE INDUSTRIAL \_\_\_\_\_ / /

DIRECCION DEL ENTREVISTADO:  
Calle \_\_\_\_\_  
Barrio o colonia \_\_\_\_\_  
Municipio \_\_\_\_\_

NOMBRE DEL ENTREVISTADOR: \_\_\_\_\_  
FECHA: \_\_\_\_\_  
RESULTADO: \_\_\_\_\_  
Codigos 1 Entrevista completa 2 Incompleta  
3 Se rehusa 4 Otro \_\_\_\_\_

SUPERVISOR DE CAMPO \_\_\_\_\_

**1. DATOS BASICOS**

1.1 Sexo: M F

1.2 Edad: (Años completos) \_\_\_\_\_

1.3 Nacionalidad: \_\_\_\_\_

1.4 Estado civil:

1 Soltero/a      2 Divorciado/a      [IR A 1.6]  
3 Separado/a    4 Viudo/a                      [IR A 1.6]  
5 Casado/a      6 Unión libre                 [IR A 1.5]

1.5 ¿En este momento, su compañero vive en la misma casa con Ud.? SI NO

1.6 Número (vivos) de: \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_  
hijos \_\_\_\_\_ hijas \_\_\_\_\_

1.7 Número de sus propios hijos que actualmente viven en la misma casa con Usted: \_\_\_\_\_

1.8 Incluyendo sus hijos, ¿cuántas personas en total que viven en la misma casa con Usted son económicamente dependientes de Usted? \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_  
1. Menores de edad \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Adultos \_\_\_\_\_

1.9 ¿Son todos sus hijos del mismo padre /madre?   
SI NO  
[IR A 1.11]

1.10 ¿Cuántos diferentes padres/madres hay? \_\_\_\_\_

1.11 ¿Quién es jefe de su familia?

1. El entrevistado                      2. Su compañero/a  
3. Su padre                              4. Su madre  
5. Un hermano                         6. Una hermana  
7. Otra persona \_\_\_\_\_

1.12 En total, ¿cuántas personas viven en su hogar? \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_  
Adultos \_\_\_\_\_ Menores \_\_\_\_\_

2.2 ¿Asiste actualmente a un establecimiento de enseñanza? SI NO

2.3 ¿Cuál es el nivel más alto de estudio que cursa o cursó?; y ¿Cuál es el último año aprobado en ese nivel?  
1. Ninguno                      2. Pre-primaria                      3. Cent. Alfabet.  
4. Primaria                      5. Secundaria                      6. Técnico formal  
7. Superior no universitaria    8. Superior universitaria

PARA 4-8: ¿Ultimo año aprobado? \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_

2.4 ¿Qué educación técnica tiene Usted?

0. Ninguna                      1. Electrónica  
2. Soldadura                      3. Modista  
4. Belleza                      5. Fontañería  
6. Electricidad                      7. Cocinera  
8. Mecánica                      9. Otro: \_\_\_\_\_

**3. MERCADO DE TRABAJO**

3.1 ¿Cuál es su trabajo actual?

1. Operario                      2. Técnico/Mec.  
3. Secretaria/Otro admin.                      4. Supervisor/Instructor  
5. Contador                      6. Corte Confección  
7. Gerente                      8. Control de Calidad  
9. Empaque                      10. Otro \_\_\_\_\_

3.2 ¿Tiempo en su puesto de su trabajo actual? \_\_\_\_\_  
Años \_\_\_\_\_ meses \_\_\_\_\_

3.3 ¿Tiempo en ésta empresa? \_\_\_\_\_  
Años \_\_\_\_\_ meses \_\_\_\_\_

3.4 ¿Tiempo en éste Parque? \_\_\_\_\_  
Años \_\_\_\_\_ meses \_\_\_\_\_

3.5 Antes de venir al ZIP, ¿qué hacía?  
Trabajó:

1. Trabajadora doméstica  
2. Trabajó en otro ZIP ¿Cual? \_\_\_\_\_  
3. Otro oficio ¿Cual? \_\_\_\_\_  
(Use los codigos del guía)

4. Trabajo no bien definido \_\_\_\_\_

[IR A 3.7]

No trabajaba:

5. Ama de casa                      6. Estudiante  
7. Desempleado/a                      8. Otra razón \_\_\_\_\_

**2. EDUCACION DEL ENTREVISTADO**

2.1 ¿Usted sabe leer y escribir? SI NO

al

(Apunte hasta dos razones)

[IR A 3.9]

3.7 ¿Cuánto ganaba en su último trabajo antes de trabajar en el ZIP? L. \_\_\_\_ por \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_

¿Cuándo fue eso? \_\_\_\_ mes \_\_\_\_ Año / \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_

3.8 ¿Cuáles fueron sus motivos por trasladarse al ZIP? (Apunte hasta tres razones) / \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_

- 1. Mejor salario
- 2. Mejores condiciones
- 3. Más cerca de casa
- 4. Estar con amigos/os
- 5. Mayor seguridad de empleo
- 6. Otros \_\_\_\_\_

3.9 ¿Cómo supo del trabajo en el ZIP?

- 1. De los periódicos, radio o televisión / \_\_\_\_
- 2. De un amigo/a
- 3. De una hoja publicitaria del ZIP
- 4. Otro \_\_\_\_\_

3.10 ¿Usted se trasladó de casa especialmente para trabajar en el ZIP? / \_\_\_\_

SI NO

¿Dónde vivía antes?  
 Departamento: \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_  
 Municipio: \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_  
 ¿Cuándo se trasladó? \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_

3.11 ¿Cuánto tiempo le toma cada día para llegar a su centro de trabajo? / \_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ (Minutos)

3.12 ¿Qué medio de transporte usa para llegar a trabajar? / \_\_\_\_

- 1. Bus
- 2. Carro priv.
- 3. Taxi
- 4. Bicicleta
- 5. A pie
- 6. Tren
- 7. Otro \_\_\_\_\_

3.13 ¿Cuánto le cuesta diariamente, ida y vuelta? / \_\_\_\_

3.14 ¿Cuál es su jornada de trabajo? (Diario) No. de horas: \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_

¿Trabajó horas extra en la semana pasada? SI NO / \_\_\_\_

¿Cuántas? \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_

¿Su turno?: 1. Día 2. Mixto 3. Noche / \_\_\_\_

3.15 Dentro de su jornada de trabajo, ¿cuánto tiempo se le permite para: / \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_

- 1. Comer \_\_\_\_\_
- 2. Otros descansos \_\_\_\_\_

menores de 13 años? / \_\_\_\_  
 SI NO  
 [IR A 3.17] [IR A 4.1]

3.17 ¿Quién cuida sus hijos menores de 13 años cuando está trabajando? / \_\_\_\_

- 1. Compañero/a
- 2. Madre/Suegra
- 3. Se paga una niñera
- 4. Otro pariente
- 5. Guardería de la empresa
- 6. Guardería privada
- 6. Otro arreglo \_\_\_\_\_
- 7. No es necesario cuidarlos, porque: / \_\_\_\_
  - 1. Están en escuela o colegio \_\_\_\_\_
  - 2. Están trabajando \_\_\_\_\_
  - 3. Se saben cuidar \_\_\_\_\_
  - 4. Otro razón \_\_\_\_\_

4. INGRESOS Y GASTOS

4.1 ¿En qué base se le paga? / \_\_\_\_

- 1. Por día
- 2. Sueldo base diario más bonus
- 3. Semanal
- 4. Sueldo base semanal más bonus
- 5. Por mes
- 6. Por pieza/al destajo
- 7. Otro \_\_\_\_\_

¿Cuánto le pagan? \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_

4.2.1 ¿Cuánto ganó la semana pasada? L. \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_

2. ¿Cuántas horas trabajó en la semana pasada? \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_

4.3 ¿Usted personalmente tiene otras fuentes de ingreso aparte de su salario aquí? / \_\_\_\_

SI NO [IR A 4.4]

- ¿Cuáles son? (dar monto/mes):
- 1. Contribución de padre de hijos \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_
  - 2. Bonos del gobierno \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_
  - 3. Trabajo de hijos \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_
  - 4. Otros trabajos propios \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_
  - 5. Otros \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_

4.4 Aparte de Usted, ¿cuántas otras personas que viven en su hogar trabajan para ganar un ingreso? \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_

4.5 ¿Es Usted él que más contribuye a los gastos del hogar? / \_\_\_\_

SI NO

4.6 En una semana típica, ¿cómo gasta sus ingresos? (indicar monto aproximado en los siguientes rubros)

- 1. Comida \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_
- 2. Vivienda \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_
- 3. Transporte \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_
- 4. Educación \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_
- 5. Diversión \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_
- 6. Pagando deudas \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_
- 7. Ahorrando \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_

4.7 ¿Cuántos ahorros tiene actualmente? L. \_\_\_\_\_

4.8 ¿En qué forma tiene sus ahorros? (Indicar montos de cada tipo):

- 1. Billetes en efectivo \_\_\_\_\_
- 2. Cuenta bancaria \_\_\_\_\_
- 3. Ahorro y préstamos/cooperativa \_\_\_\_\_
- 4. Prestado a un amigo/familia \_\_\_\_\_
- 5. Otro \_\_\_\_\_

4.9 ¿Que es la cantidad de deudas que tiene Ud personalmente?

\_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_

### 5. SALUD, SERVICIOS MEDICOS, PLANIFICACION FAMILIAR Y Y RELACIONES COMUNITARIAS

5.1 ¿Está Usted inscrito en el IHSS? / \_\_\_\_\_

SI NO NO SABE

1. ¿Cuánto le cuesta por semana (mes)? / \_\_\_\_\_

5.2 ¿Hay servicio médico en su lugar de trabajo?

SI NO / \_\_\_\_\_

IR A 5.3

1. ¿Quién lo pone?

1. La empresa 2. El IHSS 3. No Sabe / \_\_\_\_\_

2. ¿Quién puede utilizar este servicio? / \_\_\_\_\_

1. Usted 2. Sus hijos 3. Su compañero

3. En los últimos 6 meses, ¿cuántas veces han utilizado el servicio médico:

- 1. Usted \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_
- 2. Su compañero/a \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_
- 3. Sus hijos \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_

4. ¿Qué opinión le merece el servicio? / \_\_\_\_\_

MB B R M MM

Dar razones por su respuesta:

(Nota hasta 2 razones) / \_\_\_\_\_

- 1. Buena atención 4. Falta de medicinas
- 2. Dan medicinas 5. Medicinas no sirven
- 3. Le curan 6. No hay especialistas
- 7. Otro \_\_\_\_\_

5. Usted considera que el servicio médico en su lugar de trabajo vale la pena considerando el costo de sus contribuciones al IHSS? / \_\_\_\_\_

SI NO NO SABE

¿médica, ¿para dónde van, y cuanto tiempo necesitan para llegar desde su casa?

Tiempo para llegar(en minutos):

- 1. Clínica privada \_\_\_\_\_
- 2. Medico privado \_\_\_\_\_
- 3. Centro de Salud \_\_\_\_\_
- 4. Hospital - IHSS \_\_\_\_\_
- 5. Hospital - MSP \_\_\_\_\_
- 6. Farmacia \_\_\_\_\_
- 6. Otro \_\_\_\_\_

/ \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_

5.4 En los últimos 6 meses, ¿cuántos días ha perdido de trabajo por enfermedad :

Días \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_

5.5 ¿Qué tipo de participación tiene Usted en las siguientes actividades en su comunidad? (para cada caso, señale Activo (a), Medio Activo (m) o No activo (n):

- 1. Deportes \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_
- 2. Partidos políticos \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_
- 3. Clubes sociales \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_
- 4. Patronato \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_
- 5. Iglesia/religión \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_
- 6. Sindicatos \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_
- 7. Grupos de mujeres \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_

### PLANIFICACION FAMILIAR

Introducir la materia: "Quisiera preguntarle algunas cosas sobre la planificación familiar" o algo semejante.

5.6 1. ¿Usted ha mantenido relaciones sexuales con algun(a) pareja durante el año pasado? / \_\_\_\_\_

SI NO [IR a 5.11]

2. ¿Utiliza Usted cualquier método de planificación familiar? / \_\_\_\_\_

SI NO [IR A 5.8]

5.7 1. ¿Por qué razones planifica? / \_\_\_\_\_

- 1. Económicas
- 2. De salud
- 3. Religión/moral
- 4. Otras razones \_\_\_\_\_

2. ¿Quién decide planificar? / \_\_\_\_\_

1. Usted 2. Su compañero 3. Ambos

[IR A 5.9]

93

(Apunte hasta tres razones)               

1. Económicas
2. De salud
3. Religión/moral
4. No conoce ningún método
5. No puede conseguir métodos
6. Está embarazada
7. Temor
8. Su pareja no lo permita
9. No hace falta si uno es cuidadosa
10. Otras razones \_\_\_\_\_

[IR A 5.10]

5.9 ¿Dónde consigue Usted su método de planificación familiar?     

1. Hospital/Clinica privado
2. Medico privado
3. Hospital del IHSS
4. Hospital Ministerio de Salud
5. ASHONPLAFA
6. Centro de salud
7. Partera
8. Farmacia
9. Pulperia
10. Clinica en su lugar de trabajo
11. Otro: \_\_\_\_\_
12. No sabe/ no recuerda

5.10 En este momento ¿Usted está embarazada?

SI NO     

5.11 Señale cuales de los siguientes métodos de planificación familiar Usted

(a) conoce (b) ha utilizado (c) está utilizando:

- |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Piladora/pastilla  | — | / | / |
| 2. Condones/preservativos   | — | — | / |
| 3. DIU (anillo, dispositivo)  | — | — | / |
| 4. Esterilización femenina  | — | — | / |
| 5. Esterilización masculina (Vasectomía)  | — | — | / |
| 6. Inyección  | — | — | / |
| 7. Espuma/crema/jalea/ovulos  | — | — | / |
| 8. Ritmo (donde no se mantienen relaciones durante el período fértil de la mujer) | — | — | / |
| 9. Retiro (donde el hombre toma mucho cuidado y se retira antes de eyacular)      | — | — | / |
| 10. Otros : _____   | — | — | / |

5.12 ¿Qué edad es la que Usted considera ideal para empezar a tener hijos?      años     

5.13 ¿Cuál es, para Usted, el número ideal de hijos?     

5.14 ¿Ha recibido pláticas de planificación familiar?

SI NO     

5.15 ¿Ha oído hablar de enfermedades de transmisión sexual?

SI NO     

---

5.16 ¿Cómo calificaría Ud el trato personal que recibe por parte de la empresa?

MB B R M MM  
(MB Muy bueno, B bueno, R regular, M Malo MM Muy Malo)

¿ Por qué?

5.17 ¿HAY ALGO QUE USTED QUIERE AGREGAR SOBRE SU EXPERIENCIA DE TRABAJO EN EL ZIP?

94

NUMERO DE REFERENCIA

Four empty boxes for the reference number.

BARRIO O COLONIA:

CASA, CALLE

CONTROL DEL TRABAJO

A. CODIGOS RESULTADO:

- 1 = Realizada
2 = Rechazada
3 = Viv. desocupada
4 = Viv. no localizada
5 = Incompleta: cita para continuación:

B. PERSONAL PARTICIPANTE:

- Entrevistador:
Supervisor de Campo:
Codificador:

C: CONTROL DE VISITAS:

- No. Fecha Hora Res.
1.
2.
3.
4.

I DATOS DE LA VIVIENDA Y CARACTERISTICAS DEL HOGAR

Esta sección se llena por observación del entrevistador y por discusión con el jefe del hogar

1. CANTIDAD DE FAMILIAS EN LA VIVIENDA

2. TIPO DE VIVIENDA

- 1. Casa o apartamento independiente
2. Rancho
3. Cuarto en mesón o cuartería
4. Barracón
5. Casa improvisada
6. Local no destinado a habitación pero usado como vivienda

3. MATERIAL PREDOMINANTE EN LAS PAREDES

- 1. Ladrillo, piedra o bloque
2. Adobe
3. Madera
4. Bahareque, vara o caña
5. Deshechos
6. Otro

4. SERVICIO DE AGUA

- 1. ¿De donde proviene el agua que utiliza?
1. Tubería - servicio público
2. Tubería colectivo o privado
3. Pozo malacate o con bomba
4. Río, reachuelo, manantial, etc.
5. Vendedores ambulantes
6. Otro
2. ¿Como la obtiene?
1. Dentro de la vivienda
2. Fuera de la vivienda y dentro de la propiedad
3. Fuera de la propiedad

5. ELECTRICIDAD y COMBUSTIBLES

- 5.1 ¿Qué tipo de electricidad tiene?
1. Suministro ENEE
2. Planta privada colectiva
3. Planta privada individual
4. No tiene
5.2 ¿Qué combustible utilizan para cocinar?
1. Electricidad
2. Gas líquido (kerosena)
3. Gas volátil (LPG)
4. Leña
5. Otro
6. No cocinan

6. SERVICIO SANITARIO

- a. ¿Qué tipo de servicio sanitario tiene?
1. Inodoro 2. Letrina 3. No tiene (Pase a 7)
b. ¿A qué está conectado?
4. Tubería 5. Tanque séptico 6. Pozo negro
c. ¿Es de uso individual o colectivo?
7. Individual 8. Colectivo

7. CALIDAD DE SERVICIOS PUBLICOS

- Opinión sobre la calidad de los servicios públicos que existen en su casa, calle, o barrio y sobre las prioridades para mejorar.
COND/1 PRIOR/2
1. Agua de llave
2. Alcantarillado
3. Aguas negras
4. Alumbrado públ.
5. Luz eléctrica
6. Teléfono
7. Pavimentación
8. Recoln basura
9. Centro Salud
10. Clín. plan. fam.
11. Guard. infantil
12. Primaria

/1 Evaluar calidad: MB, B, R, M, MM o NH
/2 Señalar los cuatro prioritarios para establecer o mejorar, del 1 al 4

8. SALUD Y SEGURO SOCIAL

- 1. No. de miembros del hogar con derechos de usar los servicios médicos del IHSS:

Adultos: Hijos/Hijas

- 2. Cuánto Usted y su familia necesitan ayuda médica, a dónde van, y cuánto tiempo necesitan para llegar desde su casa?

- Tiempo para llegar (mins):
1. Clínica privada
2. Médico privado
3. Centro de Salud
4. Hospital IHSS en ZIP
5. Clínica IHSS en ZIP

- 6. Hospital del MSP
7. Farmacia
8. OTRO

9. TENENCIA DE LA VIVIENDA

- ¿En qué caracter ocupan esta vivienda?
1. Propietario y esta pagada totalmente
2. Propietario y la está pagando
3. Alquilada
4. Cedida sin pago
Si es 2 o 3, ¿Que es el pago mensual?

10. CUARTOS DE LA VIVIENDA

- 1. ¿Cuántos cuartos tiene la vivienda? (inc. la cocina pero no el baño)
2. De ellos, ¿cuántos son del uso exclusivo de ésta familia?
3. De ellos, ¿cuántos cuartos utilizan exclusivamente para dormir?
4. ¿Cuántos otros cuartos también se usan para dormir?

11. ARTEFACTOS DEL HOGAR

- ¿Cuáles de los siguientes posee la familia:
1. Radio
2. Plancha electr.
3. Televisor B/N
4. Tele a color
5. Teléfono
6. Equipo de sonido
7. Bicicleta
9. Estufa
10. Lavadora
11. Refrigeradora
12. Calent. ducha
13. Vehículo
14. Motocicleta
15. Máquina coser

12. GASTOS DE LA FAMILIA

- En un mes típico, cuanto gastan Ustedes en las siguientes cosas?
Lempiras
1. Comida
2. Vivienda
3. Ropa
4. Luz, agua, teléf.
5. Transporte
6. Educación
7. Diversión
8. Pagando deudas

Handwritten initials 'AS' in the bottom right corner.

9. Ahorrando \_\_\_\_\_  
**13. AHORROS DEL HOGAR**

1. Cuántos ahorros tiene el hogar actualmente en total? L \_\_\_\_\_

2. En qué forma ahorran?  
 (Señalar cantidad de cada tipo)

- 1. Billetes efectivo \_\_\_\_\_
- 2. Cuenta bancaria \_\_\_\_\_
- 3. Ahorro y prestamos (coop) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4. Prestado a amigo/familiar \_\_\_\_\_
- 5. Otro: \_\_\_\_\_

**14. INTEGRACION COMUNITARIA Y ACTITUDES HACIA ZIP Y SERVICIOS PUBLICOS**

1. Qué tipo de participación tiene Usted u otros miembros de su familia en las siguientes actividades en su comunidad?

- a) Deportes \_\_\_\_\_
- b) Partidos políticos \_\_\_\_\_

- c) Clubes sociales \_\_\_\_\_
- d) Patronato \_\_\_\_\_
- e) Iglesia/religión \_\_\_\_\_
- f) Sindicatos \_\_\_\_\_
- g) Grupos de mujeres \_\_\_\_\_

MA (Muy Activo), ME (Medio activo) NA (No activo)

2.1 En términos generales, ¿piensa usted que el impacto de los ZIP sobre su comunidad ha sido:

- MUY BUENO? BUENO? \_\_\_\_\_
- REGULAR? MALO? MUY MALO? \_\_\_\_\_

¿Por qué? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

2.2 Para cada uno de los siguientes factores, señale si la situación en su comunidad está MEJOR, PEOR o IGUAL desde la llegada de los ZIP:

- 1. Empleo \_\_\_\_\_
- 2. Criminalidad \_\_\_\_\_
- 3. Alcohismo \_\_\_\_\_
- 4. Prostitución \_\_\_\_\_
- 5. Contaminación \_\_\_\_\_
- 6. Otros: \_\_\_\_\_

¿Por qué? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

**II COMPOSICION DEL HOGAR (usa letra de molde para llenar)**

TOTAL DE PERSONAS QUE VIVEN EN LA CASA \_\_\_\_\_

NOMBRES DE LAS PERSONAS

RELACION CON EL JEFE

SEXO

EDAD

ESTADO CIVIL

Anote aquí los nombres y apellidos de las personas que residen habitualmente en este hogar, en el siguiente orden:

Anote la relación con el jefe de cada miembro del hogar

M o F

A ñ o s  
 totales  
 (menor a  
 uno = 0)

ACTUAL  
 C=Casado  
 UL=Union Lib  
 D=Divorciado  
 V=Viudo  
 S=Soltero  
 M=Menor

- 1. jefe/a del hogar
- 2. su conyuge (sean o no casados)
- 3. hijos y hijas solteros, del mayor al menor
- 4. hijos y hijas casados y sus esposos, del mayor al menor
- 5. nietos
- 6. padras
- 7. suegros, hermanos, tíos, cuñados etc
- 8. trabajadora domestica con dormida adentro
- 9. otras personas no miembros de la familia.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

(Continue si hay más)..

Continúe con 22) FIN)

SI NO [RA 34]

/ /

2. ¿Cuanto tiempo hace que labora o laboró en su último trabajo, negocio propio o finca?

\_\_\_\_ años \_\_\_\_ meses) / /

3. ¿Cuál es o era la clase de trabajo que realiza actualmente o realizó en su ocupación principal?

\_\_\_\_ / /

PARA LOS QUE TIENEN TRABAJO AHORA:

4. ¿Nombre de la empresa, negocio o finca donde realiza su ocupación principal:

\_\_\_\_\_

5. ¿Dónde se ubica? Municipio: \_\_\_\_\_

Dirección: \_\_\_\_\_

¿Está en un parque industrial? SI NO / /  
Cuando la respuesta es SI: ¿Cual? \_\_\_\_\_

26. ¿Qué produce o a que se dedica la empresa?  
\_\_\_\_\_ / /

27. ¿Cuánto tiempo le toma cada día para llegar a trabajar?  
(Mins) \_\_\_\_\_

28. ¿Qué medio de transporte usa para llegar a trabajar?  
1. Bus 2. Carro privado 3. Taxi / /  
4. Bicicleta 5. A pie 6. Tren  
7. Otro: \_\_\_\_\_

29. ¿Cuánto le cuesta diariamente, ida y vuelta? L. \_\_\_\_\_ / /

30. En el mes pasado ¿Cuánto fue su ingreso por sueldo, salario o jornal?  
Ocupación principal | | | | | | / /  
Otras ocupaciones | | | | | |  
TOTAL | | | | | |

31. En los últimos 6 meses ¿Cuánto fue su ingreso promedio mensual por ganancia o beneficios como cuenta propia o como patron en su negocio o finca?  
Ocupación principal | | | | | | / /  
Otras ocupaciones | | | | | |  
TOTAL | | | | | |

(FIN)

PARA MUJERES ENTRE 15 Y 45 AÑOS

32. ¿Usted actualmente mantiene relaciones sexuales con algun pareja? SI NO [RA 37]

33. a) ¿Por qué razones planifica?  
1. Económicas 2. De salud 3. Religion/moral / /  
4. Otras razones \_\_\_\_\_

b) ¿Quién decide planificar?  
1. Usted 2. Su compañero/a 3. Ambas personas / /

[RA 35]

34. ¿Por qué razones no planifica?  
(Apunte hasta 3 razones) / / / /  
1. Económicas  
2. De salud  
3. Religion/moral  
4. No conoce ningún método  
5. No pueda conseguir métodos  
6. Está embarazada  
7. Temor  
8. Su pareja no lo permita  
9. No hace falta si uno es cuidadosa  
10. Otras razones \_\_\_\_\_ / /

[RA 36]

35. ¿Dónde consigue Usted su método de planificación familiar?  
1. Hospital/Clinica privado  
2. Medico privado  
3. Hospital del IHSS  
4. Hospital Ministerio de Salud  
5. ASHONPLAFA  
6. Centro de Salud  
7. Partera  
8. Farmacia  
9. Pulperia  
10. Clínica en su lugar de trabajo  
11. Otro: \_\_\_\_\_ / / / /  
12. No sabe/ no recuerda

36. En este momento ¿Usted está embarazada?  
SI NO / /

37. Señale cuales de los siguientes métodos de planificación familiar Usted (a) conoce (b) ha utilizado (c) está utilizando:  
1. Píldora/pastilla / /  
2. Condones/preservativos / /  
3. DIU (anillo, dispositivo) / /  
4. Esterilización: femenina / /  
5. Esterilización masculina (Vasectomía) / /  
6. Inyección / /  
7. Espuma/crema/jales/ovulos / /  
8. Ritmo (donde no se mantienen relaciones durante el periodo fértil de la mujer) / /  
9. Retiro (donde el hombre toma mucho cuidado y se retira antes de eyacular) / /  
10. Otros: \_\_\_\_\_ / /

38. ¿Qué edad es la que Usted considera ideal para empezar a tener hijos? \_\_\_\_ años / /

39. ¿Cuál es, para Usted, el número ideal de hijos? \_\_\_\_ / /

40. ¿Ha recibido pláticas de planificación familiar?  
SI NO / /

41. ¿Ha oído hablar de enfermedades de transmisión sexual?

Continúe con 22) FIN)

SI NO [RA 34]

/

¿Cuánto tiempo hace que labora o laboró en su último trabajo, negocio propio o finca?

años meses

¿Cuál es o era la clase de trabajo que realiza actualmente o realizó en su ocupación principal?

PARA LOS QUE TIENEN TRABAJO AHORA:

4. ¿Nombre de la empresa, negocio o finca donde realiza su ocupación principal:

5. ¿Dónde se ubica? Municipio:

Dirección:

¿Está en un parque industrial? SI NO Cuando la respuesta es SI: ¿Cuál?

6. ¿Qué produce o a que se dedica la empresa?

27. ¿Cuánto tiempo le toma cada día para llegar a trabajar?

(Mins)

28. ¿Qué medio de transporte usa para llegar a trabajar?

- 1. Bus 2. Carro privado 3. Taxi 4. Bicicleta 5. A pie 6. Tren 7. Otro:

29. ¿Cuánto le cuesta diariamente, ida y vuelta? L

30. En el mes pasado ¿Cuánto fue su ingreso por sueldo, salario o jornal?

Table with 3 rows: Ocupación principal, Otras ocupaciones, TOTAL. Columns for monetary values.

31. En los últimos 6 meses ¿Cuánto fue su ingreso promedio mensual por ganancia o beneficios como cuenta propia o como patron en su negocio o finca?

Table with 3 rows: Ocupación principal, Otras ocupaciones, TOTAL. Columns for monetary values.

(FIN)

PARA MUJERES ENTRE 15 Y 45 AÑOS

32. ¿Usted actualmente mantiene relaciones sexuales con algun pareja? SI NO [RA 37]

33. a) ¿Por qué razones planifica? 1. Económicas 2. De salud 3. Religion/moral 4. Otras razones

b) ¿Quién decide planificar? 1. Usted 2. Su compañero/a 3. Ambas personas

[RA 35]

34. ¿Por qué razones no planifica? (Apunte hasta 3 razones)

- 1. Económicas 2. De salud 3. Religion/moral 4. No conoce ningún método 5. No puede conseguir métodos 6. Está embarazada 7. Temor 8. Su pareja no lo permita 9. No hace falta si uno es cuidadosa 10. Otras razones

[RA 36]

35. ¿Dónde consigue Usted su método de planificación familiar?

- 1. Hospital/Clinica privado 2. Medico privado 3. Hospital del IHSS 4. Hospital Ministerio de Salud 5. ASHONPLAFA 6. Centro de Salud 7. Partera 8. Farmacia 9. Pulperia 10. Clínica en su lugar de trabajo 11. Otro: 12. No sabe/ no recuerda

36. En este momento ¿Usted está embarazada? SI NO

37. Señale cuales de los siguientes métodos de planificación familiar Usted (a) conoce (b) ha utilizado (c) está utilizando:

- 1. Píldora/pastilla 2. Condones/preservativos 3. DIU (anillo, dispositivo) 4. Esterilización: femenina 5. Esterilización masculina (Vasectomía) 6. Inyección 7. Espuma/croma/jalea/ovulos 8. Ritmo (donde no se mantienen relaciones durante el periodo fértil de la mujer) 9. Retiro (donde el hombre toma mucho cuidado y se retira antes de eyacular) 10. Otros:

38. ¿Qué edad es la que Usted considera ideal para empezar a tener hijos? años

39. ¿Cuál es, para Usted, el número ideal de hijos?

40. ¿Ha recibido pláticas de planificación familiar? SI NO

41. ¿Ha oído hablar de enfermedades de transmisión sexual?

## AGE AND SEX STRUCTURE OF SAMPLE POPULATION IN COMMUNITY SURVEY

Age:	CHOLOMA						VILLANUEVA						TOTAL					
	Number			Percent			Number			Percent			Number			Percent		
	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total
			Row %	Row %	Col %				Row %	Row %	Col %				Row %	Row %	Col %	
< 5	82	66	149	55	44	13	44	27	72	61	38	16	126	93	221	57	42	14
5- 14	152	171	323	47	53	28	60	46	106	57	43	24	212	217	429	49	51	27
15- 19	70	68	138	51	49	12	23	36	59	39	61	13	93	104	197	47	53	12
20- 29	80	117	197	41	59	17	31	40	71	44	56	16	111	157	268	41	59	17
30- 44	76	101	177	43	57	16	40	34	74	54	46	17	116	135	251	46	54	16
45- 49	44	42	86	51	49	8	22	21	43	51	49	10	66	63	129	51	49	8
60+	28	36	64	44	56	6	7	15	22	32	68	5	35	51	86	41	59	5
	532	601	1134	47	53	100	227	219	447	51	49	100	759	820	1581	48	52	100

There are two cases where the sex of the child was not know by the informant, both children were underfives, one case in each community.