#### Introduction

Increasingly, discussion of the appropriateness and effectiveness of methods to limit population growth have focussed on those measures which go beyond family planning to emphasize the need for adoption of policies "expressly related to family roles and opportunities for legitimate alternative satisfactions and activities" (1). Proponents of such measures argue that they offer greater promise of reduction in family size because they directly assault the motivational framework of reproduction. Among the means suggested for limiting reproduction within marriage as well as postponing marriage is modification of the complementarity of the roles of men and women (3). Of particular interest in this regard is the nature of the relation between female labor force participation and fertility.

In contrast to the generally well established negative relationship between female employment and fertility in the industrialized world (See, for example, 16, 17), research focussing on less developed countries points to no such uniform pattern (See, for example, 5, 10, 11, 13, 17). There is increasing evidence to suggest, however, that the greater the incompatibility between the role of mother and worker, the greater is the differential fertility behavior of workers and women not in the labor force (12, 19). Also, it may not be labor force participation per se, but rather a series of other variables associated with labor force participation, such as later age at marriage and longer periods of schooling, which affect fertility levels (20).

If the degree of incompatibility between the roles of mother and worker affects the extent of difference in fertility level between working and non-working women, one would expect such fertility differentials among rural women to be less than those of urban women; participation in farm work as well as the greater availability of parental surrogates would lead to less role conflict among working women in rural places in contrast to the situation in urban places where the likelihood of work in the modern sectors of the economy, the greater separation of work and residence, and the absence of parental surrogates are all probably greater (6).

The analysis of fertility differentials in Thailand provides some opportunity to test the relationship between fertility and labor force participation of women in a developing country. Like many such countries, Thailand has had a high growth rate, over three percent, due largely to continuation of fertility levels exceeding 40 per 1,000 (2, 15, 18), while mortality declined sharply (14). The country remains highly rural in character: three-fourths of its population live in households engaged in agriculture, and over four-fifths of the economically active population 11 years of age and older work on farms. Yet, urbanization in Thailand is assuming increasing importance (9). The 1970 level of urbanization (14.7 percent) was still low, but the urban growth rate is high, averaging about 5 percent a year. Particularly

noteworthy has been the very rapid population increase in Greater Bangkok, which grew from only 0.8 million persons in 1947 to 2.9 million by 1970. Containing over half of all of Thailand's urban population, Greater Bangkok accounted for almost two-thirds of all urban population growth in the country. Yet, urban development has also begun to permeate all regions of Thailand and has become an important factor in the complex process of national, social, and economic development. The existence of differential patterns of urban and rural female labor force participation suggests the desirability of assessing the extent to which such differentials are, in turn, associated with differential patterns of fertility.

# <u>The Data</u>

Just recently special tabulations based on a 1 percent sample tape of the 1960 Thai census became available; they provide one of the first opportunities for a comprehensive assessment of fertility differentials in Thailand. The data, based on a question on children ever born to ever married women, permit controls for age of mother, urban-rural residence, and agricultural household status,<sup>1</sup> and make possible the evaluation of the relation between labor force participation and fertility in Thailand. Furthermore, a comparative analysis for both the urban and the rural segments of the population provides the opportunity to explore further, although indirectly, the relation between fertility and the compatibility of the roles of mother and worker. (For discussion of the limitations of the data from the 1 percent tape for fertility analysis, see 8.)

### Urban-Rural Differentials in Fertility, Labor Force Participation, and Occupation

As in many countries of the world, urban-rural residence in Thailand is related to fertility level. For the kingdom as a whole, the average number of children ever born per 1,000 ever married women was reported as 4,261 in 1960. But the fertility level varied from a high of 4,461 for the rural, agricultural population to a low of 3,375 for those living in Bangkok. Bangkok's level, about 25 percent below that of the most rural part of Thailand, corroborates the significant impact of the urban residence on fertility levels. But it also emphasizes that the still predominantly rural character of Thailand and the high rural fertility account for the high fertility level characterizing the country as a whole.

Thailand's rural character also accounts for the exceptionally high proportion of its adult female population in the labor force (4). In 1960, 78 percent of all adult females and over 85 percent of those between ages 20 and 50 were labor force participants (Table 1). The high proportion of women in the labor force results largely from the inclusion of unpaid family workers, particularly those engaged in agriculture. For Thailand as a whole, 82 percent of all females in the labor force were unpaid family workers. Compared to 87 percent of the rural, agricultural women aged 11 and over who were in the labor force, only one-third of those in Bangkok were reported as working. Moreover, 97 percent of all working women living in rural, agricultural households worked on farms, compared to only 2.4 percent of those in metropolitan Bangkok. As would be expected, the female urban labor force is characterized by considerable variation in occupational composition with onethird employed as sales workers, one quarter as skilled laborers, and almost one-fifth as service workers (Table 2). These differential patterns of labor force participation by urbanrural residence emphasize the desirability of ascertaining the pattern of fertility differentials characterizing the labor force participants and non-participants as well as the impact which urban-rural residence and type of occupation have on fertility.

### Labor Force Participation and Fertility

For the kingdom as a whole, the fertility level of women who were in the labor force in 1960, as shown in Table 3, was 15 percent higher than that of women classified as housewives, and 10 percent higher when standardized. Thus, for Thailand as a whole, participation of women in the labor force as measured by "current" activity patterns is not associated with lower fertility. To the contrary, these particular data suggest that factors associated with labor force participation may be conducive to higher average fertility. This pattern of differentials runs counter to that noted for the developed world, as well as for many developing countries.

But the age specific data suggest that the relation between labor force participation and fertility may operate differentially for the various age segments of the population, favoring lower fertility among labor force participants compared to housewives under age 30, and higher fertility for the labor force participants aged 30 and over, with the degree of difference between the economically active women and the housewives tending to increase with increasing age. This pattern suggests that among those in the early and peak ages of childbearing, participation in the labor force is more incompatible with fertility than it is among older women, especially those who have completed their childbearing.

The higher fertility levels of older employed women compared to the housewives may reflect several situations: 1) Higher cumulative fertility may force women to work in order to meet the greater consumption needs of the larger household size. 2) The availability in the household of older children who are able to care for the younger children may permit a higher degree of labor force participation by these mothers (19). 3) For women aged 45 and over, the end of childbearing may facilitate labor force participation.

The higher fertility characterizing the economically active women in the kingdom as a whole does not extend uniformly to all residence categories, but shows a clear-cut pattern in relation to urban-rural status. For both the labor force participants and the housewives in the rural, agricultural category, fertility exceeds that of comparable groups in all other urbanrural categories, but the differential between labor force participants and housewives within the rural, agricultural category is very small for both the unstandardized and standardized levels.

Yet within the rural population there are some age differentials following the same pattern as noted earlier for the kingdom as a whole. Because the rural, agricultural category of employed women includes such a large proportion of unpaid family workers, participation in the labor force and continued maintenance of the role of mother are not strongly incompatible. This may well account for the relatively low level of fertility differentials characterizing the economically active and the housewife group.

For all other rural-urban categories, the age standardized fertility levels of the economically active women were below those of the housewives, but the differential was noteworthy only for Bangkok where the fertility of housewives was over 10 percent below that of economically active women. Moreover, with the exception of two age groups (35-39 and 50 and over) whose levels were almost identical, every age group in Bangkok was characterized by lower fertility for economically active women than for housewives.

That the fertility level of housewives in Bangkok is higher than that of labor force participants in all ages under 35 and in several age groups above 35 indicates that in the urban environment higher fertility does not in itself serve as a stimulus for increased participation of women in the labor force in order to increase family income. The close similarity for the 50 and over age category in the fertility levels of the economically active women and the housewives may well be due to the inclusion of a wide range of older age groups in this category, including many older women who because their children are no longer living at home are more easily able to participate in the labor force. In the more homogeneous 40-49 age group the fertility level of housewives was considerably above that of economically active women. This suggests that high fertility in the urban environment may require women to spend more time at home with their children. In part this may reflect the absence of parental surrogates in the urban environment. In part it may be indicative of a greater ability in urban places to rely upon the income of husbands and other members of the family. It may also reflect less opportunities in the metropolitan area for women to work due to the excessive rate of population growth.

Most likely, however, the pattern of fertility differentials in Bangkok is associated with the different nature of the work experience of economically active women and the fact that employment more often involves separation of work and family roles (Cf., for example, patterns noted for Latin American cities and Puerto Rico, 5, 19).

The fact that the direction of differentials between economically active women and housewives at the two extremes of the urban-rural category are opposite suggests that labor force participation operates quite differently in a highly urban and a highly rural environment, having little, if any, overall effect on fertility in the latter and considerable effect in the former. This is further suggested by the occupational differentials which exist (Table 4). For the kingdom as a whole, women engaged in farming have by far the highest fertility, 4,503 per 1,000 ever married women, standardized for age; and women farmers in the rural, agricultural category have the highest levels of all residence-occupation groups. Overall, the data on occupational differentials reenforce the conclusion that women engaged in agricultural activities tend to have a higher number of children while those not in agriculture have lower levels of fertility, although the pattern of differentials was not altogether consistent for the specific non-agricultural categories.

Overall, this comparison of the fertility levels of employed women and housewives as well as women in specific occupations in Bangkok with those of women in corresponding categories in other urban and rural groups shows that, with minor exceptions, fertility in Bangkok is considerably lower. This lends support to the conclusion that the impact of urban and rural residence on fertility operates independent of the labor force status of the female population. Other factors, such as differentials in literacy or education associated with urban living or the selection of migrants to urban places, result in urban women having lower fertility.

As part of a larger study (7), the relation between education, as measured by both literacy and number of school years completed, and fertility has also been assessed. This showed that both literacy and educational achievement affect fertility. The number of children ever born is lower for literate women in both rural and urban residence categories. The influence of literacy is greater, however, in the highly urban environment of Bangkok, where sharp differentials characterize the total group as well as all age segments. In part, this may reflect the higher level of educational achievement of the literate urban population. This interpretation is supported by the fertility differentials by educational level. Regardless of residence category, education is inversely related to fertility level. For older women, the sharper differential obtains between those with no schooling and those with primary schooling; for younger women achievement of more than a primary education seems to have the greatest effect on fertility levels. Overall, education plays a key role as an instrument of fertility reduction. Moreover, the analysis suggests that the lower fertility characterizing the metropolitan center probably reflects the combined effects of higher educational levels and higher rates of female labor force participation.

In sum, the joint analysis of the impact of labor force participation and education on fertility lends support to the view that adoption of policies expressly related to family roles and opportunities for legitimate alternative satisfactions and activities holds promise of reduction in family size. To the extent that significant labor force, education, and urbanrural differentials exist, even in a country with high overall levels of fertility, policies directed at fostering high rates of educational enrollment of women, greater participation in the non-agricultural labor force, and greater exposure to the urban way of life should be considered as part of any program designed to achieve reductions in fertility.

## FOOTNOTES

\*This research was initiated while the author served, under sponsorship of the Population Council, as Demographic Advisor to the Institute of Population Studies at Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok. The full cooperation of the Institute's staff and of the National Statistical Office in making unpublished data available is gratefully acknowledged. The research upon which this manuscript is based was performed pursuant to Contract No. NIH-70-2190 with the National Institutes of Health, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

1. Using both residence in 1960 and householdtype data as a joint means of approximating an urban rural "continuum", five categories of urban-rural status have been established: at the most urban level are those living in the metropolis of Bangkok in non-agricultural households. Three intermediary categories consist of (a) all other urban residents living in non-agricultural households; (b) all urban residents in agricultural households; (c) all rural residents in nonagricultural households. At the most rural extreme are all rural, agricultural households. The relative positions of categories (b) and (c) are somewhat arbitrary; had household type rather than residence been used as primary classification variable, the order would have been reversed.

## REFERENCES

- (1) Blake, Judith, "Demographic Science and the Redirection of Population Policy," <u>Journal</u> <u>of Chronic Diseases</u>, 18 (1965), 1200.
- (2) Caldwell, J. C., "The Demographic Structure," in T. H. Silcock, <u>Thailand: Social</u> <u>and Economic Studies in Development</u>, Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1967, 27-64.
- (3) Davis, Kingsley, "Population Policy: Will Current Programs Succeed?" <u>Science</u>, 158 (November, 1967), 730-739.
- (4) Debavalya, Nibhon, "Labor Force Composition of Thailand," <u>Journal of Social Sciences</u>, 8 (January, 1971), 143-157.
  (5) Gendell, Murray, "The Influence of Family
- (5) Gendell, Murray, "The Influence of Family Building Activity on Woman's Rate of Economic Activity," <u>World Population Conference, 1965</u>, Vol. IV, New York: United Nations, 1967, 285.
- (6) Gendell, Murray, Maria Nydia Maraviglia, and Philip C. Kreitner, "Fertility and Economic Activity of Women in Guatemala City, 1964," <u>Demography</u>, 7 (August, 1970), 273-286.
- (7) Goldstein, Sidney, "The Influence of Labor Force Participation and Education on Fertility in Thailand," <u>Population Studies</u>,

- 26 (November, 1972), forthcoming.
  (8) Goldstein, Sidney, "Religious Fertility Differentials in Thailand 1960," <u>Population</u> <u>Studies</u>, 24 (November, 1970), 327-328.
- , "Urbanization in Thai-(9) land, 1947-1960," Demography, 8 (May, 1971), 205-223.
- (10) Heer, David, and Elsa S. Turner, "Areal Differences in Latin American Fertility," Population Studies, 18 (March, 1965), 279-292.
- (11) Jaffe, A. J., People, Jobs, and Economic Development, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1959.
- (12) Jaffe, A. J., and K. Azumi, "The Birth Rate and Cottage Industries in Underdeveloped Countries," Economic Development and Cultural Change, 9 (October, 1960), 52-63.
- (13) Miro, Carmen A., and F. Rath, "Preliminary Findings of Comparative Fertility Surveys in Three Latin American Countries," Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly, 42, No. 2, Part 2 (April, 1965), 36-62.
- (14) National Statistical Office, The Survey of Population Change, 1964-1966, Bangkok:

National Statistical Office, 1969, 9.

- (15) Perkin, Gordon W., et al., Country Profiles: Thailand, New York: The Population Council, May, 1969.
- (16) Ridley, Jeanne Clare, "Women's Changing Status," in Fogarty International Center Proceedings No. 3. The Family in Transition: A Round Table Conference, 1969, Bethesda: National Institutes of Health, 1971.
- (17) Stycos, J. Mayone, and Robert H. Weller, "Female Working Roles and Fertility," Demography, 4 (1967), 210-217.
- (18) Thomlinson, Ralph, Thailand's Population, Bangkok: June, 1971.
- (19) Weller, Robert H., "The Employment of Wives, Role Incompatibility, and Fertility," Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly, 46, (October, 1968), 507-526.
- (20) Weller, Robert H., and James M. Sakoda, "A Longitudinal Study of Female Employment and Fertility in Puerto Rico: 1940-1960." Paper presented at annual meeting of the Eastern Sociological Society, New York April, 1971.

Table 1. PERCENT OF FEMALES IN THE LABOR FORCE, BY AGE AND URBAN-RURAL RESIDENCE, 1960

Age	Bangkok	Other Urban, Non-Agric.	Urban, Agric.	Rural, Non-Agric.	Rural, Agric.	Total Kingdom
11 - 12	8.9	5.0	15.0	21.9	42.6	36.4
13 - 19	28.8	33.3	48.3	62.5	88.7	80.2
20 - 24	42.1	51.2	70.3	63.1	97.0	87.5
25 - 29	40.8	46.2	75.2	61.7	96.6	85.8
30 - 34	41.4	50.3	80.2	61.7	96.4	86.6
35 - 39	48.3	49.8	63.1	64.4	96.7	87.1
40 - 44	43.5	61.7	71.2	63.8	97.0	88.3
45 - 49	33.8	64.2	74.7	67.5	96.2	87.9
50 and over	24.9	38.1	53.5	43 <b>.3</b>	70.2	62.8
Total	34.2	42.7	60.0	56.8	86.8	77.9
Total standardized for age	34.0	42.6	60.3	56.8	86.8	77.9

Table 2. OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALES BY URBAN-RURAL RESIDENCE, 1960 (Standardized for Age)

Occupation	Bangkok	Other Urban, Non-Agric.	Urban, Agric.	Rural, Non-Agric.	Rural, Agric.	Total Kingdom
Professional and						
administrative workers	6.7	7.1	5.4	2.0	0.2	0.9
Clerical workers	5.3	1.2	1.6	0.2	*	0.2
Sales workers	34.8	53.3	14.6	29.6	1.2	6.0
Farmers and miners	2.4	7.0	65.1	42.5	97.2	87.4
Service and transport						
workers	18.2	12.9	5.0	5.4	0.2	1.5
Craft workers	27.8	15.7	6.8	17.9	1.0	3.6
Unclassified and new						
workers	4.8	2.7	1.3	2.3	0.1	0.4
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total number	1,363	1,550	685	6,180	54,843	64,621

\*Less than 0.1 percent.

Age	In the Labor Force	Housewife	In the Labor Force	Housewife	
	Bang	kok	Rural, Non-Ag	ricultural	
13 - 19	*	964	464	569	
20 - 24	1.488	1.641	1.417	1.662	
25 - 29	2,371	2,605	2,611	2,768	
30 - 34	3,127	3,657	3,731	4,012	
35 - 39	4.347	4.331	4,929	5.059	
40 - 44	4,602	5,140	5,411	5,854	
45 - 49	4,093	4 406	5,415	5,172	
50 and over	3,688	3,658	5,027	5,373	
Total	3.374	3,407	3,794	3.733	
Total standardized for ag	e 3,256	3,675	3,957	4,179	
Ot	her Urban, N	on-Agricultural	<u>Rural, Agricultural</u>		
13 - 19	450	667	478	667	
20 - 24	1,430	1.583	1.347	1.345	
25 - 29	2.761	2.873	2,675	2.824	
30 - 34	3.820	3.778	4,140	4.420	
35 - 39	4.752	4.597	5.415	5,296	
40 - 44	4.830	5.736	6,199	5,608	
45 - 49	5.246	4.828	6.360	5,176	
50 and over	4,507	4,531	6,148	5,922	
Total	3,956	3,575	4,336	4,204	
Total standardized for ag	e 3,775	3,853	4,508	4,349	
	<u>Urban, Agri</u>	<u>cultural</u>	<u>Total K</u>	ingdom	
13 - 19	571	*	478	688	
20 - 24	1,500	1,900	1,359	1,598	
25 - 29	2,358	2,741	2,661	2,760	
30 - 34	3,592	4,625	4,076	3,987	
35 - 39	4,784	4,560	5,315	4,862	
40 - 44	5,544	5,667	6,044	5,616	
45 - 49	5,789	5,400	6,187	4,895	
50 and over	5,441	4,964	5,948	5,058	
Total	4,183	4,176	4,253	3,742	
Total standardized for age	e 4.038	4,121	4,406	4.022	

Table 3. NUMBER OF CHILDREN EVER BORN PER 1,000 EVER MARRIED WOMEN BY AGE, LABOR FORCE STATUS, AND URBAN-RURAL RESIDENCE, 1960

\*Less than 10 women.

Table 4.	NUMBER	OF	CHILDREN	EVER	BORN	PER	1,000	) EVER	. MAE	RIED	WOMEN	I BY	OCCU	PA ]	CION,	BY
U	RBAN-RUR	AL	RESIDENCE	E (STA	ANDARI	DIZED	FOR	AGE)	AND	FOR	TOTAL	KINC	GDOM	BY	AGE,	1960

Bangkok $2,659$ $2,834$ $2,416$ $2,881$ $3,720$ Other Urban, Non-Agricultural $3,978$ $3,072$ $3,081$ $3,823$ $3,988$ Urban, Agricultural $4,125$ $2,231$ $2,182$ $3,276$ $4,131$ Rural, Non-Agricultural $4,055$ $3,922$ $3,423$ $4,114$ $3,919$ Rural, Agricultural $4,527$ $3,598$ $3,939$ $3,735$ $3,780$ Total Kingdom13 - 19 $477$ $542$ ** $511$ $20 - 24$ $1,365$ $1,163$ $974$ $1,338$ $1,496$ $25 - 29$ $2,683$ $2,419$ $2,188$ $2,375$ $2,704$ $30 - 34$ $4,129$ $3,535$ $3,591$ $3,705$ $3,714$ $35 - 39$ $5,404$ $4,767$ $3,671$ $4,243$ $5,073$ $40 - 44$ $6,196$ $4,830$ $4,087$ $4,672$ $5,211$ $45 - 49$ $6,356$ $4,831$ $4,727$ $4,983$ $5,298$ $50$ and over $6,126$ $4,559$ $5,162$ $4,549$ $4,698$ Total $4,315$ $3,460$ $3,322$ $3,580$ $4,143$ Total standardized for age $4,503$ $3,627$ $3,508$ $3,592$ $3,887$		Farmers and Miners	Craft Workers	Professional and Admin- istrative Workers	Service and Transport Workers	Sales Workers
Other Urban, Non-Agricultural       3,978       3,072       3,081       3,823       3,988         Urban, Agricultural       4,125       2,231       2,182       3,276       4,131         Rural, Non-Agricultural       4,055       3,922       3,423       4,114       3,919         Rural, Agricultural       4,527       3,598       3,939       3,735       3,780         Total Kingdom         13 - 19       477       542       *       *       511         20 - 24       1,365       1,163       974       1,338       1,496         25 - 29       2,683       2,419       2,188       2,375       2,704         30 - 34       4,129       3,535       3,591       3,705       3,714         35 - 39       5,404       4,767       3,671       4,243       5,073         40 - 44       6,196       4,830       4,087       4,672       5,211         45 - 49       6,356       4,831       4,727       4,983       5,298         50 and over       6,126       4,559       5,162       4,549       4,698         Total       4,315       3,460       3,322       3,580       4,143	Bangkok	2,659	2,834	2,416	2,881	3,720
Urban, Agricultural4,1252,2312,1823,2764,131Rural, Non-Agricultural4,0553,9223,4234,1143,919Rural, Agricultural4,5273,5983,9393,7353,780Total Kingdom13 - 19477542**\$51120 - 241,3651,1639741,3381,49625 - 292,6832,4192,1882,3752,70430 - 344,1293,5353,5913,7053,71435 - 395,4044,7673,6714,2435,07340 - 446,1964,8304,0874,6725,21145 - 496,3564,8314,7274,9835,29850 and over6,1264,5595,1624,5494,698Total4,3153,4603,3223,5804,143Total standardized for age4,5033,6273,5083,5923,887	Other Urban, Non-Agricultural	3,978	3,072	3,081	3,823	3,988
Rural, Non-Agricultural $4,055$ $3,922$ $3,423$ $4,114$ $3,919$ Rural, Agricultural $4,527$ $3,598$ $3,939$ $3,735$ $3,780$ Total Kingdom13 - 19 $477$ $542$ **\$51120 - 241,3651,163 $974$ 1,3381,49625 - 292,6832,4192,1882,3752,70430 - 344,1293,5353,5913,7053,71435 - 395,4044,7673,6714,2435,07340 - 446,1964,8304,0874,6725,21145 - 496,3564,8314,7274,9835,29850 and over6,1264,5595,1624,5494,698Total4,3153,4603,3223,5804,143Total standardized for age4,5033,6273,5083,5923,887	Urban, Agricultural	4,125	2,231	2,182	3,276	4,131
Rural, Agricultural $4,527$ $3,598$ $3,939$ $3,735$ $3,780$ Total Kingdom13 - 19 $477$ $542$ ** $511$ 20 - 241,3651,163 $974$ 1,3381,49625 - 292,6832,4192,1882,3752,70430 - 344,1293,5353,5913,7053,71435 - 395,4044,7673,6714,2435,07340 - 446,1964,8304,0874,6725,21145 - 496,3564,8314,7274,9835,29850 and over6,1264,5595,1624,5494,698Total4,3153,4603,3223,5804,143Total standardized for age4,5033,6273,5083,5923,887	Rural, Non-Agricultural	4,055	3,922	3,423	4,114	3,919
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Rural, Agricultural	4,527	3,598	3,939	3,735	3,780
13 - 19 $477$ $542$ **511 $20 - 24$ $1,365$ $1,163$ $974$ $1,338$ $1,496$ $25 - 29$ $2,683$ $2,419$ $2,188$ $2,375$ $2,704$ $30 - 34$ $4,129$ $3,535$ $3,591$ $3,705$ $3,714$ $35 - 39$ $5,404$ $4,767$ $3,671$ $4,243$ $5,073$ $40 - 44$ $6,196$ $4,830$ $4,087$ $4,672$ $5,211$ $45 - 49$ $6,356$ $4,831$ $4,727$ $4,983$ $5,298$ $50$ and over $6,126$ $4,559$ $5,162$ $4,549$ $4,698$ Total $4,315$ $3,460$ $3,322$ $3,580$ $4,143$ Total standardized for age $4,503$ $3,627$ $3,508$ $3,592$ $3,887$		<u>Total</u>	Kingdom			
20 - 241,3651,1639741,3381,496 $25 - 29$ 2,6832,4192,1882,3752,704 $30 - 34$ 4,1293,5353,5913,7053,714 $35 - 39$ 5,4044,7673,6714,2435,073 $40 - 44$ 6,1964,8304,0874,6725,211 $45 - 49$ 6,3564,8314,7274,9835,298 $50$ and over6,1264,5595,1624,5494,698Total4,3153,4603,3223,5804,143Total standardized for age4,5033,6273,5083,5923,887	13 - 19	477	542	*	· *	511
25 - 29 $2,683$ $2,419$ $2,188$ $2,375$ $2,704$ $30 - 34$ $4,129$ $3,535$ $3,591$ $3,705$ $3,714$ $35 - 39$ $5,404$ $4,767$ $3,671$ $4,243$ $5,073$ $40 - 44$ $6,196$ $4,830$ $4,087$ $4,672$ $5,211$ $45 - 49$ $6,356$ $4,831$ $4,727$ $4,983$ $5,298$ $50$ and over $6,126$ $4,559$ $5,162$ $4,549$ $4,698$ Total $4,315$ $3,460$ $3,322$ $3,580$ $4,143$ Total standardized for age $4,503$ $3,627$ $3,508$ $3,592$ $3,887$	20 - 24	1,365	1,163	974	1,338	1,496
30 - 34 $4,129$ $3,535$ $3,591$ $3,705$ $3,714$ $35 - 39$ $5,404$ $4,767$ $3,671$ $4,243$ $5,073$ $40 - 44$ $6,196$ $4,830$ $4,087$ $4,672$ $5,211$ $45 - 49$ $6,356$ $4,831$ $4,727$ $4,983$ $5,298$ $50$ and over $6,126$ $4,559$ $5,162$ $4,549$ $4,698$ Total $4,315$ $3,460$ $3,322$ $3,580$ $4,143$ Total standardized for age $4,503$ $3,627$ $3,508$ $3,592$ $3,887$	25 - 29	2,683	2,419	2,188	2,375	2,704
35 - 395,4044,7673,6714,2435,07340 - 446,1964,8304,0874,6725,21145 - 496,3564,8314,7274,9835,29850 and over6,1264,5595,1624,5494,698Total4,3153,4603,3223,5804,143Total standardized for age4,5033,6273,5083,5923,887	30 - 34	4,129	3,535	3,591	3,705	3,714
40 - 446,1964,8304,0874,6725,21145 - 496,3564,8314,7274,9835,29850 and over6,1264,5595,1624,5494,698Total4,3153,4603,3223,5804,143Total standardized for age4,5033,6273,5083,5923,887	35 - 39	5,404	4,767	3,671	4,243	5,073
45 - 496,3564,8314,7274,9835,29850 and over6,1264,5595,1624,5494,698Total4,3153,4603,3223,5804,143Total standardized for age4,5033,6273,5083,5923,887	40 - 44	6,196	4,830	4,087	4,672	5,211
50 and over6,1264,5595,1624,5494,698Total4,3153,4603,3223,5804,143Total standardized for age4,5033,6273,5083,5923,887	45 - 49	6,356	4,831	4,727	4,983	5,298
Total4,3153,4603,3223,5804,143Total standardized for age4,5033,6273,5083,5923,887	50 and over	6,126	4,559	5,162	4,549	4,698
Total standardized for age 4,503 3,627 3,508 3,592 3,887	Total	4,315	3,460	3,322	3,580	4,143
	Total standardized for age	4,503	3,627	3,508	3,592	3,887

\*Less than 10 women.