



Journal Homepage: - [www.journalijar.com](http://www.journalijar.com)  
**INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF  
ADVANCED RESEARCH (IJAR)**

Article DOI: 10.21474/IJAR01/23179  
DOI URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/23179>



**RESEARCH ARTICLE**

**EMPLOYMENT SHOCK, LABOUR-MARKET INEQUALITY, AND PUBLIC HEALTH  
AFTER COVID-19: A GLOBAL SECONDARY POLICY ANALYSIS, 2020–2024**

Dvir Levin

**Manuscript Info**

**Manuscript History**

Received: 4 February 2026  
Final Accepted: 8 March 2026  
Published: April 2026

**Key words:-**

global labour market; COVID-19;  
unemployment; jobs gap; gender  
inequality; informality; public health;  
social determinants of health

**Abstract**

**Background:** Employment is a central social determinant of health, yet post-pandemic labour-market recovery has often been narrated in aggregate economic terms that obscure continuing deficits in access to decent work, income security, and inclusive participation.

**Methods:** This article uses a secondary policy-analysis design based on official International Labour Organization (ILO), United Nations (UN), and World Health Organization (WHO) publications issued between 2021 and 2025. It synthesizes key global indicators on unemployment, jobs gaps, pandemic-related working-hour losses, labour-income decline, youth unemployment, real wages, informality, and gender gaps, and interprets them through a public-health lens.

**Results:** The global unemployment rate rose to 6.5% in 2020, while 8.8% of working hours were lost, equivalent to 255 million full-time jobs, and global labour income fell by 8.3%. Recovery followed, but remained incomplete in welfare terms: the unemployment rate was still 5.8% in 2022 and 5.1% in 2023, while the global jobs gap stood at 473 million people in 2022 and about 402 million in 2024. Gender inequality remained marked: in 2024, 46.4% of working-age women were employed compared with 69.5% of men. Official ILO updates also indicate that informality remained extensive, at roughly 2.0 billion workers in 2024.

**Conclusion:** The evidence supports a cautious interpretation of labour-market recovery. The post-COVID period brought lower unemployment but not a full restoration of equitable labour-market participation, job quality, income security, or health-protective working conditions. For health-oriented journals, labour-market resilience should therefore be evaluated together with underutilization, informality, gender inequality, and the broader social determinants of health.

"© 2026 by the Author(s). Published by IJAR under CC BY 4.0. Unrestricted use allowed with credit to the author."

**Introduction:-**

Employment conditions influence income security, housing stability, food security, stress exposure, and the capacity to obtain timely healthcare. For that reason, employment is not merely an economic category; it is a public-health variable. WHO continues to define the social determinants of health as the conditions in which people are born,

grow, work, live, and age, and recent WHO reporting on health equity has reaffirmed that work quality, income security, and social protection remain among the most powerful non-medical drivers of unequal health outcomes. Unemployment, in its standard labour-market sense, refers to the condition in which individuals who are actively seeking work and available to work are unable to find employment. Yet for health analysis, unemployment alone is too narrow. People may remain outside adequate employment through discouragement, care burdens, informal work, or underemployment without being counted as unemployed. The broader idea of labour underutilization is therefore more informative when the goal is to understand material insecurity and health risk.

Gender inequality is similarly more than a demographic descriptor. In labour markets it refers to unequal access to paid work, lower-quality jobs, lower wages, weaker social protection, and the unequal distribution of unpaid care responsibilities. These mechanisms matter for health because they shape household resources, stress exposure, autonomy, and long-term life chances. The global labour-market shock generated by COVID-19 was unprecedented in speed and scale. Yet the key analytical question in 2024–2025 is no longer whether a collapse occurred, but whether recovery has been sufficiently inclusive to restore health-protective employment conditions. A narrow reading focused only on the unemployment rate suggests a strong rebound. A broader reading that considers working-hour losses, labour-force exits, jobs gaps, youth unemployment, gender inequality, informality, and wage trends yields a more guarded interpretation. This article therefore reframes the labour-market recovery question for a health and medicine audience. Rather than asking whether aggregate unemployment has fallen, it asks whether the post-pandemic labour market has recovered in a way that meaningfully reduces exposure to financial insecurity, precarious work, social exclusion, and health-relevant inequality. The central argument is that global recovery has been real but incomplete: headline unemployment improved, while underutilization, informality, and unequal access to decent work remained substantial.

### Materials and Methods:-

This study uses a secondary policy-analysis design based on aggregated global indicators and narrative synthesis rather than individual-level microdata. The empirical backbone is drawn from ILO flagship reports and updates published between 2021 and 2025, complemented by United Nations Sustainable Development Goal reporting and WHO publications on social determinants of health and workers' health. The article focuses on a selected set of globally comparable indicators that are especially relevant to public-health interpretation: the unemployment rate; the jobs gap; pandemic-related working-hour losses; labour-income decline; youth unemployment; wage recovery; informality; and sex differences in employment rates. These indicators were chosen because they allow the analysis to move beyond narrow unemployment statistics toward a broader account of labour-market access, household vulnerability, and structural inequality.

The design is descriptive and interpretive rather than econometric. It does not attempt causal identification of specific health outcomes. Its purpose is instead to integrate official labour-market evidence with a public-health framework and to assess whether global labour-market recovery after COVID-19 can reasonably be described as inclusive, equitable, and health-protective. A further methodological choice concerns scale. This article prioritizes global comparability over regional detail. That choice is useful for identifying worldwide patterns, but it also means that the analysis may understate regional divergence. To address this limitation, the revised discussion now distinguishes more explicitly between aggregate recovery and uneven distribution across groups and settings. No human participants were recruited and no identifiable data were used; ethical approval was therefore not required.

### Key global indicators used in the analysis

Year	Unemployment rate (%)	Jobs gap / other labour deficit	Additional inequality signal	Interpretive note
2020	6.5	255 million full-time-job equivalent working-hour losses; labour income -8.3%	33 million additional unemployed; 81 million exited the labour force	Acute pandemic collapse
2021	6.2	Recovery began, but unemployment remained above pre-	Labour-force scarring remained evident	Partial rebound

		pandemic levels		
2022	5.8	Jobs gap: 473 million; jobs-gap rate: 12.3%	Recovery remained incomplete beyond official unemployment	Persistent underutilization
Real wages / informality	Reflect purchasing power and job quality, not only job possession	Shape food, housing, healthcare affordability, and insecurity	Support wage adequacy, formalization, and inflation-sensitive protection	Broad recovery, unequal gains
2024	5.0	Jobs gap: about 402 million; real wage growth: 2.7%; informal employment around 2.0 billion workers	Women employed: 46.4%; men: 69.5%	Lower unemployment, unresolved inequity




Figure 1. Global unemployment rate, 2020–2024. Based on ILO / UN official global estimates.




Figure 2. Global jobs gap, 2022 versus 2024. Based on ILO official estimates.




Figure 3. Global employment rate by sex, 2024. Based on ILO official estimates.

**Results:-**

**The acute global employment shock of 2020:-**

The labour-market collapse in 2020 was far broader than conventional unemployment statistics alone suggest. Global unemployment rose to 6.5%, 33 million more people became unemployed, and another 81 million left the

labour force altogether. At the same time, 8.8% of total working hours were lost compared with the pre-pandemic baseline, equivalent to 255 million full-time jobs. These employment losses translated into an 8.3% decline in global labour income before support measures. In public-health terms, this represented not only job destruction but a major deterioration in income security, access to necessities, and protection from stress-related harm.

**Recovery occurred, but labour underutilization remained large:-**

Recovery after 2020 was substantial but uneven. The global unemployment rate declined to 6.2% in 2021, 5.8% in 2022, 5.1% in 2023, and 5.0% in 2024. If unemployment is viewed in isolation, this pattern may appear to reflect near-normalization. However, broader underutilization indicators show that the system remained under strain. In 2022, the global jobs gap still amounted to 473 million people and the jobs-gap rate stood at 12.3%, far above the unemployment rate itself. Even by 2024, the jobs gap remained about 402 million people, indicating that hundreds of millions worldwide still wanted work but were either unavailable, discouraged, or otherwise excluded from standard unemployment counts.

**Youth and gender inequalities remained structural rather than marginal:-**

The post-pandemic recovery did not affect all groups equally. Global youth unemployment stood at 13.0% in 2023, representing 64.9 million unemployed young people, and the improvement was uneven across regions. Gender disparities remained especially persistent. In 2024, 46.4% of working-age women were employed compared with 69.5% of men. The persistence of this gap suggests that the labour-market recovery did not remove the barriers created by unpaid care responsibilities, occupational segmentation, weaker access to formal employment, and unequal labour-market attachment.

**Wage recovery improved, but did not erase insecurity:-**

The global wage picture improved after the inflation shock of 2022. According to the ILO, global real wage growth returned to positive territory in 2023 and preliminary data indicated global real wage growth of 2.7% in 2024. This matters directly for food security, housing affordability, and the ability to absorb health shocks. However, positive wage growth does not eliminate the broader problem of unequal job quality, informality, or weak employment access in lower-income settings. Recovery in average wage indicators can therefore coexist with continuing insecurity at household level.

**Global aggregates improved, but structural fragility remained visible:-**

A more critical reading of the global evidence shows why aggregate recovery should not be overstated. ILO updates indicate that informal employment remained extremely large in 2024, at approximately 2.0 billion workers. This means that falling unemployment was accompanied by continued exposure to weaker labour protections and unstable income in much of the world economy. In addition, official global averages conceal meaningful regional divergence, with stronger labour-market performance in some settings and weaker hiring or job-quality conditions in others. From a policy-analysis perspective, these patterns support a conclusion of recovery with unresolved structural vulnerability rather than full labour-market normalization.

**Discussion:-**

The evidence supports a core conclusion: post-pandemic labour-market recovery should not be described only in terms of falling unemployment. From a public-health standpoint, the more relevant question is whether people regained stable, adequate, and equitable access to work that supports material security and reduces exposure to chronic stress. On that criterion, the recovery remained incomplete. The global jobs gap illustrates why this broader view matters. Even after the unemployment rate fell, hundreds of millions of people still faced unmet demand for employment. This distinction is important for health researchers because unemployment counts alone understate the population exposed to precarious economic conditions. Discouraged workers, individuals unable to search actively because of care burdens, and people trapped in inadequate or informal work may still face many of the same health consequences as those officially counted as unemployed.

The gender findings reinforce this point. Employment rates among women remained far below those of men even after the worst phase of the pandemic passed. The likely mechanisms are familiar: unpaid care work, weaker access to secure jobs, occupational segmentation, and structural inequality in labour markets. These are not peripheral issues. They shape household income, social participation, access to benefits, and the distribution of psychosocial strain. The revised analysis also strengthens the article's critical dimension in two ways. First, it makes clearer that global aggregates are analytically useful but politically incomplete. A recovery visible at world level may still mask

sharp regional divergence and stratified outcomes across groups. Second, it emphasises that real wage recovery, while encouraging, does not itself demonstrate a return to decent work if informality, inadequate hours, or weak job security remain widespread. Compared with narrower economic accounts of labour-market normalization, a public-health reading demands a broader evaluative standard. The relevant benchmark is not merely whether labour demand returned, but whether labour-market participation became sufficiently inclusive, protected, and health-supporting. That is why underutilization, job quality, wages, and gendered access to employment remain central rather than secondary indicators.

**Limitations:-**

This article is based on secondary policy analysis and therefore depends on the scope and quality of official published sources. It does not estimate causal effects on health outcomes and does not disaggregate findings by region, income group, or sector with the granularity that country-level studies can provide.

A second limitation is the use of global aggregates. While this approach is appropriate for identifying broad post-pandemic patterns, it may obscure divergence between advanced economies, emerging markets, and low-income settings. The article therefore should be read as a global interpretive overview rather than a substitute for regional or national labour-market analysis.

**Conclusion:-**

COVID-19 produced a historic global employment shock whose consequences extended far beyond a temporary rise in unemployment. The evidence reviewed here shows marked improvement between 2020 and 2024, but also demonstrates that recovery remained incomplete when measured against broader indicators of labour underutilization, informality, and inequality. In 2024, unemployment had returned to 5.0%, yet the jobs gap still affected about 402 million people, gender employment gaps remained wide, and the health significance of insecure or inadequate work persisted. For journals in health and medicine, the main implication is conceptual as well as empirical: employment should be treated as a core part of population-health analysis. Future research should continue to connect labour-market indicators with mental health, food insecurity, delayed care, occupational risk, and household stress. Policy, in turn, should combine employment recovery with childcare, social protection, wage adequacy, formalization strategies, and measures that reduce structural barriers to decent work, particularly for women and young people.

**Policy interpretation table**

Indicator	Why unemployment alone is insufficient	Health relevance	Policy implication
Jobs gap	Captures discouraged or unavailable workers excluded from unemployment counts	Signals wider exposure to income insecurity and social exclusion	Combine job creation with childcare and activation support
Gender employment gap	Shows unequal access to paid work despite aggregate recovery	Linked to unequal care burden, lower income security, and stress	Invest in care infrastructure and equal labour-market access
Youth unemployment	Tracks labour-market entry failure among younger cohorts	Associated with scarring, delayed independence, and mental strain	Target entry-to-work pathways and training
Real wages and informality	Reflect purchasing power and job quality, not only job possession	Shape food, housing, and healthcare affordability, and exposure to insecurity	Support wage adequacy, formalization, and inflation-sensitive protection

**Acknowledgments:-**

None.

**Funding:-**

No external funding was reported for this manuscript.

**Conflict of Interest:-**

The author declares no conflict of interest.

**Ethical Statement:-**

This study used only aggregated public data and published reports. No ethical approval was required.

**Data Availability:-**

All data used in this manuscript derive from public ILO, UN, and WHO publications cited in the reference list.

**Key summary points:-**

- Headline unemployment improved after 2020, but broader labour underutilization remained large.
- Gender inequality and youth disadvantage persisted despite aggregate recovery.
- From a public-health perspective, decent work, wages, and inclusion matter as much as unemployment alone.

**References:-**

1. Benach, J., Vives, A., Amable, M., Vanroelen, C., Tarafa, G., & Muntaner, C. (2014). Precarious employment: Understanding an emerging social determinant of health. *Annual Review of Public Health, 35*, 229–253.
2. International Labour Organization. (2021). *World Employment and Social Outlook: Trends 2021*. ILO.
3. International Labour Organization. (2022). *COVID-19 and the Sustainable Development Goals: Reversing progress towards decent work for all? ILOSTAT / ILO*.
4. International Labour Organization. (2023). *World Employment and Social Outlook: Trends 2023*. ILO.
5. International Labour Organization. (2024a). *World Employment and Social Outlook: Trends 2024*. ILO.
6. International Labour Organization. (2024b). *World Employment and Social Outlook: May 2024 Update*. ILO.
7. International Labour Organization. (2024c). *Global Employment Trends for Youth 2024*. ILO.
8. International Labour Organization. (2024d). *Global Wage Report 2024–25*. ILO.
9. International Labour Organization. (2025a). *World Employment and Social Outlook: Trends 2025*. ILO.
10. International Labour Organization. (2025b). *Achieving gender equality in employment rates would take almost two centuries*. ILO News.
11. Paul, K. I., & Moser, K. (2009). Unemployment impairs mental health: Meta-analyses. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 74*(3), 264–282.
12. United Nations. (2021). *Goal 8: Decent work and economic growth. The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2021*. UN Statistics Division.
13. United Nations. (2024). *Goal 8: Decent work and economic growth. The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2024*. UN Statistics Division.
14. World Health Organization. (2017). *Protecting workers' health*. WHO fact sheet.
15. World Health Organization. (2025). *Social determinants of health*. WHO fact sheet.
16. World Health Organization. (2025). *World report on social determinants of health equity*. WHO.