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Foreword

The Caribbean Community Council of Ministers, acting on the advice and recommendations of the Standing Committee of Caribbean Statisticians (SCCS), in February 2000, approved the use of a regionally coordinated approach for the 2000 Round of Population and Housing Censuses. The strategy included an activity on the Analysis and Dissemination of Census Data and Results, which comprised the preparation of National Census Reports (NCRs) and Regional Special Topic Monographs (RSTMs).

Fourteen Member States and four Associate Members participated in the programme. The participation of these countries in the Regional Census programme was in recognition of the value and economy of regional co-operation and coordination in executing the Censuses and for the production of comparable, high quality socio-economic data, useful in planning and in improving the quality of life and achieving overall progress of the peoples of the Region.

The NCRs were undertaken by writers from the Region with experience in Demography, with two reviewers from the University of the West Indies (UWI) ensuring the soundness of the quality of the publications. On the basis of the review and comments by the respective National Statistical Offices and consultation with the writers and reviewers, the reports were finalised by the CARICOM Secretariat.

The first and final drafts of this publication, “2000 Round of Population and Housing Census of the Caribbean Community: National Census Report, Anguilla” was prepared by Julian Devonish of Jamaica and reviewed by Professor Chukwudum Uche of UWI, Mona, Jamaica. The tables for the report were generated by Mr. Wendell Thomas, of Trinidad and Tobago as well as by the staff of the CARICOM Secretariat specifically with respect to the RSTMs. The final draft was extensively reviewed by the Secretariat, including technical and language review and general formatting.

The analysis of the Census was funded by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) through the CARICOM Capacity Development Programme (CCDP). The CCDP was designed as a strategic response to key trends and emerging priorities in the CARICOM environment with the objective of promoting the economic and social development of CARICOM through the deepening of the regional integration process. The overall aim of the CCDP was the strengthening of the institutional capacity of CARICOM to provide leadership in the regional integration process, and the enhancing of the implementation capacity of the CARICOM Secretariat to achieve clear results in core programme areas.

Specifically, the outputs of the Census Statistics Sub-Project under the CCDP were to lead to improved development planning in Member States and in the Region through the use of the census data and information. The deliverables anticipated are eighteen (18) National Census Reports; five (5) Regional Special Topic Monographs (work in progress); a volume of Basic Tables; training of personnel in demographic analysis through a seven-week workshop facilitated by the University of the West Indies; and the establishment of an online facility to enable access to census data by users for analysis, research, policy formulation and decision-making.
The Census Data Analysis project was aimed at filling the gap existing in the Region and specifically within the national statistical systems in the area of demographic and population analysis, thereby enabling its use in policy and decision-making. Statisticians are in short supply in the Region and the area of demography is even more severely affected. The Census Data Analysis project provided a common framework for enabling comparability of the demographic transition and population characteristics across Member States based on the elements outlined in the content of the National Census Report. Additionally the reports are able to highlight trends in the demographic transition of the population of Member States from youthful to ageing populations; to make significant linkages with respect to education, training and economic activity; or economic activity with gender and fertility. The process of preparing the reports also allowed for quality checks on data, with the support of the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) and the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin American and the Caribbean (UNECLAC).

A major challenge that persists is that of having clean data sets for analysis. To mitigate these data challenges, a series of four training courses is being undertaken to train personnel in the Region, with the first one funded out of the CCDP and the remaining three from a multi-programme technical assistance project with funds received from the Caribbean Development Bank. In addition, a short course for senior officials from statistical officers is planned with CDB funding.

It is hoped that these reports will benefit the countries through providing the analysis with regard to their age, sex, education, occupation, economic activity and other critical characteristics that are important to aid the formulation of policy and decision-making, both public and private, such as government officials, researchers, academics, members of the business community and civil society. Furthermore, the experience gained, together with the efforts to strengthen capacity, will equip the Region to analyse the results of the 2010 Census.

The CARICOM Secretariat takes this opportunity to thank all persons and organisations who have been associated with this Statistics project.

EDWIN W. CARRINGTON
SECRETARY-GENERAL
CARIBBEAN COMMUNITY
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Caribbean Community (CARICOM) Secretariat wishes to express its gratitude to the Canadian International Development Agency for funding the production of this report through the CARICOM Capacity Development Programme (CCDP) - 2000 Round of Population and Housing Census Data Analysis Sub-Project.

The CARICOM Secretariat also wishes to acknowledge the following contributors: the Consultant, Mr Julian Devonish who was responsible for preparing the First and Final Drafts of the National Census Report for Anguilla; Mr. Chukwudum Uche who was the Census Data Analysis Consultant (CDAC) responsible for reviewing the first and final drafts, preparing guidelines for writers and facilitating the meetings of writers of the National Census Reports (NCRs); Mr. Wendell Thomas, Consultant, who was the main data processing resource used in the production of the tabulations. All three Consultants gave of their valuable time in the production of this publication.

Appreciation is also expressed to Ms Lori-rae Franklin-Alleyne and current Chief Statistician of the Statistics Department Anguilla and to the other Staff of the Statistics Department of Anguilla who provided invaluable support in the preparation of this report. The CARICOM Secretariat also wishes to acknowledge the tremendous support provided by a number of persons including government officials and those from other public and private organisations from Anguilla who provided critical assistance in enabling the preparation of the First and Final Drafts of the publication by Mr Devonish.

The support of the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) in contributing to the printing of the publication is highly appreciated.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreword</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgement</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table of Contents</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of Tables</td>
<td>ix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronyms and Abbreviations</td>
<td>xvii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter 1: National Population Trends: Size, Growth and Distribution</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Introduction</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Population Size and Growth</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Population by Administrative Division</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Population Density</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Population by Age Group and Sex</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Dependency Ratios</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 Sex Ratios</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 Age-Sex Ratio</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9 Sex Structure in Administrative Areas</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10 The Elderly Population</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11 Age Ratio Analysis</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter 2: National Population Trends: Social and Economic Characteristics</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Introduction</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Place of Birth</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Race and Ethnicity</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Religion</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Marital and Union Status</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Educational Attainment</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Academic Qualifications</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 Training</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9 Status in Employment</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10 Household Headship</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter 3: Distribution and Patterns of Migration</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1 Introduction .................................................................................................................41
3.2 Returning Residents by Country of Origin .................................................................42
3.3 Age Structure of Returning Migrants .........................................................................45
3.4 Distribution of Returning Residents by Area..............................................................46

**Chapter 4: Education and Training** .............................................................................49
4.1 Introduction .................................................................................................................49
4.2 School Attendance for the Under Five Population .....................................................49
4.3 Type of School attended .............................................................................................50
4.4 School Attendance for the Population Five Years or Over .....................................53
4.5 Educational Attainment for the Population Fifteen Years and Older .......................54
4.6 Highest Examination Passed ....................................................................................56
4.7 Technical and Vocational Training ..........................................................................58
4.8 Currently being Trained .............................................................................................59
4.9 Mode of Transportation Used to Travel to School ....................................................60

**Chapter 5: Economic Activity** ..................................................................................63
5.1 Introduction .................................................................................................................63
5.2 Activity Status .............................................................................................................63
5.3 Activity Status by Age and Sex ................................................................................64
5.4 Employed and Unemployed Labour Force ................................................................68
5.5 Labour Force by Occupational Category ................................................................71
5.6 Labour Force by Industrial Group ..........................................................................76
5.7 Status in Employment ...............................................................................................79

**Chapter 6: Household and Housing Characteristics** ...............................................81
6.1 Introduction .................................................................................................................81
6.2 Type of Dwelling Unit ..............................................................................................81
6.3 Tenure of Dwellings ................................................................................................84
6.4 Housing Stock by year of construction ....................................................................84
6.5 Material used for Roof ............................................................................................85
6.6 Material of Outer Walls ..........................................................................................86
6.7 Number of Rooms .....................................................................................................87
6.8 Overcrowding ..........................................................................................................88
6.9 Main Source of Lighting ..........................................................................................90
6.10 Type of Toilet Facilities .........................................................................................91
6.11 Type of Fuel for Cooking .......................................................................................91

**Chapter 7: Disability and Infirmities** .......................................................................93
7.1 Introduction .................................................................................................................93
7.2 Chronic Illnesses .......................................................................................................96
7.3 Health Service Utilization .......................................................................................98
7.4 Utilization of Medical Facilities Abroad .................................................................100

**Chapter 8: Children** .................................................................................................102
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1: Total Population and Intercensal Change by Major Administrative Divisions, Percentage Change, Doubling Time and Rates of Growth, 1992 and 2001
Table 1.2: Percentage Distribution of Total Population, By Rank Order and Change in Rank Order by Administrative Division, 1992 and 2001
Table 1.3: Percentage Distribution of Total Population by Major Administrative Divisions and Sex, 1992 and 2001
Table 1.4: Total Population and Intercensal Change by Five-Year Age Group and Sex, 1992 and 2001
Table 1.5: Total Population and Intercensal Change by Broad Age Groups and Sex 1992 and 2001
Table 1.6: Dependency Ratios by Type, 1992 and 2001
Table 1.7: Age-Sex Ratios by Five-Year Age Groups, 1992 and 2001
Table 1.8: Sex Ratio for the Population by Administrative Division, 1992 and 2001
Table 1.9: Sex Ratios (Males per 100 Females) by Five-Year Age Group and Major Administrative Divisions, 2001
Table 1.10: Age-Sex Accuracy Index, 1992
Table 1.11: Age-Sex Accuracy Index, 2001
Table 2.1: Total Population and Intercensal Change by Place of Birth and Sex, 1992 and 2001.
Table 2.2: Percentage Distribution of Total Population by Place of Birth and Sex, 1992 and 2001
Table 2.3: Total Population and Percentage Distribution by Ethnic Group and Sex, 2001
Table 2.4: Total Population and Intercensal Change by Religious Affiliation, 1992 and 2001
Table 2.4b: Male Population by Religious Affiliation and Intercensal Change, 1992 to 2001
Table 2.4c: Female Population by Religious Affiliation and Intercensal Change, 1992 to 2001
Table 2.5: Percentage Distribution of Total Population by Religious Affiliation and Sex, 1992 and 2001
Table 2.6: Total Population (16 years and over) by Marital Status, Sex and Intercensal Change, 1992 and 2001
Table 2.7: Percentage Distribution of Total Population (16 years and over) by Marital Status
National Census Report, 2001, Anguilla

and Sex 1992 and 2001

Table 2.8: Total Population (16 years and over) and Intercensal Change by Union Status and Sex, 1992 and 2001

Table 2.9: Percentage Distribution of Total Population (15 years and Over) by Highest Level of Educational Attainment and Sex, 2001

Table 2.10: Total and Percentage of Population (15 years and over) by Highest Examination Passed and Sex, 2001

Table 2.11a: Total Population (15 yrs. and Over) Trained and Not Trained by Five Year Age Group and Sex, 2001

Table 2.11b: Percentage Distribution of Population (15 years and Over) Trained and Not Trained By Five Year Age Group and Sex, 2001

Table 2.12: Number and Percentage Distribution of Employed Persons by Status in Employment and Sex, 2001

Table 2.13: Number of Household Heads and Percentage Distribution by Age Group and Sex of Household Head, 2001

Table 3.1: Number and Percentage Distribution of the Foreign Born Population by Five-Year Age Groups and Sex, 2001

Table 3.2: Percentage Distribution of Returning Residents, by Five-Year Age Group and Country/Region of Origin, 2001

Table 3.3: Number and Percentage Distribution of Returning Residents from the Caribbean by Sex Ratios and Country of Previous Residence, 2001

Table 3.4: Percentage Distribution of Returning Residents by Age Group and Sex, 2001

Table 3.5: Percentage Distribution of Total Returning Migrants by Administrative Division and Broad Age Groups, 2001

Table 4.1: Children Under 5 Years by School Enrolment, Administrative Division and Sex, 2001

Table 4.2: Percentage Distribution of Children Under 5 Years Attending School by Type of School and Administrative Division, 2001

Table 4.3: Percentage Distribution of Male Children Under 5 Years Attending School by Type of School and Administrative Division, 2001

Table 4.4: Percentage Distribution of Female Children Under 5 Years Attending School by Type of School and Administrative Division, 2001
Table 4.5: Percentage Distribution of Persons Five Years and Over by School Attendance and Administrative Division, 2001
Table 4.6: Number and Percentage Distribution of Persons Five Years and Over Attending School by Type of School and Sex, 2001
Table 4.7: Persons 15 Years and Over by Highest Level of Educational Attainment and Administrative Division, 2001
Table 4.8: Percentage Distribution of Persons (15 years and Over) by Highest Level of Educational Attainment and Administrative Division, 2001
Table 4.9: Percentage Distribution of Persons (15 years and Over) by Highest Examination Passed and Administrative Division, 2001
Table 4.10: Percentage Distribution of Persons (15 years and over) Who Have Been Trained by Age Group, Sex and Administrative Division, 2001
Table 4.11: Percentage Distribution of Persons (15 years and over) Currently Receiving Technical / Vocational Training by Age Group, Administrative Division and Sex, 2001
Table 4.12: Percentage of Persons Under 18 Years Attending School by Main Mode of Transportation and Age Group, 2001
Table 4.13: Number of Persons Under 18 Years Attending School by Main Mode of Transportation and Administrative Division, 2001
Table 4.14: Percentage of Persons Under 18 Years Attending School by Main Mode of Transportation and Administrative Division, 2001
Table 5.1(a): Total Persons Aged 15 years and over by Economic Activity in the Past Week and Five-Year Age Group, 2001
Table 5.1(b): Percentage Distribution of Total Persons Aged 15 years and over by Economic Activity in the Past Week and Five-Year Age Group, 2001
Table 5.2(a): Males aged 15 years and over by Economic Activity in the Past week and Five-Year Age Group, 2001
Table 5.2(b): Percentage Distribution of Males Aged 15 years and over by Economic Activity in the Past Week and Five-Year Age Group, 2001
Table 5.3(a): Females Aged 15 years and over by Economic Activity in the Past Week and Five-Year Age Groups, 2001
Table 5.3(b): Percentage Distribution of Females Aged 15 years and over by Economic Activity in the Past Week and Five-Year age group, 2001
Table 5.4: Total Population (15 years and Over) By Main Labour Force Indicators
Table 5.5: Male Population (15 years and Over) By Main Labour Force Indicators
Table 5.6: Female Population (15 years and Over) By Main Labour Force Indicators
Table 5.7(a): Total Employed (15 years and over) Who Worked Last Week by Occupational Group and Five-Year Age Group, 2001
Table 5.7(b): Percentage of Total Employed (15 years and over) Who Worked Past Week by Occupational Group and Five-Year Age Group, 2001
Table 5.8(a): Employed Males (15 years and over) Who Worked Past Week by Occupational Group and Five-Year Age Group, 2001
Table 5.8(b): Percentage Distribution of Employed Males(15 years and over) Who Worked Past Week by Occupational Group and Five-Year Age Group, 2001
Table 5.9(a): Employed Females (15 years and over) Who Worked Past Week by Occupational Group and Five-Year Age Group, 2001
Table 5.9(b): Percentage of Employed Females (15 years and over) Who Worked Past Week by Occupational Group and Five-Year Age Group, 2001
Table 5.10(a): Total Employed (15 years and over) Who Worked Past Week by Industrial Group and Five-Year Age Group, 2001
Table 5.10(b): Percentage of total Employed (15 years and Over) Who Worked Past Week by Industrial Group and Five-Year Age Groups, 2001
Table 5.11: Percentage of Employed Males (15 years and over) Who Worked Past Week by Industrial Group and Age Group, 2001
Table 5.12: Percentage of Employed Females (15 years and over) Who Worked Past Week by Industrial Group and Five-Year Age Group, 2001
Table 5.13: Employed Persons (15 years and Over) Who Worked Past Week by Status in Employment, 2001
Table 6.1: Dwelling Units by Type and Administrative Division, 2001
Table 6.2: Percentage Distribution of Dwelling Units by Type and Administrative Division, 2001
Table 6.3: Percentage Distribution of Dwelling Units by Tenure and Administrative Division, 2001
Table 6.4: Percentage Distribution of Dwelling Units by Year Built and Major Administrative Division, 2001
Table 6.5: Percentage Distribution of Dwelling Units by Type of Roofing Material and Administrative Division, 2001
Table 6.6: Percentage Distribution of Dwelling Units by Material of Outer Walls and Administrative Division, 2001
Table 6.7: Dwelling Units by Size of Household and Number of Rooms, 2001
Table 6.8: Dwelling Units by Size of Household and Number of Bedrooms, 2001
Table 6.9: Percentage Distribution of Dwelling Units by Size of Household and Number of Rooms, 2001
Table 6.10: Percentage Distribution of Dwelling Units by Size of Household and Number of Bedrooms, 2001
Table 6.11: Percentage Distribution of Households by Sources of Lighting and Administrative Division, 2001
Table 6.12: Percentage Distribution of Households by Main Toilet Facilities and Administrative Division, 2001
Table 6.13: Percentage Distribution of Households by Type of Fuel Used Mainly for Cooking and Administrative Division, 2001
Table 7.1: Total Number of Persons Reporting Disability or Infirmity and Total Responses by Selected Age Group and Type, 2001
Table 7.2: Percentage of Total Responses Reported on Disability or Infirmity by Selected Age Group and Type, 2001
Table 7.3: Percentage of Total Responses Reported on Chronic Illness by Selected Age Group and Type, 2001
Table 7.4: Percentage of Total Responses Reported on Chronic Illness by Type of Illness and Selected Age Groups and Sex Distribution, 2001
Table 7.5: Percentage Distribution of Total Responses Reported on Type of Medical Facilities by Selected Age Groups and Sex Distribution, 2001
Table 7.6: Percentage Distribution of Persons Reporting Use of Medical Facilities By Selected Age Groups and Sex, 2001
Table 7.7: Population Who Accessed Care Abroad By Broad Age Groups, Sex Ratios and
Percentage Distribution, 2001

Table 8.1: Total Population 0-14 Years by Sex and Age- Group as A Percentage of the Total Population, 2001
Table 8.2: Percentage Distribution of the Child Population by Age Group and Sex, 2001
Table 8.3: Population 0-14 Years by Administrative District of Residence, 2001
Table 8.4: Number and Percentage Distribution of Children by broad Age Groups and Sex of Household Head, 2001
Table 8.5: Number and Percentage Distribution of Children by Selected Age Group and by Age of Head of Household, 2001
Table 8.6: Number of Children in Households by Age-Group of Child and Age Group and Sex of Household Head, 2001
Table 8.7(a): Number of Children in Overcrowded Households by Age Group, Administrative Division and Sex, 2001
Table 8.7(b): Percentage Distribution of Children in Overcrowded Households by Age Group, Administrative Division and Sex, 2001
Table 8.8: Number and Percentage of Children 0-14 Years Attending School by Sex of Person and Sex of Head of Household, 2001
Table 8.9: Number of Children Attending and Not Attending School by Occupational Group of Head of Household and Sex of Child, 2001
Table 8.10: Population 0-14 and 15-64 by Labour Force Participation Rate, Dependency Ratios and Child Support Ratio by Area of Residence, 2001
Table 8.11: Number of Children Reporting Illness by Age Group and Sex, 2001
Table 8.12: Number and Percentage Distribution of Children by Administrative Division Reporting Illness to Population Imbalance, 2001
Table 8.13: Number of Children in Each District and Prevalence Rates by Rank Order, 2001

Table 9.1 Number and Percentage Distribution of Youtsh by Broad Age Group and Sex, 2001
Table 9.2: Number and Percentage of Population 15-24 by District of Residence and Proportion of the Population, 2001
Table 9.3: Number of Youths in Overcrowded Households by Sex and Administrative Division, 2001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>Number and Percentage Distribution of Youths by Selected Age Group and Sex of Head of Household, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>Number of Youths by Selected Age Group and Sex of Head of Household, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>Percentage of Youths Attending and Not-Attending School by Sex of Youth, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>Percentage of Youths Attending and Not Attending School by Sex of Head of Household and Sex of Youth, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>Number and Percentage Distribution of Youths Attending School by Occupational Group of Head of Household and Sex of Youth, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>Number and Percentage of Youths Working by Educational Attainment, and Sex, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Total Population and Intercensal Change by Selected Age Group and Sex, 1992 and 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>Number and Percentage Distribution of The Elderly (Aged 60+) by Household Size and Sex, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>Number and Percentage Distribution of The Elderly (Aged 65+) by Household Size and Sex, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>Percentage of The Elderly by Type of Tenure of Dwelling Unit, Age and Sex, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>Percentage of Dwelling Units Occupied by the Elderly (Aged 60+) by Age of Dwelling Unit and Type of Tenure, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>Percentage of Dwelling Units Occupied by the Elderly (Aged 65+) by Age of Dwelling Unit and Type of Tenure, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>Number and Percentage Distribution of The Elderly (Aged 60+) by Union Status and Sex, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>Percentage of The Elderly (Aged 65+) by Union Status and Sex, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>Percentage of The Elderly by Economic Activity, Age Group and Sex, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>Number and Percentage of The Elderly (Aged 60+) Reporting Illnesses (Total Responses), by Type of Illness and Sex Distribution, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>Number and Percentage of The Elderly (Aged 65+) Reporting Illnesses (Total Responses) by Type of Illness and Sex Distribution, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>Number and Percentage of The Elderly (Aged 60+) by Source of Livelihood and Sex, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>Sex Distribution of The Elderly (Aged 60+) by Sources of Livelihood, 2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10.14: Number of Elderly Persons (Aged 60+) by Insurance Coverage and Sex, 2001
Table 10.15: Percentage of The Elderly (Aged 65+) by Experience of Crime and Sex, 2001

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1 Population Pyramid for Anguilla, 1992
Figure 1.2 Population Pyramid for Anguilla, 2001
Figure 5.1: Employed and Unemployed Labour Force by Age and Sex, 2001
Figure 5.2: The Employed Labour Force by Occupational Group
**ACRONYMS and ABBREVIATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CARICOM</td>
<td>Caribbean Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDB</td>
<td>Caribbean Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAW</td>
<td>Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Violence against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSME</td>
<td>CARICOM Single Market and Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CXC</td>
<td>Caribbean Examinations Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Eastern Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECLAC</td>
<td>Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCE ‘O’Level</td>
<td>General Certificate of Education Ordinary level (Examination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCE ‘A’ Level</td>
<td>General Certificate of Education Advanced level (Examination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECS</td>
<td>Organization of Eastern Caribbean States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCCC</td>
<td>Regional Census Coordinating Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRH</td>
<td>Sexual and Reproductive Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWI</td>
<td>University of the West Indies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

1. Census Activities in Anguilla
The history of census taking in Anguilla dates back to the early nineteenth century when systematic attempts were made to count the colonial and slave population on the island. As in all other British colonies, the first of such attempts was made in 1817, and continued through a system of Slave Registration, until the abolition of slavery in 1834. The modern phase of census taking in the British West Indies and by extension, Anguilla, began in 1943. This period was marked by the mechanical processing of census data. During the decades of the 1950s and 60s, censuses for Anguilla were conducted and published jointly with statistical data for St. Kitts and Nevis.

In 1971, the Statistical Act of Anguilla was passed. This Act conferred legal authority on the Statistical Department to coordinate all data collection on the island. Since 1960, the United Nations, through a resolution of the Economic and Social Commission, has urged Member States to conduct decennial Population and Housing Censuses in years ending preferably in ‘0’ or in ‘1’. In adherence to the guidelines of international standards, concepts, definitions, classifications and methodologies outlined by the United Nations, censuses were conducted in 1974, 1984, 1992 and 2001. The census of 2001 conformed more closely, for the first time, to the timing outlined by the United Nations.

2. Justification for the Conduct of the Censuses of Population and Housing
Population and Housing censuses are essentially a stocktaking exercise of the number of persons in a country, their demographic, social and economic conditions. This information, collected on a decennial basis, provides an invaluable source of data for development planning and a benchmark from which intercensal estimates of population change can be derived. In the absence of a population register, a modern vital registration system or a properly administered frontier control system, the census provides the only complete source of data on the country’s population. Currently, the functions of a vital registration system, which includes the registration of births, deaths and marriages, among others, are being administered by the courthouses, while issues related to citizenship and residency are handled through the Attorney General’s Office.
Although efforts are being made by the immigration department to monitor the movement of persons at ports of exits and entrances, the accuracy of data collected from this source, continues to be fraught with incomplete immigration records. Additionally, the open nature of Anguilla’s borders and the lack of sufficient border control patrols, present a difficulty in accounting for all population movements. These institutional constraints have resulted in the lack of any official intercensal estimates for the population and underscore the importance of decennial censuses.

3. The Conduct of the 2001 Population and Housing Census
The 2001 Population and Housing Census was conducted on census day, May, 9th 2001, approximately nine years after the preceding 1992 census, conducted during the week of February 24-28, 1992. The census was conducted on a de jure basis, which rendered only usual residents of the country eligible to be counted. These persons include those residents who were in the island on census night and those who were abroad for less than six months. During census taking, a de facto count of the population, which included all residents and visitors found in hotels, on boats, in institutions or in private residences, but excludes usual residents temporarily abroad, was established.

4. The Scope of the Census
The census questionnaire was prepared in accordance with the U.N. Principles and Recommendations for census taking. These include technical considerations in the choice of questions as well as in the administration of the census. Two questionnaires were administered in the census. The first was a Household Questionnaire, which was administered to the head of household or a responsible adult in the household (any person over the age of eighteen years). The second questionnaire was an Individual Questionnaire, administered to all adult persons in the household. Minors and persons incapable of answering the questions were reported on by the head or the head’s nominee. The total census questionnaire consisted of 144 questions, 29 questions on the Household roster and 115 on the Individual Questionnaire. The topics included in the questionnaires were as follows:

a. Individual questionnaire
   - Age
   - Sex
National Census Report, 2001, Anguilla

- Relationship to head of household
- Religious affiliation
- Ethnic origin
- Marital and union status
- Education and training
- Residency and place of birth
- Health status
- Fertility
- Economic activity

b. **Household questionnaire**
- Type of unit
- Materials of outer walls and roof
- Number of rooms
- Tenure
- Toilet facilities
- Sources of drinking water, lighting and fuel for cooking

5. **Geographic Division of Anguilla**

Anguilla is a small country covering a total area of 36 square miles, sixteen square miles long and three square miles at its widest point. The country is divided into fourteen administrative areas called ‘Districts’. For the purpose of data collection during the census, these districts were further subdivided into smaller geographical units called Enumerations Districts or EDs. These enumeration districts share contiguous boundaries and no ED extends beyond the administrative boundaries of a single district. For the 2001 census, the country was divided into 54 EDs, with each ED containing between 24 to 143 households.

A total of 3,730 households were identified in the census. The *de jure* count identified 11,561 usual residents; however analysis in this paper is based on the 11,430 persons who were actually enumerated.
CHAPTER 1

NATIONAL POPULATION TRENDS: SIZE, DISTRIBUTION AND CHANGE

1.1 Introduction
This Chapter highlights some of the major changes in population growth and distribution in Anguilla between 1992 and 2001. An analysis of the changes in the age and sex structure of the population is undertaken, with a special focus on changes in five year age groups and broad demographic groups, namely children, working age and the elderly population. The chapter also seeks to evaluate the quality of age and sex data collected in 1992 and 2001 census using the United Nations Age Accuracy Index.

1.2 Population Growth
In the 2001 population census, the enumerated population of Anguilla stood at 11,430 persons, (Table 1.1). This represents an increase of 2,474 persons or a 27.6 percent increase over the 1992 count of 8,956 persons. The number of males in the population was 5,628 compared to 5,802 females. The population in twelve of the fourteen administrative districts recorded net increases ranging from six percent in North Hill to 78 percent in The Farrington. East End and Blowing Point were the only two districts to record net declines in their population, during the intercensal period 1992 to 2001. The most substantial change in population size occurred in the North Side district, where the population increased by 75.6 percent or 504 persons.
Table 1.1: Total Population and Intercensal Change by Major Administrative Divisions, Percentage Change, Doubling Time and Rate of Growth, 1992 and 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Division</th>
<th>1992</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>Intercensal Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
<th>Percent Annual Growth Rate</th>
<th>Doubling Time in years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Absolute Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anguilla</td>
<td>8,956</td>
<td>11,430</td>
<td>2474</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>26.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>34.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>1,483</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>21.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blowing Point</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>-41</td>
<td>-5.1</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>-122.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Ground</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hill</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>112.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hill</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>30.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Valley</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>16.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>11.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quarter</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>16.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Ground</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>1,116</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>39.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farrington</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>11.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Hill</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>15.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>-62</td>
<td>-9.2</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
<td>-66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Harbour</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>46.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The intensity and variation in population change during the intercensal period is reflected in Table 1.1 by calculating the annual rate of growth for selected areas within the country. Generally, a population with an annual rate of growth of two percent can be expected to double itself in thirty five years. On the contrary, a population with a zero percent rate of growth will remain stationary or decline over the same period. Likewise a population with negative growth will decrease in size. Although we know that populations rarely grow as fast as they actually can, given their internal and external checks, calculating the doubling time helps us to identify the areas in which there will be greatest pressure on resources in the future.
During the intercensal period 1992-2001, the population grew at a rate of 2.65 percent per annum. This rate is considered high, since the population is likely to double its present size in approximately 26.4 years or by 2028, if demographic patterns remain unchanged into the future. Table 1.1 shows that six districts experienced growth rates which are higher than that of the national average and can potentially double their present size in a much shorter period. These six districts have very high growth rates (> 3 percent per annum), one with high growth (2-2.99 percent per annum) and four districts with moderate growth (1-1.99 percent per annum). One district recorded slow growth (<1 percent per annum), while the other two districts recorded negative growth. The Farrington (r = 6.3) and North Side (r = 6.1) have the highest growth rates and can potentially double their population size within the next eleven and a quarter years. Sandy Hill (r = 4.4), The Valley (r = 4.1) and The Quarter (r = 4.1) have the potential to double their size within the next seventeen years.

1.3 Population Distribution
Anguilla has experienced significant changes in its population distribution since 1992, although the population continues to be unevenly distributed, (Table 1.2). South Hill continues to be the most populous district, increasing its share of the population to 13 percent (1,483 persons) in 2001 from 12.3 percent (1,102 persons) in 1992. Stony Ground, having accounted for the second largest share of the population in 1992, moved two places down to fourth position with 9.8 percent by 2001. North Side (10.2 percent) moved five places up to become the second most populous district in 2001. Gradual depopulation in the Blowing Point and East End districts contributed to their fall in population ranking to eighth and tenth position respectively from third and sixth position in 1992. Sandy Ground remains the least populated district for the two censuses, and accounts for 2.4 percent of the population in 2001. Although Stoney Ground and North Hill experienced declines in their relative ranking, their actual population size increased by 17.6 percent and 5.9 percent respectively, since 1992.
Table 1.2: Percent Distribution of Total Population, By Rank Order and Change in Rank Order by Administrative Division, 1992 and 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Division</th>
<th>Census Count</th>
<th>Percent Distribution of Population by Year</th>
<th>Ranking Order in Population Distribution</th>
<th>Change in Ranking Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,956</td>
<td>11,430</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>1,483</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>12.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blowing Point</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Ground</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hill</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hill</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>6.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Valley</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>10.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>10.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quarter</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>8.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Ground</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>1,116</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>9.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farrington</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Hill</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Harbour</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>7.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many countries use rural and urban areas to broadly describe the residential location of their populations and to illustrate differences in the quality of life enjoyed by their citizens, given the differential social and economic milieus of rural and urban areas. Neither a political nor geographical classification of rural and urban areas has been established in Anguilla over its history of census, although the Valley can easily be recognized as the prime urban administrative centre. The Valley is the major economic hub in the country, houses the only hospital, the only international airport and serves as the headquarters for several government ministries, private sector organizations, Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and department stores. More importantly, the disproportionately high level of commercial activity concentrated in the Valley is evidence of its role and importance as an urban centre.
The Valley contains all the modern amenities, such as running water, electricity, telecommunication services and administrative and recreational facilities that distinguish an urban settlement from a rural area. Since 1992, The Valley has experienced a 46.5 percent increase in its population and currently accounts for 10 percent, or the third largest share of the nation’s population. Currently, 581 persons reside in the Valley, (Table1.3).

Table 1.3: Percentage Distribution of Total Population by Major Administrative Divisions and Sex, 1992 and 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Division</th>
<th>1992</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>Male Intercensal Change</th>
<th>Female Intercensal Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Absolute Change</td>
<td>Percentage Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4469</td>
<td>5,628</td>
<td>1,159</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blowing Point</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Ground</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hill</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hill</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Valley</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quarter</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Ground</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farrington</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Hill</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Harbour</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In 1992, total males and females do not add up to the total in Table 1.2 (or Table 1.1)
1.4 Population Composition and Structure

The age and sex structure of the population are probably the most important demographic characteristics to be studied when planning a count of country’s population, as they both have far-reaching impacts on the social and demographic characteristics of a country. This is because similar groups in the population have similar needs which change over the life cycle. Such changes precipitate and are precipitated by demographic events. Additionally, the needs of the male population are sometimes different from that of the female population. Therefore an analysis of the age and sex structure can assist in the setting of gender specific policies rather than assume equality between the sexes.

1.5 Age Composition

Based on a median age calculation of 29.3 years in 2001, Anguilla’s population can be classified as a population of intermediate ages. The median age in the population has increased by 3.3 years, from 26 years in 1992 indicate that the population is ageing. This increase is due mainly to a reduction in the fertility rate and an increase in immigration of working age persons. The female population is slightly older than the male population, given a median age of 29.5 years for females and 29.2 years for males in 2001. However, the male population has aged more rapidly than the female population during the intercensal period. In 1992, the median age for males was 25.8 years and 26.3 for females. By 2001, the median age for males increased by 3.4 years, this being marginally higher than the 3.2 years increase for females.

The shift towards a population of intermediate age can be better appreciated by looking at the changes which occurred in the child, working age and elderly age groups over time. Tables 1.4 and 1.5 show a shift in the population towards the working-age group 15-64 years, as the child population (0-14 years) and the elderly population (65 and older) decline. In 1992, 30.5 percent of the population was below the age of fifteen years. By 2001 the population share in this group fell to 28 percent, although the number of persons aged 0-14 years increased by 17 percent. The elderly share also declined by 1.5 percentage points to 7.6 percent in 2001, from 9.1 percent of the total population in 1992.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>1992</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>Male Absolute Change</th>
<th>Male Percentage Change</th>
<th>Female Absolute Change</th>
<th>Female Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4473</td>
<td>5628</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>25.82</td>
<td>4487</td>
<td>5802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>39.36</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>23.26</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td>-8.31</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>-6.38</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>30.69</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>55.52</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>115.38</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>59.46</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28.68</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47.22</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-21.15</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-21.69</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-84</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>182.35</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In 1992, total males and females do not add up to the total in Table 1.2 (or Table 1.1)

This resulted in the working-age population steadily increasing its relative share of the total population by 4 percent, to 64.4 percent in 2001 from 60.4 percent in 1992. The shift towards a larger working-age population is due mainly to a reduction in the fertility level and the net-increase in the number of working aged migrants in the country.
Table 1.5: Total Population and Intercensal Change by Broad Age Groups and Sex 1992 and 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Both Sexes</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8960</td>
<td>4473</td>
<td>4487</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-14</td>
<td>2735</td>
<td>1361</td>
<td>1374</td>
<td>30.53</td>
<td>30.43</td>
<td>30.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-64</td>
<td>5414</td>
<td>2750</td>
<td>2664</td>
<td>60.42</td>
<td>61.48</td>
<td>59.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>10.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,430</td>
<td>5628</td>
<td>5802</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-14</td>
<td>3,202</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td>28.01</td>
<td>28.25</td>
<td>27.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-64</td>
<td>7,358</td>
<td>3,632</td>
<td>3,726</td>
<td>64.37</td>
<td>64.54</td>
<td>64.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In 1992, total males and females do not add up to the total in Table 1.2 (or Table 1.1)

In 2001, the child-woman ratio was 337.7 children 0-4 years per 100 women of reproductive age (15-49 years), falling from 434.9 per 1000 in 1992. These changes occurred in spite of a 40.1 percent increase in the number of women in the reproductive age group, 3,177 in 2001 from 2,267 women in 1992. These respective child–woman ratios, translate into a general fertility rate (GFR) of 75.1 in 2001 from 96.6 in 1992. The decline in fertility can partly be attributed to better contraception practices among women and an increase (121.5 percent) in the number of older reproductive women (40-49 years), who are likely to have completed their childbearing in earlier years. The implications of this large increase in Anguilla’s working age population, which is commonly referred to as a demographic bonus, can be better appreciated in our analysis of dependency ratios below.

1.6 Dependency Ratios

The dependency ratio expresses the potential or hypothetical social and economic burden of dependents (persons under 15 years and over 64 years) on the working-age population, (population 15-64 years). It is a hypothetical measure, because not all persons in the working age group are actually working and some persons in the dependent category may be working, but are economically independent. By extension, this measure captures the social costs and opportunities of a country’s changing age structure over time.
The increase in the working-age population and a reduction in the number of child and elderly dependents have resulted in a more favorable pattern of dependency when compared to 1992. In 2001, every 100 working-age person bore the cost of 55 dependents in the population, declining from about 66 dependents to every 100 working-age person in 1992, (Table 1.6). The child dependency ratio fell to 44 child dependents for every 100 working-age person in 2001, from 51 children to every 100 working-age person in 1992. Similarly, the elderly dependency ratio fell to 12 elderly dependents per 100 working-aged person in 2001, from 15 per 100 in 1992.

Table 1.6: Dependency Ratios by Type 1992 and 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependency Ratios</th>
<th>Census year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>50.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old</td>
<td>14.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.7 Sex Ratio

The sex ratio captures the balance of males and females within a population and has implications for social relations, economic activities and the location of specialized services within a given area, among other things.

Whenever the sex ratio is greater than 100, this indicates an excess of males over females, while a ratio of fewer than 100 indicates an excess of females over males. A sex ratio of 100 indicates a perfect balance in the number of males and females in the population. When compared to 1992, Table 1.7 shows that the sex ratio has become slightly less balanced. In 2001, 50.8 percent of the population was female compared to 50.1 percent in 1992. Table 1.4 shows that 5,628 males and 5,802 females were enumerated in the 2001 census count. This represents a 29.3 percentage increase in the female population or 1,315 additional females and a more modest increase of 25.8 percent or 1,155 males since 1992. These changes served to widen the gender gap slightly by decreasing the sex ratio to 97 males per 100 females in 2002, compared to 99.7 males per 100 females in 1992. Much of this change can be attributed to heavier net-immigration of females than males during the intercensal period and is discussed in Chapter 2 of this report.
Table 1.7: Age-Sex Ratios by Five-Year Age Group, 1992 and 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>1992</th>
<th>2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Ages</td>
<td>99.69</td>
<td>97.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>100.41</td>
<td>95.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>96.26</td>
<td>102.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>100.75</td>
<td>98.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>103.75</td>
<td>97.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>105.14</td>
<td>90.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>110.07</td>
<td>101.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>96.18</td>
<td>97.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>100.93</td>
<td>95.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>108.84</td>
<td>94.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>114.97</td>
<td>104.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>101.37</td>
<td>101.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>101.57</td>
<td>105.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>80.65</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>89.26</td>
<td>125.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>92.86</td>
<td>63.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>82.18</td>
<td>72.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-84</td>
<td>86.21</td>
<td>104.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>29.82</td>
<td>70.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sex-Ratio: Number of males per 100 females.

1.8 Age-Sex Ratio

Changes in the age-sex structure between 1992 and 2001 are presented in Table 1.7 and further depicted graphically by the population pyramids in Figures 1.1 and 1.2. Since 1992, the population structure resembled the general constrictive type seen in developed countries like the USA and Singapore. The bulge in the working-age population which is more pronounced in the 30-39 age group in 2001, and in the 20-29 age group in 1992, is evidence of larger birth cohorts from the past high fertility decade of the 1960s and early 1970s, moving up the age structure. These patterns in the age structure are also influenced by the immigration of working-aged persons and their children during the intercensal period.
A second bulge in the 10-19 age group is indicative of rising fertility in the late 1980s and early 1990s, after a period of sustained decline in the 1970s up to the mid 80s. Differences in the width of the 0-4 and 5-9 age bars are again indicative of another period of fertility decline in the intercensal period. The pyramid also shows a decline in the male population, 70-79 years when compared to 1992 and a similar decline in the female population, aged 75-84 years. Such patterns suggest an increase in mortality rate among these older age groups and are a common feature of population aging globally.

An examination of the age and sex structure in most countries will show that females outnumber males in all age groups, except for the youngest group, aged 0-4 years. The sex ratio globally, reflects the pattern of being highest at birth, but decreasing gradually as age increases. Normally, the sex ratio at birth is around 102-107 males for every 100 females. Given higher mortality rates for males than females at all ages, the ratio levels off at around age five, dips to below 100 in the teen and early adult/youthful years, before leveling out in the mid to late adult years, and falling to its lowest point during the elderly years.
Figure 1.1

Figure 1.2
In 2001, the age-sex ratio for Anguilla deviates from the regular pattern identified previously, in that males dominate the age structure from ages 45 to 59 years and again in the age group 65 to 69 years. The sex ratio in the early childhood years is lower than expected, with females dominating the new born to four year old category at a ratio of 95.8 males per 100 females. The sex ratio increases in the 5-9 years age group, then decreases as expected, up to the end of the age of youth (24 years).

In the 25-29 age group, the ratio is almost balanced, at 101.6 males to 100 females but declines again up to aged 44 years. Males dominate the age distribution from ages 45 to 59 years, where the sex ratio is as high as 105.7 males per 100 females, before being outnumbered again at ages 60-64 years by a ratio of 90 males to 100 females. The sex ratio then rises to its highest point of 125 males to every 100 females in the 65-69 age group and falls to its lowest point 63.6 in the 70-74 age group thereafter.

1.9   Sex Structure in Administrative Areas
Internal migration, like international migration plays a critical role in shaping the age-sex structure at different geographical locations within a country. This is because economic betterment is one of the chief motivations for migration and the economic base of an area acts as a powerful push or pull factor for the population. The small size of Anguilla provides easy access from any geographical location, thus reducing the need to reside in close proximity to work, school or other obligatory activities. In that case, the distribution of the population by age and sex in an area, may reflect more of a difference in affluence and family size preferences among different social classes, or may simply bear the imprint of historical settlement patterns.

Table 1.8 reflects the general pattern of most divisions tending towards a more balanced sex composition, with the exception of George Hill, Stony Ground, Sandy Hill and Blowing Point, which became more imbalanced over the intercensal period. In 2001, six of the fourteen divisions had a larger number of females than males compared to five divisions in 1992. In 2001, The Valley and North Side had the most balanced sex ratios, with 99.5 and 100.9 males to every 100 females, respectively. West End had the highest sex ratio of 106.2 males for every 100 females, while George Hill had the lowest sex ratio of 86.9 males per 100 females.
Table 1.8: Sex Ratio for the Population by Administrative Division, 1992 and 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99.60</td>
<td>97.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>114.39</td>
<td>106.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill</td>
<td>107.14</td>
<td>103.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blowing Point</td>
<td>96.57</td>
<td>94.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Ground</td>
<td>102.46</td>
<td>97.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hill</td>
<td>111.34</td>
<td>103.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hill</td>
<td>94.19</td>
<td>86.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Valley</td>
<td>99.75</td>
<td>99.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side</td>
<td>97.34</td>
<td>100.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quarter</td>
<td>86.86</td>
<td>89.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Ground</td>
<td>95.27</td>
<td>89.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farrington</td>
<td>109.66</td>
<td>101.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Hill</td>
<td>91.58</td>
<td>87.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>88.76</td>
<td>96.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Harbour</td>
<td>108.99</td>
<td>103.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When we examine the age-sex ratio by administrative districts, Table 1.8 shows that the sex ratio does not follow a regular pattern across districts. For the child population, birth to four years, the widest imbalance occurred in West End where the ratio was 133 males for every 100 females and in Sandy Ground, where there were 57.1 males for every 100 females. For the elderly population, the sharpest variations were observed in The Farrington and Blowing Point in the 70-74 age group, where males outnumbered females by a ratio of 5:1 in the former and females outnumbered males by a ratio of 3:1 in the latter.

Table 1.9 provides a more detailed breakdown of the age-sex structure by administrative districts.
Table 1.9:  Sex Ratio (Males per 100 Females) by Five-Year Age Group and Major Administrative Division, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>West End</th>
<th>South Hill</th>
<th>Blowing Point</th>
<th>Sandy Ground</th>
<th>North Hill</th>
<th>George Hill</th>
<th>The Valley</th>
<th>North Side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>133.33</td>
<td>81.54</td>
<td>112.12</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>88.37</td>
<td>77.97</td>
<td>109.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>121.74</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>97.37</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>166.67</td>
<td>93.75</td>
<td>91.07</td>
<td>123.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>92.31</td>
<td>116.22</td>
<td>94.87</td>
<td>162.50</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>70.21</td>
<td>94.83</td>
<td>145.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>93.33</td>
<td>102.94</td>
<td>73.68</td>
<td>91.67</td>
<td>161.54</td>
<td>87.10</td>
<td>120.93</td>
<td>82.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>182.35</td>
<td>169.23</td>
<td>82.35</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>53.85</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>97.56</td>
<td>61.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>103.85</td>
<td>111.67</td>
<td>119.23</td>
<td>114.29</td>
<td>93.33</td>
<td>75.56</td>
<td>105.08</td>
<td>110.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>70.97</td>
<td>119.64</td>
<td>103.33</td>
<td>114.29</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>112.50</td>
<td>126.92</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>70.83</td>
<td>110.00</td>
<td>93.33</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>112.50</td>
<td>142.86</td>
<td>93.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>116.67</td>
<td>103.64</td>
<td>88.24</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>78.57</td>
<td>76.36</td>
<td>111.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>106.25</td>
<td>101.96</td>
<td>91.67</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>113.64</td>
<td>120.69</td>
<td>120.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>89.36</td>
<td>116.67</td>
<td>87.50</td>
<td>109.09</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>126.92</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>90.91</td>
<td>166.67</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>78.57</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>70.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>122.22</td>
<td>166.67</td>
<td>166.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>222.22</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>140.00</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>142.86</td>
<td>78.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>90.91</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>63.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>78.26</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>52.94</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>106.16</td>
<td>103.15</td>
<td>94.13</td>
<td>97.10</td>
<td>103.76</td>
<td>86.90</td>
<td>99.49</td>
<td>100.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>The Quarter</th>
<th>Stoney Ground</th>
<th>The Farrington</th>
<th>Sandy Hill</th>
<th>East End</th>
<th>Island Harbour</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>112.77</td>
<td>103.70</td>
<td>114.81</td>
<td>96.67</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>95.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>77.55</td>
<td>84.75</td>
<td>142.86</td>
<td>147.37</td>
<td>136.00</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>102.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>111.11</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>39.39</td>
<td>70.83</td>
<td>97.87</td>
<td>98.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>105.71</td>
<td>84.13</td>
<td>96.00</td>
<td>95.45</td>
<td>78.57</td>
<td>128.13</td>
<td>97.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>105.71</td>
<td>55.32</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>39.13</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>139.29</td>
<td>90.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>95.45</td>
<td>105.26</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>87.88</td>
<td>101.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>107.14</td>
<td>74.07</td>
<td>104.17</td>
<td>124.00</td>
<td>97.30</td>
<td>97.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>63.64</td>
<td>84.75</td>
<td>112.00</td>
<td>106.67</td>
<td>97.06</td>
<td>102.70</td>
<td>95.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>86.11</td>
<td>90.24</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>61.90</td>
<td>84.62</td>
<td>159.09</td>
<td>94.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>82.50</td>
<td>91.43</td>
<td>111.11</td>
<td>72.73</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>110.53</td>
<td>104.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>140.00</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>84.62</td>
<td>133.33</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>101.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>175.00</td>
<td>145.45</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>105.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>94.12</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>84.62</td>
<td>76.92</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>76.19</td>
<td>225.00</td>
<td>233.33</td>
<td>133.33</td>
<td>121.43</td>
<td>125.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>63.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>52.17</td>
<td>77.78</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>72.73</td>
<td>54.55</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>89.31</td>
<td>89.15</td>
<td>101.12</td>
<td>87.93</td>
<td>96.14</td>
<td>103.57</td>
<td>97.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.10 The Elderly Population

A population with 10 percent or more of its members 60 years and older is commonly regarded an aging population. Once a population starts to assume an aging profile, the general trend is for the elderly share to gradually increase over time, regardless of significant future increase in the fertility level or heavy positive net-migration flows.

In Anguilla, heavy increases in the working age group served to reverse an aging population trend. In 1992, 11.6 percent of the population was 60 years and older; by 2001, elderly persons accounted for 10.3 percent of the population. Additionally, there were fewer elderly women aged 75-84 years and men aged 70-79 years, in the 2001 census count, compared to 1992.

The gender mix of the elderly is predominantly female, as 53.2 percent are female and 46.8 percent male. In all elderly age groups, females outnumber males, except for the (65-69) and (80-84) age cohorts in (65-69) age cohort, where males outnumber females by a ratio of five males to every four females.

Another feature of the elderly population is the rapid increase of the oldest elderly or frail elderly (persons 85 years and older). At the 2001 census count, 99 persons had already celebrated their 85th birthday compared to 74 persons in 1992. This meant that the oldest elderly increased by 33.8 percent while the total elderly population grew by only 13.4 percent. Although females in the frail elderly category outnumbered males by a ratio of 2:1, the increase in the oldest elderly male population was 16.7 times greater than that of their female counterparts. These figures suggest significant gains in life expectancy during the intercensal period.

However, the disproportional increase in the frail elderly population is similar to that observed globally and may suggest the need for greater institutionalized care facilities for this group as family members may be unable to adequately provide the specialized care required.

1.11 Age Ratio Analysis

The UN age-sex accuracy index is a measure used to evaluate the accuracy of data on age and sex reported in a census. The calculation has two parts, with both parts based on the assumptions of linearity and rectangularity in the distribution of age and sex within a population. The results
The age ratio analysis is an estimate of net age misreporting and, is measured by taking the population of a given age group to one-half of the sum of the populations in the preceding and following groups, times 100. Excluding extreme fluctuations in past births, deaths, or migration, the three age groups should form a nearly linear series, and the age ratios should then approximate 100.

The sex ratio analysis tells the extent to which there is variation in sex composition from one age group to the other. It is measured by taking the ratio of males to females in each age group and multiplying by 100, then calculating the difference in the ratio between each successive age group and averaging these differences.

Tables 1.10 and 1.11 suggest that between 1992 and 2001, the quality of age and sex data collected in the census has progressively worsened. This resulted in the 2001 census being classified as highly inaccurate, based on an age-sex accuracy index of 55.3 compared to 1992 when the data were classified as inaccurate based on an index of 34.5. These results should be viewed with caution, since immigration might have contributed to the deviations from the expected pattern.

Much of this apparent decline in data quality during the intercensal period can be attributed to heavy immigration of young workers which distorted the age structure. Never-the-less, inaccuracies in the reporting of age in both censuses also impacted on data quality. This is apparent since females reported their ages more accurately than males, irrespective of a higher immigration level for females than males during the intercensal period.

The mean age ratio for females increased from 6.5 (1992) to 9.2 (2001), while for males, the increase was greater; from 7.0 in 1992 to 11.1 in 2002. Sharp deviations in the sex ratio, especially at older ages, resulted in a higher mean overall sex ratio of 11.7 in 2001, compared to
a ratio of 7 in 1992. This reflects greater variation in the sex composition of the population in 2001, than in 1992. Some of these differences were highlighted earlier in this chapter.

Table 1.10: Age-Sex Accuracy Index, 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male Age Ratio</th>
<th>Female Age Ratio</th>
<th>Sex Ratio</th>
<th>Successive Differences</th>
<th>Male Deviation From 100</th>
<th>Female Deviation From 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>103.12</td>
<td>107.73</td>
<td>96.26</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>7.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>95.06</td>
<td>93.91</td>
<td>100.75</td>
<td>-4.49</td>
<td>-4.94</td>
<td>-6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>95.20</td>
<td>94.43</td>
<td>103.75</td>
<td>-3.01</td>
<td>-4.80</td>
<td>-5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>95.45</td>
<td>97.25</td>
<td>105.14</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
<td>-4.55</td>
<td>-2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>119.44</td>
<td>109.21</td>
<td>110.07</td>
<td>-4.93</td>
<td>19.44</td>
<td>9.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>94.97</td>
<td>104.80</td>
<td>96.18</td>
<td>13.89</td>
<td>-5.03</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>106.54</td>
<td>106.25</td>
<td>100.93</td>
<td>-4.75</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>94.55</td>
<td>91.49</td>
<td>108.84</td>
<td>-7.91</td>
<td>-5.45</td>
<td>-8.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>88.48</td>
<td>81.44</td>
<td>114.97</td>
<td>-6.13</td>
<td>-11.52</td>
<td>-18.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>99.33</td>
<td>106.57</td>
<td>101.37</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>104.03</td>
<td>94.07</td>
<td>101.57</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>-5.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>84.39</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>80.65</td>
<td>20.93</td>
<td>-15.61</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>105.88</td>
<td>102.54</td>
<td>89.26</td>
<td>-8.61</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>92.86</td>
<td>-3.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total absolute value   97.57  91.58  84.50
Mean deviations       6.97   7.04   6.50
Age-sex Accuracy Index 34.45

Note: Calculations were made based on a method recommended in the United Nations technical publication.
Table 1.11: Age-Sex Accuracy Index, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male Age Ratio</th>
<th>Female Age Ratio</th>
<th>Sex Ratio</th>
<th>Successive Differences</th>
<th>Male Deviation From 100</th>
<th>Female Deviation From 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>95.80</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>92.28</td>
<td>87.60</td>
<td>102.24</td>
<td>-6.44</td>
<td>-7.72</td>
<td>-12.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>115.02</td>
<td>116.70</td>
<td>98.25</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>15.02</td>
<td>16.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>101.71</td>
<td>99.59</td>
<td>97.15</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>81.79</td>
<td>89.39</td>
<td>90.80</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>-18.21</td>
<td>-10.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>101.27</td>
<td>94.34</td>
<td>101.62</td>
<td>-10.82</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>-5.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>104.33</td>
<td>104.55</td>
<td>97.82</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>109.86</td>
<td>111.39</td>
<td>95.12</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>11.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>98.51</td>
<td>102.38</td>
<td>94.91</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-1.49</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>109.47</td>
<td>102.34</td>
<td>104.00</td>
<td>-9.09</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>89.06</td>
<td>91.52</td>
<td>101.72</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>-10.94</td>
<td>-8.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>87.37</td>
<td>80.10</td>
<td>105.73</td>
<td>-4.01</td>
<td>-12.63</td>
<td>-19.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>88.62</td>
<td>112.68</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>15.73</td>
<td>-11.38</td>
<td>12.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>140.71</td>
<td>87.89</td>
<td>125.20</td>
<td>-35.20</td>
<td>40.71</td>
<td>-12.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63.57</td>
<td>61.63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total absolute value 163.33 144.74 119.60
Mean deviations 11.67 11.13 9.20
Age–sex Accuracy Index 55.33

Note: Calculations were made based on a method recommended in the United Nations technical publication.
CHAPTER 2

NATIONAL POPULATION TRENDS: SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

2.1 Introduction
This Chapter examines the changing characteristics of Anguilla’s population since 1992, as it relates to the broad changes that have taken place in the social and economic profile of the population. Special attention is given to the changes in the growth of the foreign born population, ethnic composition, and religious affiliation, marital and union status of the population. The chapter also focuses on current patterns in training, education and economic activity status within the country.

2.2 Population by Place of Birth
Tables 2.1 and 2.2 suggest that the growth of the foreign born population is an important feature of Anguilla’s demography. In 2001, 37 percent of the population was foreign born compared to 23.2 percent in 1992. During the intercensal period, the foreign born population more than doubled, increasing by 103.5 percent, to reach 4,224 persons in 2001. Females comprised 53 percent (2,245 females), and males 47 percent (1,979 males), of the total foreign born population in 2001, compared to 49.5 percent male and 50.5 percent female in 1992. By 2001, foreign born females accounted for 38.7 percent of the female population and foreign born males 35.2 percent of the male population.

Locally born persons increased by a modest 322 persons or by 4.7 percent and accounted for 63 percent of the total population in 2001, compared to 76.8 percent in 1992. Between 1992 and 2001, locally born males increased by 5.9 percent or 203 persons, while locally born females increased by 3.5 percent or 119 persons. In the absence of a 114 percent increase in foreign born females which translated into 1,196 additional females, the male population would have exceeded the female population, given that the increase in locally born males was 1.3 percentage points higher than locally born females.
Table 2.1: Total Population and Intercensal Change by Place of Birth and Sex, 1992 and 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Both Sexes</th>
<th>Intercensal Change</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Absolute Change</td>
<td>Percentage Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in Anguilla</td>
<td>6,884</td>
<td>7,206</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born Abroad</td>
<td>2,076</td>
<td>4,224</td>
<td>2,148</td>
<td>103.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Intercensal Change</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Absolute Change</td>
<td>Percentage Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in Anguilla</td>
<td>3,446</td>
<td>3,649</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born Abroad</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>1,979</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>92.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Intercensal Change</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Absolute Change</td>
<td>Percentage Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in Anguilla</td>
<td>3,438</td>
<td>3,557</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born Abroad</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>2,245</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>114.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In 1992, male total differs by 4 persons as compared to the corresponding figure in Table 1.2

Table 2.2: Percentage Distribution of Total Population by Place of Birth and Sex, 1992 and 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Both Sexes</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Born in Anguilla</td>
<td>76.83</td>
<td>63.04</td>
<td>77.04</td>
<td>64.84</td>
<td>76.62</td>
<td>61.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born Abroad</td>
<td>23.17</td>
<td>36.96</td>
<td>22.96</td>
<td>35.16</td>
<td>23.38</td>
<td>38.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the intercensal period, net-migration played a greater role in population increase than natural increase. This is evident as eighty-seven percent of the population increase between 1992 and 2001 was due to net-migration, while only 13 percent was due to natural increase.
2.3 Race and Ethnicity

Race and ethnicity are highly contested issues globally and may be the source of bitter social and political rivalry in populations with two or more dominant racial or ethnic groups. A look at Table 2.3 shows that, nine out of every ten persons, or 10,297 individuals in the 2001 census classified themselves as being black or of African origin. People of mixed races are the second largest ethnic group, accounting for 4.7 percent or 531 persons. Whites or people of caucasian descent make-up 3.7 percent or 428 persons in the population, while all other ethnic groups combined, accounted for only 1.5 percent of the population.

The reporting of ethnic origin by sex appears to be fairly uniform, (Table 2.3). The main difference observed is that, a slightly smaller percentage of the female population classified themselves as black, 89.4 percent and a greater percentage mixed, 5.3 percent, when compared to 90.8 percent black and 4.0 percent mixed, for the male population. Additionally, the largest difference in sex ratio by race is among the Chinese or Oriental population where 71 percent is male.

Table 2.3: Total Population and Percent Distribution by Ethnic Group and Sex, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11430</td>
<td>5628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African/Negro/Black</td>
<td>10297</td>
<td>5109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amerindian Carib.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Indian</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese/Oriental</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In 1992, total males and females do not add up to the total in Table 1.2 (or Table 1.1)
2.4 Religion

The 2001 census categories for religion provided a more comprehensive representation of the population by religious orientation than in 1992. A major difference in the way this question was constructed in the two censuses is that: in 1992 there was a greater emphasis on denominational groups within Christianity. In 2001, the categories were widened to include more contemporary Christian denominational groups and two other world religions, Hinduism and Islam.

Anglicans and Methodists are the two dominant denominations. More than half of the population is either Anglican (29 percent) or Methodist (24 percent). Although both denominations experienced significant declines in their percentage share of the population, from 65.3 percent in 1992 to 52.9 percent in 2001, their membership increased marginally by 3 percent over the same period.

The next closest denominational group is Pentecostal, representing 7.7 percent of the population. The fastest growing religious denominations are the Church of God (147.6 percent), Seventh Day Adventist (42.1 percent), Baptist (32.6 percent) and Roman Catholics (30.0 percent).

Females generally outnumbered males in most denominations. The only exceptions to this trend were among, Evangelicals, Muslims, Jews, Rastafarians and persons of Bahai faith, (See Tables 2.4-2.5).
Table 2.4: Total Population and Intercensal Change by Religious Affiliation, 1992 and 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Affiliation</th>
<th>1992</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>Absolute Change</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
<td>8960</td>
<td>11430</td>
<td>2470</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>3207</td>
<td>3313</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahai</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brethren</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of God</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>147.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehovah’s Witnesses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>2648</td>
<td>2733</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecostal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rastafarian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Day Adventist</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>-613</td>
<td>-60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.4b: Male Population by Religious Affiliation and Intercensal Change, 1992 to 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Affiliation</th>
<th>1992</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>Absolute Change</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Male Population</td>
<td>4473</td>
<td>5628</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>1583</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahai</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brethren</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of God</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>131.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehovah’s Witnesses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>1343</td>
<td>1365</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecostal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rastafarian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Day Adventist</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>-323</td>
<td>-62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In 1992, total males and females do not add up to the total in Table 1.2 (or Table 1.1)
### Table 2.4c: Female Population by Religious Affiliation and Intercensal Change, 1992 to 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Female Population</td>
<td>4487</td>
<td>5802</td>
<td></td>
<td>1315</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>1666</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>449</td>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahai</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brethren</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of God</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>510</td>
<td></td>
<td>314</td>
<td>160.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehovah’s Witnesses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>1368</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecostal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>480</td>
<td></td>
<td>480</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rastafarian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>343</td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Day Adventist</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>447</td>
<td></td>
<td>156</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
<td>-290</td>
<td>-58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In 1992, total males and females do not add up to the total in Table 1.2 (or Table 1.1)
Table 2.5: Percentage Distribution of Total Population by Religious Affiliation and Sex, 1992 and 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>8,960</td>
<td>11,430</td>
<td>4,473</td>
<td>5,628</td>
<td>4,487</td>
<td>5,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>28.99</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>29.26</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>28.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahai</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brethren</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of God</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>8.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehovah’s Witnesses</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>23.91</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>24.25</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>23.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecostal</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rastafarian</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Day Adventist</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In 1992, total males and females do not add up to the total in Table 1.2 (or Table 1.1)

An increase in the number of persons with no religious affiliations since 1992 is also of interest. In 2001, 456 persons or four percent of the population said they had no religion, compared to universal religious affiliation in 1992. Of this latter number, 64.9 percent (296) were male and 35.1 percent (160) female.
2.5 Marital and Union Status

The demographic transition of a country is largely responsible for changes in household composition and union formation over time. Where the fertility level is high, union formation will be earlier and the portion of single persons, especially women may be lower than when fertility is low. A high mortality rate is often accompanied by increased widowhood as females usually outlive their male counterparts. Economic and social developments which are companions of the demographic transition also increase economic opportunities for women. These changes may lead to greater gender equity and female autonomy and may result in an increase in the number of single and divorced women in a population, as the welfare of the women is no longer dependent on their marital status.

In 2001, slightly more than half or 50.7 percent of the population sixteen years and older was never married, 40.3 percent married, 4.1 percent widowed, 3.2 percent divorced and 1.3 percent separated.

**Table 2.6: Total Population (16 yrs. and over) by Marital Status, Sex and Intercensal Change 1992 and 2001**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>1992</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>Absolute Change</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,112</td>
<td>3,956</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>27.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>35.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>1,665</td>
<td>2,057</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>23.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-31.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>260.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,113</td>
<td>4,092</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>31.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1,194</td>
<td>1,606</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>34.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>1,509</td>
<td>2,019</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>33.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>366.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Census Report, 2001, Anguilla

Table 2.7: Percentage Distribution of Total Population (16 yrs. and over) by Marital Status and Sex, 1992 and 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>6,225</td>
<td>8,048</td>
<td>3,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>38.56</td>
<td>40.30</td>
<td>38.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>50.99</td>
<td>50.64</td>
<td>53.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 2.6 and 2.7 capture the changes in marital status between 1992 and 2001. The major trend reflected in the tables is the increase in the percent of divorced, married and never married persons as the number of legally separated individuals decline.

In 1992, 2,400 persons or 38.6 percent of the population were legally married and 187 persons or three percent of the population, divorced. Between 1992 and 2001, the number of divorced persons increased by 36.9 percent, at a faster rate than any other group. Married persons increased by 35.1 percent or 843 persons, the never married increased by 28.4 percent or 902 persons, while the number of widowed persons increased by 4.1 percent or 13 persons. There was an increase in the number of divorced persons while the number of separated persons declined. This may also be due to the fact that persons received a decree nisi from the courts prior to the 1992 census and the decree absolute by 2001.

There is a greater tendency for males to be married than females. A look at Table 2.7 will show that 41.4 percent of males and 39.3 percent of females were married in 2001. Similar differences were observed in 1992. Even when males are divorced, they appear to remarry more frequently
within a shorter time period than females as the number of divorced males is smaller than divorced females while the number of married males is greater. This is further substantiated when we look at changes in the patterns of legal separation and divorce.

The decline in the number of legally separated persons was due mainly to the decrease in the number of legally separated males, and reflects the tendency for divorced males to remarry sooner than divorced females. In 2001, 42.6 percent of legally separated persons were males, down from 49.3 percent in 1992. The percent of legally separated females declined marginally by 10.1 percent, compared to a 31.3 percentage fall in legally separated males.

Since traditional marital status categories do not adequately reflect the full range of union types that exist within Caribbean households, Table 2.8 presents data on the legal and consensual arrangements which usually precede family formation in the Caribbean.

In 2001, 38.9 percent of the populations reported themselves as single or not in a union. The second largest group was married persons, accounting for 38.6 percent. Of the 3,243 persons who were still married, 95.9 percent were living with their spouse as husband and wife. Common-law unions accounted for 8.5 percent of all unions and are slightly more prevalent among males (8.6 percent) than females (8.4 percent). This union type is characterized by a male and female who co-reside permanently on a consensual basis and have sexual intercourse. The union may or may not produce children.

Another 4.1 percent are widowed, with widows 6.0 percent and widowers 2.2 percent. Visiting unions which are characterized by individuals who share a sexual relationship but do not permanently co-reside, accounted for 3.2 percent of all unions. Divorced individuals who are not in a union account for 3.2 percent and legally separated persons another 1.3 percent of the population. The relatively small proportion in common law unions (8.5 percent) and visiting unions (3.2 percent) suggest that traditional marital status categories adequately reflect union types in Anguilla.
Table 2.8: Total Population (16 years and over) and Intercensal Change by Union Status and Sex, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8048</td>
<td>3956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legally Married</td>
<td>3110</td>
<td>1576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Law</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Partner</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Union and Married</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Union and Legally Separated</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Union and Widowed</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Union and Divorced</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Union and Single</td>
<td>3132</td>
<td>1591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6 Educational Attainment

Table 2.9 shows that 32.1 percent of the Anguilla’s population had at least a primary education in 2001. Another 47.8 percent had secondary schooling, 2.4 percent post secondary education and 14.2 percent had a university education. Only 1.6 percent or 133 persons, fifteen years and older, had never received any formal education. A key point to note is that there were no significant gender differences among persons with any education.

Generally, the educational attainment level for females was higher than males, as 15.5 percent of females and 12.7 percent of males received a university education. One in every two females had at least a secondary education compared to 46 percent of males. Another 35.4 percent of the male population had a primary level education only, compared to 28.8 percent of females.
Table 2.9: Percentage Distribution of Total Population (15 years and over) by Highest Level of Educational Attainment and Sex, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8228</td>
<td>4038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>2637</td>
<td>1429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>3935</td>
<td>1853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post secondary</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>1164</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.7 Academic Qualifications

When we examine academic qualifications in Table 2.10, a slightly different pattern emerges. We will notice that 7.9 percent of the population has no academic qualifications and a further 16.1 percent, received only a school leaving certificate or a school diploma or certificate. The school leaving certificate is given to students on completion of primary school, while the high school diploma is given to secondary school students who attended school on a regular basis but took neither CXC, GCE ‘O’ Level nor A Level examinations. When we consider that another 673 persons over fifteen years who attended school, or 16.1 percent of the population has received no CXC, GCE qualifications, the proportion of the population with no real internationally recognized qualification increases to 23.97 percent, or 1003 persons. These persons are almost perfectly distributed by sex as 503 or 50.1 percent are males.

Less than a quarter of the population (23.2 percent) has 1-4 CXC or ‘O’ Level subjects, 10.3 percent have five subjects or more and only 1.7 percent received A’ Levels.

When we look at the population with secondary level qualifications, females have performed better than males in this regard. However at the tertiary level the pattern is reversed. A larger percentage of females (3.5 percent) than males (3.0 percent) have received undergraduate diplomas or associate degrees but, a larger percentage of males that females received Bachelor’s degrees and higher degrees or professional certificates.
Table 2.10 shows that 8.1 percent of males and 7.8 percent of females received a Bachelor’s degree, 4.9 percent of males and 3.2 percent of females received post graduate degrees and 5.8 percent of males and 5.8 percent of females received a professional certificate. These figures suggest that females tend to aspire less toward higher education although their performance at the secondary level is better than that of their male counterparts.

Females seemed to be more interested in shorter diploma and certificate courses which will qualify them for a particular position in the job market, and incidentally, a lower level post. When the data on other diplomas and certificates in Table 2.10 are further disaggregated, two thirds of the 94 persons who had a trade certificate were male, while two thirds of the 406 persons who completed a skills training diploma or certificate were female.

Table 2.10: Total and Percentage of Population (15 years and over) by Highest Examination Passed and Sex, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Examination</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4185</td>
<td>1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCE O’ Level/CXC/Cambridge 1-4 Subjects</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCE O’ Level/CXC/Cambridge 5+ Subjects</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCE A’ Levels</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Diploma/Associate degree</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate Degree</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Certificate</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Diploma/Certificate/Trade certificate</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.8 Training

Approximately two fifths of the population fifteen years and older was trained for a specific occupation or profession. This training was not uniform by sex, as a larger percentage of males (46.1 percent) than females (40.6 percent) were trained for a specific occupation or profession. When we limit our analysis to the current working-age group 15-64 years, the trained labour force increased to 45.3 percent or 7,164 persons. Gender differences remained unchanged, as a larger percentage of current working-age males (47.3 percent) than females (43.4 percent) have been trained for a specific job, (See Tables 2.11a and 2.11b).

Table 2.11a: Total Population (15 years and over) Trained and Not Trained by Five-Year Age Group and Sex, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>Not Trained</td>
<td>Trained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3458</td>
<td>4527</td>
<td>1802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-84</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.11b:  Percentage Distribution of Population (15 years and over) Trained and Not Trained by Age Group and Sex, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Total Trained</th>
<th>Total Not Trained</th>
<th>Male Trained</th>
<th>Male Not Trained</th>
<th>Female Trained</th>
<th>Female Not Trained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>17.18</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>18.24</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>16.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>9.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>14.72</td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>13.26</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>9.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>15.76</td>
<td>10.38</td>
<td>15.89</td>
<td>9.98</td>
<td>15.64</td>
<td>10.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>13.36</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>13.59</td>
<td>9.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>7.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-84</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.9 Status in Employment

Table 2.12, identifies the private sector as the largest employer of workers in Anguilla. In 2001, 64.3 percent of all workers were employed in the private sector, 16.7 percent in government and 15.9 percent worked in their own business. A further sub-division of the own business category shows that 6.2 percent of those with their own businesses had paid help and 9.6 percent were without paid help.

Table 2.12 shows that government was a greater employer of female (59.7 percent) workers while a larger percentage of males (52.3 percent) worked in the private sector or statutory boards (63.8 percent) or owned businesses (70.8 percent).
Table 2.12: Number and Percentage Distribution of Employed Persons by Status in Employment and Sex, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5851</td>
<td>3123</td>
<td>2728</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Employee Government</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>16.71</td>
<td>12.62</td>
<td>21.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Employee Private</td>
<td>3759</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1792</td>
<td>64.25</td>
<td>62.98</td>
<td>65.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Employee Statutory Board</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid Worker</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own Business Paid Help</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own Business Without Paid Help</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.10 Household Headship

In 2001 there were 3,727 households in Anguilla. Males headed 64.5 percent or 2,405 households and the remaining 1,322 households or 35.5 percent were headed by female.

Generally speaking, Table 2.13 shows that in 2001, female heads were slightly older than male heads. The median age of female heads was about 45.4 years while the median age for male head was 42.8 years old. Almost one out of every two heads or 48.1 percent were 25-44 years, while another 32 percent were aged 45-64 years. Elderly persons headed 16.3 percent of all households and while youth were in charge of the remaining 3.6 percent.

When we take both the age and sex of the household head into consideration, the largest percentage of male (49.8 percent) or female (45.2) heads were in the 25-44 age group. The major difference in household headship is that a larger percentage of young females (4.2 percent) than males (3.2 percent) and elderly females (19.3 percent) than elderly males (14.6 percent) were heads of households.
Table 2.13: Number of Household Heads and Percentage Distribution by Age Group and Sex of Household Head, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group of Head</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3727</td>
<td>2405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>1794</td>
<td>1197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>1194</td>
<td>779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and Over</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 3

POPULATION DISTRIBUTION AND MIGRATION

3.1 Introduction

This Chapter examines the characteristics of the immigrant population in Anguilla. Special attention is given to the age and sex structure of returning residents, their country of origin and their residential location within the population.

Explanations of the age-sex structure of the migrant population in Anguilla, calls for a deeper understanding of the social and political economy of Anguilla in the context of push and pull factors that influence migration streams, to and within the island. Given that people generally migrate for economic betterment, it is not surprising that nearly three quarters of the foreign born population, 72.5 percent of males and 72.7 percent of females, are in the working-age group.

Since the present stock of migrants reflects migration patterns over a period of time spanning several decades and not just recent migrants, many of the persons in the foreign born population would have actually been younger when they first came to Anguilla. In the absence of historical data on exact entry dates, we can infer that the existing pattern of immigration has remained constant although the volume of migrants may have changed.

In Table 3.1, the distribution of immigrants across age groups shows no real differences in pattern by sex, although the migrant population is slightly biased towards females.

Females comprise 53.1 percent of the foreign born population, or 2,245 females compared to 1,979 males. Further analysis by age reveals that the number of immigrants in all age groups hovered at around an average of 6.7 percent in the age range 0 to 19 years. The only exception was in the 10-14 age group, which accounted for 9.3 percent of the total foreign born population.

The average age of the foreign born population in 2001, was 35 years compared to 29.3 years for the total population. This is because the majority of immigrants, 3,066 persons or 72.6 percent, were clustered within the working age group. Of this number, 33.1 percent or one third, were aged 30-44 years. Children aged 0-14 years accounted for 22.9 percent and youth aged 15-24
years, 13.2 percent of immigrants/foreign born persons. Persons in the retirement age group, 65 years and older accounted for the smallest share, 4.5 percent, of the foreign born population.

Table 3.1: Number and Percentage Distribution of the Foreign Born Population by, Five-Year Age Groups and Sex, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4224</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-84</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Returning Residents by Country of Origin

Given the high obstetric risk in the developing world, there is the tendency for middle-class and upper–class women in developing countries to seek prenatal and antenatal care, especially for the delivery of the baby in a developed country where maternal care is perceived to be better and safer.

In developing countries, fertility is also used as a strategy for migration, as women in developing countries may attempt to give birth in a developed country in order to secure citizenship for themselves and their newborn child. Where this pattern occurs over time the sending country builds an enclave of individuals with legal status in both the receiving and study country. This enclave then facilitates streams and counter streams of migrants with close familial ties between the two countries, a process commonly referred to as chain migration. Where a developing
country shares historical/political ties or geographic proximity to a developed country, this pattern is commonplace.

Anguilla is currently a British dependency and Anguilla citizens are entitled to British citizenship. Neighboring US Virgin Island is a United States dependency and its citizens can easily access U.S. visas and U.S. citizenship.

Given the close proximity of the British Virgin Islands (BVI), St. Thomas, the US Virgin Islands and Anguilla, inter-island migration and even inter-island marriages are common place. As a result people in these neighboring islands share strong kinship relations. These kinship ties facilitate the step migration of Anguillans through St. Thomas to the U.S.A. and by the same token, the migration of people from BVI and St. Thomas through Anguilla, to the UK.

The data of return migration in Table 3.2 suggest a very strong pattern of inter Caribbean migration from Anguilla. It is noted that almost two-thirds of the returning migrants resided in the Caribbean region. The data also reflect the profile of returning migrants to be predominantly males, middle-aged and retired.

Apart from the Caribbean, the United States and the UK seemed to be the preferred place of residence for Anguillans who lived abroad. This can be inferred based on the patterns of return migration in Table 3.2, which shows that 15.3 percent (236 persons) are from the USA, 11.8 percent (183 persons) from the United Kingdom, 2.2 percent (34 persons) from Canada and 2.9 percent (45 persons) from the rest of the world.
Table 3.2: Percentage Distribution of Returning Residents, by Five-Year Age Group and Country/Region of Origin, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>Caribbean</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>Rest of the world</th>
<th>Not Stated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw percentage</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>15.26</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>64.45</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>13.14</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>10.92</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>11.63</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>13.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>17.49</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>13.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>9.18</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>28.41</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>11.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-84</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A more specific look at the Caribbean country of origin in Table 3.3 shows that 40.8 percent of immigrants to Anguilla, are from the US Virgin islands. The second largest sending country is St. Martin (27.6 percent), British Virgin Islands (2.9 percent), Santo Domingo (1.1 percent) and all other Caribbean countries contributed 27.6 percent of returning migrants from the Caribbean. The sex ratio of returning migrants from the Caribbean is in favor of males, with a total sex ratio of 126.1 males for every 100 females. The sex ratio is widest for Santo Domingo, where ninety percent of returning migrants are male. The US Virgin Islands also has a high sex ratio of 184.6 males per 100 females. Only returning migrants from the British Virgin Islands have their sex ratio in favour of females with 70 males per 100 females.
Table 3.3: Number and Percentage Distribution of Returning Residents from the Caribbean by Sex Ratios and Country of Previous Residence, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sex Ratio</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Martin</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Virgin Islands</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Virgin Islands</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santo Domingo</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Caribbean</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Age Structure of Returning Migrants

The age structure of returning residents shown in Table 3.4 indicates that returning residents are mainly in the pre and post-retirement years. One in every three persons who returned is in the post-retirement age group, 60 years and older. This is especially true for those returning from the United Kingdom, as 50.9 percent of males and 57.3 percent of females are in the post-retirement age group. From the United States, 10.6 percent are males 65 years and older and 11.3 percent females, 60 years and older. From Canada, 12.5 percent are males, 65 years and older and 22.2 percent are females, 60 years and older.

Middle-aged and pre-retirement individuals - 45-64 years for males and 45-59 years for females - accounted for 34.4 percent of male and 21 percent of female returnees. The age selectivity of returning migrants is even more apparent when we examine 5 year age groups.

The largest percentage of returnees in any single age group was 10.9 percent in the 40-44 age group. From the United Kingdom, 28.4 percent were in the 65-69 age group, from Canada 29.4 percent were in the 45-49 age group and from the United States 15.3 percent were in the 40-44 age group. Returnees from the Caribbean were more evenly distributed across the working age and elderly groups, although a larger proportion was in their middle ages. Only 2.8 percent of returning residents, 43 persons, were children birth to fourteen years old, while 11.3 percent were young adults, 20-29 years. This may reflect a tendency for most Anguillans to return home when their children have grown-up. Generally those who return do so singly rather than as an entire nuclear family unit.
Table 3.4: Percentage Distribution of Returning Residents by Age Group and Sex, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>10.92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>11.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>9.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>9.18</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-84</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Distribution of Returning Residents by Area

Returning residents may change the geographical distribution of a small population, if their numbers are large enough and the profile of returnees differs sufficiently from that of the non-migrant population, in terms of age, gender and social class. Many returning residents are doing so, having spent most of their working years abroad in more developed countries and are likely to be financially better off than non-migrants. As a result, they can better afford to reside in the more expensive, more developed areas of the country.
Returning residents constituted 13.5 percent of the total population in 2001. They also accounted for 15.2 percent of persons in the labour force, less than three percent of children under 15 years and 25 percent of elderly persons in the population.

The volume of returnees residing in any given area ranged from a high of 16.6 percent of the population in Sandy Hill, 16.5 percent in Sandy Ground and 16.3 percent in West End, to a low of 6.3 percent in the Quarters and 8.3 percent in North Hill. Table 3.4 also shows that the majority of returning residents resided in South Hill (12.6 percent) and Stony Ground (11.5 percent). North Hill and Sandy Ground had the smallest share of returnees with 2.3 and 2.9 percent, respectively.
Table 3.5: Percentage Distribution of Total Returning Migrants by Administrative Division and Broad Age Groups, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>West End</th>
<th>South Hill</th>
<th>Blowing Point</th>
<th>Sandy Ground</th>
<th>North Hill</th>
<th>George Hill</th>
<th>The Valley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 15</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>8.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-59</td>
<td>56.44</td>
<td>48.33</td>
<td>60.01</td>
<td>58.33</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>58.34</td>
<td>63.83</td>
<td>60.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and older</td>
<td>32.13</td>
<td>38.34</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>28.13</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>24.47</td>
<td>27.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Number of returning residents | 1547 | 120 | 195 | 96 | 45 | 36 | 94 | 151 |
| Percent of total population  | (13.5) | (16.3) | (13.1) | (12.6) | (16.5) | (8.3) | (12.0) | (13.0) |
| Percentage distribution of total returning residents | 100.0 | 7.76 | 12.60 | 6.20 | 2.91 | 2.33 | 6.08 | 9.76 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>North Side</th>
<th>The Quarter</th>
<th>Stoney Ground</th>
<th>Farrington</th>
<th>Sandy Hill</th>
<th>East End</th>
<th>Island Harbour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 15</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>9.31</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-59</td>
<td>63.55</td>
<td>64.25</td>
<td>43.25</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>52.23</td>
<td>54.92</td>
<td>53.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and older</td>
<td>24.04</td>
<td>27.14</td>
<td>41.58</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>36.66</td>
<td>38.04</td>
<td>37.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Number of returning residents | 129 | 151 | 178 | 75.0 | 90.0 | 71.0 | 116.0 |
| Percent of total population  | (11.0) | (6.3) | (15.9) | (13.8) | (16.6) | (11.6) | (13.6) |
| Percentage distribution of total returning residents | 8.34 | 9.76 | 11.50 | 4.85 | 5.82 | 4.59 | 7.50 |
CHAPTER 4

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

4.1 Introduction
The education system is important to the maintenance of social solidarity, as it integrates the social and economic systems within a county through the preparation of the child for adult roles. This chapter examines the performance of the education and training system, through an analysis of enrolment levels, academic qualifications and number of persons trained for a particular job in 2001. Special emphasis is placed on spatial differences in enrolment, training and performance rates at different levels of the education system. The chapter also highlights some fundamental differences in the education attainment of males and females in different age cohorts at the time of the 2001 census.

4.2 School Attendance for Population Under 5 Years

For analytical purposes, school attendance is used synonymous with school enrolment as the census questionnaire captured the number of students enrolled in a given institution, rather than their frequency of school attendance. In many societies, the level of school attendance for children under five years old, often mirrors the labour force participation rate for women. This is so for two reasons. Firstly, women enroll their children in school early in order to pursue paid employment outside the home, and secondly, working mothers can better afford the cost of pre-primary education.

Table 4.1 indicates that 1,073 children or 69.4 percent of the child population under five years of age were attending school or enrolled in school at the time of the 2001 census. Overall, girls had a higher school enrolment rate (72.1 percent) than boys (66.7 percent). The only exceptions were in South Hill, Blowing Point, Sandy Hill and Island Harbour, where boys recorded higher enrolment rates than girls.

The variation in school enrolment across districts is wide, ranging from a high of 94.6 percent in The Farrington to a low of 53.6 percent in West End. The overall gender gap in enrolment was 5.4 percent. The highest gap in enrolment was in North Side (18.4 percent) and Sandy Ground (16.1 percent), in favour of girls. A lower gender gap in favour of boys was evident in Blowing
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Point (6.0 percent), Sandy Hill (3.8 percent) and South Hill (3.0 percent).

**Table 4.1: Children Under 5 Years by School Enrolment, Administrative Division and Sex, 2001**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Division</th>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Percent of Children Attending School under 5 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1073</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blowing Point</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Ground</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hill</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hill</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Valley</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quarter</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Ground</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farrington</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Hill</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Harbour</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Type of School Attended

Table 4.2 shows that about half of the under five population were enrolled in pre-school (50.3 percent), 32 percent were cared for at home, 14.6 percent attended a day-care facility outside of the home and 1.5 percent attended regular primary school.

Children in most of the districts attended preschool or were cared for within a home based day-care. The only exception was in the Farrington, where the majority of children (50 percent) were in a day-care facility outside of the home.

Preschool attendance was highest in Island Harbour (62.5 percent) and The Valley (61.5 percent), while the proportion of children attending day-care in a home was highest in East End (43.2 percent) and George Hill (42.9 percent). Only a very small proportion of children (0.27 percent or two children) attend a special primary education institution and all of these children resided in the Bowling Point district. This indicates the low incidence of learning disabilities among children in this age group.
### Table 4.2: Percentage Distribution of Children Under 5 Years Attending School by Type of School, Administrative Division, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Division</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Day Care in a Home</th>
<th>Day Care Not in a Home</th>
<th>Preschool</th>
<th>Primary - Special Education</th>
<th>Primary - Regular</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Not Stated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>31.95</td>
<td>14.63</td>
<td>50.34</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>56.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>31.58</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>52.63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blowing Point</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>21.57</td>
<td>25.49</td>
<td>47.06</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Ground</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hill</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>22.58</td>
<td>22.58</td>
<td>51.61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hill</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>48.21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Valley</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>27.69</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>33.80</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>52.11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quarter</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>37.65</td>
<td>14.12</td>
<td>45.88</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Ground</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>12.86</td>
<td>52.86</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farrington</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Hill</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>35.71</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>52.39</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>43.18</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>47.73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Harbour</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>62.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 4.3 and 4.4 reflect little gender differences in the pattern of school attendance by institution, although the level of attendance across districts varied. Overall, a larger percentage of males than females attended day care facilities both inside and outside of the home and a larger percentage of females (51.9 percent) than males (48.6 percent) attended preschool. No male children were enrolled in a day care facility outside of the home in Sandy Ground or the Valley, the same being true for girls in Island Harbour.

The Valley had the largest percentage of male children (69.2 percent) and Island Harbour the largest percentage of female children (72.4 percent) who were attending preschool in any district. Sandy Ground had the largest percent of male children (60 percent) and George Hill the largest percentage of female children (45.2 percent) attending day-care inside of a home.
Table 4.3  Percentage Distribution of Male Children Under 5 Years Attending School by Type of School, Administrative Division, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Division</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Day Care in a Home</th>
<th>Day Care Not in a Home</th>
<th>Pre-School</th>
<th>Primary - Special Education</th>
<th>Primary - Regular</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Not Stated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>34.29</td>
<td>15.43</td>
<td>48.57</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>29.41</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td>52.94</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>48.57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blowing Point</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>53.57</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Ground</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hill</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>36.36</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>27.28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hill</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Valley</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>69.23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>53.13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quarter</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>41.46</td>
<td>14.64</td>
<td>43.90</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Ground</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>29.41</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>55.88</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farrington</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>57.69</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Hill</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>30.43</td>
<td>13.05</td>
<td>56.52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0East End</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Harbour</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>51.85</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4  Percentage Distribution of Female Children Under 5 Years Attending School by Type of School, Administrative Division, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Division</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Day Care in a Home</th>
<th>Day Care Not in a Home</th>
<th>Pre-School</th>
<th>Primary - Special Education</th>
<th>Primary - Regular</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Not Stated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>29.87</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td>51.90</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>24.39</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>56.10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blowing Point</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>21.74</td>
<td>30.43</td>
<td>39.13</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Ground</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>54.55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hill</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hill</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>45.16</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>48.39</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Valley</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>56.41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quarter</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>34.09</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>47.72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Ground</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>30.56</td>
<td>13.89</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farrington</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>26.92</td>
<td>42.31</td>
<td>26.92</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Hill</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>42.11</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>47.36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>54.17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Harbour</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>24.14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>72.41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 School Attendance for Population 5 Years and Older

Just over one quarter (26.6 percent) of the population five years and older or 2,753 persons, were attending school in 2001. Of this total, 1,443 were females and 1,310 were males, (Table 4.5). The portion of the female population attending school was slightly higher than that of their male counterparts, viz., 27.5 percent for females and 25.7 percent for males. This brings the gender gap in school enrolment for persons five years and older, to 1.8 percent. Slight deviations ranging from less than one percent to eight percent can be observed across districts. Table 4.5 records a narrow range in school attendance across the districts from a low of 23.2 percent in Sandy Ground, to a high of 29.6 percent in East End.

Table 4.5 Percentage Distribution of Persons (5 years and over) by School Attendance, Administrative Division and Sex, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Division</th>
<th>Number of Persons 5 Years and Older</th>
<th>Number of Persons Attending School 5 years and older</th>
<th>Percent Attending School 5 Years and Older</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Male Female</td>
<td>Total Male Female</td>
<td>Total Male Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10357 5103 5254</td>
<td>2753 1310 1443</td>
<td>26.58 25.67 27.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>680 347 333</td>
<td>159 78 81</td>
<td>23.38 22.48 24.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill</td>
<td>1365 700 665</td>
<td>356 173 183</td>
<td>26.08 24.71 27.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blowing Point</td>
<td>691 332 359</td>
<td>193 90 103</td>
<td>27.93 27.11 28.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Ground</td>
<td>250 126 124</td>
<td>58 30 28</td>
<td>23.20 23.81 22.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hill</td>
<td>393 205 188</td>
<td>104 58 46</td>
<td>26.46 28.29 24.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hill</td>
<td>704 327 377</td>
<td>188 77 111</td>
<td>26.70 23.55 29.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Valley</td>
<td>1060 535 525</td>
<td>290 134 156</td>
<td>27.36 25.05 29.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side</td>
<td>1060 530 530</td>
<td>282 148 134</td>
<td>26.60 27.92 25.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quarter</td>
<td>854 400 454</td>
<td>212 100 112</td>
<td>24.82 25.00 24.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Ground</td>
<td>1016 473 543</td>
<td>279 124 155</td>
<td>27.46 26.22 28.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farrington</td>
<td>486 244 242</td>
<td>137 76 61</td>
<td>28.19 31.15 25.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Hill</td>
<td>487 224 263</td>
<td>125 48 77</td>
<td>25.67 21.43 29.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>551 270 281</td>
<td>163 79 84</td>
<td>29.58 29.26 29.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Harbour</td>
<td>760 390 370</td>
<td>207 95 112</td>
<td>27.24 24.36 30.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 presents data on the institutions which the population over five years old was attending in 2001. About half the students were attending a primary school, 37.9 percent attended a secondary school, inclusive of those in sixth form and 2.7 percent attended university. Generally, a larger percentage of males than females were enrolled at the lower levels of the education

---

1 Total Population 5 years and over is based on inconsistent total from Table 1.3
system, while more females were enrolled in institutions of higher education. At the primary level, males had a higher enrolment rate (52.3 percent) than females (47.8 percent).

A slightly different pattern in favour of girls emerged at the secondary level, where 38.5 percent of the female population and 37.3 percent of the male population were enrolled in a secondary school. At the university level, the enrolment rate for females was more than twice that of males: 3.8 percent for females and 1.5 percent for males. Persons enrolled in adult education classes were predominantly female and accounted for 1.9 percent of all individuals enrolled in an institution.

Table 4.6  Number and Percentage Distribution of Persons (5 years and Over) Attending School by Type of School and Sex, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2753</td>
<td>1310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Care Not in a Home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per School</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary - Special Education</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary - Regular</td>
<td>1374</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary/High School</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Form/’A’ Level</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Vocational</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWI Extra Mural/US University/College</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWI/UK or Equivalent</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5  Educational Attainment for Population 15 Years and Older

Table 4.7 presents the educational attainment for the population fifteen years and older by highest level of education attained and by residential districts. These figure do not represent the

---

2 Total Population 15 years and over is based on inconsistent total from Table 1.3
ultimate academic potential of the population, bearing in mind that a significant proportion of the
over fifteen population are below the age of entry into university. A more careful disaggregation
by age would present a clear picture of the educational performance of the population. Never-
the-less, these figures give us a good indication of the level of academic exposure of the
population. One-tenth of the population (10.7 percent) has attained a university level education
as their highest level, 3.4 percent a college education, 47.8 percent achieved the secondary level,
with 32.4 percent actually completing their secondary schooling. Another 32 percent have
attained primary level education while a small proportion (1.6 percent) has no formal education,
(Table 4.8).

**Table 4.7:** Persons (15 years and over) by Highest Level of Educational Attainment and
Administrative Division, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Division</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Primary 1-3 Years</th>
<th>Primary 4-7 Years</th>
<th>Some Secondary</th>
<th>Complete d High School</th>
<th>UWI Extra Mural/ College</th>
<th>US University/ College</th>
<th>University W.I./UK Equivalent</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Not Stated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8228</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>2494</td>
<td>1273</td>
<td>2662</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill</td>
<td>1091</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blowing Point</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Ground</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hill</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hill</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Valley</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quarter</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Ground</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farrington</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Hill</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Harbour</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8 highlights the highest level of educational attainment by administrative district.
George Hill emerges as the district with the largest share of its population (17.1 percent) having
attained university education. The Valley has the largest share (12.5 percent) of all university
trained persons in the country and also the largest percentage (36.3 percent) of residents who
have completed high school. Six districts have a smaller percentage of university graduates than
in the average population. Blowing Point has the smallest proportion of university trained persons (6.1 percent) in its residential composition; although the smallest share of university trained persons reside in Sandy Ground (3.3 percent). South Hill, although having the second largest share of persons with a university education (12.0 percent) also has the largest proportion of individuals with no education (8.0 percent).

Table 4.8  Percentage Distribution of Persons (15 years and over) by Highest Level of Educational Attainment and Administrative Division, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Division</th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>Primary 1-3 Years</th>
<th>Primary 4-7 Years</th>
<th>Some Secondary</th>
<th>Completed High School</th>
<th>UWI Extra Mural/College</th>
<th>US University/College</th>
<th>University W.I./UK Equivalent</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Not Stated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>30.31</td>
<td>15.47</td>
<td>32.35</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>15.88</td>
<td>26.35</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>24.56</td>
<td>16.32</td>
<td>33.73</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blowing Point</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>36.67</td>
<td>14.81</td>
<td>34.63</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Ground</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>29.86</td>
<td>13.74</td>
<td>32.23</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hill</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>37.54</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>33.89</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hill</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>23.67</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td>33.45</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>9.96</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Valley</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>15.24</td>
<td>36.31</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>31.75</td>
<td>16.94</td>
<td>33.06</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quarter</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>27.06</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>36.18</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Ground</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>30.51</td>
<td>17.06</td>
<td>33.13</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farrington</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>24.62</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>30.51</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Hill</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>32.23</td>
<td>11.17</td>
<td>29.70</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>39.76</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>29.76</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Harbour</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>38.86</td>
<td>17.76</td>
<td>24.29</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 Highest Examination Passed

A look at the educational achievements of the population in Table 4.9 as indicated by the highest examination passed reveals that the majority of persons (23.2 percent) have attained 1-4 GCE O’ level/ CXC passes, 10.3 percent have five or more GCE O’ Level/CXC/Cambridge Subjects, 9.7 percent, a tertiary level certificate and 7.9 percent a Bachelor’s degree. Only 7.9 percent of persons have no academic qualifications.
Table 4.9: Percentage Distribution of Persons (15 years and over) by Highest Examination Passed and Administrative Division, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Division</th>
<th>School Leaving Certificate</th>
<th>GCE O' Level/CXC/ Cambridge 1-4 Subjects</th>
<th>GCE O' Level/CXC/ Cambridge 5+ Subjects</th>
<th>High School Diploma/Certificate</th>
<th>GCE A' Levels 1 Subject</th>
<th>GCE A' Levels 2+ Subjects</th>
<th>Undergraduate Diploma</th>
<th>Other Diploma/Certificate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>23.20</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>9.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>20.63</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill</td>
<td>10.72</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>9.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blowing Point</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>25.68</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>8.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Ground</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>17.86</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>9.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hill</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>21.85</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>12.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hill</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>19.31</td>
<td>12.39</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>9.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Valley</td>
<td>9.54</td>
<td>23.26</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side</td>
<td>11.84</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>14.73</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quarter</td>
<td>17.43</td>
<td>24.66</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>14.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Ground</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>24.62</td>
<td>10.51</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>10.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farrington</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>25.85</td>
<td>13.66</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Hill</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>27.19</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>8.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>27.47</td>
<td>14.84</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>13.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Harbour</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>22.82</td>
<td>9.96</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>10.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 cont’d.: Percentage Distribution of Persons (15 years and over) by Highest Examination Passed and Administrative Division, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Division</th>
<th>Associate Degree</th>
<th>Professional Certificate</th>
<th>Trade Certificate</th>
<th>Bachelors Degree</th>
<th>Post Graduate Degree</th>
<th>Other None</th>
<th>Not Stated</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>6.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>14.68</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>13.12</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blowing Point</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>15.95</td>
<td>7.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Ground</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hill</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hill</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Valley</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>7.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quarter</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Ground</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>11.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farrington</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>8.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Hill</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>13.36</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>8.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Harbour</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>9.96</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Census Report, 2001, Anguilla

There is much variation in academic achievement across the districts. However, West End (43.6 percent) and George Hill (42.1 percent) have the highest proportion of their population certified at the tertiary level and East End (42.9 percent) and the Farrington (42.0 percent) has the highest proportion that is certified at the secondary level.

4.7 Technical and Vocational Training

Table 4.10 presents data on the level of technical and vocational training among the population fifteen years and older by age and residential district. A total of 3,005 persons had been trained. A look at the table will show that 20.8 percent of persons 25 to 44 years and 9.7 percent of persons 45 to 64 years have completed technical or vocational training. The level of training among youth and the elderly is low, 3.5 percent and 2.5 percent respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Division</th>
<th>Age of Both sexes</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15-25</td>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>45-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>1708</td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Total</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>20.76</td>
<td>9.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>19.68</td>
<td>9.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>21.08</td>
<td>12.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blowing Point</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>9.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Ground</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>10.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hill</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>24.02</td>
<td>13.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Valley</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>28.93</td>
<td>12.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>20.14</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quarter</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>19.39</td>
<td>9.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Ground</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>20.30</td>
<td>7.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farrington</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>22.82</td>
<td>11.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Hill</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>12.18</td>
<td>9.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>18.54</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Harbour</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>6.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, a larger percentage of males than females in all age groups have received vocational training; the only exception is among youths, with the percentage of trained females (3.53
percent) being marginally higher than males (3.49 percent). This pattern is not consistent across all districts as eight districts recorded a larger percentage of trained male youths than female youths. Across districts, the percentage of trained youths ranged from 2 percent in North Hill to 6.9 percent in Blowing Point.

The distribution of trained persons 25-44 years, varied sharply across districts from a low of 12.2 percent in Sandy Hill to a high of 28.9 percent in the Valley. Gender differences in training among persons in the 25-44 age group were also small. The largest disparity was in the Blowing Point district where 27.5 percent of males and 19.5 percent of females 25 to 44 years have been trained.

Less than ten percent (9.7 percent) of persons aged 45 to 64 years have been trained. Variations of trained persons in this age group ranged from 13.7 percent in George Hill to 5.9 percent in East End. In spite of the low levels of training among the elderly, which ranged from 4.7 percent in Sandy Ground to 1.2 percent in East End, trained elderly males outnumbered their female counterparts. This is a reflection of the strong traditional roles of breadwinner and homemaker played by males and females in the past. Given the small numbers on which these percentages are based, caution is advised in interpreting this and similar tables.

4.8 **Currently Being Trained**

A total of 453 persons currently receiving vocational training accounted for less than three percent of persons in any age group, (see Table 4.11). A total of 247 females and 206 males are currently being trained. The distribution of trainees by age is similar to that of persons already trained, with 2.9 percent of the 25 to 44 age group, 2.2 percent of the 15 to 25 age group and less than 0.5 percent of persons from other age groups. Island Harbour has the largest percentage (12.3 percent) of persons in any district who are currently undergoing training.
Table 4.11  Percentage Distribution of Persons (15 years and over) Currently Receiving Technical / Vocational Training by Age Group, Administrative Division and Sex, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Division</th>
<th>15-24</th>
<th>25-44</th>
<th>45-64</th>
<th>65 and over</th>
<th>15-24</th>
<th>25-44</th>
<th>45-64</th>
<th>65 and over</th>
<th>15-24</th>
<th>25-44</th>
<th>45-64</th>
<th>65 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Percent</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blowing Point</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Ground</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hill</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hill</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Valley</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quarter</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Ground</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farrington</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Hill</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Harbour</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.9 Mode of Transportation Used to Travel to School

The mode of transportation used for travel to school is critical to the access of educational facilities especially where these facilities are not located within walking distance of the population. The majority of the school aged population, 45.4 percent is driven to school in private vehicles, 21.2 percent walk, 12.7 percent take the school bus and 4.8 percent hitched rides to school. Another 15.2 percent did not state the method of transportation used for travel to school.
Table 4.12 shows a shift from students being driven to school to those taking the school bus with increasing age. The percentage of children being driven to school in private motor vehicles decreased to 35.8 percent among 15 to 17 year olds from 58.3 percent among children 5 to 9 years old. This, when compared to an increase in those taking the school bus, from 5.8 percent among younger children 5 to 9 years old to 26.0 percent among those 15 to 17 year old, reflects the tendency for children to become more independent in their travel to school as they age. It also reflects greater confidence among parents in the safety and reliability of public transport. The large percentage (25 percent) of children five to eighteen years who walk to school, also suggest the close proximity of schools to residential areas; this undoubtedly reduces the time spent in travel to school. It also indicates that at least a quarter of the school aged population is involved in daily exercise, which is essential for good physical and mental health.

### Table 4.12: Percentage of Persons Under 18 Years Attending School by Main Mode of Transportation and Age Group, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Number of persons by Mode of Transportation to School</th>
<th>Mode of Transportation to School By Percentage Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hitches</td>
<td>Ride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;18 years</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A further breakdown of the mode of transportation used to travel to school by residential districts is presented in Table 4.13. With the exception of a few districts, the general pattern identified earlier prevails. One major deviation from this trend is in The Quarters where the majority of children (36.4 percent) walked to school. The Valley, North Side and Stony Ground also have in excess of one-third of their child population who walked to school compared to one-fifth in the entire population. In West End (39.4 percent) and North Hill (35.1 percent) the percentage of
children who took the school bus was in excess of the national average. Sandy Hill (65.6) and The Farrington (61.8 percent) had the largest proportion of their populations being driven to school in private motor vehicles. George Hill (12.8 percent) also had the largest share who reportedly hitched hike to school.

Table 4.13 Number of Persons Under 18 Years Attending School by Main Mode of Transportation and Administrative Division, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Division</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Hitches Ride</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Drive/Is Driven</th>
<th>School Bus</th>
<th>Taxi</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Not Stated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3285</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1492</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blowing Point</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Ground</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hill</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hill</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Valley</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quarter</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Ground</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farrington</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Hill</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Harbour</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.14 Percentage of Persons Under 18 Years Attending School by Main Mode of Transportation and Administrative Divisions, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Division</th>
<th>Percent Total</th>
<th>Hitches Ride</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Drive / Is Driven</th>
<th>School Bus</th>
<th>Taxi</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Not Stated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>21.19</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>45.42</td>
<td>12.72</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>15.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>12.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40.44</td>
<td>39.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>17.37</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>42.68</td>
<td>24.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blowing Point</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>42.80</td>
<td>25.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>14.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Ground</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>46.97</td>
<td>28.79</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hill</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>44.78</td>
<td>35.07</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hill</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>12.83</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>49.56</td>
<td>13.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>14.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Valley</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>32.20</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>49.39</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>14.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>39.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>44.69</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>14.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quarter</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>36.36</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>34.55</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>25.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Ground</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>39.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>10.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farrington</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>61.80</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>25.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Hill</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>65.56</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>21.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>45.54</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>14.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Harbour</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>19.60</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>43.20</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>15.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5
ECONOMIC ACTIVITY

5.1 Introduction
This Chapter provides an overview of the level of economic activity in the population during the reference week May 2 – 9, 2001. It also highlights the existing level in some of the main Labour force indicators, namely unemployment and labour force participation rates by age group and sex. An analysis of the distribution of the labour force by occupational class and industry group completes this chapter.

5.2 Activity Status
Tables 5.1(a) and 5.1(b) reflect the activity status of 8,228 persons over the age of fifteen years in the 2001 census. About two-thirds or 5,556 persons were employed. Home duties were the second most frequently reported activity engaged in by 9.28 percent or 764 persons. Persons attending school represented 6.45 percent or 531 persons. Retired persons accounted for another 6.44 percent or 530 persons.

The fifth largest group, (292 persons), reported themselves as not engaged in any productive activity. When added to the group of individuals who were looking for a job, this group of economically inactive persons increased to six percent, or 483 persons.

Since disability may prevent an individual from engaging in the labour market, it is important to note that 2.7 percent of the respondents, or 222 persons were disabled and unable to work.

---

3 Total Population 15 years and over is based on inconsistent total from Table 1.3
Table 5.1 (a) *Total* Persons Aged 15 years and over by Economic Activity in the Past Week and Five-Year Age Groups, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>15-19</th>
<th>20-24</th>
<th>25-29</th>
<th>30-34</th>
<th>35-39</th>
<th>40-44</th>
<th>45-49</th>
<th>50-54</th>
<th>55-59</th>
<th>60-64</th>
<th>65 and Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8228</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>5556</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Duties</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>411</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 (b) Percentage Distribution of *Total* Persons (15 yrs. and over) by Economic Activity in the Past Week and Five-Year Age Group, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>15-19</th>
<th>20-24</th>
<th>25-29</th>
<th>30-34</th>
<th>35-39</th>
<th>40-44</th>
<th>45-49</th>
<th>50-54</th>
<th>55-59</th>
<th>60-64</th>
<th>65 and Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>67.53</td>
<td>33.06</td>
<td>79.06</td>
<td>84.99</td>
<td>84.79</td>
<td>85.96</td>
<td>84.11</td>
<td>79.83</td>
<td>75.64</td>
<td>59.75</td>
<td>39.08</td>
<td>15.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Duties</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>11.75</td>
<td>17.03</td>
<td>23.03</td>
<td>19.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>49.59</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td>47.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>11.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3  Activity Status by Age and Sex

A look at economic activity by age group shows that half of the teen populations (15-19 years) were in school during the reference week of May 2 – 9, 2001, (Table 5.1(b)). Another 33 percent (320 persons) were at work or attached to a job, while 5.6 percent (54 persons) were inactive or doing nothing and 4.4 percent (43 persons) were actively seeking work.

The majority of persons aged 20 – 64 years were either employed (5,098 persons) or performing home duties (544 persons), The general trend observed is that as age increased up to 39 years, the number of employed persons in all age groups also increased but declined thereafter. At ages 60 – 64 years, 44 percent of the population was employed and another 23 percent doing home duties while 21 percent was retired.

Nearly half (47.2 percent), of the elderly population over 65 years was retired, 19.4 percent were engaged in home duties and 15.9 percent continued to work. Disability had limited the activity of another 11.5 percent. The data also show a pattern of increasing levels of disability with age. The percentage of disabled persons in any age group ranged from a low of 0.9 percent among persons 30 – 34 years to 5.9 percent within the 60 -64 age group. Just about 1.2 percent of the youth population, 15-24 years, reported themselves as having a disability which prevented them from working.

Females reported a slightly higher level of disability than males, given that 3.1 percent of females and 2.3 percent of males were unable to work because of a disability, (Tables 5.2 (b) and 5.3 (b)). This pattern was consistent in all age groups from age 25 to 49 years, the only exception being in the 35 – 39 age groups where the percentage of females (1.31) reporting a disability was slightly higher than males (1.4). Between ages 50 – 64 years, males reported an overall 5 percent higher level of disability than females. At age 65 and over, females (13.2%) reported a higher level of disability than males (9.6%). This may be due in part to higher morbidity deriving from higher life expectancy rates for females at older ages, while the mortality rate for older men increased.

---

4 Total Population 15 years and over is based on inconsistent total from Table 1.3
Further analysis of the data in Tables 5.2 (a) and 5.3 (b) show that a larger percentage of females (15.6 percent) than males (2.7 percent) were involved in home duties, likewise a larger percentage of females (7.1 percent), than males (5.8 percent) were students and a larger percentage of females (6.6 percent), than males (6.3 percent), were retired. Conversely, more males (73.6 percent), than females (61.65 percent) were employed, also, more males (7.5 percent), than females (4.3 percent) were unemployed or doing nothing.

Table 5.2 (a)  *Males Aged 15 years and over by Economic Activity in the Past Week and Age Group, 2001*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>15-19</th>
<th>20-24</th>
<th>25-29</th>
<th>30-34</th>
<th>35-39</th>
<th>40-44</th>
<th>45-49</th>
<th>50-54</th>
<th>55-59</th>
<th>60-64</th>
<th>65 and Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4038</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>2973</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Duties</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2 (b)  *Percentage Distribution of *Males* Aged 15 years and over by Economic Activity in the Past Week and Five-Year Age Group, 2001*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>15-19</th>
<th>20-24</th>
<th>25-29</th>
<th>30-34</th>
<th>35-39</th>
<th>40-44</th>
<th>45-49</th>
<th>50-54</th>
<th>55-59</th>
<th>60-64</th>
<th>65 and Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>73.63</td>
<td>37.53</td>
<td>88.80</td>
<td>88.40</td>
<td>88.87</td>
<td>89.55</td>
<td>87.18</td>
<td>86.54</td>
<td>82.62</td>
<td>69.88</td>
<td>57.64</td>
<td>23.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Duties</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>9.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>45.91</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>19.44</td>
<td>50.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>9.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.3 (a) *Females* Aged 15 years and over by Economic Activity in the Past Week and Five-Year Age Groups, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>15-19</th>
<th>20-24</th>
<th>25-29</th>
<th>30-34</th>
<th>35-39</th>
<th>40-44</th>
<th>45-49</th>
<th>50-54</th>
<th>55-59</th>
<th>60-64</th>
<th>65 and Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4190</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>2583</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Duties</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>9.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3 (b) Percentage Distribution of *Females* Aged 15 years and over by Economic Activity in the Past Week and Five-Year Age Group, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Status</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>15-19</th>
<th>20-24</th>
<th>25-29</th>
<th>30-34</th>
<th>35-39</th>
<th>40-44</th>
<th>45-49</th>
<th>50-54</th>
<th>55-59</th>
<th>60-64</th>
<th>65 and Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>61.65</td>
<td>28.71</td>
<td>70.22</td>
<td>81.52</td>
<td>80.79</td>
<td>82.55</td>
<td>81.20</td>
<td>72.86</td>
<td>68.53</td>
<td>49.04</td>
<td>31.88</td>
<td>9.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Duties</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>12.59</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td>10.88</td>
<td>13.06</td>
<td>15.14</td>
<td>21.12</td>
<td>29.94</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>28.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>53.16</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>44.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>13.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Census Report, 2001, Anguilla
5.4 Employed and Unemployed Labour Force

Table 5.4 presents the population by main Labour force indicators. In 2001, the total labour force consisted of 6,039 persons or 73.4 percent of the total population, 15 years and older. The employment rate stood at 92 percent while 8 percent of the population was unemployed. Persons outside of the labour force totaled 24.9 percent or 2,047, and included full-time students, retired persons, those involved in home duties and those who were incapable of working because of disability.

Table 5.4 Total Population (15 years and over) by Main Labour Force Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (15 yrs. &amp; over)</td>
<td>8228</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed Persons (a)</td>
<td>5556</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed Persons (b)</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Labour Force (a + b)</td>
<td>5747</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the Labour Force</td>
<td>2339</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Rate</td>
<td>96.68</td>
<td>88.15</td>
<td>95.26</td>
<td>96.87</td>
<td>97.13</td>
<td>97.70</td>
<td>98.15</td>
<td>97.44</td>
<td>98.61</td>
<td>97.47</td>
<td>97.10</td>
<td>97.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation Rate</td>
<td>69.85</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>82.99</td>
<td>87.74</td>
<td>87.29</td>
<td>87.98</td>
<td>85.70</td>
<td>81.93</td>
<td>76.71</td>
<td>61.30</td>
<td>45.39</td>
<td>16.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactivity Rate</td>
<td>28.43</td>
<td>60.85</td>
<td>15.10</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td>10.29</td>
<td>13.05</td>
<td>14.99</td>
<td>21.58</td>
<td>36.84</td>
<td>53.29</td>
<td>82.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un-classified as % of total pop</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, unemployment rates are calculated based on two measures: the job-seeking rate and the non-job seeking rate. If we consider only persons who are seeking work and are available for work, a measure commonly known as the job-seeking rate is applied. Non-job seeking rate includes persons who wanted work but not actively seeking. In the census in Anguilla, non-seeking persons were not captured separately therefore the Non-seeking rate cannot be determined. The unemployment rate in Anguilla which included both seeking and not seeking was 3.3 percent at the time of the census. The persons falling into category “Nothing” recorded under inactivity status.
The data reflect a pattern of decreasing level of employment with age. The only exception is in the age group 55 to 59 years where the level of unemployment is 13.1 percent and is higher than in the previous age group. This age group represents the pre-retirement category and may include returning residents and some individuals who have fulfilled the mandatory 33 1/3 years of work in government services before actually reaching the mandatory retirement age of 60 years for women and 65 years for men. Hence, it is not surprising that 10.6 percent of persons in 60+ age group are non job seekers.

Young persons 15 to 19 years experience a disproportionately higher level of unemployment, as one in every four young persons within this age group are unemployed compared to less than one in ten in all other age groups up to age 64.

Another feature of Anguilla’s labour market is that people tend to find employment relatively early in their adult years and continue to work after retirement. By age 25, nine out of every ten persons are employed, as reflected by a 91.8 percent employment rate for older youth aged 20 to 24 years. By age 39, the unemployment rate is at its lowest level, 4.9 percent. Likewise, 97 percent of the population aged 60 and older was still employed.

Tables 5.5 and 5.6, also reflect a higher unemployment rate for males (9.2 percent) than females (6.6 percent). The non job seeking rate is again higher for males (5.4 percent) than for females (4.2 percent). However, the percent of the female population (32.4 percent) outside the labour force is about twice as high as that of the male population (17.1 percent).

In 2001, 81.1 percent (3,274) of the male population, compared to 66 percent (2,765) of the female population was a part of the labour force. This further translated into 64.8 percent of the labour force being male and 35.2 percent female; see Tables 5.5, 5.6 and Figure 5.1. The unemployment rate decreased with age irrespective of gender. However the unemployment rate for young females 15 to 24 years was disproportionately higher (10.3 percent), than their male counterparts. Up to age 29, females experienced a higher unemployment rate than males. From aged 30, through to retirement, the reverse was true. Male unemployment exceeded their female counterparts up to 64 years, doubling and almost tripling in some age groups. It is only after age 65 that the female unemployment rate exceeded that of the male population again. This is not
reflective of any labour force gains for men at older ages, but rather the impact of a mandatory earlier retirement age (60 years) for women.

**Table 5.5  Male Population (15 yrs. and over) by Main Labour Force Indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (15 yrs. &amp; over)</td>
<td>4038</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed Persons (a)</td>
<td>2973</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed Persons (b)</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Labour Force (a + b)</td>
<td>3097</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the Labour Force</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Rate</td>
<td>96.00</td>
<td>89.05</td>
<td>95.69</td>
<td>96.06</td>
<td>96.80</td>
<td>96.89</td>
<td>96.04</td>
<td>98.98</td>
<td>96.67</td>
<td>95.40</td>
<td>96.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>10.95</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation Rate</td>
<td>76.70</td>
<td>42.14</td>
<td>92.80</td>
<td>92.05</td>
<td>92.51</td>
<td>92.50</td>
<td>89.98</td>
<td>90.11</td>
<td>83.47</td>
<td>72.29</td>
<td>60.42</td>
<td>24.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactivity Rate</td>
<td>21.47</td>
<td>55.56</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>14.83</td>
<td>25.90</td>
<td>38.19</td>
<td>73.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un-classified as % total pop.</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.6  Female Population (15 yrs. and over) by Main Labour Force Indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (15 yrs. &amp; over)</td>
<td>4190</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed Persons (a)</td>
<td>2583</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed Persons (b)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Labour Force (a + b)</td>
<td>2650</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the Labour Force</td>
<td>1540</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Rate</td>
<td>97.47</td>
<td>87.04</td>
<td>94.77</td>
<td>97.78</td>
<td>98.31</td>
<td>98.65</td>
<td>99.46</td>
<td>99.22</td>
<td>98.15</td>
<td>98.72</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>12.96</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation Rate</td>
<td>63.25</td>
<td>32.99</td>
<td>74.09</td>
<td>83.37</td>
<td>82.18</td>
<td>83.68</td>
<td>81.64</td>
<td>73.43</td>
<td>69.83</td>
<td>49.68</td>
<td>31.88</td>
<td>9.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactivity Rate</td>
<td>35.13</td>
<td>65.99</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>15.24</td>
<td>16.83</td>
<td>14.45</td>
<td>17.48</td>
<td>23.43</td>
<td>28.45</td>
<td>48.41</td>
<td>66.88</td>
<td>89.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un-classified as % total pop.</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.5  Labour Force by Occupational Category

In 2001, 22 percent of the population reported working in services and sales as their main occupation, followed by clerical 13.8 percent, craft 13.1 percent and elementary occupations 9.9 percent. Persons in technical and professional occupations represented 9.3 percent and 9.1 percent of workers respectively. Legislators and managers accounted for another 6.1 percent. Persons in skilled agriculture and machine operators accounted for the smallest share, 4.4 percent and 3.8 percent respectively, (Tables 5.7 (a) and 5.7 (b)).

Further segmentation of the labour force by age and occupational class in Figure 5.2 and Table 5.7 (b) will show that young persons, 15 to 29 years, were mainly employed in clerical, sales and service positions, while the majority of persons in legislative or managerial (42.7 percent) and
professional (43.8 percent) positions were older persons 45 – 64 years. Skilled agricultural workers and those in elementary occupations were slightly older, and technical workers were evenly distributed across age groups from 15 to 49 years; this pattern remained generally consistent by sex.

Table 5.7 (a) Total Employed (15 yrs. and over) Who Worked Past Week by Occupational Group and Age Group, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6156</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislator/Manager</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services/Sales</td>
<td>1324</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled/Agricultural</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft / Trade</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine Operator</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Total employed does not tally with the corresponding figure given in Table 5.1 (a) and Table 5.4. Figures are greater than the total labour force in the tables.

Table 5.7 (b) Percentage of Total Employed (15 yrs. and over) Who Worked Past Week by Occupational Group and Five-Year Age Group, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislator/Manager</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>12.28</td>
<td>11.18</td>
<td>7.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>22.80</td>
<td>22.66</td>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>14.51</td>
<td>12.16</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled/Agricultural</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>5.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft / Trade</td>
<td>13.14</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>10.72</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>14.85</td>
<td>16.47</td>
<td>17.24</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>11.84</td>
<td>11.18</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine Operator</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>26.45</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>14.47</td>
<td>18.23</td>
<td>48.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clear gender differences in the occupational class can be observed in Tables 5.8 (b) and 5.9 (b). The majority of male workers, 23.5 percent were employed in craft, 12.8 percent in services or sales and 12.8 in elementary occupations. More than half of all female workers were employed either in services sales (31.1 percent) or clerical occupations (22.4 percent). Females were more than males at the topmost occupational groups.

A larger percentage of female workers, 6.7 percent (196 persons) than male workers, 5.5 percent (177 persons), were engaged in legislative or managerial posts. Similarly, the percentage of females in the professional occupational classes out numbered males, namely, 319 females or 10.9 percent of female workers to 239 males or 7.4 percent of male workers.

Males dominated the technical occupations, both in terms of absolute numbers and relative percentage shared. A total of 329 males or 10.2 percent of the male labour force were in technical jobs compared to 244 females or 8.3 percent of the female labour force. A larger percentage of males than females in the labour force were to be found in the lower level occupational groups of skilled agriculture, machine operators and elementary occupations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3222</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislator/Manager</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services/Sales</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled/Agricultural</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft / Trade</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine Operator</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Number of males employed does not tally with the corresponding figure given in Table 5.2 (a) and Table 5.5.
### Table 5.8 (b)  Percentage of Employed Males (15 yrs. and over) Who Worked Past Week by Occupational Group and Age Group, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislator/Manager</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>14.74</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>10.61</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>10.97</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services/Sales</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>14.23</td>
<td>17.60</td>
<td>15.87</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled/Agricultural</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>8.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft / Trade</td>
<td>23.46</td>
<td>11.79</td>
<td>19.65</td>
<td>22.83</td>
<td>27.83</td>
<td>31.90</td>
<td>31.20</td>
<td>23.64</td>
<td>19.61</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>17.89</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>12.76</td>
<td>15.04</td>
<td>15.54</td>
<td>13.65</td>
<td>10.87</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>13.08</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>12.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>24.80</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>37.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.9 (a)  Employed Females (15 yrs. and over) Who Worked Past Week by Occupational Group and Five-Year Age Group, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2934</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislator/Manager</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services/Sales</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled/Agricultural</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft / Trade</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine Operator</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Number of females employed does not tally with the corresponding figure given in Table 5.3 (a) and Table 5.6
Table 5.9 (b) Percentage of Employed *Females* (15 yrs. and over) Who Worked Past Week by Occupation Group and Five-year Age Group, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislator/Manager</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>11.49</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>11.49</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>22.36</td>
<td>36.07</td>
<td>36.45</td>
<td>31.44</td>
<td>25.87</td>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>17.36</td>
<td>13.17</td>
<td>10.92</td>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>5.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services/Sales</td>
<td>31.05</td>
<td>17.81</td>
<td>26.17</td>
<td>29.81</td>
<td>34.50</td>
<td>35.70</td>
<td>40.41</td>
<td>35.59</td>
<td>24.71</td>
<td>30.61</td>
<td>29.33</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled/Agricultural</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft / Trade</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine Operator</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>5.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>28.31</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>22.45</td>
<td>29.33</td>
<td>63.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.2. The Employed Labour Force by Occupational Group
5.6  Labour Force by Industrial Group

Anguilla can be described as a service economy based on the classification of 5,320 workers by industry group in Table 5.10. In 2001, 40.6 percent, or 2,161 persons, were employed in wholesale and retail trades, hotels and restaurants, 10.8 percent in community, social and personal services, 8.2 percent in financial, insurance, real estate and business and 7.1 percent in transport and communication.

Table 5.10 (a)  Total Employed (15 yrs. And over) Who Worked Past Week by Industrial Group and Age Group, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industrial Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>15-19</th>
<th>20-24</th>
<th>25-29</th>
<th>30-34</th>
<th>35-39</th>
<th>40-44</th>
<th>45-49</th>
<th>50-54</th>
<th>55-59</th>
<th>60-64</th>
<th>65 and Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5988</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Hunting and Forestry</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining and Quarrying</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elec. Gas and Water</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale/Retail</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel and Restaurant</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and Comm.</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Intermediaries</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Community</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Households</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Total employed does not tally with the corresponding figure given in Table 5.7 (a)

Construction was the second largest industry, employing 15.8 percent of the labour force or 839 persons. A further 1.5 percent or 81 persons were employed in electricity, gas and water. As in many Caribbean countries, the tourism sector is the mainstay of the economy, employing 1,579 persons or 26.7 percent of the country’s labour force.
### Table 5.10 (b) Percentage of Total Employed (15 yrs. And over) Who Worked Past Week by Industrial Group and Five-year Age Group, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industrial Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>15-19</th>
<th>20-24</th>
<th>25-29</th>
<th>30-34</th>
<th>35-39</th>
<th>40-44</th>
<th>45-49</th>
<th>50-54</th>
<th>55-59</th>
<th>60-64</th>
<th>65 and Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Hunting and Forestry</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining and Quarrying</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, Gas and Water</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>14.01</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>14.84</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>14.37</td>
<td>17.43</td>
<td>16.20</td>
<td>13.82</td>
<td>11.44</td>
<td>12.95</td>
<td>14.20</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel and Restaurant</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>29.37</td>
<td>32.67</td>
<td>29.66</td>
<td>29.41</td>
<td>27.49</td>
<td>25.26</td>
<td>24.25</td>
<td>20.09</td>
<td>18.52</td>
<td>9.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and Comm.</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Intermediaries</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>11.16</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>11.16</td>
<td>12.97</td>
<td>12.81</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Community</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Households</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>26.74</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>14.73</td>
<td>19.14</td>
<td>49.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The small percentage of workers in the primary industries of agriculture and mining is compelling evidence of Anguilla’s service driven economy. Only 3.4 percent or 183 persons were employed in Agriculture and fishing or forestry and mining and an even smaller share, 2.3 percent or 120 persons, were employed in manufacturing.

In analyzing these figures, one must also be mindful of the large proportion, 10.3 percent or 547 persons, who did not report an industrial class. This figure is substantial enough to result in a re-ranking of some industrial group.

Given the country’s heavy dependence on wholesale and retail trade, hotel and restaurant and construction, it is not surprising that these industrial classes were dominant across all age groups.
Almost three in every ten new labour market entrants, that is, persons 15 to 19 years, did not report an industry. Nevertheless three in every ten found employment in wholesale, retail trade and hotel or restaurant with two out of every three working in the hotel and restaurant sector. Another one in ten worked either in construction or was absorbed in the civil service or in public administration. See Tables 5.11 and 5.12 for a breakdown by age and gender. (Absolute data of Tables 5.11 and 5.12 are presented in the Appendix).

Table 5.11 Percentage of Employed Males (15 yrs. And over) Who Worked Past Week by Industrial Group and Age Group, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industrial Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>15-19</th>
<th>20-24</th>
<th>25-29</th>
<th>30-34</th>
<th>35-39</th>
<th>40-44</th>
<th>45-49</th>
<th>50-54</th>
<th>55-59</th>
<th>60-64</th>
<th>65 and Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Hunting and Forestry</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining and Quarrying</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, Gas and Water</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>18.37</td>
<td>27.22</td>
<td>25.06</td>
<td>27.37</td>
<td>32.96</td>
<td>31.33</td>
<td>23.85</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>21.88</td>
<td>24.45</td>
<td>9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale/Retail</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>9.79</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>12.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel and Restaurant</td>
<td>19.92</td>
<td>17.96</td>
<td>26.63</td>
<td>26.08</td>
<td>22.30</td>
<td>20.44</td>
<td>15.67</td>
<td>14.98</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>17.19</td>
<td>14.44</td>
<td>10.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Intermediaries</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Community</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Households</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>24.90</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>38.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.12 Percentage of Employed Females (15 yrs. And over) Who Worked Past Week by Industrial Group and Five-year Age Group, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industrial Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>15-19</th>
<th>20-24</th>
<th>25-29</th>
<th>30-34</th>
<th>35-39</th>
<th>40-44</th>
<th>45-49</th>
<th>50-54</th>
<th>55-59</th>
<th>60-64</th>
<th>65 and Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Hunting and Forestry</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining and Quarrying</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, Gas and Water</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale/Retail</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>12.71</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>10.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel and Restaurant</td>
<td>34.24</td>
<td>23.72</td>
<td>32.36</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>37.65</td>
<td>38.57</td>
<td>39.73</td>
<td>38.22</td>
<td>29.34</td>
<td>23.96</td>
<td>23.61</td>
<td>7.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and Comm.</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Intermediaries</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>12.73</td>
<td>13.49</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>13.91</td>
<td>15.69</td>
<td>13.24</td>
<td>11.58</td>
<td>13.77</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>14.37</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Community</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Households</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>28.84</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>22.92</td>
<td>30.56</td>
<td>64.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.7 Status in Employment

Table 5.13, identifies the private sector as the main employer of workers, followed by Government and own account businesses. Almost two-thirds, 64.3 percent, worked in the private sector, 16.7 percent were employed in Government, and another 15.9 percent worked in their own businesses, with or without paid help. A slightly larger percentage of females (65.7 percent) than males (63.0 percent), worked in the private sector. Likewise, a larger share of females (21.4 percent) than males (12.6 percent) was employed to Government. Over seventy percent of own account businesses with paid help (71.2 percent) and 70.6 percent, operating without paid help were owned by males. This translated to 12.7 percent of male workers, versus 6.1 percent of the females, who worked in their own businesses without paid help. Similarly, 8.3 percent of males worked in their own businesses with paid help, versus 3.9 percent of the females. The percentage of the male workers (2.1 percent) paid by statutory boards was also greater than the percentage
of females (1.4 percent). Less than one percent of all workers (51 persons) were unpaid, 56.9 percent being female and 43.1 percent male.

**Table 5.13: Employed Persons (15 Yrs. and Over) Who Worked Last Week by Status in Employment, 2001**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percentage Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5858</td>
<td>3130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Employee Government</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Employee Private</td>
<td>3765</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Employee Statutory Board</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid Worker</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own Business Paid Help</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own Business Without Paid Help</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Total employed does not tally with the corresponding figure given in Table 5.10 (a)*
CHAPTER 6
LIVING CONDITIONS

6.1 Introduction
This Chapter focuses on the living condition of households in terms of the type and characteristics of dwellings they occupy and the various types of amenities that are available to them. Dwellings are described in terms of: type of structure; number of rooms/bedrooms; age (year when built); type of material used for roofing and in the construction of outer walls; type of tenure (ownership). The number of bedrooms especially, in relation to the number of persons that comprise the household is used as a measure of overcrowding and one of the indicators of living condition.

6.2 Type of Dwelling Unit
In 2001, the housing stock consisted of 3,730 dwelling units. Of this total 72.7 percent were fully detached private dwellings and 15.3 percent, 571 units, flats or apartments (Table 6.2). Semidetached private dwellings were the third most common type of unit, accounting for 5.1 percent or 192 units, followed by duplex apartments (3.4 percent) and dwelling units combined with commercial activities (3.4 percent). Only one barrack type dwelling which was located in the Valley district was identified.

Table 6.2 indicates that in all fourteen districts, individual private dwellings were the main type of dwelling unit, with distributions ranging from a low of 62.2 percent in the Valley to 86 percent in Sandy Hill. Flats or apartments accounted for one in every four dwellings in the Valley and approximately one in every five in The Quarters and South Hill. Of the 125 units used for dual commercial and residential purposes, 23 were located in South Hill, 18 in West End and The Quarters, 15 in The Valley and 14 in Sandy Ground. All other districts contained 10 or less of this dwelling type.
Table 6.1  Dwelling Units by Type and Administrative Division, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>West End</th>
<th>South Hill</th>
<th>Blowing Point</th>
<th>Sandy Ground</th>
<th>North Hill</th>
<th>George Hill</th>
<th>The Valley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3730</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undivided Private House</td>
<td>2710</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of Private House</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex Apartment</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat/Apartment</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Dwelling and Business</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barracks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling Type</th>
<th>North Side</th>
<th>The Quarter</th>
<th>Stoney Ground</th>
<th>The Farrington</th>
<th>Sandy Hill</th>
<th>East End</th>
<th>Island Harbour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undivided Private House</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of Private House</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex Apartment</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat/Apartment</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Dwelling and Business</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barracks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.2 Percentage Distribution of Dwelling Units by Type and Administrative Divisions, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>West End</th>
<th>South Hill</th>
<th>Blowing Point</th>
<th>Sandy Ground</th>
<th>North Hill</th>
<th>George Hill</th>
<th>The Valley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undivided Private House</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of Private House</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex Apartment</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat/Apartment</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Dwelling and Business</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barracks</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling Type</th>
<th>North Side</th>
<th>The Quarter</th>
<th>Stoney Ground</th>
<th>The Farrington</th>
<th>Sandy Hill</th>
<th>East End</th>
<th>Island Harbour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undivided Private House</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of Private House</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex Apartment</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat/Apartment</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Dwelling and Business</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barracks</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Incidentally, Sandy Ground contains the smallest share of the country’s dwelling units, 2.7 percent or 100 units. It is not surprising that South Hill contains the largest share of the country’s dwelling units, 13.0 percent, since the districts also contain the largest share of the country’s population, 13.0 percent. However, the density of population to housing units was almost twice as large as in Sandy Ground (4.1:1) than in South Hill (2.3:1).
6.3 Tenure of Dwellings

Table 6.3 shows that 64 percent of dwellings are owner occupied units which constitute the principal type of housing tenure in Anguilla while another 27.7 percent are rented. Four out of every five households in The Farrington, approximately three out of every four in North Hill, West End and Island Harbour and two out of every three in George Hill, East End and Bowling Point are owner occupied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling Unit Tenure</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>West End</th>
<th>South Hill</th>
<th>Blowing Point</th>
<th>Sandy Ground</th>
<th>North Hill</th>
<th>George Hill</th>
<th>The Valley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3730</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>64.10</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>67.60</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>77.10</td>
<td>66.20</td>
<td>51.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented</td>
<td>27.70</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>31.20</td>
<td>27.70</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>19.40</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td>39.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rented units are most common in The Valley and The Quarters, where 39.9 percent and 36 percent of households, respectively. Persons who lease their dwelling are few, being less than one percent of households or 30 units. Other alternative types of tenure arrangements exist for 4.8 percent or 179 dwellings. These alternative types were most common in Sandy Hill, 13.5 percent, and Stoney Ground, 10.4 percent.

6.4 Housing Stock by Year of Construction

The housing stock is relatively new, with rapid expansion occurring in recent years. One quarter of all units were built prior to the 1970s and steady additions continued into the decades of the
1970s and 1980s, when 12.7 percent (1970s) and 19.5 (1980s) percent of all units were constructed. Rapid expansion occurred in the 1990s, when 1,041 dwelling units or 27.9 percent of all units were built. This rapid expansion continued into the twenty first century as 175 dwelling units or 4.7 percent of all dwellings were constructed within a seventeen month period. Of all the districts, Sandy Ground has the oldest housing stock, with 36 percent of all units therein constructed prior to 1970 and no units constructed since the end of 1990s. Most of the housing construction in this century is taking place in South Hill and Stony Ground, where 29 and 21 units were constructed respectively.

Table 6.4: Percentage Distribution of Dwelling Units by Year Built and Administrative Division, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>West End</th>
<th>South Hill</th>
<th>Blowing Point</th>
<th>Sandy Ground</th>
<th>North Hill</th>
<th>George Hill</th>
<th>The Valley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3730</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1970</td>
<td>24.60</td>
<td>25.80</td>
<td>18.60</td>
<td>22.70</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>31.90</td>
<td>13.49</td>
<td>26.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>16.10</td>
<td>20.60</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>22.10</td>
<td>20.20</td>
<td>23.90</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>28.40</td>
<td>14.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>27.90</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>30.60</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>25.70</td>
<td>29.50</td>
<td>23.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>10.59</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>13.79</td>
<td>22.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>North Side</th>
<th>The Quarter</th>
<th>Stoney Ground</th>
<th>The Farrington</th>
<th>Sandy Hill</th>
<th>East End</th>
<th>Island Harbour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1970</td>
<td>22.70</td>
<td>26.30</td>
<td>27.10</td>
<td>30.40</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>26.90</td>
<td>25.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>13.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>24.70</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>17.70</td>
<td>21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>29.80</td>
<td>32.60</td>
<td>25.30</td>
<td>32.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>17.79</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5 Roofing

The materials used for roofing in Anguilla are durable enough to withstand the annual threat of hurricanes. Three quarters (75.3 percent) of all roofs are made from concrete and 19.2 percent use sheet metal, 1.4 percent use wood shingles and only 0.2 percent are constructed from makeshift materials or thatched. Concrete or sheet metal is the main type of roofing materials
used in all districts. Concrete is the preferred roofing material used in all districts. Concrete roofs range from a high of 83.6 percent of all roofs in George Hill, to 64.0 percent in Sandy Ground. Wood shingle is used on 3.5 percent of all dwelling units in The Quarters, while all other types of materials are used on less than 3 percent of all roofs in any single district.

### Table 6.5 Percentage Distribution of Dwelling Units by Type of Roofing Material and Administrative Divisions, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roofing Material</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>West End</th>
<th>South Hill</th>
<th>Blowing Point</th>
<th>Sandy Ground</th>
<th>North Hill</th>
<th>George Hill</th>
<th>The Valley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All units</td>
<td>3730</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>75.30</td>
<td>74.60</td>
<td>76.20</td>
<td>76.90</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>80.60</td>
<td>83.60</td>
<td>66.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheet Metal</td>
<td>19.20</td>
<td>20.40</td>
<td>19.60</td>
<td>19.70</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>13.80</td>
<td>26.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Shingle</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Shingles</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiles</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makeshift/Thatched</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roofing Material</th>
<th>North Side</th>
<th>The Quarter</th>
<th>Stoney Ground</th>
<th>The Farringdon</th>
<th>Sandy Hill</th>
<th>East End</th>
<th>Island Harbour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All units</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>78.60</td>
<td>76.60</td>
<td>74.90</td>
<td>74.90</td>
<td>67.90</td>
<td>72.60</td>
<td>79.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheet Metal</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>21.60</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>19.20</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>14.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Shingle</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Shingles</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Shingles</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiles</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makeshift/Thatched</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.6 Materials of Outer Walls

Concrete and concrete blocks are the preferred materials used in the construction of outer walls. A total of 93.4 percent of houses use concrete and concrete blocks for outer wall construction and 2.7 percent use wood. Another 2.6 percent are constructed with both concrete and wood. Blowing Point has the largest percentage of wooden houses in their stock, 4.6 percent, while
South Hill contained the only unit constructed of makeshift outer walls. North Hill on the other hand, has the highest proportion of houses with outer walls constructed of concrete and blocks (97.2 percent).

Table 6.6 Percentage Distribution of Dwelling Units by Material of Outer Walls and Administrative Division, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material of Outer Walls</th>
<th>All outer walls</th>
<th>West End</th>
<th>South Hill</th>
<th>Blowing Point</th>
<th>Sandy Ground</th>
<th>North Hill</th>
<th>George Hill</th>
<th>The Valley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete/Concrete Blocks</td>
<td>93.35</td>
<td>91.67</td>
<td>93.80</td>
<td>93.28</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>97.22</td>
<td>92.73</td>
<td>91.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood and Concrete</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone and Concrete</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makeshift</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material of Outer Walls</th>
<th>North Side</th>
<th>The Quarter</th>
<th>Stoney Ground</th>
<th>The Farrington</th>
<th>Sandy Hill</th>
<th>East End</th>
<th>Island Harbour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete/Concrete Blocks</td>
<td>95.82</td>
<td>93.99</td>
<td>91.93</td>
<td>89.47</td>
<td>94.82</td>
<td>93.54</td>
<td>94.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood and Concrete</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone and Concrete</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makeshift</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.7 Number of Rooms

Of the 3,692 dwellings identified in 2001, larger units, six rooms or more accounted for 18.1 percent of all units. Three and four room units accounted for 21.3 and 23 percent respectively, while 210 units or 5.7 percent of households occupied one room units, (calculations based on Table 6.7). When the number of bedrooms is taken into consideration it is clear that
two and three bedroom units are the most common type of dwellings in Anguilla. Calculations based on Table 6.8 will show that 32.8 percent of households occupy two bedroom units and 32.7 percent three bedroom units. Roughly 17 percent of units are one bedroom units.

Table 6.7  Dwelling Units by Size of Household and Number of Rooms, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Size</th>
<th>Total Dwellings</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>Two</th>
<th>Three</th>
<th>Four</th>
<th>Five</th>
<th>Six</th>
<th>Seven</th>
<th>Eight +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3692</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight +</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.8  Dwelling Units by Size of Household and Number of Bedrooms, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Size</th>
<th>Total Dwellings</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>Two</th>
<th>Three</th>
<th>Four</th>
<th>Five</th>
<th>Six</th>
<th>Seven</th>
<th>Eight +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3524</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>1151</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight +</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Number of dwelling units does not tally with the figure given in Table 6.7.*

6.8  Overcrowding

In order to determine the level of overcrowding in households, two indexes of overcrowding are used. The first method is referred to as the comfortable room density ratio (CRDR) and takes into consideration the number of persons living in a household per habitable room. The second method is called the privacy room density ratio (PRDR) and looks at the number of persons per bedroom. Given that households with eight or more persons are grouped together, the ratio
ranges from 8 to 0.125, with 8 depicting a situation of one person to eight rooms and .125 depicting 8 persons to one room. The threshold used for both the CRDR and PRDR is 0.5. A lower value constitutes a situation of overcrowding as there are more than two individuals to a bedroom. A value of 1 indicates absolute privacy while anything greater than 1 indicates low room occupancy.

Table 6.9  Percentage Distribution of Dwelling Units by Size of Household and Number of Rooms, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Household</th>
<th>Number of Rooms</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One</td>
<td>Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>60.48</td>
<td>48.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>21.90</td>
<td>21.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>13.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>10.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight +</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.10  Percentage Distribution of Dwelling Units by Size of Household Number of Bedrooms, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Household</th>
<th>Number of Bedrooms</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One</td>
<td>Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>21.38</td>
<td>24.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>18.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>16.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight +</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dwelling units in Anguilla provide an adequate level of comfort and privacy for their occupants. The comfort level of dwellings is premised on the basis of 93.5 percent of households with electricity, 89.9 percent with flushed toilets inside of the unit and a comfortable room density
ratio of one person to 3.1 habitable rooms. Individual privacy can also be assumed based on an average of 1.3 bedrooms per person. Overcrowding is a problem in 17.6 percent of one room units, 6.8 percent of two room units and 2.3 percent of three room units.

6.9 Sources of Lighting

The traditional kerosene lamp is the main source of lighting in 2.6 percent of households in which 93.5 percent use electricity and less than one percent use gas or other sources. In eight districts the percentage of households utilizing electricity exceeds that of the national average, (Table 6.11).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Lighting</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Administrative Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total households</td>
<td>3730</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity – Public</td>
<td>93.51</td>
<td>95.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerosene</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity – Private</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Lighting</th>
<th>North Side</th>
<th>The Quarter</th>
<th>Stoney Ground</th>
<th>The Farrington</th>
<th>Sandy Hill</th>
<th>East End</th>
<th>Island Harbour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>383</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity – Public</td>
<td>92.69</td>
<td>90.19</td>
<td>92.22</td>
<td>92.40</td>
<td>94.82</td>
<td>91.40</td>
<td>94.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerosene</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity – Private</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.10 Type of Toilet Facilities

The majority of households, 3,379, or 90.6 percent used modern flushed toilets, while 3.9 percent used pit latrines, (Table 6.12). A total of 2.1 percent of all households had no toilet facilities and 0.5 percent used other methods of disposing their human waste. The percentage of households with flushed toilets ranged from 86 percent in East End and Stoney Ground to 94.1 percent in Blowing Point. Stoney Ground had the largest percentage of households with no toilet facilities (6.1 percent) and pit latrines (6.9 percent). Sandy Hill had the second highest percentage of households with no toilet facilities, (4.2 percent) and 4.2 percent with pit latrines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of facility</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>West End</th>
<th>South Hill</th>
<th>Blowing Point</th>
<th>Sandy Ground</th>
<th>North Hill</th>
<th>George Hill</th>
<th>The Valley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>3730</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC Flush Toilet Inside Home</td>
<td>89.92</td>
<td>88.75</td>
<td>91.94</td>
<td>91.18</td>
<td>87.00</td>
<td>93.75</td>
<td>91.27</td>
<td>91.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit Latrine Inside Home</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit Latrine Outside Home</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC Flush Outside Home</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of facility</th>
<th>North Side</th>
<th>The Quarter</th>
<th>Stoney Ground</th>
<th>The Farrington</th>
<th>Sandy Hill</th>
<th>East End</th>
<th>Island Harbour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC Flush Toilet Inside Home</td>
<td>89.30</td>
<td>87.97</td>
<td>85.59</td>
<td>92.40</td>
<td>90.16</td>
<td>86.02</td>
<td>90.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit Latrine Inside Home</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit Latrine Outside Home</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC Flush Outside Home</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.11 Type of Fuel for Cooking

Table 6.13 reveals that Liquid petroleum gas was the main type of fuel used for cooking in 93 percent of households, electricity in 1.2 percent while 0.08 percent used kerosene. Table 6.13 also indicates that 1.4 percent of households used coal/wood for cooking. The dependence on
natural fuels of wood and coal for cooking was heaviest among households in North Side (3.1 percent), Stony Ground (2.9 percent), Sandy Hill (2.6 percent) and North Hill (2.1 percent). Less than two percent of households in all other areas used these methods.

Table 6.13 Percentage Distribution of Households by Type of Fuel Used Mainly for Cooking and Administrative Division, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of fuel</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>West End</th>
<th>South Hill</th>
<th>Blowing Point</th>
<th>Sandy Ground</th>
<th>North Hill</th>
<th>George Hill</th>
<th>The Valley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total households</td>
<td>3730</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas/LPG</td>
<td>93.00</td>
<td>93.75</td>
<td>94.83</td>
<td>97.48</td>
<td>96.00</td>
<td>95.83</td>
<td>90.18</td>
<td>92.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal/Wood</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerosene</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of fuel</th>
<th>North Side</th>
<th>The Quarter</th>
<th>Stoney Ground</th>
<th>The Farrington</th>
<th>Sandy Hill</th>
<th>East End</th>
<th>Island Harbour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total households</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas/LPG</td>
<td>91.91</td>
<td>91.46</td>
<td>92.80</td>
<td>89.47</td>
<td>91.19</td>
<td>93.55</td>
<td>92.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal/Wood</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerosene</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 7
DISABILITIES AND INFIRMITIES

7.1 Introduction
Disabled persons constitute a vulnerable group in the society. Irrespective of the severity, type or timing of the disability, individuals and their family members experience some temporary or permanent disruptions to their life. Although disability is a traumatic experience, disabled persons can still live normal lives. It is therefore incumbent on all societies to enact the necessary policies and programmatic support that will enable these individuals and their family members to cope with their circumstances.

Many disabilities are associated with the aging process and occur later along the life course, while others may be congenital. Still others may be due to environmental or accidental causes. Prevention or treatment of disabilities, where possible, is critical to the development of a society, and creating an environment in which persons with disabilities may function, free of discrimination, is desirable.

Table 7.1 Total Number of Persons Reporting Disability or Infirmity and Total Responses by Selected Age Group and Type, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Disability</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0 – 14</th>
<th>15 – 24</th>
<th>25 – 44</th>
<th>45-64</th>
<th>65 +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Persons</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>24.63</td>
<td>23.29</td>
<td>33.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sight</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Limb</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Limb</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck or Spine</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow to Learn</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2001, 601 persons reported a disability (with reported 744 multiple responses), 33.94 percent occurred among elderly persons 65 years and older, while 24.6 percent were among persons 25 to 44 years. Children under fifteen years accounted for 8.3 percent, while youth 15 -24 years accounted for 9.8 percent of all disabled persons, (Table 7.1).

Table 7.2 shows that the most common type of disability was those associated with the lower limb (22.3 percent), sight (15.2 percent) and the upper limb (9.0 percent). Disabilities of a behavioral nature accounted for 8.5 percent. Neck or spine injuries were responsible for 6.7 percent of all cases, 16.4 percent were otherwise classified and the case of 7.4 percent not stated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Disability</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0 – 14</th>
<th>15 – 24</th>
<th>25 – 44</th>
<th>45 -64</th>
<th>65 +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Persons</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sight</td>
<td>15.19</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>19.02</td>
<td>21.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Limb</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>11.89</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>7.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Limb</td>
<td>22.31</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>14.52</td>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>21.47</td>
<td>30.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck or Spine</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>6.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow to Learn</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>12.86</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>11.29</td>
<td>14.59</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16.40</td>
<td>27.14</td>
<td>30.65</td>
<td>15.68</td>
<td>15.34</td>
<td>11.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is difficult to use the census data on disability to accurately inform disability policies and programmes for children and youth, given that 38.6 percent and 33.9 percent of disabilities among persons 0 -14 years and 15 to 24 years were not specifically classified. In children 0-14 years old, impaired speech (14.3 percent), slowness of learning (12.9 percent) and sight related (11.4 percent) disabilities are the most common types reported. These types of disabilities when
occurring in children were usually related to congenital or accidental causes and are sometimes treatable.

Proper antenatal and maternal care may also assist in their prevention. In each age cohort the percentage of persons reporting a speech or learning disability progressively declines with age. For sight related disabilities, the percent declines up to age forty-four and thereafter, increases to its maximum in old age.

In children, behavioral disorders which are usually diagnosed as attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), may be more commonplace than others but are treatable and will not usually run the entire life course. In each successive age cohort from birth to 44 years, the percentage of behavioral related disabilities increased from 5.7 percent among persons 0-14 year to 11.3 percent for persons 15-24 years to reach 14.6 percent among adults 25 to 44 years. This increase over time may be due to improved diagnostic procedures in recent times and that not necessarily age related.

Anguillan youths who have a disability, tend to suffer more from those related to the lower limb (14.5 percent) and those with a behavioural origin (11.3 percent). Neck or spine related disability was lowest in this age group, while disabilities related to hearing, speech, slowness of learning and behavioural factors were higher among persons of this age than most of the population. Youths also had the largest percentage (33.9 percent) of unclassified disabilities.

Adults 25 – 44 years reported disabilities related to the lower limb (18.9 percent) and behavioural factors (14.6 percent) more frequently than other causes, and it was among this age group that behavioural infirmity/disability was greatest.

Disability among the elderly was better reported and classified than in the rest of the population. Only 4.8 percent of elderly persons did not specify their disability, and 11.4 percent were unclassified as “other”. Among the elderly population, 52.65 percent of all disabilities were either sight or lower limb related. Almost one in every three (30.68 percent) had a lower limb disability, slightly more than one in every five (21.97 percent) had a sight related disability. Only sight, hearing and lower limb related disabilities were higher among the elderly than in the rest of the population.
7.2 Chronic Illnesses

Table 7.3 reveals that hypertension was the leading chronic disorder, accounting for almost one quarter (23.1 percent) of all reporting chronic illnesses. This was followed by allergies (16.8 percent), diabetes (13.9 percent), arthritis (13.5 percent) and asthma (11.5 percent). Asthma and allergies were the most common type of illnesses affecting children and youth. Hypertension, allergies and diabetes were the leading illnesses in the adult population 25 to 64 years, with hypertension emerging as a chief concern mainly after the age of 25 years. Arthritis was common, mainly from age forty-five, accounting for 16.4 percent of all illnesses in the 45 to 64 age group and 26.9 percent in persons 65 years and older.

Based on the reporting of multiple responses on chronic illness, the percentages of heart disease, cancer and stroke, were low in the population. Less than one percent of the population suffered from strokes and cancers while 4.3 percent had heart disease.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Illness</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0 – 14</th>
<th>15 – 24</th>
<th>25 – 44</th>
<th>45 – 64</th>
<th>65 +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Persons</td>
<td>2454</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>17.11</td>
<td>10.47</td>
<td>23.80</td>
<td>25.43</td>
<td>23.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>3144</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sickle Cell</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthritis</td>
<td>13.46</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>16.36</td>
<td>26.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthma</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>42.64</td>
<td>21.18</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>11.18</td>
<td>21.86</td>
<td>19.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>23.09</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>22.49</td>
<td>33.95</td>
<td>31.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart Disease</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>7.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroke</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidney Disease</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupus</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Illness</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allergies</td>
<td>16.83</td>
<td>38.02</td>
<td>40.63</td>
<td>22.92</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>18.06</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The elderly population faces a higher risk of stroke, cancer and heart disease than others. Heart disease accounted for 7.1 percent, strokes 2.4 percent and cancers 1.2 percent of all chronic illnesses among the elderly. However the prevalence of cancer, tended to be slightly higher among adults 25 to 44 years. Prevalence of mental illness was low in the population and accounted for 1.7 percent of all illnesses. Mental illness was highest among youth, accounting for 6 percent of all illnesses in that age cohort. Kidney disease was also low and accounted for 1.3 percent of all chronic illnesses. Kidney disease was most prevalent among persons 25 to 44 years, accounting for 2.4 percent of all illnesses in this age group.

Sickle cell accounted for 2.8 percent of all reporting multiple responses of illnesses and was found mainly in the population under aged 45 years. Sickle cell disorder was more frequently diagnosed in children and youth, accounting for 7.5 and 5.6 percent of illnesses in each age cohort, respectively.

Table 7.4 demonstrates the burden of chronic illness in the population by age and sex. Close examination of the table shows that females share disproportionately higher in the burden of sickle cell, arthritis, diabetes, hypertension, heart disease, kidney disease, cancer, lupus and allergies related illness, when compared to men. However, a larger percentage of males than females suffer from asthma, strokes and mental illness.

These patterns were consistent across age groups except for persons aged 15 to 24 years. In this group, a larger percentage of females than males suffered from arthritis, hypertension and cancer. Also in the age group 45 to 64 years a larger percentage of males suffered from heart disease and a larger percentage of females than males were strokes.
Table 7.4  Percentage of Total Responses Reported on Chronic Illness by Type of Illness and Selected Age Groups and Sex Distribution, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Sickle Cell M</th>
<th>Arthritis M</th>
<th>Arthritis F</th>
<th>Asthma M</th>
<th>Asthma F</th>
<th>Diabetes M</th>
<th>Diabetes F</th>
<th>Hypertension M</th>
<th>Hypertension F</th>
<th>Heart Disease M</th>
<th>Heart Disease F</th>
<th>Stroke M</th>
<th>Stroke F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>31 M</td>
<td>58 F</td>
<td>151 M</td>
<td>272 F</td>
<td>186 M</td>
<td>175 F</td>
<td>172 M</td>
<td>264 F</td>
<td>252 M</td>
<td>474 F</td>
<td>55 M</td>
<td>81 F</td>
<td>15 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Distribution</td>
<td>34.8 M</td>
<td>65.2 F</td>
<td>35.7 M</td>
<td>64.3 F</td>
<td>51.5 M</td>
<td>48.5 F</td>
<td>39.4 M</td>
<td>60.5 F</td>
<td>34.7 M</td>
<td>65.3 F</td>
<td>40.4 M</td>
<td>59.6 F</td>
<td>53.6 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 -14</td>
<td>50.0 M</td>
<td>50.0 F</td>
<td>100.0 M</td>
<td>0.0 F</td>
<td>59.8 M</td>
<td>40.2 F</td>
<td>0.0 M</td>
<td>100.0 F</td>
<td>100.0 M</td>
<td>0.0 F</td>
<td>50.0 M</td>
<td>50.0 F</td>
<td>0.0 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 24</td>
<td>31.2 M</td>
<td>68.8 F</td>
<td>20.0 M</td>
<td>80.0 F</td>
<td>49.2 M</td>
<td>50.8 F</td>
<td>33.3 M</td>
<td>66.7 F</td>
<td>11.1 M</td>
<td>88.9 F</td>
<td>50.0 M</td>
<td>50.0 F</td>
<td>0.0 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 44</td>
<td>18.8 M</td>
<td>81.3 F</td>
<td>27.3 M</td>
<td>72.7 F</td>
<td>33.3 M</td>
<td>66.7 F</td>
<td>37.1 M</td>
<td>62.8 F</td>
<td>32.5 M</td>
<td>67.5 F</td>
<td>29.2 M</td>
<td>70.8 F</td>
<td>0.0 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 -64</td>
<td>50.0 M</td>
<td>50.0 F</td>
<td>33.6 M</td>
<td>66.4 F</td>
<td>48.0 M</td>
<td>52.0 F</td>
<td>42.5 M</td>
<td>57.5 F</td>
<td>39.6 M</td>
<td>60.4 F</td>
<td>62.9 M</td>
<td>37.1 F</td>
<td>40.0 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>33.3 M</td>
<td>66.7 F</td>
<td>38.2 M</td>
<td>61.8 F</td>
<td>38.1 M</td>
<td>61.9 F</td>
<td>37.9 M</td>
<td>62.1 F</td>
<td>31.7 M</td>
<td>68.3 F</td>
<td>30.2 M</td>
<td>69.8 F</td>
<td>61.9 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Total Responses reported include the total number of persons reporting chronic illness with multiple responses.

Table 7.4 Cont’d:  Percentage of Total Responses Reported on Chronic Illness by Type of Illness, Selected Age Groups and Sex Distribution, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Kidney Disease M</th>
<th>Cancer M</th>
<th>HIV M</th>
<th>AIDS M</th>
<th>Lupus M</th>
<th>Mental Illness M</th>
<th>Allergies M</th>
<th>Other M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>15 M</td>
<td>25 F</td>
<td>10 M</td>
<td>20 F</td>
<td>0 M</td>
<td>0 F</td>
<td>0 M</td>
<td>0 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex distribution</td>
<td>37.5 M</td>
<td>62.5 F</td>
<td>33.4 M</td>
<td>66.7 F</td>
<td>0.0 M</td>
<td>0.0 F</td>
<td>0.0 M</td>
<td>0.0 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 -14</td>
<td>0.00 M</td>
<td>0.00 F</td>
<td>50.0 M</td>
<td>50.0 F</td>
<td>0.0 M</td>
<td>0.0 F</td>
<td>0.0 M</td>
<td>0.0 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 24</td>
<td>33.3 M</td>
<td>66.7 F</td>
<td>0.0 M</td>
<td>100.0 F</td>
<td>0.0 M</td>
<td>0.0 F</td>
<td>0.0 M</td>
<td>0.0 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 44</td>
<td>29.4 M</td>
<td>70.6 F</td>
<td>11.1 M</td>
<td>88.9 F</td>
<td>0.0 M</td>
<td>0.0 F</td>
<td>0.0 M</td>
<td>0.0 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 -64</td>
<td>50.0 M</td>
<td>50.0 F</td>
<td>28.6 M</td>
<td>71.4 F</td>
<td>0.0 M</td>
<td>0.0 F</td>
<td>0.0 M</td>
<td>0.0 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>40.0 M</td>
<td>60.0 F</td>
<td>54.5 M</td>
<td>45.5 F</td>
<td>0.0 M</td>
<td>0.0 F</td>
<td>0.0 M</td>
<td>0.0 F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This may reflect the need for anonymity among HIV infected persons given the small size of the population and the stigma associated with the virus.

7.3  Health Service Utilization

The utilization of health facilities is often influenced by the type of services provided, accessibility, and affordability, quality of client care and morbidity levels within the population, to name a few. About 18.7 percent of the population, or 2142 persons visited a health facility in
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2001. Of this total, 81 percent utilized local health care facilities, while 18 percent sought health care abroad (Table 7.5).

Slightly more than half (50.9 percent) of the persons utilized public health facilities. Private Doctors were the main health care providers to 29.8 percent of the population; 26.1 percent utilized the main hospital in the country and 24.8 percent used public health clinics. Clinics or hospitals in St. Martin were sought after by 3.5 percent of the 2,142 persons who utilized a medical facility in 2001, while another 13.0 percent visited a private doctor overseas.

Table 7.5  Percentage of Total Responses Reported on Type of Medical Facilities, Selected Age Groups and Sex Distribution, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Main Hosp. in Anguilla</th>
<th>Private Doctor in Anguilla</th>
<th>Doctor Overseas</th>
<th>Public Health Clinic Anguilla</th>
<th>Drug Store</th>
<th>Clinic or Hosp. St. Martin</th>
<th>Clinic or Hosp. Overseas</th>
<th>Main Med. Facility Other</th>
<th>Main Medical Facility Not Stated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Persons</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Distribution</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 14</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 24</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 44</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 64</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 +</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Total Responses reported include the total number of persons reporting chronic illness with multiple responses.

Table 7.5 shows that older adults and females accessed health facilities more readily than males and younger persons. Overall, 58.6 percent of persons who utilized health facilities in 2001 were female. With the exception of the child population where males outnumbered females in service utilization by a ratio of 127.7 males to every 100 females, all other age cohorts showed a disproportionate higher access rate for females. The greatest difference in service utilization was seen among persons 25-44 years; in this age group females outnumbered males by a ratio of two females to each male.

Table 7.6 shows that 9.5 percent of all persons who utilized health facilities were youths who tended to utilize health services less than all other age groups. Further comparisons by age show almost uniform utilization of health services in the three older age groups. One in every four
persons (25.9 percent) who utilized health facilities were 45 to 64 years, 23.9 percent 25 to 44 years and 23.2 percent, 65 years and older. Children accounted for 17.6 percent of all users.

Gender differences in health service utilization are consistent with global trends, as females generally seek health care at an earlier onset of illness and more regularly than males. Neither is it surprising that fewer youth utilize medical facilities, given that youth generally enjoy better health than the rest of the population. This is not to say that young persons have fewer health care needs as youth is a period of tremendous physical and psychological change.

Table 7.6: Percentage Distribution of Persons Reporting Use of Medical Facilities by Selected Age Groups and Sex, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Sex Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Ages</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>1256</td>
<td>2142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-14</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.4 Utilization of Medical Facilities Abroad

Persons may elect to seek health care abroad for many reasons: the unavailability of specialized care at local health facilities; dissatisfaction with the existing quality of care or the need for a second medical opinion about a serious condition; or simply the need for greater privacy. Table 7.7 shows that 28.4 percent of persons who sought health care abroad were aged 25 to 44 years. Children accounted for 17.7 percent, youth 13.3 percent and the elderly, 15.4 percent.

Females accounted for 59.1 percent of persons who sought care abroad, outnumbering males by a ratio of 69.3 males per 100 females. In the child and middle-aged group, males outnumbered females by a ratio of 115.6 males per 100 females and 102 males per 100 females, respectively. Among youth (15-24 years) and adults (25-44 years), females outnumbered males by a ratio of 36.8 and 37 males per 100 females, respectively. These two age groups make up the reproductive years for women, and in the absence of actual data on type of services received it is
plausible to suggest that some of these women might be seeking reproductive health services abroad.

Table 7.7  Population Who Accessed Care Abroad By Broad Age Groups, Sex Ratios, and Percentage Distribution, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percent Distribution</th>
<th>Sex Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 14</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td>115.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 24</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 44</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>28.39</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 64</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>25.32</td>
<td>102.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 +</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 8
CHILDREN

8.1 Introduction
This Chapter highlights the situation of children, birth to fourteen years in Anguilla. Although the aggregate data on children collected in the population census do not adequately address all areas of their wellbeing, the chapter provides some critical information on the context in which children live, specifically their residential location, household characteristics, school enrolment status and health status.

In 2001, children, birth to fourteen years, constituted more than a quarter (28 percent) of Anguilla’s population. Table 8.1 shows that male children accounted for 28.3 percent of the male population and female children, 27.8 percent of the female population.

Table 8.1 Total Population 0-14 Years by Sex and Age-Group as a Percentage of the Total Population, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group of child</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>% of total population</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 0-14</td>
<td>3,202</td>
<td>28.01</td>
<td>1,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>11430</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>5628</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of children, 9.9 percent are aged 10 to 14 years, another 9.4 percent are birth to four years and 8.7 percent are aged 5 to 9 years old. The pattern of age distribution for both sexes in Table 8.2 is almost identical. Children are evenly spread across the three age groups, reflecting a consistent pattern of fertility within the last fifteen years. The overall sex ratio is almost perfectly balanced, at 98.6 boys per 100 girls or boys accounting for 49.7 and girls 50.3 percent of the child population. Girls predominate the child population at younger and older ages. This is reflected by a sex ratio of 95.8 boys to every 100 girls in the birth to four age group and 98.3 boys per every 100 girls in the 10 to 14 age group. It is only in the five to nine age group that...
boys outnumber girls by a ratio of 102 boys per 100 girls. Incidentally, this age group also has the smallest share, 31.0 percent, of the child population.

**Table 8.2: Percentage Distribution of the Child Population by Age Group and Sex, 2001**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group of child</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Male Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 0-14</td>
<td>3,202</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>33.51</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>31.01</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>35.48</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**8.2 Residential Location**

Table 8.3 shows that the representation of children in each district is fairly uniform. In eight of the 14 districts, the proportion of children was slightly lower than the national average of 28 percent. Four districts deviated most from the national pattern, with East End, North Hill and Island Harbour having a slightly higher proportion of children, 32.8 percent, 30.7 percent and 30.2 percent, respectively. Likewise, Sandy Ground and West End had the lowest proportion of children in their population, 22.4 percent and 24.7, respectively.

**Table 8.3: Population 0-14 Years by Administrative District of Residence, 2001**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Residence</th>
<th>Population 0-14 Years</th>
<th>Persons 0-14 Years as a % of Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3202</td>
<td>28.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>24.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>26.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blowing Point</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>29.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Ground</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>22.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hill</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>30.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hill</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>28.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Valley</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>27.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>27.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quarter</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>27.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Ground</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>28.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farrington</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>27.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Hill</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>27.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>32.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Harbour</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>30.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.3 Household Characteristics

Male-headed households are the most common household type for children in Anguilla. Almost 60 percent of children (1,918 children or 59.9 percent) live in households headed by a male, while the remaining 1,284 or 40.1 percent live in a female-headed household. The breakdown of children by age according to the sex of household head in Table 8.4 is fairly uniform. Female-headed households contained a slightly larger percentage of older children, 10 to 14 years (36.2 percent), than male-headed households (35 percent), while the differences in the distribution of younger children are marginal.

Table 8.4: Number and Percentage Distribution of Children by Broad Age Group and Sex of Household Head, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group of Child</th>
<th>All Heads</th>
<th>Sex of Head of Household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 0-14</td>
<td>3202</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>1073</td>
<td>33.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>31.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>35.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data on children in households by age of household head in Table 8.4 can provide some insights into the structure of families and union formation. In population censuses, households are synonymous to families, where a household is defined as a group of individuals who share a single dwelling unit, share at least one meal per day and have common arrangements for the care of each other. Each household declares a single head, who is usually the principal breadwinner. Here the household is defined, both in terms of financial care and legal or blood relations to the head.

Where a man and a woman co-reside, it is usual in Anguilla, for the man to be declared head of the household, even if his spouse is a co-breadwinner, or the principal breadwinner. Therefore, in cases where the woman is declared head, this usually indicates that she is not in a co-residential union, although she may be in a visiting union.

Given the tendency for Anguillans to migrate, male and female heads alike, may be a part of a transnational family structure; in which one parent remains at home with the children while the other migrates. In such circumstances, the resident parent is declared head, although the
principal breadwinner may be overseas. In other cases, both parents may be abroad, while the children remain at home with an older sibling or relative who assumes the role of head.

Joint-households are difficult to identify, since members are identified in terms of their relationship to the head, rather than their relationship to each other. Where three or more generations co-reside, this may be an indication of a joint-household. Still, some difficulty in identifying the joint-households may exist because adult children, living with their parent(s), but still having responsibilities for their own children, may either report themselves or their elderly parent as the household head.

Upon examination of the data in Table 8.5, household heads aged 25-44 years are responsible for 63.9 percent of all children in Anguilla. Heads, 45-64 years care for another one-quarter (26.0 percent) and elderly persons, 65 years and older are responsible for 7.5 percent. The smallest share of the child population (2.7 percent) is cared for in households headed by youth under the age of 25 years.

Table 8.5 shows that persons under 25 years, who are at the early stage of family formation are mainly responsible for young children. Almost three-quarters (72.1 percent) of the children in these households are under the age of five years, 22.1 percent between the ages of five and nine and only 5.8 percent are nine to fourteen years. The family type in these households is likely to be nuclear, although the union status of the head may be married, common-law and even single.

Children in households headed by persons 25 to 44 years are almost evenly distributed across the three age groups. As expected, older household heads 45 to 64 years are responsible for more children 10-14 years, (43.4 percent), than children 5 to 9 years (31.5 percent) or children under four years (25.1 percent). The distribution of children in households headed by elderly persons is similar to that of heads 25-44 years. These households are more likely to be joint households, where these children are grandchildren rather than biological children of the head.
Table 8.5  Number and Percentage Distribution of Children by Selected Age Groups and by Age Group of Head of Household, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group of Household Head</th>
<th>All Children 0-14 years</th>
<th>Age Group of Child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>2045</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and older</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.6 shows that in male headed households, 66.5 percent of children are cared for by heads 25 to 44 years, compared to 59.9 percent in female-headed households. Female headed households also contain a larger percentage of elderly heads (10.6 percent) than male headed households (5.4 percent), reflecting higher life expectancy for females and the matrifocality of the joint-household.

While there are no real substantive differences in the age distribution of children in male-headed versus female-headed households, some sharp variations are apparent when we take both the age and sex of the head in consideration. Firstly, male heads aged (25-44) tend to have more children under age five in their households (36.6 percent) than female heads (32.8 percent). The converse is true where female heads have a larger proportion (38 percent), of children 10 to 14 years than male heads (31.2 percent). Secondly, the data highlights single parenting as a salient feature among Anguillan woman of all ages.

Among heads 45-64 years, female heads have a larger percentage (28.1 percent) of children less than five years old living in their households than male heads (23.2 percent). Since most of these women have completed their childbearing years earlier; these heads are more likely to be grandmothers to children of their younger daughters. This explanation is in keeping with the expectations of the joint-households of Afro-Caribbean families and a historic pattern of teen childbearing being more commonplace in single-parent, female headed households. In households with heads aged 45 to 64 years, 46 percent of the children, irrespective of the head’s
gender, are 10 to 14 years old. This proportion is twice that of children less than five years in male headed households, where both grandparents are likely to be present.

**Table 8.6: Number of Children in Households by Age-Group of Child and Age Group and Sex of Household Head, 2001**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group of Heads</th>
<th>Age-group of Child</th>
<th>All persons 0-14 years</th>
<th>0-4 years</th>
<th>5-9 years</th>
<th>10-14 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male Heads</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>33.79</td>
<td>31.23</td>
<td>34.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25 years</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>8.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44 years</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>1276</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>36.60</td>
<td>32.21</td>
<td>31.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64 years</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>23.21</td>
<td>30.56</td>
<td>46.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and older</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>37.86</td>
<td>26.21</td>
<td>35.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female Heads</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>33.10</td>
<td>30.69</td>
<td>36.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25 years</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>72.55</td>
<td>23.53</td>
<td>8.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44 years</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>32.77</td>
<td>29.26</td>
<td>37.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64 years</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>28.05</td>
<td>32.93</td>
<td>46.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and older</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>32.35</td>
<td>36.03</td>
<td>35.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.4 Children Living in Overcrowded Households

The inclusion of data on children living in overcrowded households provides us with a basis for assessing the quality of life enjoyed by children. This is an indicator of household resources and highlights the social vulnerabilities which children are likely to face due to uncongenial living conditions.

Almost one-third (32.8 percent) of all children or 1,052 children were living in conditions deemed to be overcrowded. The majority of these children are birth to four years (37.1 percent), followed by children 10 to 14 years (34.9 percent) and those 5 to 9 years (28.0 percent), (Table 8.7(a)). Most of the children living in overcrowded dwellings were located in South Hill (12.9 percent), Stony Ground (11.2 percent), and North Side (10.5 percent). A number of the children who lived in these dwellings were located in Sandy Ground (2.9 percent), North Hill (3.1 percent) and West End (4.1 percent). In seven of the fourteen districts, the percentage of boys living in overcrowded dwellings was higher, while the level was higher for girls in six districts and identical in one district.
### Table 8.7(a)  Number of Children in Overcrowded Households by Age Group, Administrative Division and Sex, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Division</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>All persons</th>
<th>Age Group of Child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All persons</td>
<td>0-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>533</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>519</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blowing Point</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Ground</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hill</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hill</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Valley</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quarter</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Ground</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farrington</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Hill</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Harbour</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.7(b) Percentage Distribution of Children in Overcrowded Households by Age Group, Administrative Division and Sex, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Division</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>ALL persons (0-14)</th>
<th>Age Group of Child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blowing Point</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Ground</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hill</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hill</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Valley</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quarter</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Ground</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farrington</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Hill</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Harbour</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.5 School Attendance

School attendance data presented in Table 8.8 should be viewed with caution as some of the children, birth to four years, who are included in these figures, are not eligible for entry into school. Bearing this in mind, school enrolment among children, birth to fourteen years was 88.8 percent, with 89.5 percent of girls and 88.1 percent of boys. When we select children four to fourteen years only (2,287 children), school enrolment increased to 98.5 percent. Gender differences remained marginal with 98.6 percent of girls and 98.4 percent of boys enrolled in school. The sex of the head of household has no bearing on school enrolment, although school enrolment for all children (0-14 years) was marginally higher (less than 1 percent) in households with a female head.

Table 8.8 Number and Percentage of Children 0-14 Years Attending School by Sex of Person and Sex of Head of Household, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Child</th>
<th>All Children</th>
<th>% Attending</th>
<th>Sex of Head</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>% Attending</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>% Attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All children</td>
<td>3202</td>
<td>88.79</td>
<td>All Children</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>88.01</td>
<td>1284</td>
<td>89.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>88.05</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td>89.52</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Government of Anguilla’s policy of free and compulsory primary and secondary education reduces the negative impact that social class can have on school attendance among children in working-class households. Table 8.9 shows a fairly uniform pattern of school attendance for children less than fifteen years, irrespective of the occupational status of their household head. Notwithstanding this, the attendance rate of children in the traditionally low paid occupational groups - Craft & Related Trades Workers (88.2 percent), Skilled Agriculture and Fishery Workers (86.6 percent) and Elementary Occupations (86.9 percent) - continues to be lower than the national average of 88.7 percent. Children from households where the head is a Plant & Pachine Operator or Assembler have the highest attendance rate (91.9 percent), followed by Professionals (91.2 percent) and Legislators, Senior Officials and Managers (90.3 percent).

When the sex of the household head is taken into consideration, Table 8.9 shows that children in
female headed households from all occupational groups, with the exception of Technicians & Associate Professionals and Elementary Occupations, have higher attendance rates than those in male headed households. This difference rises to 4.8 percent in the case of Craft & Related Trades Workers and to 4.5 percent in the case of Legislators, Senior Officials and Managers.

Table 8.9 Number of Children Attending and Not Attending School by Occupational Group of Head of Household and Sex of Child, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Group of Head</th>
<th>Male Total Children</th>
<th>Male Number Attending</th>
<th>Male Percent Attending</th>
<th>Female Total Children</th>
<th>Female Number Attending</th>
<th>Female Percent Attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislators, Senior Officials and Managers</td>
<td>1527</td>
<td>1344</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>89.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>88.12</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>92.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians &amp; Associate Professionals</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>91.04</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>91.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>89.73</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>88.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Workers &amp; Shop &amp; Market Sales Workers</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>86.84</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>88.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Agriculture and Fishery Workers</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>88.27</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>89.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft &amp; Related Trades Workers</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>83.87</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>89.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant &amp; Machine Operators &amp; Assemblers</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>86.00</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>90.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Occupations</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>91.78</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>92.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>87.06</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>86.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>76.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The present employment status of the head has a direct impact on the quality of life enjoyed by children. In larger households with fewer working age persons than dependents, or where the head has experienced extended periods of unemployment, the welfare of children may be low.

In all districts, with the exception of Sandy Hill (66.8 percent), the labour force participation rate exceeded 72 percent. On the other hand, the child dependency ratio which is calculated as the number of children per 100 working persons varied from a high of 74.4 children per 100 working age persons in East End to a low of 42.4 children per 100 working person in Sandy Ground. There is no consistent pattern between labour force participation rate and dependency ratio, although it is evident from Table 8.10, that Sandy Ground which has the lowest dependency ratio (42.4 children per 100 working age persons) also has the highest labour force participation rate.
(79.6 percent). On the contrary, North Hill which has the second highest labour force participation rate (79.5 percent) has the third highest child dependency ratio (63.7 children per 100 working age persons).

The Child Support Ratio in all districts is good, when we consider that each child is supported by approximately 1.7 working persons. However the support ratio in Table 8.10 will decline when we consider that almost one-quarter of the working age population is not working.

### Table 8.10: Population 0-14 and 15-64 by Labour Force Participation Rate, Dependency Ratio, Child Support Ratio by Area of Residence, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Residence</th>
<th>Population 0-14 years</th>
<th>Population 15-64</th>
<th>Working Population</th>
<th>Labour force Participation Rate</th>
<th>Child Dependency Rate (per 100 working persons)</th>
<th>Child Support Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3202</td>
<td>7358</td>
<td>5556</td>
<td>75.51</td>
<td>57.63</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>73.80</td>
<td>51.27</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>79.39</td>
<td>50.13</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blowing Point</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>72.35</td>
<td>63.51</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Ground</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>79.56</td>
<td>42.36</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hill</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>79.47</td>
<td>63.64</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hill</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>77.36</td>
<td>56.74</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Valley</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>76.74</td>
<td>54.71</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>76.86</td>
<td>55.61</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quarter</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>74.60</td>
<td>56.75</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Ground</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>74.47</td>
<td>59.96</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farrington</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>73.33</td>
<td>57.20</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Hill</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>66.76</td>
<td>65.94</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>73.50</td>
<td>74.35</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Harbour</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>74.81</td>
<td>65.82</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8.6 Health Status

The health status of children is relatively good with 13.1 percent of the child population reported to be suffering from an illness. A close look at Table 8.11 will show that 14.7 percent of boys and 11.5 percent of girls were afflicted with some form of illness. A larger percentage (15.9 percent) of the 5 to 9 year old population than the 10 to 14 (14.3 percent) and birth to four years old population (9.3 percent) reported an illness at the time of census taking. However, there were no significant gender differences, as the pattern of illness remained unchanged, regardless of the child’s gender. Overall, boys 5 to 9 years reported the highest level of illness (17.5 percent).
Table 8.11: Number of Children Reporting Illness by Age Group and Sex, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Child</th>
<th>All children 0-14 years</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>0-4</th>
<th>% Suffering from illness</th>
<th>5-9</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% Suffering from illness</th>
<th>10-14</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% Suffering from illness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All children</td>
<td>3202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1073</td>
<td></td>
<td>993</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>525</td>
<td></td>
<td>502</td>
<td>563</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>548</td>
<td></td>
<td>491</td>
<td>573</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.12 Number and Percentage Distribution of Children by Administrative Division Reporting Illness to Population Imbalance, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Division</th>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>% Distribution (a)</th>
<th>Number of Children Reporting Illness</th>
<th>% Distribution of Illness (b)</th>
<th>Illness to Population Imbalance (a) – (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3202</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blowing Point</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Ground</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hill</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hill</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Valley</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>-1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>10.21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quarter</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10.47</td>
<td>-2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Ground</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farrington</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Hill</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Harbour</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For comparative purposes, Table 8.12 presents the prevalence rates and distribution of illness by districts. Generally, the administrative divisions with the larger population also have a larger share of illnesses. However, seven divisions have a disproportionate share of ill persons. This imbalance is greatest in The Quarters, which has 8.3 percent of the population and 10.5 percent of ill children. Blowing Point on the other hand, has 6.9 percent of all children and 5.2 percent of ill children. Sandy Hill has the most balanced ratio, with 4.7 percent of the child population...
and 4.3 percent of ill children. These differences have implications for the location of medical facilities targeting children within the country.

Table 8.13 Number of Children in Each District and Prevalence Rates by Rank Order, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All areas</th>
<th>Number of Children in Division</th>
<th>Prevalence Rate per 1000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3202</td>
<td>131.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farrington</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>86.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blowing Point</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>99.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hill</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>107.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>109.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>113.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Hill</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>119.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Harbour</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>120.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Ground</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>137.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>140.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Valley</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>153.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hill</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>157.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quarter</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>166.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Ground</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>229.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When we look at the overall health status of children, which is captured by the prevalence rate, the average prevalence is 131.2 per 1000 children, birth to fourteen years. Sandy Ground has the highest prevalence (229.5 per 1000), followed by The Quarters (166.0 per 1000) and North Hill (157.9 per 1000). The lowest prevalence is observed in The Farrington (86.1 per 1000) and Blowing Point (99.6 per 1000). Prevalence rates of this level among children are not unusual, since the measure is self assessed health for all illnesses rather than a specific illness.
CHAPTER 9
YOUTH

9.1 Introduction
Youths provide an invaluable resource of human capital for the present and future development of a country. Strictly speaking, youths are defined as persons aged 15 to 24 years. The Youth is an important transitional period from childhood to adulthood and is accompanied by biological and psychosocial changes. It is also a transition from dependency to independence; from school to work and from living with parents to living alone. This chapter highlights the circumstances of youth in Anguilla by focusing on their household characteristics, academic achievements and working status.

9.2 Composition and Distribution of the Youth Population
In 2001, the youth population numbered 1,756 persons and accounted for 15.4 percent of the total population. This represents a 12.7 percent increase over the 1992 population of 1,558 youths. Table 9.1 reflects the predominance of females (904 females) over males (852 males) in the youth population, or a sex ratio of 94.3 males for every 100 females. Younger youths, aged 15-19 years, accounted for more than half the youth population, 55.1 percent, and older youth, aged 20-24 years, 44.9 percent. The sex ratio(97.2) among younger youth also reflect a small majority of females (491) over males(477), and is more balanced than among older youths, where the sex ratio widens to 90.8 males per every 100 females.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age-Group</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>Male Number</th>
<th>Male %</th>
<th>Female Number</th>
<th>Female %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All youths 15-24 years</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19 years</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>55.13</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>55.99</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>54.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24 years</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>44.87</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>44.01</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>45.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9.2 shows a wide variation in the distribution of youth across districts. These patterns reflect differences in the fertility rate over the period 1966 to 1977 and settlement patterns created by migration over time. The largest proportion of youth resides in South Hill (13.8 percent), North Side (11.0 percent), Stony Ground (10.8 percent) and the Valley (10.0 percent). All other areas contain less than ten percent of the youth population, with the smallest percentage of youth residing in Sandy Ground (2.2 percent).

In spite of the uneven distribution of youths across districts, their representation in the population of each district ranges slightly from 12.4 percent in North Hill to 16.9 percent in Stony Ground. In many countries, imbalances in life chances between the rural and urban areas cause youth to gravitate to the ‘bright lights’ of the city, resulting in their overrepresentation in the urban area. This does not appear to be the case in Anguilla, as the Valley, which is the most pronounced urban settlement, contains ten percent of the youth population, while only 15.1 percent of its overall population is youth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Division</th>
<th>Persons Aged 15-24 Years</th>
<th>Percentage Distribution of persons aged 15-24 years</th>
<th>Persons 15-24 Years as a Percent of Population of each Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>15.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>14.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>16.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blowing Point</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>16.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Ground</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>13.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hill</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>12.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hill</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>12.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Valley</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>10.02</td>
<td>15.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>16.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quarter</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>15.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Ground</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>10.76</td>
<td>16.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farrington</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>16.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Hill</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>13.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>13.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Harbour</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>16.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.3 Youths Living in Overcrowded Households

Although not a perfect match, the distribution of youth in overcrowded households closely mirrors their distribution and representation in the population of each district. Table 9.3 shows that one in every four youths lives in an overcrowded household, the majority of whom, live in South Hill (15.9 percent), Stoney Ground (11.4 percent) and North Side (10.1 percent). Given their numeric advantage, it is not surprising that more females (238) than males (208) are living in overcrowded households. Most of these females are living in South Hill (15.1 percent), Stony Ground (14.7 percent) and North Side (12.6 percent). The majority of males in overcrowded dwellings are located in South Hill (16.8 percent) and the Quarter (11.1 percent). With the exception of North Side The Quarter, George Hill and Sotney Ground, the number of male and female youths in overcrowded households in each district is similar, although their percentage distribution varies.

Table 9.3 Number of Youths in Overcrowded Households by Sex and Administrative Division and Sex, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division of Residence</th>
<th>All persons 15-24 years</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>15.92</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blowing Point</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Ground</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Hill</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hill</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Valley</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10.09</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quarter</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Ground</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farrington</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Hill</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Harbour</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.4 Household Characteristics

More than half of all youths, 990 persons or 56.6 percent, live in households headed by a male, the remaining 760 youths, or 43.4 percent, live in female-headed households. The predominance of the male head increases slightly to 57.3 percent, among older youths. This may be due in part, to older male youths living alone, or males assuming the role of head at an earlier age than their
female peers. This is evidenced in Table 9.5, where males account for 60.8 percent of the 186 heads, under the age of twenty–five years.

Table 9.4: Number and Percentage Distribution of Youths by Selected Age Groups and Sex of Head of Household, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age-Group of Youth</th>
<th>Total Youths</th>
<th>Male Head</th>
<th>Female Head</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Youths</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number of Youths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All youths</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>990 56.57</td>
<td>760 43.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19 years</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>541 56.0</td>
<td>425 44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24 years</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>449 57.27</td>
<td>335 42.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some consistent patterns in household composition are evident, irrespective of the gender of the head of household. Heads under the age of twenty-five years, account for 11 percent of all heads and are directly responsible for 2.2 percent of individuals who themselves are youths, those aged 15-19 years. Generally, households headed by young persons under twenty-five years of age, have four–fifths of their youths in the 20-24 age groups. Undoubtedly, many of these youths are siblings, relatives or spouse of the head.

A look at Table 9.5 will show that as the age of the head increases, the composition of youths in their household shifts from older to younger youths and finally, to a larger percentage of younger youths in female- headed households and a larger percent of older youths in male headed households. Male heads, aged twenty–five to sixty-four years have about 61 percent of youths in their households, in the 15 to 19 age group and 39 percent in the 20-24 age groups.

The situation is different for female heads, where the narrowing of the age composition of youths within their households occurs much earlier than in male- headed households. Male heads aged 45 to 64 years are responsible for 39.6 percent of youths aged 20-24 years, compared to female heads, who are responsible for 48.8 percent of youths in the same age group.

Where gender differences are most pronounced is among elderly heads. Six out of every ten (60.6 percent), of youths in elderly female-headed households are in the 15-19 age group. The
situation is reversed in male-headed households, where four out of every ten (41.9 percent), are in the 15 to 19 age group. These patterns reflect the tendency for young people to co-reside with their elderly parent well into their late youth /early adult years.

Table 9.5: Number of Youths by Selected Age Groups and Sex of Head of Household, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group of Head</th>
<th>Male Heads</th>
<th>Age of Youth</th>
<th>Female Heads</th>
<th>Age of Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Youths</td>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>Total Youths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Ages</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>54.65</td>
<td>45.35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25 years</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>18.58</td>
<td>81.42</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44 years</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>61.56</td>
<td>38.44</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64 years</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>60.36</td>
<td>39.64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and older</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>41.89</td>
<td>58.11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is true especially for nuclear households/nuclear families, which are also more likely to have a male head. The data also underscores the role played by elderly grandmothers in caring for their grandchildren.

9.5 School Attendance

In 2001, school attendance among youth was 30.8 percent. This translates into 541 youth attending school, while 1,215 were not registered in an academic institution. Table 9.6 shows higher enrolment rates for females, 34.5 percent, than for males, 26.9 percent.
Table 9.6 Percentage of Youths Attending and Not-Attending School by Sex of Youth, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Youth</th>
<th>All Youths</th>
<th>Percent Attending</th>
<th>Percent Not-Attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All youths</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Caution must be taken in attributing gender differences in enrolment in Table 9.7, to the sex of the household head, given that youths are also heads of households. Never-the-less, the gender gap in school attendance for female-headed households is smaller, 6.7 percent, compared to 8.4 percent for male-headed households. Although this reflects greater equality in female headed households, male headed households appear to facilitate greater opportunities for youths to attend school.

Table 9.7 Percentage of Youths Attending and Not Attending School by Sex of Head of Household and Sex of Youth, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Youth</th>
<th>Male Heads</th>
<th>Female Heads</th>
<th>Male Heads</th>
<th>Female Heads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Youths 15-24 Years</td>
<td>Percent Attending</td>
<td>Percent Not Attending</td>
<td>Percent Attending</td>
<td>Percent Not Attending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Youths in households with a male head, have a slightly higher enrolment rate. Male youths in households with a male head, have an enrolment rate of 27.6 percent, compared to 26.2 percent for their male peers in households headed by a female. The gap is wider for female youth, where 36.0 percent of females in households with a male head are attending school, compared to 32.9 percent in households with a female head.

It can be expected that the occupational status of parents has an impact upon the ability of youth to continue their education. This may be true for several reasons. Firstly, parents in higher occupational classes are more able to finance their children’s tertiary education through personal funds or loans, thus providing a smooth transition from high school to university. On the contrary, youths of parents in lower occupational classes may be forced to find work upon
leaving high school, in order to supplement household income, or to finance their tertiary education.

Secondly, the aspirations of youths may be shaped by the expectations of parents. Parental expectations about schooling may be homogeneous across classes, resulting in no significant difference in school enrolment among youth. Parents with low status occupations may see tertiary education as a means for social mobility, while parents in higher status occupations may see education as necessary for the maintenance of social status. Ultimately, the aspirations of the child make the difference in school enrolment among youth, given the opportunities that exist in Anguilla for free and sponsored tertiary education.

Table 9.8 shows those youths, whose heads of household are Professionals (47.0 percent), Senior Officials and Managers (35.3 percent) have the highest enrolment rate, followed closest by youths whose heads work in elementary occupations (32.2 percent).

Female youths generally have higher enrolment rates than male youth whose head may be in a similar occupational group. The only exception is among heads (in the clerical occupational category) whose sons have a higher school enrolment rate (31.6 percent) than daughters (27.7 percent).

The greatest variation in school attendance is among agricultural workers. In this category, enrolment of daughters in school is 52 percent higher than for sons. Incidentally, males whose household head is an agricultural worker has the lowest enrolment rate among their male peers. The situation is slightly better for females with a head who is an agricultural worker. These females have a higher enrolment rate than their peers, whose head is a Clerk (27.7 percent), Service Worker, Shop or Market Sales (28.9 percent) or Craft and Retailed Trade Worker (30.4 percent).

Another interesting finding is that, male youths whose heads work in Clerical (31.6 percent) or Craft and Related Trade (29.3 percent) have a higher school enrolment rate than male youths whose heads are Legislators, Senior Officials and Managers (27.1) Technicians & Associate Professionals (28.6 percent). Males, livings in households with heads who are Plant and
Machine Operators and Assemblers (27.6 percent) also had a slightly higher school enrolment rate than those whose heads are Legislators, Senior Officials and Managers.

### Table 9.8 Number and Percentage Distribution of Youths Attending School by Occupational Group of Head of Household and Sex of Youth, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Group of Head of Household</th>
<th>Total Children</th>
<th>% Attending school</th>
<th>Total Children</th>
<th>% Attending school</th>
<th>Total Children</th>
<th>% Attending school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislators, Senior Officials and Managers</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians &amp; Associate Professionals</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Workers &amp; Shop &amp; Market Sales Workers</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Agriculture and Fishery Workers</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft &amp; Related Trades Worker</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant &amp; Machine Operators &amp; Assemblers</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Occupations</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 9.6 Economic Activity

The expected relationship between educational attainment and employment status is that as one’s level of education increases the ability to find employment also increases. While it is generally true that education increases labour market participation, labour market interactions of supply and demand will eventually determine employment levels in a population. Generally, youths are faced with the highest level of unemployment, even where their academic qualifications equal that of older persons. In chapter five we noted that the unemployment rate for youths was 14.6 percent compared to 8.0 for the entire labor force.

A look at their activity level in Table 9.9, irrespective of school attendance, shows that more than a third, 35.48 percent, was working. The employment rate for males was 12.6 percent higher than for females, given that 60.1 percent of males and 47.5 percent of females were working. Full
employment for male youths who attained university level education (not including UWI Extra Mural College) is noted, compared to an 85.7 percent employment rate for females with the same level of education. With the exception of females who achieved their highest formal education from UWI Extra Mural College or another institution, males out-performed females with similar education level in gaining employment.

Table 9.9  Number and Percentage of Youths Working by Highest Level of Educational Attainment and Sex, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Both Sexes</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent working</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All ages (15-24)</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>35.48 (N=623)</td>
<td>852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary 1-3 Years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary 4-7 Years</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>33.78</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Secondary</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed High School</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>45.11</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWI Extra Mural College</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US University/College</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>63.33</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University W.I./UK Equivalent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>77.78</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Youth with a tertiary level education are one and a half to three times more likely to be working than those who achieved a primary or secondary level education. On the average, 73 percent of persons with a college or university education were employed, compared to 41.9 percent with primary level only and 45.1 percent who completed high school. It should be noted that youth with US based tertiary training have a lower employment rate (63.3 percent), that those trained in the United Kingdom or at the University of the West Indies (77.8 percent). Youth who have not completed high school, have an employment rate of 18.2 percent, two and a half times lower than their peers who completed secondary school. Although many of these youth are still registered students, this finding underscores the importance of remaining in school.
CHAPTER 10
ELDERLY

10.1 Introduction
Traditionally, many persons defined the elderly population as persons 65 years and older, as this corresponded to the mandatory age for retirement and old age social security benefits in most countries. In 1982, the United Nations General Assembly on Aging recognized age 60 as the chronological age to mark the start of the aging process, and suggested that countries modify their data collection procedures to reflect this change. The adjustment of the chronological start of aging from 65 to 60 years was suggested in recognition of the biological, social and economic dimensions of the aging process, which start at birth but are manifested in most persons by aged 60.

In adherence to the UN declaration and in recognition of the need for relevant data to inform policy decisions on the elderly, this chapter provides comparative data for the elderly population 60 years and older and 65 years and older. Special emphasis will be placed on the social network, health status and sources of livelihood among the elderly.

Generally, a population with 10 percent or more of its members 60 years and older is regarded as an aging population. Once a population starts to assume an aging profile, the general trend is for the elderly to gradually increase over time, regardless of any significant future increase in the fertility level or heavy losses in the working age and child population due to net-migration flows.

10.2 Elderly Population Size and Structure
In 1992, 11.6 percent of the population was 60 years and older. By 2001, heavy increases in the working age population served to reverse the aging population trend, resulting in elderly persons accounting for 10.3 percent of the total population. Changes in the elderly population due to mortality and migration also contributed to the declining share of the elderly. The proportion of elderly men aged 75-79 years declined by about one-fifth since 1992. Similarly, the proportion of elderly women aged 75-84 years declined by approximately one tenth when compared to 1992 (see Table 1).
Table 10.1  Total Population and Intercensal Change by Selected Age Groups and Sex, 1992 and 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Census</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercensal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8960</td>
<td>11430</td>
<td></td>
<td>2470</td>
<td>27.57</td>
<td>4473</td>
<td>5628</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>25.82</td>
<td>4487</td>
<td>5802</td>
<td>1315</td>
<td>29.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35.71</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>24.89</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47.22</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-2.31</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-21.15</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>-15.76</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-21.69</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-10.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-84</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-5.56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-13.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56.76</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>182.35</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12.15</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>1174</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>13.43</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The gender of the elderly population is predominantly female, 53.2 percent female and 46.8 percent male. In all elderly age groups, females outnumber males, except for the 65-69 and 80-84 age cohorts, in 65-69 age cohort where males outnumber females by a ratio of five males to every four females.

Another feature of the elderly population is the rapid increase of the oldest elderly, persons 85 years and older, (sometimes referred to as the frail elderly). At the 2001 census count, 116 persons had already celebrated their 85th birthday, an increase of 42 persons, or 56.8 percent when compared to 74 persons in 1992. This means that the rate of increase among the old elderly is four times greater than the overall increase in persons over sixty years. During the intercensal period, the old elderly increased by 56.8 percent while the total elder population grew only by 13.4 percent.

Although females in the oldest elderly category outnumbered males by a ratio of 1.4:1, the increase in the frail elderly male population was 16.7 times greater than that of their female counterparts. The disproportional increase in the frail elderly or oldest elderly population is similar to that observed globally. This may suggest the need for more facilities in the future which can provide institutionalized care for this group, as family members may be unable to
adequately provide the specialized care this group usually requires. The extent to which the immediate and long-term needs (for instrumental and financial support) of the elderly, are being met by family members, can be inferred through observations of their household structure, family ties and employment status.

### 10.3 Household Size

A look at Table 10.2 shows that one in every five elderly is living alone. The larger proportion of these persons, 57.2 percent is male (26.7 percent). Households with two persons are the most common type with 34.3 percent of elderly persons living in such dwellings. The second person is likely to be a spouse of similar age. Another 29 percent live in median size households, containing three to five persons and the remaining 15 percent are living in large households of six or more persons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1174</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8+</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When we compare the household size of elderly persons over 60 years in Table 10.2, to those 65 years and older, in Table 10.3, the patterns in household size remains consistent.
Table 10.3  Number and Percentage Distribution of The Elderly Population (Aged 65+) by Household Size and Sex, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8+</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.4 Tenure of Dwellings

Home ownership is high among the elderly (Table 10.4). On the average, 90.6 percent own their homes. Females and older persons have a higher percentage of home ownership than males. Table 10.4 highlights rental as the second largest tenure type for dwellings. A slightly higher percentage of males (7.1 percent) than females (5.6 percent) over sixty years of age rent their dwellings. Only 1.3 percent is living rent free and less than one percent leased (0.5 percent), or has other tenure arrangements (0.2 percent).

Table 10.4 Percentage of The Elderly Population by Type of Tenure of Dwelling Unit, Age and Sex, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure of Dwelling</th>
<th>Elderly 60+</th>
<th>Elderly 65+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All dwellings</td>
<td>100.0 N=1174</td>
<td>100.0 N=550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent free</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.5 Construction of Dwellings

The majority of elderly, 43.1 percent are living in dwellings constructed between 1970 and 1995.
Another 40.0 percent live in older dwellings built prior to the 1970s. The remaining 9.8 percent live in newer dwellings constructed after 1995. Both the oldest and newest dwellings have the largest percents of owner occupied tenure.

**Table 10.5 Percentage of Dwelling Units Occupied by The Elderly Population (Aged 60+), by Age of Dwelling Unit and Type of Tenure, 2001**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure of Dwelling</th>
<th>Year of Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All dwellings</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent free</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 10.6 Percentage of Dwelling Units Occupied by The Elderly Population (Aged 65+), by Age of Dwelling Unit and Type of Tenure, 2001**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure of Dwelling</th>
<th>Year of Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All dwellings</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent free</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10.6 Union Status

The union status of the elderly is a good indication of the support systems available to them. This is because persons in stable unions have greater access to a larger pool of familial resources than single individuals.
Table 10.7  Number and Percentage Distribution of The Elderly Population (Aged 60+), by Union Status and Sex, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legally Married</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common law</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting partner</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Union and married</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Union and legally separated</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Union and widowed</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Union and divorced</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Union and Single</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.8 shows that about one half (82.59 percent) of the elderly were legally married at some time in their lives. Currently, one in two are living together as a legal married couple. The proportion that is currently legally married is higher among males (60.4 percent) than females (40.4 percent). Females are more likely to be widowed (31.4 percent) than males (12.5 percent). This is due to higher mortality rates for males than females in the population. Approximately one in every six elderly, 15.2 percent, have never been married, 7.0 percent are divorced or separated and 0.4 percent experience in visiting unions.
Table 10.8  Percentage of The Elderly Population (Aged 65+), by Union Status and Sex, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legally Married</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common law</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting partner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Union and married</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Union and legally separated</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Union and widowed</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Union and divorced</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Union and Single</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost one quarter of elderly persons over 60 years are working. When those over sixty five years are considered, the figure falls to 15.9 percent. Males maintain a higher employment rate and a longer period of employment after retirement, than females. This is indicated in Table 10.9 where 32.5 percent of males over 60 years are working compared to 14.9 percent of females. Among those 65 years and older, almost one quarter of the males are still working compared to about one tenth of the females.

Table 10.9 Percentage of The Elderly Population by Economic Activity, Age Group and Sex, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Activity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 60+</td>
<td>1174</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not work</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 65+</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.7 Health Status

Hypertension, arthritis and diabetes are the commonest reported illnesses among the elderly. Tables 10.10 and 10.11, show that 32.1 percent (of total responses) were from Hypertension, 27 percent from arthritis and 19.7 percent from diabetes. Twice as many females (62.8 percent), as males (37.2 percent), were suffering from an illness. With the exception of strokes, cancers and mental illness, females reported higher incidences of illness than males. This suggests that a greater proportion of illness among females than males may be related to lifestyle practices, rather than simply be attributed to old age. Also, males tend to use health facilities less than their female counterparts.

Table 10.10 Number and Percentage of The Elderly Population (Aged 60+), Reporting Illnesses (Total Responses), by Type of Illness and Sex Distribution, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Illness</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent Distribution</th>
<th>Sex Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Responses</td>
<td>1074</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sickle Cell</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthritis</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthma</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart Disease</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroke</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidney Disease</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Illness</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allergies</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Totals include multiple responses.

Table 10.11 Number and Percentage of The Elderly Population (Aged 65+),
### Reporting Illnesses (Total Responses), by Type of Illness and Sex Distribution, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Illness</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent Distribution</th>
<th>Sex Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Responses</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sickle Cell</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthritis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthma</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart Disease</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroke</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidney Disease</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Illness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allergies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Totals include multiple responses.

### 10.8 Financial Status

The elderly in Anguilla depend on a broad range of formal and informal sources to meet their financial needs. These sources are summarized in Table 10.12. The majority of persons rely on a pension (29.52 percent), friends and family members (21.07 percent) and social security benefits from Government and other public assistance (15.4 percent). Another 11.2 percent made financial investments in property or financial instruments and 11.4 percent rely on their savings. The range of independent sources (pension, personal savings, investments) from which the elderly are supported; suggest a concerted effort to ensure their financial independence after retirement.

The reliance on financial assistance from overseas in the form of pensions, investments and from family members combined; contribute 28.9 percent of all sources. This means that the elderly will continue to contribute to the national economy even after retirement, providing significant foreign exchange which will help to stimulate the local economy and mitigate risk and vulnerability within their households, in the event of local economic shocks.
Gender differences in sources of livelihood are noticeable in Tables 10.12 and Tables 10.13. Both tables indicate a heavier dependence among females than males on family and friends, local pension and Government assistance. The contribution of family and friends locally is three times higher for females than for males. Relatives abroad also contribute two times more to their female than male relatives. Although a higher percentage of males rely on their personal assets (work related pensions, savings, income from investments and rental), the percentage of males on disability benefit is three times higher than for females. These data provide important insights into the financial network of the elderly, although the value of contribution from each source is unknown.

**Table 10.12  Number and Percentage of The Elderly Population (Aged 60+), by Source of Livelihood and Sex, 2001**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Livelihood</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1267</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension – Anguilla</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension (Overseas)</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments - Anguilla</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments - Overseas</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends/Family - Anguilla</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends/Family - Overseas</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Income - Anguilla</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Income - Overseas</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings/Interest</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Benefit</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Benefit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Public Assistance</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10.13  Sex Distribution of The Elderly (60+), by Sources of Livelihood, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Livelihood</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pension –Anguilla</td>
<td>45.86</td>
<td>54.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension (Overseas)</td>
<td>52.70</td>
<td>47.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments - Anguilla</td>
<td>64.86</td>
<td>35.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments - Overseas</td>
<td>58.97</td>
<td>41.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends/Family - Anguilla</td>
<td>23.47</td>
<td>76.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends/Family - Overseas</td>
<td>32.39</td>
<td>67.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Income - Anguilla</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Income - Overseas</td>
<td>53.33</td>
<td>46.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings/Interest</td>
<td>55.17</td>
<td>44.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Benefit</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Benefit</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td>52.97</td>
<td>48.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Public Assistance</td>
<td>32.08</td>
<td>67.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>46.07</td>
<td>53.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.9  Insurance Coverage

Since old age is accompanied by increasing poor health due to chronic diseases and a loss of income as a result of retirement, insurance coverage for the elderly is critical to their maintenance. This will help them in accessing health care and in the recovery of any loss to property or persons in the event of a disaster. According to Table 10.14, only 11.7 percent of the elderly have any form of insurance coverage. The situation is worse among females, where only 2.6 percent have insurance, compared to 27.3 percent of males.

Table 10.14  Number of The Elderly (Aged 60+) by Insurance Coverage and Sex, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Insurance Coverage (Aged 60+)</th>
<th>Insurance Coverage (Aged 65+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nos.</td>
<td>Percent Insured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All elderly</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.10 Experience of Crime

The vulnerability of the elderly in any society is also gleaned from a look at their experiences with crime. In the 2001 census, 3.1 percent of the elderly aged sixty years and older were victims of crime. The majority of these victims, 72.2 percent were males, see Table 10.15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience of Crime</th>
<th>Sex of Elderly (Aged 60+)</th>
<th>Sex of Elderly (Aged 65+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim of Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1162</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=26</td>
<td>N=10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1126</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REFERENCES


Caribbean Community Secretariat
The Statistics Sub-Programme
P.O. Box 10827
Turkeyen,
Greater Georgetown, Guyana

Tel. (592) 222-0001-75
Fax. (592) 222-0098
E-mail: stats1@caricom.org
Web site: www.caricomstats.org