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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Introduction

The 2015 Sierra Leone Population and Housing Census is the fifth in a series of modern censuses conducted in 1963, 1974, 1985 and 2004. Census data are used for policy making, planning and administration, research, business, electoral boundary delimitation and sampling frameworks for surveys (United Nations, 2008).

The 2015 Census used two types of questionnaires to collect socio-demographic data: the institutional questionnaire which collected information on five items (name, age, sex, nationality and place of birth) and the household questionnaire. The household questionnaire had seven sections and collected information on geographical identification, population characteristics, housing facilities, ownership of durables, agricultural module, death in the household and Ebola socio-economic impacts.

This analytical report comprises 16 chapters covering a wide range of topics such as census methodology, migration and urbanization, housing conditions, population in agriculture, persons with disability, Internet, and Ebola's socio-economic impacts. Its primary objective is to provide policy makers, academics, data users and the general reader with timely and relevant demographic, socio-economic data and information for policy formulation, development planning, monitoring and evaluation of programmes and plans, as well as service delivery.

## Main findings

This section highlights some of the major findings of each chapter.

## Chapter One: Introduction, profile of Sierra Leone and census methodology

The census data collection activities comprised three main phases: pre-enumeration, enumeration and post-enumeration activities. The first phase involved preparatory activities like mapping of enumeration areas, census questionnaire construction and its pilot work, as well as preparation of ancillary documents (for example, enumerators' manuals, summary sheets and house listing forms).

In the main, the 2015 Census was successfully conducted. However, there were challenges including recruitment and training issues, boundary disputes and monitoring and supervision. These were mitigated with appropriate solutions.

## Chapter Two: Evaluation and adjustment of age-sex data

Accurate data on age and sex are vital information in demographic analysis, socio-economic planning and service delivery. The sex ratio, age specific sex ratios, visual observation and Whipple's, Myers' and Bachi's indices of digit preference, as well as the United Nations age accuracy index, were used as data evaluation methods to examine the quality of the census data.

The results indicate that there was evidence of age heaping and that the quality of the age-sex data was rated as 'highly inaccurate'. The evaluation results suggested that the adjusted age-sex distribution of the population should be used for making population projections and developing plans.

## Chapter Three: Population size, composition and age-sex structure

Knowledge of population size, composition and age-sex structure is essential in sustainable development planning and service delivery. The 2015 Census enumerated 7,092,113 persons comprising 3,490,978 males and 3,601,135 females respectively. The Northern Region had the largest share of the population, while the Western Region had the smallest share.

The population has increased by about 2 million persons between 2004 and 2015 with a 3.2 per cent annual growth rate. The population of Sierra Leone is young with 40.8 per cent of the population under 15 years, 55.7 per cent aged 15-64 years and 3.5 per cent aged 65 years and above. The proportion of non-Sierra Leoneans was 0.6 per cent. The Mende language is the main language followed by Temne and Krio. Islam is the most dominant religion, constituting 77 per cent.

## Chapter Four: Household size, composition and structure

The household is the basic socio-economic unit whose welfare is of paramount importance to the government. The results show that the mean household size was 5.6 persons in 2015. The mean household size varied from 4.7 persons in the Western Region to 6.0 in the Northern Region. There were more male than female heads, 71.9 per cent compared with 28.1 per cent. Nearly a half of the households were extended households, while nuclear households and single-person households were 38.6 per cent and 6.4 per cent respectively.

## Chapter Five: Fertility

Fertility, a major component of population change, has declined with the total fertility rate decreasing from 6.5 in 1974 to 5.6 in 2015. There are fertility differentials in terms of place of residence, region, educational attainment and marital status. For instance, the total fertility rate for women who have never been to school was 6.2 compared to 3.0 for women with tertiary education. The total fertility rate was higher in rural than urban areas.

A minimal change in the mean age at childbearing ( 29.2 years) was observed from the 2004 Census figure of 30 years. Regarding childlessness, 81 per cent of all women aged 15-19 years were childless but by age 45-49 years, just 8 per cent of women were childless. The phenomenon of childlessness was observed among married women and the percentages of married women who were childless and aged 15-19 and 25-29 were 42.9 and 11.9 respectively.

## Chapter Six: Mortality and Orphanhood

The level of mortality reflects the health status of a population, including its health services. The risk of dying is also known to vary with age and sex. Deaths in children is a critical indicator of the level of socio economic development.

This chapter presents the levels and trends of childhood and adult mortality including maternal mortality and the mortality differentials. It also presents life tables which help mortality analysis, as well as information on orphanhood status of children under age 18.

The reported crude death rate is 14.7 per 1000 population. The results also show that the infant mortality rate for Sierra Leone is 96 deaths per 1000 while the child mortality rate is 67 deaths per 1000. The under-five mortality rate is 157 deaths per 1000. The educational attainment of a mother affects her child's survival rates, with women with tertiary education having an infant mortality rate of 63 per 1,000 compared to 108 per 1,000 among women with primary education. The results show that women have a higher life expectancy at birth of 51.3 years, compared to 47.6 years for men. The difference between the life expectancy at birth of males and females is 3.7 years. Maternal mortality rate is 1.8 deaths per 100,000 women while the adjusted maternal mortality ratio is estimated at 997 maternal deaths per 100,000 births. Most maternal deaths occur during pregnancy.

## Chapter Seven: Migration and urbanization

Migration, which is one of the three components of population change, has consequences for places of origin and destination. The rural-urban migration has brought about an increase in the population of urban areas.

The analyses show that 85 per cent of the population had not moved from their district of birth, with the Northern Region registering the greatest proportion of non-movers, while the Western Region had the smallest number of non-movers. The urban growth rate of 4.2 per cent indicated a faster growth rate than the corresponding value for the rural areas ( 2.6 per cent) and this puts a heavier strain on educational and health facilities, as well as a need for the creation of more job opportunities.

## Chapter Eight: Marital characteristics

This chapter on marital characteristics attempts to present an overview of the marital status situation and its related characteristics at the time of the census. It does not answer the questions on how and why. More detailed information is usually collected in the intercensal demographic and health surveys.

The main findings of this chapter show that:
i.The proportion never married is the highest in the country with 46 per cent of all marital status categories. Polygamous marriages follow with an overall proportion of 30 per cent, ranging from 43 to 55 per cent respectively in the Northern and Southern regions.
ii.There are notable differences between urban and rural areas where the proportions never married are 52 and 41 per cent respectively.
iii.The pattern for the districts follows the national one with the proportions never married dominating in all districts.
iv.Religion does not appear to influence the type of marital status. The Islamic faith is dominant with 76 per cent of the population, while the proportion of the Christian faith is 23 per cent. Islam dominates in all marital status categories, ranging from 65 per cent for those co-habiting for 5 years or more to 80 per cent for those monogamously married.
v.On economic activity status, in the case of employed men, the proportion who are polygamous dominates with 47 per cent, compared to 23 per cent for polygamous women. For the unemployed category, 49 per cent of men and 40 per cent of women belong to the never married category.
vi.As far as household headship is concerned,

72 per cent of all the households are male headed, as opposed to 18 per cent which are female headed.

## Chapter Nine: Education and literacy

Education is the key to sustainable development of a country and female education, empowers women to participate fully in the socio-economic development of a country like Sierra Leone. The results reveal that most of the population had been to school. Fifty six percent of persons aged three years and older had been to school, of which 18.2 percent attended school in the past, while 37.3 percent were enrolled in school at the time of the census. Regarding sex differences, 60.2 percent of the male population had been to school compared to 51.0 percent of females. In respect of the proportions attending school at the time of the census, the females dominated schooling from age three to 14 years, while the proportions attending school at the time of the census for males exceeded those for females from age 15 to 29 years. The proportion literate was 51 percent compared with 49 percent not literate. Thirty seven percent of the rural population was literate compared to an urban proportion of 70 percent. The most literate population was the 15-19 age group followed by persons aged 20-24 years and 10-14 years. A comparison of enrollment ratios for the population aged 6-11 years, 12-14 years and $15-17$ years suggest that the capacity of the education system at the junior and senior secondary school levels has expanded between 2004 and 2015.

The distribution of the economically active population by age group and sex indicate that the proportions for males in the younger age groups, 15-34, are higher for males than for females, while the opposite is the case for the older age groups.

The main findings on the employed population were:
i.More than three-quarters of this population are self-employed without employees. Two-thirds of them are in rural areas.
ii.Three-quarters of the paid employed population are in urban areas.
iii. Nearly two-thirds of paid employees have no education - there are significant difference between males and females.
iv. More than three-quarters of employed population in rural areas have no education.
v. Nearly six out of ten of all employed persons are agricultural or fishery workers.
vi. Crop farming is the dominant industry with 56 per cent of all employees.
vii. Between eight and nine out of ten employed people are self-employed.

## Chapter Eleven: Housing conditions

Housing characteristics are analysed by looking at households by region and place of residence. Trend analysis over the 30-year period (1985, 2004 and 2015) for the entire country is attempted wherever the data permit (data are available and definitions have remained consistent).

There has been a decline in the average household size from 6.6 in 1985 to 5.6 in 2015 but the number of households has increased two and a half times from 485,711 in 1985 to 1,265,468.

Seven out of 10 of households are owner occupiers while two in 10 are renting.

There has been a 10 per cent increase in the proportion of households with private toilet facilities and the proportion of households using flushed toilet doubled between 2004 and 2015 ( 3.5 per cent and 8.5 per cent respectively).

The main source of information for all households was radio for all the regions and both rural and urban households. Primary schools were closer to households than health facilities with the majority ( 68.8 per cent) within less than half mile. Eight out of 10 households had water within less than half a mile away.

## Chapter Twelve: Population in agriculture

The 2015 census questionnaire has an agriculture module which collected information on crop production, fishery and animal husbandry. The results indicate that 732,461 agricultural households were engaged in crop production, fishery and animal husbandry activities and rice
was the predominant crop. Eighty-two per cent of agricultural households were in the rural areas compared to 18 per cent in the urban areas.

Cacao and coffee occupied the largest land area for cultivation, while the proportion of land under cultivation of different crops varied among the regions. The mean number of cows owned by keepers was the highest and the mean number of animals owned by keepers ranged from four goats to 19 cows per keeper. The Northern Region dominated in the ownership of livestock. Agricultural households had less access to agricultural facilities like tractors, power tillers, threshers, rice millers and oil palm pressers.

## Chapter Thirteen: Poverty and durable assets

The possession of certain durable assets by household gives an indication of its standard of living. The standard of living, when put alongside education and health, show the deprivation status of households. The results show that 40 per cent of households were deprived in primary school completion compared to 19 per cent on child school attendance. The goods most commonly owned by households were a bed (81 per cent), radio (66 per cent) and mobile phone (63 per cent).

Household heads aged 55-59 years had the largest ownership proportions for 10 out of the 16 durable goods. It was also found that household heads who have never married had the highest ownership proportions in all but five durable goods: bed, bicycle, motorcycle, truck and boat.

High levels of educational attainment tend to be related to a high proportion of ownership of durable goods. For instance, household heads with tertiary and higher education topped the list of ownership of all durable goods, except boats.

## Chapter Fourteen: Persons with disability

Government policy towards ensuring that persons with disability participate fully in the socio-economic development of the country has not yet yielded the expected results.

The census results indicate that persons with disability constituted three per cent of the population of Sierra Leone. It found that 67 per cent of persons with disability were living in the rural areas compared with 33 per cent in the urban areas. More males than females are persons with disability.

The Northern Region had the highest percentage of persons with disability (35.3 per cent), while the Western Region had the smallest percentage. Disease or illness was found to be the main cause of disability. The findings reveal that the most common types of disability were physical disability or polio (21.8 per cent), partially sighted ( 15.2 per cent), blind or visually impaired (12.5 per cent) and physical disability or amputee ( 8.9 per cent). Males with disability had better socio-economic characteristics (for example, employment, educational attainment and literacy status) than their female counterparts.

## Chapter Fifteen: Internet, alcohol and tobacco use

The 2015 Census questionnaire was the first to include questions on Internet accessibility and use. A question was also included about the consumption of alcohol and tobacco. The questions were asked of those aged 10 years and over.

Overall, the largest proportion of the population had no access to the Internet ( 86.7 per cent). Looking at gender, 16 per cent and 10 per cent of males and females respectively, were accessing the Internet.

Close to 23 per cent of the population in urban areas had access to internet facilities whereas only 5.5 per cent had access in the rural areas. Most of the tobacco and alcohol consumers were in the age range 35-39 years constituting 14.3 per cent of the total. The proportions were similar by sex. In contrast, the smallest proportion of tobacco and alcohol consumers were, as might be expected, in the age group 10 to 14 years.

The findings reveal that most of the consumers ( 65.3 per cent) had no formal education. Tobacco was consumed by the following categories of the
population: self-employed without employees ( 14.8 per cent), self-employed with employees ( 13.6 per cent), paid apprentice (12.8 per cent), unpaid family workers (12.6 per cent), persons who worked before and now looking for work (12.5 per cent), and retired/ pensioners (12.3 per cent).

## Chapter Sixteen: Ebola socio-economic impacts

The Ebola disease carries a high risk of death. The findings show that 81.1 per cent of a total of 13,373 infected persons in Sierra Leone died during the 2014 outbreak. More males than females died, while most of the victims were persons aged 15-35 years. There were more rural than urban deaths.

Ebola had a negative impact on the incomes of the working population. For instance, 55 per cent of the working population reported that their incomes decreased because of the outbreak. A higher percentage of infected persons (57 per cent) in the rural areas did not seek medical care compared with 42.9 per cent in urban areas.

## Recommendations

A household sample survey should be conducted to study the complexities of household and family structure. The Government should make financial resources available to Statistics Sierra Leone for it to perform this task.

There is a need to institute measures to contain fast population growth so that it does not thwart development efforts. The family planning programme should be reinvigorated and couples should be educated about the many benefits of a small family size as well as the health dangers of excessive childbearing.

There is a need to improve policies that encourage adolescent girls to delay childbearing. The potential of women must be unlocked by encouraging girls to stay on at school longer - at least up to secondary school level. This would build a generation of empowered women.

The Government should plan for the increasing number of young persons by building more infrastructure for education, especially primary schools, as well as health facilities for both children and adults.

The Government and stakeholders should sensitize the population about Ebola. This calls for a close collaboration between the Ministry of Health and community leaders to ensure that good and adequate disease outbreak controls are provided.

The analysis of persons with disability points to the need for Government to institute programmes that target these persons to improve their wellbeing and ensure they are given the opportunity to participate fully in the socio-economic development of the country.

The country needs long-term sustainable resources of funding for development. The Government should explore the possibility of mortgaging some of its untapped mineral wealth to raise funds for socio-economic development.

# CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION, COUNTRY PROFILE AND CENSUS METHODOLOGY 

### 1.1 Introduction

The 2015 Population and Housing Census (PHC) is the fifth modern census taken in Sierra Leone. The main objective of this census is to contribute to the improvement of the quality of life of the people of Sierra Leone through the provision of relevant, reliable and timely data and information for development planning, policy formulation and service delivery, as well as for monitoring and evaluation of development programmes and plans.

The 2015 Census offered increased availability and accessibility of accurate and reliable data on a wide range of demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the population for evidencebased decisions at national, sub-national and sectoral levels and to support developmental programmes such as the Agenda for Prosperity, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the Sierra Leone International Benchmarks Systems (SLIBS) and to support the elections process.

The census process followed international standards and best practice by first of all establishing a robust governance structure that involved various committees like the National Advisory Committee (responsible for policy direction), the Technical Committee (responsible for all technical guidance, vetting all census instruments) and the Publicity Committee (responsible for census education and advocacy). In addition, all decisions of these committees were reviewed and approved by Statistics Sierra Leone Council before implementation. The 2015 Census was conducted between 5 and 18 December 2015, with reference to the night of 4 December as census night.

This analytical report could be used by ministries, departments and agencies (MDAs), local councils, development partners and the private sector to monitor progress in the implementation of development programmes and policy formulation. The information is presented at national, regional and district as well as at rural and urban levels.

Subsequent censuses collected new data items (including type of dwelling unit, repair needs of dwelling unit and number of rooms) and more detailed data on some existing items such as water. In 2015, information was sought on sources of water supply for drinking and also for domestic use. In the previous censuses, data had only been collected on source of water supply and source of drinking water in 1985 and 2004 respectively. These additional data items provide the opportunity for a more detailed assessment of the housing conditions and quality of life of the population. This information has obvious implications for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes aimed at improving living standards. The report analyses and discusses housing characteristics of households by region and place of residence. Trend analysis over the 30 year period $(1985,2004$ and 2015) for the entire country is attempted wherever the data permit (data are available and definitions have remained consistent).

### 1.2 The profile of Sierra Leone

Sierra Leone is a country in West Africa. It is bordered by Guinea to the north-east, Liberia to the south-east, and the Atlantic Ocean to the south-west. The country has a tropical climate, with a diverse environment ranging from savannah to rainforests. The total land area is $71,740 \mathrm{~km}$ ( 27,699 sq. miles) and there is a population of 7,092,113 (based on the 2015 Census). It is a constitutional republic with a directly elected president and a unicameral legislature.

Sierra Leone is made up of four administrative regions: the Northern Region, Eastern Region, Southern Region and the Western Area, which are subdivided into 14 districts. Each district has its own directly elected local government, though with limited power, as most of the power is held by the central government in Freetown. It became independent from the United Kingdom on 27 April 1961, led by Sir Milton Margai.

The current constitution of Sierra Leone was adopted in 1991, though it has been amended several times. Since independence to the present, Sierra Leonean politics has been dominated by two major political parties; the Sierra Leone People's Party (SLPP) and the All People's Congress (APC).

Sixteen ethnic groups inhabit Sierra Leone, each with its own language and customs. The two largest and most influential are the Temne and the Mende people. The Temne are predominantly found in the north of the country, while the Mende are predominant in the southeast. It is a Muslim majority country, with the overall Muslim population at 78 per cent of the population, though there is an influential Christian minority at about 21 per cent. Sierra Leone is regarded as one of the most religiously tolerant nations in the world where Muslims and Christians live and work side-by-side in peace.

Sierra Leone has relied on mining, especially diamonds, for its economic base. It is also among the largest producers of titanium and bauxite, a major producer of gold and has one of the world's largest deposits of rutile. The country is home to the third-largest natural harbour in the world. It is a member of many international organizations including the United Nations, the African Union, the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the Mano River Union, the Commonwealth of Nations, the African Development Bank and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation.

### 1.3 Population censuses in Sierra Leone

The first population count in Sierra Leone was undertaken in 1802 in what is now the Western Area. However, the first modern population census to cover the whole country, was conducted in April 1963. Since then, four more censuses have been undertaken in December 1974, December 1985, December 2004 and December 2015 respectively. It is worth noting that because of the difference in the methodology used in the censuses prior to 1963, the population totals of the country prior to 1963 cannot be compared with those
of recent censuses.
Due to the improvement of the census methodology in the 1963 population census, a reliable and trustworthy population figure of 2,180,355 was accepted for informed consent and further improvement on the other censuses continued.

The 2004 Census collected information on many demographic and socio-economic characteristics and recorded a total population of $4,976,871$ persons, with a sex ratio of 94 . Its preliminary report was published in February 2005 and the analytical report finalized in July 2006.

Following the decennial census programme, the next census was expected in December 2014. However, following the spread of the Ebola epidemic from Guinea and Liberia to Sierra Leone, with the first case recorded in May 2014 in Kailahun District, a recommendation was made by Statistics Sierra Leone (SSL) to the Government of Sierra Leone that the main field enumeration should be shifted from December 2014 to April 2015. But as the epidemic intensified, it was further postponed to December 2015. The Government of Sierra Leone accepted and announced both postponements.

The population of Sierra Leone has grown from 2,180,355 in 1963 to $2,735,159$ in 1974, $4,976,871$ and $7,092,113$ in 2004 and 2015 respectively.

### 1.4 Uses of census data

Population data are needed on a continuing basis for policy formulation and implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the country's population programme and development planning. The uses of population and housing census data are numerous and very key to the development planning of a country. The information generated serves various purposes. Essentially, census data presents a full and reliable picture of a country's population in terms of its size and spatial distribution, demographic, social and economic characteristics, as well as its housing conditions.

Being a source for evidence-based decision making, census data are critical in the demarcation of constituencies/wards and the allocation of representation on governing bodies. The census also provides data for the calculation of social indicators, particularly those that are needed for small areas or small population groups, as well as those that may be observed infrequently in the population.

Census data are also useful in categorizing the population with varying types of vulnerability. Among the special groups are minorities, the physically challenged, orphans, youth and women. Their demographic and socio-economic attributes require special treatment in policy and programme terms. This plays an indispensable role in ensuring equitable allocation of national funds and services.

Census data can also provide data for further analysis, leading to published materials, policy documents and research on issues generating interest and arousing curiosity. University academics and students constitute a special group that benefit greatly from census data since it could be referenced for publication of academic and policy papers, dissertations and thesis and the launching of new research interests and agendas. It would also provide better sampling frames for future surveys, quality maps and an expanded data processing facility that would constitute a major component of an Integrated National Statistical System (INSS).

In Sierra Leone, census data are a valuable tool for measuring and assessing development frameworks including the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) which have now been replaced by the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). These lay emphases on combating human immune virus/acquired immune deficiency syndrome (HIV/AIDS), reducing poverty and food insecurity, reducing maternal mortality, improving education, reducing gender inequality especially gender-based violence, improving adolescent and young people's reproductive health and reproductive rights, regional imbalance in development and improving service delivery through a policy of decentralization (MDG report for Sierra Leone 2005).

### 1.5 Background and justification of the 2015 population and housing census

### 1.5.1 Background

A population census is the total process of collecting, compiling, evaluating, analyzing, publishing and disseminating demographic, economic and social data for all persons in a country at a specified time. It is the largest data collection undertaking in a country by a government. Not only does it cover the whole country, but it also provides information on every person, from newly born babies to the oldest person in the country, as well as for nationals and non-nationals. The data from the census are classified, tabulated and disseminated so that political leaders, election officials, planners, national organizations including nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and civil society, regional and international organizations can use the data in decision-making.

Following the dividend yielded after the 1802 population count in what is now called Western Area, the exercise continued on an irregular and non-scientific basis (obscured methodology) until the first modern population census, which covered the whole country, was conducted in April 1963. Since then, four more censuses have been undertaken using scientific methodologies. After the establishment of a National Population Commission (NPC) in 1982, Sierra Leone adopted a 'National Population Policy for Development Progress and Welfare' (NPPDPW) in August 1989 whose goals were:
(i) to make development planning and policy more comprehensive and effective by the incorporation of the demographic dimensions;
(ii) to achieve a rate of population growth that is economically sustainable;
(iii) to contribute towards meeting the basic needs of the people and enhancing the quality and utilization of the nation's human resources; (iv) to promote the health and welfare of the people, especially those in the high-risk groups of mothers and children;
(v) to initially moderate the expected rise in, and later to progressively reduce, population growth rates through the spread of voluntary family planning and small family norms so as to facilitate the attainment of national economic and social targets; and
(vi) to guide rural-urban migration, so as to minimize socio-economic problems and optimize benefits to migrants and non-migrants alike in rural as well as urban areas.

The revised NPPDPW (August 1989) affirms the application of internationally recognized human rights standards to all aspects of population programmes in the country. This concept renewed the opportunity in the post-conflict era of Sierra Leone to comprehensively address the critical challenges and interrelationships between population and development, and to catch up on what the rest of the world was striving to achieve when the country was busy trying to put the war behind it.

The implementation of this policy established a common ground, with full respect for various religions and ethical values and cultural backgrounds of the Sierra Leonean society.
With the overall goal of the 2015 Census aimed at contributing to the improvement of the quality of life of the people through providing the government and other stakeholders with relevant, reliable and timely data, the specific objectives were to:
(i) increase the availability and accessibility of accurate, timely and reliable data on demographicandsocio-economiccharacteristics for evidence-based decisions, policy formulation and monitoring and evaluation of development frameworks at national, sub-national and sectoral levels;
(ii) increase knowledge of stakeholders at all levels, on population characteristics, patterns and trends;
(iii) increase utilization at all levels of data and information for designing, monitoring and evaluating development programmes and plans;
(iv) strengthen national capacities in data collection, processing, analysis, dissemination and utilization, including geographic information system (GIS), socio economic as well as in census strategic planning and management
and hence to provide community level data on the incidence of Ebola and use the data in postEbola recovery activities.

### 1.5.2 Justification

The 2015 Census was undertaken to maintain a major data collection programme and provide necessary data required for formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of programmes in population and housing policy, development, economic planning and good governance. Implicitly, information generated from the 2015 Census will serve various purposes such as in evidence-based decision making, policy formulation, planning and administration.

The 2015 Census would not only provide essential information for policy development and planning, but would as well manage and evaluate programme activities across a broad range of sectoral applications, which would monitor the overall development progress due to its ability to accommodate larger number of variables.

### 1.6 Funding and implementation strategy

A census requires substantial financial, material and human resources. Because of the Civil War, the Sierra Leone Government had to play a greater leadership role than in previous censuses as a confidence building measure for foreign donors. It demonstrated leadership by providing funding for the locality listing exercise, which started in January 2013. The Government also provided funds for the purchase of vehicles, office and data processing equipment, needed for the start of cartographic field work.

Donors started coming on board after they were satisfied that the security situation had improved to a level that could justify their confidence. The Government was supported by the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID), Irish Aid and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in funding the census.

To ensure adherence to the work plan, the census activities were monitored through regular meetings, field visits and preparation of relevant reports. For successful implementation, the process was divided into five phases namely the preparatory phase, whose key activity was the cartographic and listing exercise followed by the data collection, data processing, data analysis and the evaluation and dissemination phases. Details of the above phases are further explained in other chapters, especially in the methodology section.

### 1.7 Census methodology

### 1.7.1 Introduction

The census methodology, whose focus was on pre-enumeration, actual enumeration (field work) and post enumeration activities, was done as best international practice. The objectives were:
(i) to ensure that the lowest administrative units (enumeration areas) were clearly demarcated through a well-structured cartographic mapping exercise without dispute amongst local communities;
(ii) to ensure that field staff were fairly recruited to perform their duties;
(iii) to have trained staff for pre-enumeration, main data collection and post-enumeration activities; and
(iv) to ensure that quality assurance was achieved through effective monitoring and supervision activities.

### 1.7.2 Pre-enumeration activities

Pre-enumeration activities involved:
(i) the establishment of the legal basis for the census;
(ii) setting up the necessary administrative/ organizational machinery;
(iii) establishment of a cartographic mapping programme;
(iv) determination of the scope and coverage of the census, including preparation of relevant instruments; and
(v) the development of census education and communication programmes.

### 1.7.2.1 The legal basis for the census

The 2002 Statistics Act and the 2002 Census Act provided the legal authority for the 2015 Census. The legal provisions in these two acts are consistent with the objectives and strategy of the 2015 census programme and therefore facilitated the census operations. In addition, the 2014 Public Health Emergency Regulations, put in place for the containment of Ebola, was repealed. These regulations had been part of the reason for postponing the census from December 2014 to December 2015.

### 1.7.2.2 Establishment of the census administrative structure

The Statistician General (SG) of Statistics Sierra Leone (SSL) has the responsibility under the 2002 Census Act for 'the direction of the overall technical and administrative control of the taking of any census'. To exercise this responsibility, a Census Secretariat (CS) was set up for the 2015 Census.

The existing legal basis for population censuses also made provision for the appointment of a Census Advisory Committee, whose chairman was the minister of Finance and Economic Development. The Census Advisory Committee (CAC) provided policy guidelines, mobilized the necessary resources for the census, and generally acted as the link between the Government and the CS.

District census offices were also established at district administrative headquarters and operated in close contact and cooperation with the existing district statistical offices. The district census offices formed the field arm of the CS and were headed by district census officers (DCOs).

Provision was also made for consultancy support or UNFPA technical backstopping in the following areas: census organization; census cartography and mapping; census quality control and evaluation; census communication; data processing/data base management; and data analysis/dissemination.

### 1.7.2.3 Census Secretariat and committees

Conducting a census requires developing a clear census management framework which outlines the census management structures, the key activities, responsibilities and critical dates, as well as capacity enhancement and resource mobilization. This structure clearly outlines the supervisory and implementation responsibilities of the various stakeholders.

### 1.7.2.3.a The Census Secretariat

SSL had direct responsibility for implementing the 2015 Census. The Statistician General was therefore the Chief Census Officer (CCO). SSL initiated the legal basis for undertaking the census through a legal notice that was published in the Government Gazette, in accordance with the Census Act. The implementation of census activities was done through the establishment of the CS, whose membership included but was not limited to: the chief census officer; census programme manager; census field operations coordinator; finance officer; public relations officer; data processing officer; human resources officer; district census officers; and a secretary.

The CS brought together all the heads/technical personnel of key sections in SSL (including GIS/cartography, census, data processing, economics, administration/finance). The CCO chaired the Secretariat meetings.

The key responsibilities of the Secretariat were to monitor and evaluate the implementation of the census activities. In particular, the Secretariat:
(i) provided day-to-day professional, technical and administrative support;
(ii) mobilized and ensured proper usage of resources for the census;
(iii) provided secretarial services to the Census Advisory and Technical Committees (CATCs);
(iv) spearheaded the development of census instruments; supervised the design and production of census maps;
(v) the recruitment and training of census personnel;
(vi) the procurement, dispatch and receipt of all
census equipment, materials and instruments during the enumeration exercise;
(vii) developed a tracking system and supervised data processing, analysis and dissemination of census results;
(viii) developed quality assurance guidelines and monitoring mechanisms and terms of reference for technical assistance where necessary;
(ix) drew up the agenda for the CTC and liaised with the Chief Technical Adviser (CTA) and other technical experts;
( x ) coordinated the district census offices and all stakeholders; and
(xi) provided necessary link and updates to the Government and development partners/donor agencies.

The CS hosted the CTA and all other technical advisers, and was represented in both the CAC and CTC. It had several units responsible for the implementation of procurement, logistics, publicity materials development and testing and the district census offices.

## (i) District census offices

Thedistrictcensusofficesweretheoutreachunits of the CS and coordinated all pre-enumeration, enumeration and post enumeration activities in the districts. This ensured better supervision of census implementation by the CS. They worked in close collaboration with the district statistics offices, local councils, paramount chiefs, and administrative district officers.

Specifically, the responsibilities of the district census officers were to: provide oversight support to district census activities; provide support for publicity and advocacy activities within their respective districts; make security arrangements in their respective districts; ensure the safety of all census materials and instruments in the districts; and provide logistical support during recruitment, training and enumeration and payment of field staff.

## (ii) Technical experts

Technical experts were appointed in the Census Secretariat through cooperative arrangements of SSL and UNFPA, responsible for all technical tasks pertaining to the 2015 Census.

They included the CTA responsible for all census activities; the cartography/GIS, data processing, communication and publicity experts; and other national experts.

SSL professional officers, referred to as Technical Coordinators (TCs), were responsible for facilitating the districts on census technical matters during the pilot, the main census enumeration and the post-evaluation census activities. The TCs were also responsible for the training of district census officers, field officers, supervisors and enumerators.

### 1.7.2.3. b Census committees

## (i) Census Advisory Committee (CAC)

The CAC comprised high-level representatives of relevant stakeholders from the public sector, development partners and civil society. The minister of Finance and Economic Development was also the chairperson of this Committee. The CAC formulated census policies in collaboration with stakeholders; lobbied for and mobilized resources from the Government, development partners and private sector; provided leadership that guided successful execution of the 2015 Census; and liaised with all stakeholders to provide the required support to the census.

## (ii) Census Technical Committee (CTC)

Under the direction of the CCO, the committee included the technical units/sections at SSL, various MDAs, the University of Sierra Leone, Njala University, National Population Commission, civil societies and development partners and donor agencies like the United Nations Country Team (UNCT), DFID, EU, World Bank, African Development Bank (ADB).

The committee was charged with all the technical aspects of the 2015 Census, guided by inputs from the CAC. It was the responsibility of this committee to review all the census instruments, which included questionnaires, manuals and control forms. Specifically, the committee's duties were to:
(i) review and finalize the census project document and the census instruments;
(ii) recommend the best practices for preparatory activities, data collection and processing; and
(iii) ensure quality assurance guidelines and monitor and evaluate all the technical activities of the census at all stages.
(iii) Census Communication, Publicity and Advocacy Committee

The Census Communication, Publicity and Advocacy Committee (CCPAC) was responsible for information which would prepare the public for the census and make people aware that they must cooperate during the census enumeration. The specific roles of this committee were to:
(i) develop a communication, publicity and advocacy strategy and materials;
(ii) develop a strategy for disseminating census results;
(iii) prepare press releases and organize workshops, seminars and public meetings to inform the general public; and
(iv) train members of district publicity subcommittees.

The CCCAP worked closely with the other committees, for example, the CTC and the district publicity sub-committees, to incorporate technical aspects of the census in various publicity materials. It also kept the CAC informed of progress on matters relating to communication, publicity and advocacy. On the other hand, the CAC assisted the CCPAC to formulate policies and strategies to enhance fulfillment of its mandate.

### 1.7.3 The cartographic mapping programme

Mapping operations supported the census process at its three stages: pre-enumeration, enumeration and post-enumeration. Thus, at each stage, maps had specific functions with regard to census operations and various combinations of geospatial tools provided an added value to the mapping tasks at each stage.

In the pre-enumeration stage, the Census and the GIS Division prepared the enumeration area maps as a basis for counting, as accurately as possible, every household and person in a welldefined area during the enumeration period.

The use of available large-scale maps (including high-resolution satellite imagery) was therefore universal: first, to estimate the number of persons living in an area and their geographic distribution, and then to support the delineation of enumeration areas (EAs) and other census area units.

For this purpose, census mapping staff, in consultation with census planners and major census data users, had to undertake a complete and consistent partitioning of the national territory into hierarchical geographic units, with the enumeration area as the lowest level. The delineation of the boundaries of enumeration areas was consistent with the boundaries of administrative divisions and, to the extent possible, other existing natural or built reference features like roads, rivers or landmarks. Ultimately, the purpose was that they could be easily recognized by the enumerators.

The development of a coding scheme was necessary, assigning a unique code to each enumeration area. The code scheme reflected the administrative hierarchy and was flexible enough and well-structured to incorporate new and future administrative divisions. Unique identifiers, such as numerical values assigned to place names alphabetically and in a hierarchical order, to the boundaries of the enumeration areas, resulted in codes, referred to as 'geo-codes'. This permitted data to be linked geographically and displayed on a map, and therefore established a link between GIS boundaries and tabular census data.

At the enumeration stage, large-scale maps guided enumerators in identifying their assigned dwelling units and places where people were expected to be during the enumeration period of the census. In addition to their fundamental support during the census data collection, large and medium-scale maps helped supervisors coordinate the work of their enumerators and enabled them to react swiftly to any problems faced by the enumerators. These maps helped census technical staff monitor progress of the overall census operations across the country.
In the post-enumeration stage, maps were used to spatially analyze, present and disseminate census results to various users with specific
needs. Also, geographic statistical database for administrative and aggregated statistical units was developed to carry out spatial analysis and to disseminate census results.

### 1.7.4 Field mapping activities

Maps are useful at the three stages of the census mapping process. Therefore, the initial efforts at the planning stage focused on the selection of the appropriate method for successfully accomplishing the mapping programme. Indeed, the national census mapping strategy needs to be determined on a country-by-country basis and requires a tailormade approach that considers the following factors: size of the country; existing base maps; available financial resources; existing technical capabilities and trained staff; and a timeframe available to plan and carry out the census mapping process.

Sierra Leone, like many other countries, opted for a mixed approach that can use existing base maps along with existing digital maps that cover areas across the whole country. A gradual GIS-based solution, taking into account the current situation of cartographic work and focusing first on a well-defined goal, was more realistic and achievable in a reasonable period of time.

The Census and GIS Division of SSL produced hard copies of reference maps based on the administrative units of the country prior to going to the field to produce a new standard EA frame. These can be classified as district maps, rural chiefdom maps, section maps, urban layout maps and urban city maps.

Field mapping officers were trained and deployed to commence work at the district headquarter towns all over the country including Freetown, the capital. The mapping officers were generally trained to undertake a number of tasks namely: plotting and checking all administrative boundaries; updating the maps; plotting villages, trading centres, schools, roads and tracks with the Global Positioning System (GPS); naming physical features; checking spelling errors of place names; undertaking dwelling unit counts and household quickcounts; and demarcating EAs.

Based on the results of the household quickcounts, the teams demarcated EAs in the range of 80-120 households per EA. The range of 80100 households was mostly applied to cities and other major urban communities while the range of $100-120$ applied to rural communities. The range was lower for urban communities because the population was more likely to increase due to migration, prior to enumeration.

In addition to the field mapping officers, technical monitors were based in the regions (Northern, Southern, Eastern and Western) to technically oversee the work of the field staff, and to ensure that census mapping standards were met. More specifically, the monitors were required to: check the quality of work; redeploy field staff to subsequent section headquarter towns as and when necessary; to return completed maps and field control forms to SSL headquarters; and to ensure that regular supplies to field teams were assured. When maps, village lists and completed field control forms were returned from the field, they were edited and matched before being digitized, printed and distributed for enumeration.

### 1.7.4.1 Maps digitizing and preparation

The key steps to the map digitization and preparation included the following activities:
(i) Reviewing of field returns: maps and field control forms were reviewed to confirm consistency and quality control checks such as checking legibility, spellings, geographic codes and entry of GPS coordinates on the forms.
(ii) Scanning and data storage: ensuring proper analog record keeping and all field returns (base maps, sketches and forms) were booked.

The forms were placed in files and stored with their appropriate chiefdom labels and kept on shelves, and the base maps kept in individual map drawers for each district. The field returns (base maps, sketches and forms) were scanned. The scanned materials were stored in district, chiefdom and section folders which were created to facilitate systematic referencing of the mapping documents. In order to use the scanned raster maps for the map preparation, they were georeferenced using Geographic Coordinate System WGS 84.
(iii) Data digitization and integration: various datasets were reviewed, re-projected, digitized, integrated, edited and verified to make them suitable for preparation of the final census maps. (iv) Compilation of EA maps: EA maps were compiled using geographic layers such as GPS point data, administrative boundaries, EA boundaries, roads, swamps and rivers. A selection of symbols was done for the vector layers and a layout developed with elements including identification table showing administrative levels, names and geo-codes, map title, legend and description of urban EAs.
(v) Printing and management of maps: final EA maps were prepared on A3 and exported as PDF files which were then combined for fast printing. The merged PDF maps were then printed as coloured hard copy maps. The printed maps were verified against the database and organized by section (clipped) and districts (enveloped) and regions (parceled) before being ready for dispatch.

### 1.7.5 Development of census instruments

After the establishment of the CS, the Statistician General set up a Census Planning Group (CPG) which comprised the Deputy Statistician General and the directors of divisions at SSL, representatives from various ministries, the University of Sierra Leone and the Secretary, National Population Commission (NPC).

The CPG reviewed topics that have been investigated in previous censuses, procedures used and also held consultations with major data users in order to determine the topics to be investigated in the 2015 Census. Particular attention was paid to data required for policies and programmes relating to women, children, the youth and the physically challenged. The recommendations of the National Census Data Dissemination Seminar (NCDDS) and international and regional recommendations on the census were also considered in the exercise.

Following the consultations and review of the relevant materials, a number of documents were prepared and tested by the CS.

These included the preliminary evaluation and analysis plan (PEAL), tabulation plan, publication programme as well as the questionnaires and related documents and forms. Special attention was paid to the preparation of the publication plan and the evaluation programme.

Plans were also developed for a preliminary descriptive analysis of the census data. This plan formed the basis for the preparation of the census thematic reports that would be published along with statistical tables in the other census monographs. A group of analysts, comprising professionals of SSL and selected specialists of other government/private agencies and the Universities of Sierra Leone and Njala, were put together to do an in-depth policy-relevant analytical study of specific research themes using the census data. These individual themes would be published as monographs.

### 1.7.6 Pilot census implementation

As a rule of thumb in a well-coordinated scientific research (especially in larger surveys), a pilot census is undertaken to test the applicability and suitability of the questionnaire, the main instrument. A semi-completed questionnaire embracing the needs of all data users was administered to a sample population with regional bias. This is very important as a large amount of resources can be saved during the main enumeration if critical mistakes can be identified and solved at the pilot stage.

### 1.7.7 Acquisition and distribution of census materials

The acquisition of census materials was done during the pre-enumeration, enumeration and post enumeration stages. The acquisition of the census materials, as per the country's National Public Procurement Act (NPPA), starts with a tender or bidding process at a threshold purchase of any undertakings. Tender bids were put on daily tabloids at any time the Secretariat needed materials and, or logistics to facilitate the census activities. At the Secretariat, computers, stationeries and other working tools were bought to develop a conducive working environment. These materials were also allocated to the district offices. During
pretest, enumeration and post-enumeration stages, questionnaires were printed through a bidding process and selection done on quality of printing, competitiveness in terms of cost and quantity produced as and when needed.
The distribution of materials during the three stages of data collection was also achieved through a robust logistic plan. Vehicles bought for SSL by donors together with hired vehicles were used to distribute census materials to the localities to be enumerated.

### 1.7.8 Census publicity and advocacy programme (education activities)

A comprehensive census publicity and advocacy programme was prepared by the Census Secretariat in collaboration with the Ministry of Information and Communications. The implementation of the programme involved the use of various strategies and media to address census messages to different audiences in the central government, regional/district administration, the local councils, chiefdoms, various interest groups and the general public. The aim of this exercise was to sensitise and motivate different population groups to ensure their effective co-operation and support in the various census operations and also to promote timely acceptance and extensive use of the census results.

To enhance public awareness and popularity of the Census, 18,000 extra posters, 70,000 fliers, 65 banners were printed and distributed in all districts, 9 billboards were designed and mounted in strategic areas in Freetown.

In addition, activities to increased awareness on the census by rural communities without media access were held. These include sensitization meetings with all the 149 Paramount Chiefs in the country,, Chiefdom Meetings with section chiefs and other community leaders, public meetings with various groups were also held especially in Freetown, announcements in Churches/Mosques, Census song by Artist for Census advocacy in schools were also carried out.

### 1.7.9 Recruitment and training of field staff

The CS was given a huge responsibility to carry out the process of recruitment and training of candidates for the main data collection. The main objective of the recruitment exercise was to ensure that suitable candidates were selected to fill the different categories of field staff required for the enumeration exercise from 5 to 19 December 2015.

Short-listing was done from 24 August to 1 September 2015 for the post of field officers, supervisors and enumerators. SSL, together with key stakeholders including the CTC and the UNCT, ensured that the process was properly guided to achieve the desired results. To commence the short-listing process, institutions including the UNCT, DFID, Irish Aid and Sierra Leone Association of Journalists (SLAJ) were invited by the CTC to observe the process and give their own advice.

An inaugural meeting was held between SSL and these representatives for briefing on the importance of recruitment of field staff and the need to work with stakeholders at all stages of the census activities. The guidelines, processes and procedures to be used in the conduct of the short-listing exercise were explained during this meeting as well as the formation of teams per district.

At the end of the meeting, a total of 15 teams comprising staff from various organizations formed the field staff application short-listing. Each district team comprised a minimum of seven members from the CTC, UNCT, SSL Management, SSL district census officers, SSL district statisticians, Ministry of Labour and SLAJ. The UNCT comprises nominations from World Bank, United Nations Human Rights Commission for Refugees (UNHCR), Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO), United Nations Women, UNDP, World Health Organization (WHO), The Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and UNFPA. In some district teams, there was more than one UNCT nominee whilst others had only one.

The 15 short-listing teams were responsible
for short-listing census field staff including field officers, supervisors and enumerators for each district. Specifically the teams were responsible for ensuring that candidates were short-listed based on appropriate qualifications and on experience in statistical data collection. At the end of the exercise, the teams prepared and submitted a list of short-listed candidates for different positions and a report on the shortlisting to the CTC.

Each team had a chairman and a secretary to help guide the work of the team. Also, each team had the opportunity of agreeing amongst team members the way the team functioned. The chairman of SSL Council and the UNFPA census technical team comprising the UNFPA Deputy Representative, the Chief Technical Adviser and the Cartographic Technical Adviser monitored the process.

The recruitment and training of field staff was done in two stages. The first stage was the shortlisting requirements needed and recruitment process undertaken and the second stage was the training of field staff and the introduction of the listing exercise.

### 1.7.9.1 Short-listing requirements and recruitment

After the formation of the district teams responsible for the short-listing, adverts were made for each position. Applicants were required to possess relevant minimum qualification and work experience. Marks were allocated to all applicants who possessed the necessary academic qualifications. The possession of experience in statistical data collection was an added advantage that attracted more marks than possession of other experiences.

The documents which were made available to all members of each team during the process of short-listing exercise included: the 2015 Census field staff advert; district allocation for shortlisting of field staff; time table for the shortlisting process; terms of reference for the short-listing teams; hard and soft copies of individual district applicants; grading forms and grading criteria used; qualifications needed; and location codes.

A total of 2,184 candidates applied for the position of field officers nationwide. Of this total, 484 were short-listed for interview and 240 were required and recruited to participate in the main data collection exercise. In the case of supervisors, a total of 9,221 candidates applied and 2,958 were short-listed to be interviewed, 15 per cent more than the required number. Only 2,569 were required and recruited to serve in this capacity.

Following the same recruitment process, a total of 42,135 candidates applied for the position of enumerator nationwide. A total of 13,502 were short-listed to be interviewed which was 5 per cent more than the required number. Only 12,849 were needed and recruited.

As was done for all categories (field officers, supervisors and enumerators), selection started at chiefdom or ward levels. These were later transformed into district aggregate following the selection criteria adopted by the selection committee devoid of any bias (see appendix for summary of 2015 census field staff).

### 1.7.9.2 Training of field staff and house listing exercise

The training of field staff was organized in all the 14 administrative districts and training centres and was distributed in consonant with the number of enumeration areas within wards, chiefdoms and districts respectively. The training started with field officers category for a considerable number of days. This was regarded as a 'trainers training'. The trained field officers assisted the district census officers and the technical teams from the head office to train supervisors and enumerators.

The training was conducted on the instrument (questionnaire) within two weeks and field staff dispatched to their respective enumeration areas. The house listing exercise as per census methodology started two to three days before the census night of 5 December 2015. A wellstructured listing form, to be completed for each household, had the following indicators namely: province, district, chiefdom/ward, section and EA attributes.

### 1.7.10 Census enumeration

The enumeration exercise started immediately after the training, selection and deployment of enumerators in their respective enumeration areas. The process was marked by the observance of census night (the reference period for counting) from the night of 4 December 2015 at 7 p.m. to the morning of 5 December 2015 at 7 a.m. In order to capture and enumerate every person, trained enumerators on the use of the institutional population (special groups) questionnaire immediately started work during the census night. This special group included persons that spent the census night in hospitals, hostels, hotels or guest houses, border crossing points, airports and those found in the street. From 5 to 18 December, all household populations were counted using a household questionnaire. The two questionnaires (institutional and household) were used to ensure a comprehensive enumeration exercise and to avoid an undercount of the total population.
The institutional questionnaire collected information on the location of the population, age, sex, nationality and place of birth whilst the household questionnaire collected information on the general characteristics of the population (including relationship to the head of the household, literacy in any language, marital status, immunization, economic activity and the socioeconomic impact of Ebola). All the topics or modules covered were determined by the technical committee after two data user conferences.

### 1.7.11 Receipt of census material in the field

The census materials (questionnaires, training manuals, summary sheets and other materials) ready for fieldwork were distributed before or during training of field staff. These materials were transported to each district census office and distributed at the time of enumeration. Each field officer and supervisor took responsibility for distributing these unfilled questionnaires, field workers guides and summary sheets to their staff. The logistics arrangements including transportation were organized during this period, with priorities given to those travelling through rough terrain and to remote places.

### 1.7.12 Enumeration and field work

The field workers were deployed in all the census enumeration areas across the country to collect household data. This involved house-to-house visits using the household questionnaires. During the field work, enumerators first canvassed their EAs and listed the structures in the EA before actual enumeration. In rural areas, listings were done alongside enumeration due to the scattered nature of localities.

In addition, 94 enumerators were trained in the administration of the institutional questionnaire that involved prison officers, immigration officers, the police and the military, with an assignment to deal with a special type of population, mainly security personnel, hospital staff, the homeless and the transient.

The enumeration lasted for two weeks beginning on 5 and ending on 18 December 2015. . By 18 December 2015, the enumeration was completed all over the country, except for small portions in Freetown (Western Urban and Western rural). The period from 19 to 22 December 2015 was used for mopping up and verification across the country.

During the two weeks' enumeration period, the Census Command and Control Center met on a daily basis. The Command Centerwas made of the Minister of Finance and Economic Development (MoFED), Minister of State MoFED, The Statistics Sierra Leone (SSL) Council Chairman, The SSL Statistician General, the UNFPA Representative and the Census Chief Technical Advisor (CTA). This enabled on the spot decision making, such as deployment of more enumerators and mappers in the field and taking disciplinary action where field staff were not following instructions correctly.

### 1.7.13 Supervision and field monitoring

In order to ensure that quality data were collected during the census, four levels of supervision and monitoring of field staff were put in place. Firstly, a maximum of five enumerators were assigned to one supervisor. This supervisor traversed the five enumeration areas to observe interviews and recording of responses, as well as resolving
any challenges that the enumerators might face during data collection.

The next level of supervision was the field officers. Each field officer was assigned to at least two supervisors and 10 enumerators and was responsible for checking all questionnaires edited by supervisors, to ensure that responses were recorded accurately and consistently. Where there were inaccuracies, the attention of the respective supervisor was drawn to correct such inaccuracies with the enumerator. The field officer ensured that all responses were recorded correctly, no question was left unanswered and all calculations and summaries were correct.

Above the field officers, two technical coordinators were deployed in each of the 13 districts (four in the Western Area Urban) to oversee the enumeration process and resolve any field challenges that might affect the process. In addition to the technical coordinators, 20 assistant technical coordinators and 26 mapping or cartographic staff were also deployed across the city of Freetown to assist in the enumeration of expanded EAs and to guide the enumerators in defining their EA boundaries respectively.

After the first week of enumeration, a census command and control centre was established to address any issues that might emerge from the field during the enumeration process. A census telephone 'hotline' was established to receive information from the public about areas that were yet to be enumerated. Such information was communicated to the respective district census officers for the attention of the field officers. The telephone hotline was effective in ensuring that EAs that were not enumerated at the time of enumeration were revisited and enumerated. This ensured the census had a wider coverage than any of the previous censuses conducted in the country.

The fieldwork was also monitored by a team of stakeholders which included SSL Council, the CTC, civil societies, the UNCTT and international monitors which comprised statisticians and demographers from the United Kingdom, Uganda, Malawi and Ghana.

### 1.7.14 Retrieval of census materials

Upon the completion of the enumeration, all census returnable materials (including unused and spoilt questionnaires) were compiled by the field staff and transferred to the district headquarter towns for verification by the district census officers.

Each completed questionnaire was checked for completeness of pages, and all EA summary sheets verified to ensure that entries and calculations were correct. All returnable materials were compiled, counted and quantities recorded in a material transfer form by each district census officer. They were then taken to the SSL headquarters for storage and security. On arrival at the headquarters, the materials were again checked by the officers receiving them for completeness as stated in the material form.

The retrieval of these census documents was a meticulous and delicate task to make sure that all census returnable documents were collected, listed and properly archived. The returnable documents included around 65,000 questionnaire booklets, 12,856 summary sheets, 16,000 maps, in addition to tens of thousands of other documents.

The retrieval of census documents was carried out from 22 December 2015 to 15 January 2016. No single questionnaire booklet was reported missing. However, a number of summary sheets and few maps were missing but had no impact on the census data quality. The missed maps were later retraced and new summary sheets were compiled from the completed questionnaires.

### 1.7.15 Post-enumeration activities (PEA)

The PEA started immediately after all census returnable materials had been received and stored at SSL headquarters. These involved a series of activities that culminated in the release of the provisional results, the summary of the final results and the writing of both analytical and thematic reports.

### 1.7.15.1 Recruitment and training of data processing staff

The recruitment and training of data processing staff involved two levels of staff: the office coding and editing staff at one level and the data entry and verification staff at the other level. The coding and office editing staff were responsible for editing selected items on the questionnaire and transforming them into numerical codes which were then entered into the computers. Eight coding supervisors and 80 coders were recruited to perform this task. Also 26 data entry supervisors and 260 data entry operators were recruited to enter and verify the census questionnaires into computer readable form.

All the categories of data processing staff were recruited after going through a rigorous selection process. Upon compilation of those who applied, 265 and 872 applicants applied for the office editor/coder and data entry/verify positions respectively. They were shortlisted based on the job requirements. The shortlisted applicants were taken through a series of tests on basic computer literacy and keyboard speed tests. Finally, 85 applicants were selected to be trained for the office editing position and 310 applicants for the data entry/verify position respectively. A 6 -day training for the office editing/coding applicants started from 11 to 16 January 2016. They were taken through the census instruments and guidelines for editing and coding. At the end of the training, they were assessed and 80 of them were selected and given contract letters.

The training for the data entry/verify applicants was organized into three batches of about 100 applicants per batch. This was because the DP centre has 130 desktop computers installed for data capture. The training started from 8 February 2016 and ended on 20 February 2016. The training involved the introduction of the census instruments, data entry application and practical exercises on data entry and verification. At the end of the training, the trainees were assessed and 260 out of the 310 were selected for the job. The rest were placed on a stand-by list.

### 1.7.15.2 Data processing

## The Data Processing Center

In order to process the census forms, the census data processing center was renovated and refurbished. With donor support, the following IT equipment was purchased to setup the center: 145 desktop computers, 6 Servers and accessories, 6 Laptops, 16 Air conditioners, 3 network printers, a canon photocopier, computer tables and swivel chairs, office furniture, etc. In addition, a 250 KVA generator was purchased to support the census activities.

## The Data Processing activities

Data processing activities as a norm started with the coding of the census questionnaires and verifying the calculations of the EA summary sheets against the totals recorded in the questionnaires for the compilation of the provisional results.

The checking and verifying of EA summary sheets started immediately after the census materials were received at the census headquarters in Freetown. This was because the provisional results had to be released three months after the completion of the enumeration. When all EA summary sheets were verified and calculations were ascertained to be correct, they were then transferred to the data processing centre where the figures were entered and compiled to prepare the provisional results.

## a. Manual editing and coding of the census questionnaire

The commencement of data entry started with the coding teams on 2 February 2016. There were eight teams of 10 coders per team and a supervisor. They operated a two-shift system of 40 coders per shift. Data entry for the main census questionnaires started on 24 February 2016.

The coding and editing clerks were responsible for checking the cover page of each questionnaire for the accuracy of geographic codes, population totals and the total booklets used in each EA. They were also responsible for checking the accuracy of the responses recorded for each item
in the questionnaire, pick out any wrongly-coded geographical area and correcting such codes so that data from one geographical location would not be transferred to another. The questionnaires were designed using pre-coded items and a coding list of all variables was used during data collection to record all responses as numerical codes, where such codes were not provided for in the questionnaires. This was done to ensure the accuracy of the data collected and minimize errors in data entry.

The 260 data entry operators were grouped into 26 teams of 10 operators each with supervisors. They worked in a two-shift system; the first shift started from 8 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. while the second shift started from 2:30 p.m. until 9 p.m. They worked six days per week (Monday to Saturday).

## b. Data capture and cleaning

This stage covered the conversion of coded data into computer readable form with on-line and identification checks. It took 260 data entry operators using 130 desktop computers in two shifts at SSL headquarters seven months. They were responsible for capturing the data from the questionnaires and saving the contents of each batch of questionnaires in the computers. A batch constitutes all questionnaires from an Enumeration Area (EA). Daily folders were created where the captured batch was copied for the supervisors to check against the hard copy of the questionnaire. All captured data were transferred to the census server and then saved in three back-up systems, including the Statistician General's Office.

A verification rate of 10 per cent was adopted. The operation was closely monitored and supervised by the data processing consultant and the data entry supervisors. The exercise started in March 2016 and was completed in September 2016. After the data capture, a three week edit specification workshop was conducted to develop techniques that would be adopted in editing and cleaning the census data. A consultant was hired to facilitate that process.

### 1.7.15.3 Post-enumeration survey (PES)

The PES was undertaken shortly after the main census in February 2016.

The main purpose was to measure the accuracy levels of the census results, especially coverage and content errors, as well as find the main sources of error.

It randomly selected 240 EAs using probability proportional to size across the country. This was based on a sampling rate of 1.87 per cent of the total EAs nationwide and this was determined by the quality control/evaluation unit of the CS. The sample was taken and the post-enumeration survey questionnaire designed so that it would facilitate matching exercise as well as subsequent calculation of estimates. The PES procedures and data collection instruments were pilot tested in a sample of purposively selected areas shortly after the pilot census. Based on the experience, necessary modifications were incorporated before finalizing the questionnaires for the main PES.

In order to maintain independence between the census and the PES, efforts were made to use people who were not involved in the census. In the event where this was not possible and people who were involved in the census were used, they were not allowed to work in the district where they worked during the census. The information from the PES questionnaires and the census questionnaires were matched after the PES data collection, followed by field reconciliation exercises. The calculation of the required estimates and the related sample errors was also undertaken.

The results of the PES revealed that the 2015 Census had high coverage and was of good data quality. The census coverage was estimated at 97.9 per cent, which was one of the highest coverage rates ever recorded in sub-Saharan Africa.

### 1.7.15.4 Data analysis, evaluation and dissemination

The analysis and evaluation of the census data was in accordance with the plans prepared at the census preparatory phase. Preliminary or provisional results were prepared in the form of tables by CS staff at SSL headquarters shortly after completion of the enumeration exercise. The tables provided information mainly on
population and household distributions by local council areas, chiefdoms or wards and administrative districts. They were widely disseminated throughout the country. In December 2016, the final results were presented to Government and other stakeholders in a high-profile gathering, followed by a nationwide dissemination exercise.

The in-depth analysis and evaluation studies were carried out by selected specialists from various government departments as well as the Universities of Sierra Leone and Njala using census statistical tables produced by the SSL data processing division. The outputs were in the form of monographs. To maximize applications and analyses of the census and related data beyond the published tables, SSL has developed a data dissemination policy especially for the writers of the different monographs and other data users. Thus, there is greater access to census data at various levels of disaggregation, with due attention to issues of confidentiality of individual records.

The census data, therefore, would be disseminated not only by published reports as per the publication plan but also by maps, computer printouts, pen-drives and CD ROM on request, against the payment of an appropriate fee. Seminars would be organized as part of the strategy to promote effective and extensive use of the census data. The census communication and publicity programmes also included strategies to increase the use of census data.

### 1.8 Lessons learnt and challenges

The 2015 Census aims at providing information about the population in order to present a full and reliable picture of the population in the country in terms of its size and spatial distribution, demographic, social and economic characteristics, as well as housing conditions, to contribute to the improvement of the quality of life of the people of Sierra Leone.

The challenges and lessons learnt cover broader aspects such as the cartographic mapping exercise, quality control, recruitment processes, main data collection, field monitoring and supervision exercises.

This report has divided these broad challenges into key areas such as the management of the census; boundary disputes and issues of large EAs; recruitment and training; shortages of census materials; deployment of field staff and abandonment of work; storage of census materials; data processing; PES activities and the monitoring and supervision challenges encountered.

## a. Management of census

The census management required substantial financial, material and human resources, which was a huge challenge. As the Sierra Leone economy is still not buoyant, the Government was initially constrained in starting the census process due to the huge financial support needed. In addition, the outbreak of the deadly Ebola virus during the census planning stage had a damning effect that led to the postponement of the census for one year. However, the Government then played a greater leadership role than it had in previous censuses and provided funds for the locality listing exercise. Funds were also provided for the purchase of vehicles, office and data processing equipment needed for the start of cartographic field work.

To have full census coverage, a comprehensive census publicity and advocacy programme was developed by the CS in collaboration with the Ministry of Information and Communications. The implementation of this programme involved the use of various strategies and media to address census messages to all stakeholders including the central government, regional/district administration, the local councils, chiefdoms, various interest groups and the general public.

The implementation of this activity had challenges, especially when the CS had a policy adopted that the publicity and advocacy had to be decentralized, leading to the expansion of the activity budget. The aim of this exercise was to sensitize and motivate the different population groups to ensure their effective co-operation and support and also to promote timely acceptance and extensive use of the census results. This was also a success, as strategies put in place were fulfilled with the small amount of funds available. In the main data collection, remunerations paid to field staff were inadequate when compared
to the workload of staff. This resulted in some field staff abandoning their work after they had gone through the training. SSL had to recruit some additional staff to fill in positions that were abandoned. The workload for the recruitment and data collection in the Western Area Urban district was so huge that it could not be handled by a single district census officer.

The late provision of vehicles for field exercises posed serious challenge at the initial phase of field work. The delay in the payment of field supervisors affected their morale during the first week of enumeration. This resulted in some field staff not reaching their EAs before census night. The insufficient provision of transport and communication for supervisors to facilitate the monitoring process also posed some challenges.

The assignment of technical coordinators to all 14 districts to help DCOs was helpful in effective monitoring and coordination of fieldwork. However, there was not adequate fund to provide sufficient daily sustenance allowance (DSA) for technical coordinators.

## b. Recruitments and training

The recruitment by the CS at both head office and the district offices were a challenge, including picking 15,658 required field staff from 53,540 applicants.

The period for the advert and selection of enumerators was very short and this formed the basis for shortfalls in the recruitment process. During the enumeration, ad-hoc recruitment of enumerators allowed many to collect and go away with large sums of money and census materials, as there were no proper records to identify them. This happened because some enumerators did not know who to report to. The ad-hoc recruitment also allowed applicants below academic standard (without requirement) to be involved in the enumeration exercise.

In theWestern Area, there was no effective training of enumerators so as a result, some enumerators could not understand the questionnaires and so they were completed incorrectly (SSL Human Resources Department. 2015 PHC).

Another challenge was that the honorarium provided for the entire data collection exercise was so small that some staff abandoned their jobs.

The issue of ethnicity (spoken language) had not thoroughly been taken into account during recruitment. As a result, language barriers hindered the work rate of some enumerators and/or supervisors in the rural settlements and made the interpretation of the questionnaire to interviewees a challenge. Most enumerators had to find interpreters to complete the questionnaire in the language understood by the interviewees. For instance, Krio which is the most widely spoken language in Sierra Leone was difficult to understand by people in remote localities.

## c. Boundary dispute and issues of large EAs

Boundary disputes within communities and issues of large EAs were key challenges. There were a few boundary re-arrangements, especially in the northern part of the country where two provinces have been created known as the North and North-West provinces and in other areas where some chiefdom boundaries had to be revisited.

There were some large EAs where enumerators could not complete data collection within the two weeks stipulated. This was due to an increase in the population after the one-year postponement of the census because of the Ebola outbreak. However, the presence of mapping teams in the field during enumeration helped enumerators identify their EA boundaries.

## d. Shortages of census materials

With a well-structured logistics plan in place, the census was expected to be carried out smoothly. However, there were instances where there were not enough questionnaires, often because of an increase in the number of households initially targeted. Another challenge was the late arrival of field personnel and census materials, due to the difficulty in reaching some EA terrains. There were associated problems due to breakdown or unexpected mechanical
faults (for example, vehicles and bikes) because of poor road situations.

## e. Deployment of field staff and abandonment of work

During the cartographic work, deployment of mappers to unfamiliar terrains and districts was a challenge and created difficulty in mapping out EAs and localities. Some staff were also unhappy about having to travel to localities that they were not resident in. The cartographic work during the rainy season was also a major challenge as it slowed the pace of work.

The CS also noted that failure to compute telephone contacts and home addresses of staff in the recruitment process, had a negative effect during the data collection. The lack of record was also a serious challenge during short listing as people with the same name were assigned alternate positions as there was no clear identification on phone numbers and addresses of applicants. This situation made it impossible to locate some field staff who were working in large urban towns.

It was realized that Western Area Urban was too large for one district census officer, and as such it was difficult to control operations under a large unit. During the peak of the census enumeration in the Western Area, a series of issues concerning recruited staff trying to locate their areas of work arose. The major problem was the deployment of non-area staff that had difficulty in identifying EAs and localities. For instance, an enumerator resident in the eastern part of Freetown was posted to work in Lumley locality, a distance of over 20 miles with heavy vehicular congestion. This situation hindered the census enumeration not only because of the huge transportation costs but also the lack of willingness to do the job.

## f. Storage of census materials

All census returnable materials including unused and spoilt questionnaires were compiled by the field staff and transferred to the district headquarter towns for verification. The completed questionnaires were checked for completeness of pages.

EA summary sheets were also verified to ensure that all entries and calculations were correct. Upon completion of the checks at the district offices, these materials were taken to the SSL headquarters for storage and security.

Challengesstarted at the time the census materials arrived at the headquarters, where they were again checked for completeness. If a number of summary sheets and maps were missing, new summary sheets would be completed whilst the missed maps were retraced respectively.

The other main challenge was inadequate storage of questionnaires from the field. The room allocated for storing the census field returns was not big enough to allow proper labeling and arrangement of questionnaires by their geographical identifications. This made the tracking and movement of census materials very difficult during processing. In future, large storage spaces should be allocated for census field returns with properly labeled shelves.

## g. Data processing challenges

The main data processing challenge was the timely processing of census forms. The CS team was tasked to produce the final results within 12 months of field enumeration. Adequate measures were put in place for the recruitment and training of coding and verification teams, data entry operators and supervisors. A two-shift system was put in place, working six days a week.

However, a few months into the process, there were staff attritions due to several factors such as staff finding permanent jobs, going to school, and some becoming pregnant. In this regard, the CS had to find creative solutions for managing a continuous supply of personnel willing to work in all the shifts as and when necessary. The data processing department was also able to find modalities of recognizing and appreciating hard work. As a result, the data capture phase was completed one month earlier than the planned date.

## h. PES challenges

Maintaining independence between the census and the PES was not effectively followed, as people who were involved in the census were used for the PES (although they had to work
in a different district). The key reason was the time it would have taken to train new personnel to administer the questionnaire, which would eventually lead to additional expenditure.

The PES activity budget also had to be increased after the enumerators' pay was upgraded to prevent the problems experienced during the census collection period when workers left due to low pay.

## i. Monitoring and supervision challenges

The overall outcome of the 2015 Census was satisfactory and generally good, according to the various monitoring teams including the International Monitoring Team (IMT), civil society, political parties and SSL Council. The monitoring and supervision started at the beginning of the cartographic mapping exercise and this continued during the buildup of the questionnaire prior to the pilot stage, census enumeration and PEA phases.

The cartographic mapping stage was constrained by: field mapping problems and data entry errors; poor maintenance of bikes and field vehicles; staff needing to learn GIS skills and their applications in census mapping; and unreliable internet which limited the use of online map resources.

At the questionnaire development stage, the challenge was how to word questions about indicators that would suit the Sierra Leone situation.

During census enumeration and PEA stages, error editing and consistency checks continued. Another challenge was that the monitoring and supervision team had to visit all selected areas and terrains, irrespective of its accessibility, take GPS coordinates and complete the monitoring and supervision forms allocated.

### 1.9 Summary, conclusion and recommendations

### 1.9.1 Summary

Sierra Leone lies on the west coast of Africa. It is bordered by Guinea to the north-east, Liberia to the south-east, and the Atlantic Ocean to the south-west.

The country has a total area of $71,740 \mathrm{~km}$ ( $27,699 \mathrm{sq}$. miles) and a population of $7,092,113$ (based on 2015 Census). The country is made up of four administrative regions: the Northern, Eastern and Southern regions and the Western Area, which are subdivided into 14 administrative districts that comprise 19 local councils.

The 2015 Census was conducted between 5 and 18 December 2015 with reference to the night of 4 December as census night. Quantitative results were released in December 2016. An analytical report is among a series of publications that were released after the final results. The 2015 Census information would be used by MDAs, local councils, development partners and the private sector to monitor progress in the implementation of development programmes and policy formulation.

The 2015 Census methodology focused on preenumeration, actual enumeration (field work) and post enumeration activities and was done using best international practice. The objectives were to ensure that the lowest administrative units (EAs) were clearly demarcated through a well-structured cartographic mapping exercise without dispute amongst local communities; ensure that field staff were fairly recruited to perform their duties through a robust recruitment process; to have trained staff for pre-enumeration, main data collection and post-enumeration activities and make sure that quality assurance was achieved through effective monitoring and supervision activities. The aim was to provide information about the population in terms of its size and spatial distribution, demographic, social and economic characteristics, as well as housing conditions, that contributes to the improvement of the quality of life for the people of Sierra Leone.

Though the 2015 Census was successfully conducted, there were challenges in the areas of the management of the census; boundary disputes and issues of large EAs; recruitment and training; shortages of census materials; deployment of field staff and abandonment of work; storage of census materials; data processing; PES activities and monitoring and supervision; but these were mitigated with appropriate solutions.

### 1.9.2 Conclusion

The 2015 Census offered increased availability and accessibility of accurate and reliable data on a wide range of demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the population for evidence-based decisions at national, subnational and sectoral levels. It would also support developmental programmes such as the Agenda for Prosperity (PRSP 2006), the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the Sierra Leone International Benchmarks Systems (SLIBS) as well as the elections processes.

The census process followed international standards and best practice by establishing governance structures that involved various committees liketheNational Advisory Committee (responsible for policy direction), Technical Committee (responsible for all technical guidance, vetting all census instruments) and the Publicity Committee (responsible for census education and advocacy). In addition, the decisions of these committees were reviewed on timely basis and were approved by the SSL Council before implementation.

A census requires substantial financial, material and human resources. The Sierra Leone Government played a greater leadership role than it had in previous censuses as a confidence building measure to attract foreign donors. This was demonstrated by providing funding for the locality listing exercise and purchase of vehicles, office and data processing equipment needed for the start of cartographic field work. The Government was, however, also financially supported by UNFPA, DFID, Irish Aid and UNDP. Theintensive cartographic and mapping exercise ensured that EA and locality boundaries are clearly demarcated. Recruitment and training processes, monitoring and supervision for quality assurance and data collection strategies used during data collection boosted the census's methodological approach. The success of these exercises re-affirms transparency in the entire census process.

### 1.9.3 Recommendations

Census coordination among the different players such as donors, political parties, traditional leaders, civil society groups and the ed by NEC.

CS (CCPACs) should be intensified to mitigate emerging issues as fast as possible. The dialogue between the SSL and National Election Commission (NEC) should be improved, as SSL provides information used by NEC.

The re-demarcation of district boundaries and identification of EAs and chiefdom boundaries should be reviewed regularly, not only at the time of the census, as this will avoid border disputes within communities.

The role of cartography in enumeration and data processing is crucial and collaboration between office operations and cartographic field work therefore needs to be improved.

Due to the wide geographical nature of the census process, especially at the time of enumeration, robust logistics plans to distribute census materials need to be adopted to avoid unnecessary delays in materials reaching the localities.

Issues of technology in data processing, planning and budgeting had challenges. The recruitment and training of data processing staff plays a key role in achieving quality data. There were lapses in both recruitment and training of field staff and data processing staff. The review of the recruitment processes and the strategy to intensify training would be necessary as this would help field and data processing staff understand their work.

Office/storage space challenges have been an issue at SSL. To ease the problem, large storage spaces should be allocated with properly labeled shelves for census field returns.

The allowances and remuneration for future censuses or large data collection activities should be based on the current economic trend of the country, to reduce officers leaving their posts at the peak of the enumeration exercise.
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## CHAPTER 2: EVALUATION AND ADJUSTMENT OF AGE-SEX DATA

### 2.1 Introduction

Census data on age and sex are very important in demographic analysis, as well as in socioeconomic planning and service delivery. However, they are affected by errors arising out of ageselective under-enumeration, digit preference and age misstatement especially among the older persons.

Overtime, several efforts have been made to minimize age reporting errors, but the problem continues to exist. Having realized this problem, it is recommended that data quality is evaluated to provide data users with information to build their confidence, while utilizing the data and explaining errors in the census results.

The evaluation of census results should be designed to serve one or more of the following main objectives:
(i) to provide users with some measures of census data quality to help them interpret the results;
(ii) to identify as far as is practicable the types and sources of error, in order to assist the planning of future censuses; and
(iii) to serve as a basis for constructing a 'best estimate' of census aggregates, such as the total population, or to provide census results adjusted to take into account identified errors.

### 2.2 Sources of data on sex and age

The sex of a person is likely to be collected with less reporting errors, compared to the other characteristics of the population. The major problem relating to the quality of the data on sex collected in censuses concerns the difference in the completeness of coverage of the two sexes. The 2015 Census collected information on the sex of every household member and residents of institutions, by asking the question 'Is this person male or female?'. To avoid errors of misclassification, the enumerators were trained to 'not guess from the name and relationship,
which sex the person is and to be careful in dealing with names that are shared by both sexes'.

The information on the age of all persons in households and institutions was collected by asking for 'age as at last birthday (completed years)'. In cases where the age was not known, special efforts were made to estimate the person's age by using a national events calendar and relating the person's age to an event in the calendar.

Sierra Leone conducted its first scientific census in 1963, and subsequent censuses were held in 1974, 1985, 2004 and 2013. All five censuses were held on a de facto basis, and therefore the information from the censuses is comparable. Comparisons of the 2015 census indicators have been made with those of the previous censuses. The indicators were computed from the primary data using the same formula as was used on the 2015 data. Therefore, some indices may differ slightly from those in earlier publications.

### 2.3 Analysis of sex ratios

The sex ratio is a tool used for evaluating the quality of census data on sex because of the relatively limited variability of the national sex ratio and its independence of the absolute size of the population.

The sex ratio is computed as:

$$
\mathrm{SR}=100 * \mathrm{Pm} / \mathrm{Pf}
$$

where:
SR = sex ratio
Pm and Pf are the male and female population respectively.

### 2.3.1 Sex ratios, 1963-2015

In general, national sex ratios tend to fall in a narrow range from about 95 to 102, unless the population experienced some unusual circumstances, such as a history of heavy war losses or heavy immigration.

National sex ratios outside the range of 90 to 105 are to be viewed as extreme. 'Young' populations and populations with high birthrates tend to have higher overall sex ratios than 'old' populations and populations with low birthrates because of the excess of boys among births and children and the excess of male deaths at the older ages. The results of the five population censuses of Sierra Leone are given in Table 2.1.


| Census year | Total | Male | Female | Sex Ratio |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1963 | $2,180,355$ | $* * *$ | $* * *$ |  |
| 1974 | $2,735,159$ | $* * *$ | $* * *$ | 98.8 |
| 1985 | $3,515,812$ | $1,735,163$ | $1,780,649$ | 98.7 |
| 2004 | $4,976,871$ | $2,420,218$ | $2,556,653$ | 94.2 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $7,092,113$ | $3,490,978$ | $3,601,135$ |  |



Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015
Population and Housing Census

## *** Information not available

The 2015 Census gave an overall sex ratio of 96.9 males per 100 females, implying three per cent fewer males than females. Figure 2.1 shows that the sex ratios from the 1963, 1974 and 1985 censuses were close to 100 per cent. However, there was a drop in the sex ratio in the 2004 Census. This is possibly because of the Civil War (March 1991 - January 2002), which might have led to excess male deaths compared to the female deaths.

The 2015 sex ratio was higher than that of 2004 by nearly three percentage points, reflecting that the sex composition of the total population was returning to the situation prior to the war.

Figure 2.1 Sex ratios of the population, 1963-2015


### 2.3.2 Sex ratios of surviving census population

Another approach to comparing sex ratios would be to compare the sex ratio from the previous census with that of the surviving population in the current census. The sex ratios from the 2004, 1985 and 1974 censuses would be compared with those who were still alive in 2015, that is those in the 2015 census population who are aged 11 years and over, 30 years and over and 41 years and over respectively. In the absence of heavy sex-specific mortality or migration, a significant difference would point to age misreporting.

Figure 2.2 shows that the sex ratio of the survivors from the 1974 census population (108.2) was much higher than for the 1974 census population. This is unexpected given that there is higher male mortality and more males than females died in the war, which would be expected to result in a lower sex ratio for the survivors.

On the other hand, the sex ratio from the 1985 census population was close to that of their survivors in 2015. The sex ratio of the survivors from the 2004 Census was slightly higher than that from the 2004 Census. This is contrary to expectation and therefore points to existence of errors in the age data.

Figure 2.2 Sex ratios of the census population and the survivors to the 2015 census, 1974-2004


Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census
Statistics Sierra Leone, 2004 Population and Housing Census
National Statistics Office (Sierra Leone), 1985 Population and Housing Census

### 2.3.3 Sex ratios for the population in five-year age groups

Sex ratios for the population in five-year age groups vary widely from the sex ratio for the total population. For many analytic purposes, this variation may be considered the most important. The coverage of males and females is likely to be different in a census and between censuses. Agespecific sex ratios tend to be high in the younger ages and then decline with increasing age. The age specific sex ratio of a given age group ( $x+n$ years) is computed as:
$\mathrm{nSRx}=100 * \mathrm{nPx}^{m} / \mathrm{nPx}{ }^{\mathrm{f}}$
where:
$n S R x$ refers to the sex ratio at ages $x$ to $x+n$
$n P x^{m}$ and $n P x^{f}$ are the male and female population at ages $x$ to $x+n$ respectively.
The 2013 Sierra Leone Demographic Health Survey (SLDHS) showed a sex ratio at birth of about 106 males per 100 females. It also showed that females had higher survival ratios compared to males. This demographic pattern would result in the age-specific sex ratios being close to 100 males per 100 females in young ages and continuously declining as age increases.

Figure 2.3 shows the age-specific sex ratios (five-year age groups) from the 2015 Census. The sex ratios from 2015 don't follow the expected pattern. The age-specific sex ratios showed big fluctuations. The sex ratios in the age range 40 to 60 years were very high, more than 100 males per 100 females, and this is contrary to the expected demographic patterns.Despite the impact of the 11 -year civil war, it is not possible to have such wide fluctuations. This therefore points to errors in recording of the sex information or sex-selective recording of the age data.

The overall sex ratio and the sex ratio of the survivors from the previous census show that the 2015 Census overall sex data were of reasonable quality and can be used for demographic analysis, planning and policy formulation. However, the age-specific sex data should be used with caution.

Figure 2.3. Age-specific sex ratios of the population


Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 2.4 Detecting errors in age misreporting

Census data on age are characterised by two major types of errors namely, age-misreporting and age-selective under-reporting or overreporting. The errors in age data arise from many factors including proxy reporting, which is commonly practised in population censuses; not knowing the actual age of an individual; inappropriate estimation methods; deliberate attempt to over or under-report a person's age; and a tendency to report ages ending with zero or five.

There are various techniques that can be used to assess the quality of age reporting. Demographic analysis and post enumeration surveys are widely used tools for evaluating the quality of census data. This report utilizes demographic analysis techniques to evaluate the quality of age and sex data: visual inspection methods, the population pyramid and indices of digit preference.

### 2.4.1 Visual inspection methods

A population that is characterized by high fertility and declining mortality, and has not in the recent past experienced disturbances such as wars, plagues and famines, is expected to have a typical structure. This shows a substantial proportion of the population in the younger ages which gradually declines with increasing age until the proportion becomes negligible in the older ages, such as 100 years.

### 2.4.2 Population of infants

In the ideal situation, the population of infants (aged less than one year of age) should be the largest. It should be close to the number of survivors from births in the 12 months preceding the census enumeration, assuming the net international migration of infants is negligible.

However, censuses are generally associated with under-reporting of population in the younger ages, especially infants (population aged ' 0 ' years). The population age ' 0 ' is more
likely to be underreported for several reasons, for example, in some communities, ' 0 ' is not regarded as an age by many people. There is also a tendency for some parents not to think of newborn infants as regular members of the household. Therefore, it is given special treatment from the rest of the population.

The 2015 Census enumerated a total of 174,640 infants. However, the census reported only 83,418 births in the last 12 months of whom 73,762 were alive at the time of the census enumeration. The reported infant population is too low, indicating that the births were highly underreported and hence it is not used for evaluation of age data quality.

An alternative approach is to obtain the level of undercount of the infant population by combining the census information with data from other sources, such as sample surveys or civil registration systems. The fertility rates from the 2013 SLDHS were applied to the age distribution from the 2015 census (adjusted to the mid-period of the last 12 months) to obtain the expected number of births in the 12 months preceding the census enumeration.

The infant mortality rate from the 2013 SLDHS was used to obtain the central death rate for age ' 0 ' ( 1 m 0 ) to estimate how many of the births in the last 12 months were expected to survive up to the census enumeration.

The results of the above process are shown in Table 2.2. The table shows that 262,200 of all the births in the last 12 months were estimated to have survived up to December 2015. The estimated figure of 262,200 is higher compared to 174,670 population of infants who were enumerated and this gives an estimated undercount rate of about 32 per cent. Table 2.2 Estimation of the undercount of the infant population

| Indicator | value |
| :--- | :---: |
| Reported infant population | 174,670 |
| Estimated births | 290,797 |
| Infant mortality rate | 0.092 |
| Central death rate for age '0' | 0.098 |
| Estimated infant deaths | 28,595 |
| Estimated surviving births | 262,202 |
| Estimated under-reporting of infants | 32.3 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015
Population and Housing Census

### 2.4.3 Population in single years of age

Data on age can be evaluated graphically by constructing a population pyramid by age or by constructing a graph of the number or proportion of individuals by age. Figures 2.4 and 2.5 show the single-age population for the male and female populations respectively.

The figures indicate that both the male and female populations did not follow the expected pattern of the population size declining gradually with advancing age. The population of infants was larger than the population aged one year, which is as expected. However, the infant population was smaller than the population in the subsequent single ages two through 10 years.

The many tall bars at regular intervals suggest age heaping, possibly due to digit preference. The patterns depict a tendency to give ages ending in certain digits, consequently avoiding others.

Figure 2.4 Male population by single years of age


Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census


### 2.4.4 Population of extreme old age and centenarians

Census age distributions at advanced ages, judged as those aged 85 years and over, tend to suffer from serious reporting problems. This may be due to deliberate age exaggeration in older ages or a respondent misreporting the age of a household member due to ignorance of their true age. The most serious reporting problems have been found among persons reporting ages of 100 and over. This tendency, in part, is attributable to the desire to share in the esteem generally accorded extreme old age or from an ignorance of the true age.

Table 2.3 shows that 938,453 persons were enumerated aged $0-4$ years, which was 15 per cent less than the population aged $5-9$ years ( $1,108,715$ persons). Such a situation can only happen if there was a recent and drastic decline in fertility levels.

Although the 2013 SLDHS reported a decline in the total fertility rate from 5.1 in 2008 to 4.9 in 2013, the decline is not large enough to bring about such a change in the age structure of the total population. This finding is further evidence of under-enumeration of the population aged $0-4$ years.

It can also be seen in Table 2.3 that the 2015 Census recorded a total of 4,729 persons ( 0.07 per cent of the total population) aged 100 years or more, of whom 535 were aged 120 years or more. This is not consistent with a population with a life expectancy estimated at 50 years and it points to a deliberate or otherwise, exaggeration of the age of older persons.

Table 2.3 Distribution of the reported population
by age and sex

| Age Group | Number |  |  | Percentage |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Sex ratio |
| All ages | 7,092,113 | 3,490,978 | 3,601,135 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 96.9 |
| 0 | 174,670 | 87,566 | 87,104 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 100.5 |
| 1-4 | 763,783 | 381,526 | 382,257 | 10.8 | 10.9 | 10.6 | 99.8 |
| 5-9 | 1,108,715 | 555,292 | 553,423 | 15.6 | 15.9 | 15.4 | 100.3 |
| 10-14 | 847,292 | 431,588 | 415,704 | 11.9 | 12.4 | 11.5 | 103.8 |
| 15-19 | 873,620 | 430,792 | 442,828 | 12.3 | 12.3 | 12.3 | 97.3 |
| 20-24 | 662,819 | 308,135 | 354,684 | 9.3 | 8.8 | 9.8 | 86.9 |
| 25-29 | 607,983 | 277,618 | 330,365 | 8.6 | 8.0 | 9.2 | 84.0 |
| 30-34 | 434,203 | 199,964 | 234,239 | 6.1 | 5.7 | 6.5 | 85.4 |
| 35-39 | 421,172 | 201,459 | 219,713 | 5.9 | 5.8 | 6.1 | 91.7 |
| 40-44 | 299,215 | 154,121 | 145,094 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 4.0 | 106.2 |
| 45-49 | 242,188 | 133,783 | 108,405 | 3.4 | 3.8 | 3.0 | 123.4 |
| 50-54 | 186,793 | 99,050 | 87,743 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 2.4 | 112.9 |
| 55-59 | 110,449 | 59,261 | 51,188 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 1.4 | 115.8 |
| 60-64 | 112,682 | 53,987 | 58,695 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 92.0 |
| 65-69 | 73,722 | 36,414 | 37,308 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 97.6 |
| 70-74 | 65,568 | 30,606 | 34,962 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 87.5 |
| 75-79 | 39,728 | 20,044 | 19,684 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 101.8 |
| 80-84 | 31,359 | 13,177 | 18,182 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 72.5 |
| 85-89 | 15,888 | 7,258 | 8,630 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 84.1 |
| 90-94 | 9,984 | 4,430 | 5,554 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 79.8 |
| 95-99 | 5,551 | 2,662 | 2,889 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 92.1 |
| 100-104 | 2730 | 1253 | 1477 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 84.8 |
| 105-109 | 778 | 441 | 337 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 130.9 |
| 110-114 | 548 | 242 | 306 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 79.1 |
| 115-119 | 138 | 64 | 74 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 86.5 |
| $120+$ | 535 | 245 | 290 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 84.5 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015
Population and Housing Census

### 2.4.5 Population pyramid

A population pyramid is a vertically arranged bar-chart that shows the distribution of the population by age and sex. Population pyramids are a very effective and widely used pictorial presentation of the age-sex composition of the population. It gives a detailed picture of the age-sex structure of the population.

The population pyramid derived from the 2015 census data is given in Figure 2.6. The pyramid shows some anomalies, with the bars for the youngest age group ( $0-4$ years) being shorter than those for the subsequent age group (5-9 years). When age data are grouped, the magnitude of age misreporting is minimized, since some of the age distortions are due to shifts within the same age group.

Shorter bars are also observed for the female population aged 10-14 years compared to those aged $15-19$ years and the male population aged 30-34 years compared to those aged 35-39 years. Thereafter, the size of the bars decrease as the population increases. The existence of shorter bars for some of the younger age group confirms existence of age shifting or ageselective under-enumeration.

Figure 2.6 Pyramid of the reported population by age and sex


The population pyramids for the rural and urban areas are presented in Figures 2.7 and 2.8 respectively. The shape of the population pyramid for both rural and urban areas generally are the same as for the total population, with the bars for the age group 5-9 years being the widest band, while those for the subsequent bars reduce in size as the age increases. The major difference is that the bars for the younger ages were narrower compared to those of the rural areas while the reverse is seen in the older ages.

Figure 2.7 Pyramid of the reported rural population by age and sex


Figure 2.8 Pyramid of the reported urban population by age and sex


### 2.5 Measuring errors in age reporting

Digit preference is the tendency for a respondent to report, or an enumerator to estimate, ages ending in certain digits at the expense of other digits. This phenomenon is more common in communities with low education levels.

Although the patterns vary from community to community, the preference for ages ending in the digits ' 0 ' and ' 5 ' is widespread. The graphical methods used in section 2.4 were useful in showing the existence of age heaping. However, they are not good in quantifying the magnitude of the problem. This is better done using the indices of digit preference which are presented in this section.

### 2.5.1 Indices of digit preference

Several indices have been developed for measuring the extent of heaping on last digits. These indices assume the form of the true distribution of population by age over a part or all the age range. On this basis, an estimate of the true population number or numbers is developed and compared with the reported number or numbers.

The Whipple's Index measures preference or heaping on ages of multiples of five (ending in ' 0 ' and ' 5 ') between ages 23 and 62 . It varies between one, if there is no concentration at all, and five, when there is maximum concentration.

An index of less than 1.1 implies that the data are accurate; 1.1 to 1.25 means that the data are approximate; 1.25 to 1.75 means the data are rough; while an index of 1.75 or higher means the data are 'very rough'.

The overall Whipple's Index measuring preference of either of the two digits ( 0 and 5) was 2.48 (Table 2.4), indicating that the age data from the 2015 Census are 'very rough'. The indices for males and females were 2.40 and 2.55 respectively. There are wide variations between the indices for rural areas (2.84) and urban areas (2.02). The rural-urban variations are observed for both males and female population.

The Bachi's and Myers' blended indexes are widely used to measure the extent of age misreporting in many populations. The Myers' blended method avoids the biases associated with the Whipple's Index that may occur upon the population age structure or distribution for reasons other than heaping or preference, owing to natural attrition due to mortality. Myers' blended index entails determining the proportion that the population ending in each digit ( 0 ' through ' 9 ') is of the total population, by varying the starting age for any 10-year age group.

The Myers' Index shows high preference for ages ending in digits ' 0 ' and ' 5 ' (Table 2.4), and some mild preference for ages ending in digit ' 8 '. The rest of the digits were avoided, with digit ' 1 ' and ' 4 ' being the most avoided digits. The results of the Bachi's Index are similar. However, the Bachi's Index shows avoidance for all ages except those ending in ' 0 ' and ' 5 '.

The overall Myers' Index of digit preference is 49.9 and Bachi's Index is 31.6. All three indices of digit preference show that the quality of the age-data was poorer for females compared to the males, and for rural areas compared to urban areas.


| Index and terminal digit | Total country |  |  | Rural |  |  | Urban |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Whipple's Index |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 and 5 | 2.48 | 2.40 | 2.55 | 2.84 | 2.77 | 2.90 | 2.02 | 1.99 | 2.06 |
| Myer's Index |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall Index | 49.9 | 47.2 | 52.4 | 61.9 | 58.9 | 64.6 | 34.7 | 33.3 | 36.1 |
| 0 | 12.9 | 11.8 | 14.0 | 16.6 | 15.1 | 17.9 | 8.3 | 7.7 | 8.9 |
| 1 | -5.1 | -4.8 | -5.4 | -5.8 | -5.5 | -6.1 | -4.2 | -4.0 | -4.5 |
| 2 | -1.3 | -1.1 | -1.5 | -2.3 | -2.1 | -2.5 | -0.1 | 0.0 | -0.2 |
| 3 | -3.9 | -3.7 | -4.0 | -5.1 | -4.9 | -5.3 | -2.3 | -2.3 | -2.2 |
| 4 | -4.7 | -4.4 | -4.9 | -5.5 | -5.2 | -5.8 | -3.6 | -3.5 | -3.7 |
| 5 | 11.3 | 11.5 | 11.2 | 13.8 | 14.1 | 13.6 | 8.2 | 8.3 | 8.1 |
| 6 | -3.5 | -3.4 | -3.6 | -4.1 | -3.9 | -4.2 | -2.7 | -2.7 | -2.8 |
| 7 | -3.1 | -2.7 | -3.4 | -4.0 | -3.6 | -4.3 | -2.0 | -1.7 | -2.2 |
| 8 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 1.1 |
| 9 | -3.4 | -3.4 | -3.4 | -4.1 | -4.2 | -4.1 | -2.4 | -2.4 | -2.4 |

Table 2.4 Whipple's index of digit preference by place of residence and sex (continued)

| Index and terminal digit | Total country |  |  | Rural |  |  | Urban |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Bachi's Index |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall Index | 31.6 | 30.0 | 33.0 | 38.4 | 37.0 | 39.7 | 22.5 | 21.6 | 23.7 |
| 0 | 17.0 | 15.5 | 18.5 | 21.3 | 19.7 | 22.8 | 11.3 | 10.4 | 12.2 |
| 1 | -6.2 | -5.8 | -6.6 | -6.8 | -6.4 | -7.2 | -5.5 | -5.1 | -5.9 |
| 2 | -2.1 | -1.6 | -2.5 | -3.3 | -2.9 | -3.6 | -0.4 | 0.0 | -0.8 |
| 3 | -4.5 | -4.2 | -4.7 | -5.8 | -5.6 | -6.0 | -2.7 | -2.6 | -2.8 |
| 4 | -5.5 | -5.3 | -5.8 | -6.5 | -6.2 | -6.7 | -4.2 | -4.1 | -4.4 |
| 5 | 14.6 | 14.6 | 14.5 | 16.9 | 17.2 | 16.7 | 11.4 | 11.4 | 11.4 |
| 6 | -4.1 | -4.0 | -4.2 | -4.8 | -4.7 | -4.8 | -3.2 | -3.1 | -3.2 |
| 7 | -3.7 | -3.3 | -4.0 | -4.7 | -4.4 | -5.0 | -2.3 | -2.1 | -2.5 |
| 8 | -0.7 | -1.0 | -0.4 | -1.2 | -1.5 | -0.9 | -0.1 | -0.5 | 0.2 |
| 9 | -4.8 | -4.6 | -4.9 | -5.5 | -5.3 | -5.6 | -3.9 | -3.9 | -3.9 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Table 2.5 provides a comparison of the indices for the 2015 Census with those of previous censuses. The Whipple's Indices show that the data from all three censuses were 'very rough'. All three indices show that the magnitude of age heaping in 2015 was close to that in 1985, but worse than that of the 2004 Census. The overall Whipple's Index in 2004 was 2.43 compared with 2.48 in 2015. There was more age heaping for females than males in all the three censuses.


| Index | 1985 |  |  | 2004 |  |  | 2015 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Whipple's | 2.47 | 2.41 | 2.53 | 2.43 | 2.27 | 2.58 | 2.48 | 2.40 | 2.55 |
| Myer's | 51.5 | 49.1 | 53.7 | 46.2 | 41.6 | 50.3 | 49.9 | 47.2 | 52.4 |
| Bachi's | 31.7 | 30.3 | 33.0 | 29.5 | 26.4 | 32.4 | 31.6 | 30.0 | 33.0 |

Table 2.6 presents the overall indices of digit preference by region and district. The Whipple's Indices for all the regions were greater than 1.75 implying that the age data for all regions are classified as 'very rough'. Among the districts, the Western Area Urban district had the lowest Whipple's Index (1.68), thus its age data are categorized as approximate. The rest of the districts had their index bigger than 1.75 , implying that the data were 'very rough'. Kailahun district had the worst quality of data with an overall index of 3.02.

Table 2.6 Indices of digit preference by region, district and sex

| Region/ district | Whipple's index |  |  | Myer's index |  |  | Bachi's index |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Total country | 2.48 | 2.40 | 2.55 | 49.9 | 47.2 | 52.4 | 31.6 | 30.0 | 33.0 |
| Eastern | 2.80 | 2.72 | 2.87 | 59.1 | 56.7 | 61.5 | 37.7 | 36.1 | 39.2 |
| Kailahun | 3.02 | 2.95 | 3.08 | 66.2 | 63.6 | 68.7 | 41.9 | 40.9 | 42.9 |
| Kenema | 2.71 | 2.64 | 2.77 | 55.3 | 53.0 | 57.5 | 36.0 | 34.7 | 37.3 |
| Kono | 2.69 | 2.60 | 2.78 | 56.5 | 54.2 | 58.8 | 35.3 | 33.3 | 37.5 |
| Northern | 2.71 | 2.63 | 2.78 | 57.4 | 54.2 | 60.3 | 36.0 | 34.4 | 37.4 |
| Bombali | 2.50 | 2.42 | 2.57 | 51.4 | 48.2 | 54.3 | 32.0 | 30.4 | 33.5 |
| Kambia | 2.86 | 2.80 | 2.90 | 62.9 | 59.8 | 65.4 | 39.0 | 38.1 | 39.8 |
| Koinadugu | 2.75 | 2.71 | 2.79 | 57.9 | 56.1 | 59.6 | 36.6 | 35.9 | 37.2 |
| Port Loko | 2.68 | 2.58 | 2.76 | 56.4 | 52.6 | 59.9 | 35.6 | 33.5 | 37.3 |
| Tonkolili | 2.87 | 2.76 | 2.96 | 61.7 | 58.3 | 64.9 | 39.0 | 36.9 | 41.0 |
| Southern | 2.63 | 2.56 | 2.69 | 54.2 | 51.4 | 56.7 | 34.5 | 33.1 | 35.9 |
| Bo | 2.46 | 2.39 | 2.53 | 48.5 | 45.6 | 51.1 | 31.4 | 29.8 | 32.9 |
| Bonthe | 2.75 | 2.72 | 2.77 | 58.7 | 56.7 | 60.6 | 36.9 | 36.1 | 37.6 |
| Moyamba | 2.66 | 2.57 | 2.74 | 56.2 | 52.6 | 59.5 | 35.0 | 33.0 | 36.7 |
| Pujehun | 2.82 | 2.78 | 2.86 | 59.7 | 57.8 | 61.5 | 38.3 | 37.5 | 39.1 |
| Western | 1.76 | 1.76 | 1.77 | 27.7 | 27.1 | 28.3 | 17.7 | 17.4 | 18.1 |
| Western Area Rural | 1.98 | 1.97 | 2.00 | 34.0 | 33.1 | 34.9 | 21.5 | 21.3 | 22.5 |
| Western Area Urban | 1.68 | 1.68 | 1.68 | 25.2 | 24.8 | 25.7 | 16.2 | 16.0 | 16.6 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015
Population and Housing Census

### 2.5.2 Analysis of age ratios

The quality of census returns for age groups may also be evaluated by comparing age ratios. For this report, the age ratio is computed as the ratio of the population in the given age group to one-half of the sum of the populations in the two adjacent age groups, multiplied by 100. Thus, the age ratio for a 5 -year age group, 5ARx is defined as follows:
$5 \mathrm{AR}_{\mathrm{x}}=100 * 5 \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{x}} /\left(5 \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{x}}-5+5 \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{x}}+5\right)$
where:
$5 A R_{x}$ refers to age ratio for ages $x$ to $x+4$, and
$5 P_{x}$ refers to the population at ages $x$ to $x+4$.
In the absence of 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 per cent. The age ratios serve primarily as measures of net age misreporting, not net census error, and they are not to be taken as valid indicators of error for age groups.

The age ratios in Table 2.7 show wide fluctuations from the 100 per cent, with the fluctuations of the female population being generally wider than those for the male population. The age ratios for the males were high in the youngest and oldest ages, and lowest in ages 40 to 55 . Among the females, the fluctuations were very wide after age 55 . These wide fluctuations are proof of age shifting, and that the age shifting was more among females than males, especially in the older ages. This may reflect ignorance of respondent's age.

The age ratios for rural areas had wider fluctuations compared to those for urban areas. The ruralurban differences of age ratios by sex are wider than the sex differences by place of residence. Therefore, place of residence has a bigger influence on the quality of age reporting than sex.


Table 2.7 Age ratios by age, place of residence and sex

| Age | Total country |  | Rural |  | Urban |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| $0-4$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $5-9$ | 123.3 | 125.1 | 130.9 | 133.1 | 110.2 | 112.7 |
| $10-14$ | 87.5 | 83.5 | 86.2 | 77.7 | 89.7 | 92.2 |
| $15-19$ | 116.5 | 115.0 | 117.6 | 116.8 | 115.0 | 112.8 |
| $20-24$ | 87.0 | 91.7 | 77.5 | 85.6 | 97.8 | 99.4 |
| $25-29$ | 109.3 | 112.2 | 109.1 | 114.9 | 109.5 | 108.9 |
| $30-34$ | 83.5 | 85.2 | 83.5 | 87.8 | 83.5 | 81.7 |
| $35-39$ | 113.8 | 115.8 | 116.3 | 115.2 | 110.9 | 116.8 |
| $40-44$ | 91.9 | 88.4 | 91.8 | 90.7 | 92.2 | 85.2 |
| $45-49$ | 105.7 | 93.1 | 108.7 | 91.8 | 101.7 | 95.1 |
| $50-54$ | 102.6 | 110.0 | 103.2 | 110.8 | 101.7 | 108.7 |
| $55-59$ | 77.4 | 69.9 | 74.4 | 65.9 | 82.0 | 76.4 |


| Age | Total country |  | Rural |  | Urban |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| $60-64$ | 112.9 | 132.7 | 118.2 | 144.8 | 105.0 | 114.5 |
| $65-69$ | 86.1 | 79.7 | 83.4 | 74.9 | 90.9 | 88.8 |
| $70-74$ | 108.4 | 122.7 | 113.8 | 130.0 | 98.6 | 110.5 |
| $75-79$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015
Population and Housing Census

### 2.5.3 The United Nations age-sex accuracy index

The analysis in sections 2.3.5 and 2.5.2 have shown errors in reporting of the sex and age data. The United Nations age-sex accuracy index (AAI) is a combined measure of the accuracy of age and sex data. It is used to quantify the degree of errors in reporting of age and sex of the population, by employing age ratios and sex ratios simultaneously.

The sex ratio score (SRS) is defined as the mean difference between sex ratios for successive age groups, averaged irrespective of sign. The age ratio score, which is computed by taking the average deviation (without regard to sign) from 100 of the age ratios over all ages. The age ratio score is calculated separately for males ( $\mathrm{ARS}_{\mathrm{M}}$ ) and females $\left(\mathrm{ARS}_{\mathrm{F}}\right)$.

The age accuracy index is computed as:

$$
\mathrm{AAI}=3(\mathrm{SRS})+\mathrm{ARS}_{\mathrm{M}}+\mathrm{ARS}_{\mathrm{F}}
$$

Based on empirical analysis, if the AAI is less than 20, the age-sex distribution of the population is considered 'accurate'. If the AAI is between 20 and 40 , the population structure is considered 'inaccurate'. For any AAI greater than 40, the population structure is considered 'highly inaccurate'. The age ratio scores, sex ratio scores and the UN age-sex accuracy index are presented in Table 2.8. The overall sex ratio score was 8.3 while the age ratio scores were 12.8 for males and 17.3 for females. This means that the quality of age data was worse for females compared to males. The age-sex accuracy index for Sierra Leone was 54.9 and hence the age-sex data for the 2015 Census are classified as 'highly inaccurate'. This finding agrees with what the other indices have shown.

## 三C

 Table 2.8 Age ratio scores, sex ratio scores and age accuracy index of the total population| Age | Age ratio |  | Age ratio deviation |  | Sex ratio | Sex ratio difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female |  |  |
| All ages |  |  |  |  | 96.9 |  |
| 0-4 |  |  |  |  | 99.9 |  |
| 5-9 | 123.3 | 125.1 | 23.3 | 25.1 | 100.3 | 0.4 |
| 10-14 | 87.5 | 83.5 | -12.5 | -16.5 | 103.8 | 3.5 |
| 15-19 | 116.5 | 115.0 | 16.5 | 15.0 | 97.3 | -6.5 |
| 20-24 | 87.0 | 91.7 | -13.0 | -8.3 | 86.9 | -10.4 |
| 25-29 | 109.3 | 112.2 | 9.3 | 12.2 | 84.0 | -2.8 |
| 30-34 | 83.5 | 85.2 | -16.5 | -14.8 | 85.4 | 1.3 |
| 35-39 | 113.8 | 115.8 | 13.8 | 15.8 | 91.7 | 6.3 |
| 40-44 | 91.9 | 88.4 | -8.1 | -11.6 | 106.2 | 14.5 |
| 45-49 | 105.7 | 93.1 | 5.7 | -6.9 | 123.4 | 17.2 |
| 50-54 | 102.6 | 110.0 | 2.6 | 10.0 | 112.9 | -10.5 |
| 55-59 | 77.4 | 69.9 | -22.6 | -30.1 | 115.8 | 2.9 |
| 60-64 | 112.9 | 132.7 | 12.9 | 32.7 | 92.0 | -23.8 |
| 65-69 | 86.1 | 79.7 | -13.9 | -20.3 | 97.6 | 5.6 |
| 70-74 | 108.4 | 122.7 | 8.4 | 22.7 | 87.5 | -10.1 |
| 75-79 |  |  |  |  | 101.8 |  |
| Age ratio score |  |  | 12.8 | 17.3 |  |  |
| Sex ratio score |  |  |  |  |  | 8.3 |
| Age-accuracy index |  |  |  |  |  | 54.9 |

Table 2.9 shows that the age ratio scores and sex ratio scores for the urban areas were much lower than those for the rural areas, implying that the quality of age-sex data is better for the urban than rural areas. This is consistent with findings using indices of digit preference.

Table 2.9 Male and female age ratio scores, sex ratio scores and age accuracy index of the population
by place of residence

| Place of residence | Age ratio score <br> for males | Age ratio score <br> for females | Sex ratio <br> score | Age-sex <br> accuracy <br> index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total country | 12.8 | 17.3 | 8.3 | 54.9 |
| Rural | 15.8 | 20.8 | 11.5 | 71.1 |
| Urban | 8.5 | 11.9 | 6.5 | 40.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015
Population and Housing Census

The age accuracy index was computed for the previous censuses of Sierra Leone. The data from the 1974, 1985 and 2015 censuses were re-grouped to the age groupings of the 2004 census data, whose oldest closed age group was 60-64 years. Table 2.10 shows that the age data for all the four censuses were classified as 'highly inaccurate' and the quality of age data was worse for females than males. The quality of the age-sex data in 2015 was poorer than that observed in 2004 (41.9) and close to that in 1985 (44.9). Therefore, despite improvements in the socioeconomic conditions, the quality of the age data have remained poor.

> Table 2.10 Age ratio scores, sex ratio scores and age accuracy index of the total population, 1985-2015

| Census year | Age ratio score <br> for males | Age ratio score <br> for females | Sex ratio <br> score | Age-sex <br> accuracy <br> index |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1985 | 8.8 | 10.1 | 8.7 | 44.9 |
| 2004 | 9.1 | 10.3 | 7.4 | 41.9 |
| 2015 | 10.3 | 11.9 | 7.2 | 43.6 |

NB: The age and sex ratio scores for 2015 are slightly different from those in Table 2.4 because the data for 2015 were regrouped in line with the data for the previous censuses.

[^0]
### 2.5.4 Spatial differentials in quality of reporting age-sex data

The UNAAI was used to analyse regional and district differentials in the quality of the age data reporting. Table 2.11 shows that the Western Region had the best quality age-sex data with an AAI of 37.2 while the Eastern Region had the worst quality with an index of 78.5 . The indices for the Northern and Southern regions were 59.4 and 6.6 respectively.

The Western Area Urban district had the lowest AAI (37.2), thus having its data rated as 'inaccurate'. The AAI for the rest of the districts were greater than 40, hence their age-sex data was rated as 'highly inaccurate'. Nine out of the 14 districts had age-sex data with an AAI higher than 60 . The districts of the Eastern region had the worst quality of age-sex data with their AAI lying between 70 and 90 . These are followed by districts in the Northern Region, while those of the Eastern Region had the best - although the quality was also not accurate.


Table 2.11 Male and female age ratio scores, sex ratio scores and UN age accuracy index of the population by region and district

| Region/district | Age ratio score for males | Age ratio score for females | Sex ratio score | Age-sex <br> accuracy <br> index |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total country | 12.8 | 17.3 | 8.3 | 54.9 |
| Eastern | 15.0 | 21.2 | 14.1 | 78.5 |
| Kailahun | 17.6 | 24.2 | 13.4 | 82.1 |
| Kenema | 14.7 | 19.8 | 12.3 | 71.5 |
| Kono | 15.1 | 19.7 | 17.5 | 87.2 |
| Northern | 15.3 | 18.9 | 8.4 | 59.4 |
| Bombali | 12.4 | 15.8 | 7.5 | 50.8 |
| Kambia | 16.5 | 20.6 | 9.9 | 66.6 |
| Koinadugu | 18.0 | 20.8 | 9.9 | 68.4 |
| Port Loko | 14.8 | 17.7 | 8.6 | 58.3 |
| Tonkolili | 16.9 | 22.3 | 10.2 | 69.8 |
| Southern | 13.8 | 18.6 | 9.7 | 61.6 |
| Bo | 12.3 | 17.0 | 9.4 | 57.5 |
| Bonthe | 15.0 | 19.0 | 9.9 | 63.7 |
| Moyamba | 13.0 | 16.9 | 10.5 | 61.4 |
| Pujehun | 17.2 | 23.3 | 12.0 | 76.6 |
| Western | 7.5 | 9.7 | 6.7 | 37.2 |
| Western Area rural | 7.1 | 11.8 | 8.4 | 44.1 |
| Western Area urban | 7.9 | 8.9 | 6.8 | 37.2 |

### 2.6 Adjustment of the age-sex data

The evaluation of the reported age-sex distribution of the population has shown that the data have some serious reporting errors. A close examination of the age-specific sex ratios (Table 2.3) showed fluctuations that could not be explained by demographic factors and were therefore attributed to the inferior quality of the age-reporting arising from differential age shifting by sex. Similarly, the population by age (single years or five-year age groups) do not show the expected distribution pattern. Therefore, there is a need for the data to be adjusted to remove the distortions. Adjustment of age-sex data entails applying scientific formulae to the reported data to produce a new age-sex distribution, on the assumption that there were distortions in the age data.

### 2.6.1 Considerations for selection of the method for the adjustment of the age-sex data

The technique used for adjusting the age and sex data depends on the perceived severity of errors in the age and sex distribution. The techniques for adjusting the reported age structures are classified into two major groups, namely slight smoothing and strong smoothing.

1. Slight smoothing, which gently modifies irregularities in the age structure;
a. Techniques that keep the enumerated population within each 10 -year age group;
b. Techniques that modify the enumerated population totals.
2. Strong smoothing, which modifies most irregularities, some of which may represent facts instead of errors.

To maintain consistency with the rest of the census information, it is critical that the total population of each sex should be maintained as enumerated. Therefore, the techniques used for adjusting the age-sex data which preserve the original total enumerated population of each sex were preferred for smoothing the data. To achieve this, smoothing of the age data was done separately for each sex.

The U.S. Census Bureau (1994) developed a spreadsheet program (AGESMTH) which adjusts the population grouped in five-year totals using several techniques including Carrier-Farrag ratio method, Karup-King-Newton quadratic interpolation method, Arriaga technique that uses a second-degree polynomial and methods developed by the United Nations. The enumerated population was subjected to each of the above method.

The male and female populations adjusted by using the above methods are given in Tables 2.12 and 2.13 respectively. The findings show that the results from the light smoothing methods do not vary widely between the methods. This is in line with the theories behind the methods. The United Nations AAI was computed for the adjusted population and the findings are given in Table 2.14 .

Table 2.12 Reported and adjusted male population by age and technique of adjustment

| Age group | Reported | Carrier -Farrag | Karup-King Newton | Arriaga | United <br> Nations | Strong |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0-79 | 3,461,206 |  |  | 3,461,206 |  |  |
| 10-69 | 2,386,172 | 2,386,172 | 2,386,172 | 2,386,172 | 2,408,005 | 2,386,172 |
| 0-4 | 469,092 |  |  | 527,667 |  | 536,474 |
| 5-9 | 555,292 |  |  | 496,717 |  | 487,910 |
| 10-14 | 431,588 | 461,268 | 458,604 | 460,992 | 467,687 | 438,479 |
| 15-19 | 430,792 | 401,112 | 403,776 | 401,388 | 402,119 | 384,702 |
| 20-24 | 308,135 | 320,786 | 321,686 | 319,763 | 330,215 | 325,425 |
| 25-29 | 277,618 | 264,967 | 264,067 | 265,990 | 261,020 | 275,703 |
| 30-34 | 199,964 | 218,485 | 219,327 | 217,852 | 215,856 | 225,844 |
| 35-39 | 201,459 | 182,938 | 182,096 | 183,571 | 188,721 | 187,981 |
| 40-44 | 154,121 | 160,620 | 159,147 | 159,481 | 161,448 | 154,774 |
| 45-49 | 133,783 | 127,284 | 128,758 | 128,423 | 130,612 | 125,521 |
| 50-54 | 99,050 | 90,538 | 91,499 | 90,214 | 97,161 | 96,577 |
| 55-59 | 59,261 | 67,773 | 66,812 | 68,097 | 64,660 | 74,958 |
| 60-64 | 53,987 | 51,596 | 51,929 | 51,343 | 49,557 | 55,039 |
| 65-69 | 36,414 | 38,805 | 38,472 | 39,058 | 38,950 | 41,169 |
| 70-74 | 30,606 |  |  | 29,121 |  | 29,779 |
| 75-79 | 20,044 |  |  | 21,529 |  | 20,871 |
| 80+ | 29,772 |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015
Population and Housing Census

Table 2.13 Reported and adjusted female population by age and technique of adjustment

| Age group | Reported | Carrier -Farrag | Karup-King Newton | Arriaga | United <br> Nations | Strong |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0-79 | 3,563,396 |  |  | 3,563,396 |  |  |
| 10-69 | 2,485,966 | 2,485,966 | 2,485,966 | 2,485,966 | 2,512,128 | 2,485,966 |
| 0-4 | 469,361 |  |  | 531,539 |  | 533,256 |
| 5-9 | 553,423 |  |  | 491,245 |  | 489,528 |
| 10-14 | 415,704 | 450,754 | 450,374 | 450,567 | 457,375 | 445,537 |
| 15-19 | 442,828 | 407,778 | 408,158 | 407,965 | 414,128 | 400,234 |
| 20-24 | 354,684 | 369,750 | 367,811 | 369,011 | 374,354 | 356,074 |
| 25-29 | 330,365 | 315,299 | 317,238 | 316,038 | 312,300 | 306,384 |
| 30-34 | 234,239 | 255,037 | 253,948 | 253,309 | 252,683 | 251,956 |
| 35-39 | 219,713 | 198,915 | 200,004 | 200,643 | 204,731 | 204,022 |
| 40-44 | 145,094 | 145,373 | 146,438 | 144,649 | 152,589 | 153,212 |
| 45-49 | 108,405 | 108,126 | 107,061 | 108,850 | 109,031 | 118,401 |
| 50-54 | 87,743 | 77,856 | 79,309 | 77,817 | 82,001 | 87,300 |
| 55-59 | 51,188 | 61,075 | 59,622 | 61,115 | 59,495 | 67,626 |
| 60-64 | 58,695 | 53,575 | 53,269 | 53,237 | 51,139 | 53,478 |
| 65-69 | 37,308 | 42,428 | 42,734 | 42,766 | 42,302 | 41,741 |
| 70-74 | 34,962 |  |  | 32,427 |  | 31,597 |
| 75-79 | 19,684 |  |  | 22,219 |  | 23,049 |
| 80+ | 37,739 |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015
Population and Housing Census

Table 2.14 Age ratio scores, sex ratio scores and age-sex accuracy index of the reported and adjusted population

| Method used | Sex ratio score | Male age ratio <br> score | Female age <br> ratio score | Accuracy index |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reported data | 9.27 | 12.08 | 15.72 | 55.62 |
| Light methods |  |  |  |  |
| Carrier- Farrag | 7.11 | 3.38 | 3.22 | 27.94 |
| K.-King Newton | 7.8 | 3.47 | 3.43 | 30.32 |
| Arriaga | 7.15 | 3.51 | 3.31 | 28.25 |
| United Nations | 7.51 | 2.85 | 3.07 | 28.45 |
| Strong method | 3.84 | 1.74 | 2.25 | 15.49 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015
Population and Housing Census

### 2.6.2 Adjusting the distribution of the total population by age-sex

The evaluation of the quality of the age-sex data showed the data were 'very rough'. However, this has been the same trend over time, as shown in Table 2.6. It is believed that some of the seeming irregularities may be real to the population. Therefore, use of strong techniques of adjustment is likely to produce an age-sex structure which is very different from the 'true' age distribution.

Having observed some under-enumeration of the population aged 0-4 years (Section 2.4), the Arriaga technique, which adjusts the population of all age groups including the 0-4 and 5-9 years, was deemed most appropriate for adjusting the 2015 census age-sex data. It should be noted that the population 80 years and above was not adjusted by the current technique, despite the earlier observation that its share to the total population ( 1.0 per cent) is not consistent with the country's demographic patterns. The adjusted population by age and sex is given in Table 2.15.


Table 2.15 Adjusted population and adjustment factors by age and sex

| Age group | Adjusted population |  |  | Distribution |  |  | Adjustment factors |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| All ages | 7,092,113 | 3,490,978 | 3,601,135 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| 0-4 | 1,059,207 | 527,668 | 531,539 | 14.9 | 15.1 | 14.8 | 1.129 | 1.125 | 1.132 |
| 5-9 | 987,961 | 496,716 | 491,245 | 13.9 | 14.2 | 13.6 | 0.891 | 0.895 | 0.888 |
| 10-14 | 911,562 | 460,993 | 450,569 | 12.9 | 13.2 | 12.5 | 1.076 | 1.068 | 1.084 |
| 15-19 | 809,351 | 401,388 | 407,963 | 11.4 | 11.5 | 11.3 | 0.926 | 0.932 | 0.921 |

Table 2.15 Adjusted population and adjustment factors by age and sex (continued)

| Age group | Adjusted population |  |  | Distribution |  |  | Adjustment factors |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| 20-24 | 688,777 | 319,766 | 369,011 | 9.7 | 9.2 | 10.2 | 1.039 | 1.038 | 1.040 |
| 25-29 | 582,026 | 265,987 | 316,039 | 8.2 | 7.6 | 8.8 | 0.957 | 0.958 | 0.957 |
| 30-34 | 471,165 | 217,854 | 253,311 | 6.6 | 6.2 | 7.0 | 1.085 | 1.089 | 1.081 |
| 35-39 | 384,213 | 183,570 | 200,643 | 5.4 | 5.3 | 5.6 | 0.912 | 0.911 | 0.913 |
| 40-44 | 304,132 | 159,483 | 144,649 | 4.3 | 4.6 | 4.0 | 1.016 | 1.035 | 0.997 |
| 45-49 | 237,272 | 128,422 | 108,850 | 3.3 | 3.7 | 3.0 | 0.980 | 0.960 | 1.004 |
| 50-54 | 168,029 | 90,213 | 77,816 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 2.2 | 0.900 | 0.911 | 0.887 |
| 55-59 | 129,214 | 68,098 | 61,116 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 1.170 | 1.149 | 1.194 |
| 60-64 | 104,578 | 51,343 | 53,235 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0.928 | 0.951 | 0.907 |
| 65-69 | 81,826 | 39,058 | 42,768 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.110 | 1.073 | 1.146 |
| 70-74 | 61,547 | 29,119 | 32,428 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.939 | 0.951 | 0.927 |
| 75-79 | 43,750 | 21,532 | 22,218 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 1.101 | 1.074 | 1.129 |
| 80+ | 67,503 | 29,768 | 37,735 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

The population pyramid of the adjusted population is given in Figure 2.9. The pyramid bears the shape that is expected of a population with relatively high and declining fertility, thus suggesting that the adjusted age distribution is close to the true age-sex structure of Sierra Leone.


### 2.6.3 Adjusting of the age-sex distribution of the population of districts and regions

To maintain consistency between the national and sub-national projected population, the Arriaga method, which was used to adjust the national population, was also used to adjust the population of each district. The adjusted population of the regions was obtained by adding up the population of the constituent districts. The adjusted population of the regions and districts is shown in Appendix Table A2.2.

### 2.7 Summary, conclusions and recommendations

### 2.7.1 Summary

Census data on age and sex are very important in demographic analysis, as well as in socioeconomic planning and service delivery. However, they are usually affected by reporting errors which arise out of age-selective under-enumeration, digit preference and age misstatement. Therefore, it is necessary to evaluate the data to establish the magnitude and direction of the error reporting of the age and sex data.

The sex ratio was the tool used to evaluate the quality of the sex data. The data showed that between 1963 and 1985, the overall sex ratios of the total population were close to 100 males per 100 females, which is in line with the expected pattern. However, the sex ratio for 2004 dropped to 94.2 while the one for 2015 was slightly higher at 96.9. The drop in the sex ratio in 2004 can be partly attributed to the 11-year Civil War.

In a normal population, the age specific sex ratios are expected to be close to 100 in the younger ages, and decline smoothly as age increases. However, 2015 age-specific sex ratios did not follow the expected pattern but were fluctuating, especially at the older ages. Specifically, the sex ratios for the ages 40 to 64 were more than 100 males per 100 females, a phenomenon which cannot be explained by the recent demographic patterns of the country.

Visual observation of the age data showed evidence of age heaping. This was confirmed by the Whipple's, Myer's and Bachi's Indices of digit preference, which showed high preference for ages ending in digits ' 0 ' and ' 5 '. The population pyramid for the 2015 Census showed that the population aged $0-4$ years is under-enumerated. The under-enumeration of infants (population aged ' 0 ' years) is estimated to be 32 per cent.

The United Nations AAI, which measures the quality of both age and sex data concurrently, gave an index of 54.9, and hence the 2015 census age-sex data were categorized as 'highly inaccurate'. The quality of the age-sex data was rated as 'highly inaccurate' for both rural and urban areas, although the quality in the rural areas was worse than that of urban areas.
The inferior quality of the age-sex data necessitated use of mathematical methods to adjust the data. Several methods were tested to adjust the data, but the Arriaga method was chosen for producing the final adjusted age-sex distribution. The method was chosen because it does not change the total population of each sex, thus maintaining consistency with the original census information, and makes an adjustment for under-enumeration of the population aged 0 to 4 years.

### 2.7.2 Conclusion

The quality of the overall sex data from the 2015 Census was acceptable, but the quality of the age data was grossly inaccurate. The quality of 2015 census age-sex data was close to that for the 1985 Census but worse than that for the 2004 Census.

### 2.7.3 Recommendations

The quality of the age data from the 2015 Census was highly inaccurate. Therefore, it was necessary to adjust the age-sex distribution to remove the age reporting errors. The adjusted agesex distribution of the population should be used for purposes of making population projections and developing of plans.

In subsequent data collection exercises, extra efforts should be made to equip enumerators and interviewers with skills on how to collect excellent quality age and sex data. Some possible approaches include combining the question on age with that on 'exact date of birth' and encouraging enumerators to use written records, like immunization records, when estimating the age of persons who do not know their age.
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## Appendix

## Table A2.1: Technical note on discrepancy in some indicators

In the report, efforts have been made to compare indices from the 2015 Census with those from previous censuses, especially 2004 and 1985. To ensure consistency with the 2015 index, the same techniques that were used for the 2015 data were also applied to the numbers as given in the published reports. The results obtained in some cases were slightly different from those published before. Where such cases exist, both numbers are reproduced below:


Table A2.1 Technical note on discrepancy in some indicators

| Census year | Index | Current value | Published value | Source of published value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2004 | Whipple's Index (males) | 227 | 230 | 2004 Population and Housing census Analytical report on Population size, distribution and Age-sex structure |
|  | Whipple's Index (Females) | 258 | 254 |  |
|  | Overall Myer's Index (Both sexes) | 46.2 | 48.7 |  |
|  | Overall Myer's Index (Males) | 41.6 | 44.5 |  |
|  | Overall Myer's Index (Females) | 50.3 | 52.5 |  |
| 1985 | Age Accuracy index | 44.9 | 42 | 1985 Population and Housing Census Analytical Report |
|  | Overall Myer's Index (Males) | 49.1 | 47.0 |  |
|  | Overall Myer's Index (Females) | 53.7 | 52.1 |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census Statistics Sierra Leone, 2004 Population and Housing census - Analytical report on Population size, distribution and Age-sex structure National Statistics Office (Sierra Leone), 1985 Population and Housing Census - Analytical Report

| Age group | Eastern region |  |  | Kailahun |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female |
| All ages | 1,642,370 | 814,441 | 827,929 | 526,379 | 260,586 | 265,793 |
| 0-4 | 239,493 | 117,406 | 122,087 | 75,746 | 36,872 | 38,874 |
| 5-9 | 233,842 | 117,097 | 116,745 | 76,281 | 38,563 | 37,718 |
| 10-14 | 224,393 | 114,098 | 110,295 | 75,061 | 39,017 | 36,044 |
| 15-19 | 195,953 | 97,649 | 98,304 | 65,066 | 33,285 | 31,781 |
| 20-24 | 150,665 | 68,557 | 82,108 | 47,341 | 22,111 | 25,230 |
| 25-29 | 125,536 | 55,870 | 69,666 | 38,765 | 17,365 | 21,400 |
| 30-34 | 107,886 | 49,080 | 58,806 | 33,700 | 14,714 | 18,986 |
| 35-39 | 89,625 | 42,894 | 46,731 | 27,966 | 12,699 | 15,267 |
| 40-44 | 71,732 | 39,200 | 32,532 | 22,299 | 11,796 | 10,503 |
| 45-49 | 55,583 | 31,900 | 23,683 | 17,193 | 9,564 | 7,629 |
| 50-54 | 37,220 | 21,527 | 15,693 | 11,285 | 6,268 | 5,017 |
| 55-59 | 28,310 | 16,223 | 12,087 | 8,659 | 4,732 | 3,927 |
| 60-64 | 23,991 | 12,751 | 11,240 | 7,737 | 3,889 | 3,848 |
| 65-69 | 18,964 | 9,848 | 9,116 | 6,226 | 3,073 | 3,153 |
| 70-74 | 14,243 | 7,386 | 6,857 | 4,707 | 2,353 | 2,354 |
| 75-79 | 9,830 | 5,368 | 4,462 | 3,181 | 1,731 | 1,450 |
| $80+$ | 15,104 | 7,587 | 7,517 | 5,166 | 2,554 | 2,612 |


| Age group | Kenema |  |  | Kono |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female |
| All ages | 609,891 | 301,104 | 308,787 | 506,100 | 252,751 | 253,349 |
| 0-4 | 88,927 | 43,736 | 45,191 | 74,820 | 36,798 | 38,022 |
| 5-9 | 84,966 | 42,338 | 42,628 | 72,595 | 36,196 | 36,399 |
| 10-14 | 80,093 | 40,245 | 39,848 | 69,239 | 34,836 | 34,403 |
| 15-19 | 70,655 | 34,674 | 35,981 | 60,232 | 29,690 | 30,542 |
| 20-24 | 57,319 | 25,699 | 31,620 | 46,005 | 20,747 | 25,258 |
| 25-29 | 48,372 | 21,368 | 27,004 | 38,399 | 17,137 | 21,262 |
| 30-34 | 40,778 | 18,687 | 22,091 | 33,408 | 15,679 | 17,729 |
| 35-39 | 33,764 | 16,325 | 17,439 | 27,895 | 13,870 | 14,025 |
| 40-44 | 27,003 | 14,790 | 12,213 | 22,430 | 12,614 | 9,816 |
| 45-49 | 21,034 | 12,082 | 8,952 | 17,356 | 10,254 | 7,102 |
| 50-54 | 14,410 | 8,352 | 6,058 | 11,525 | 6,907 | 4,618 |
| 55-59 | 11,071 | 6,347 | 4,724 | 8,580 | 5,144 | 3,436 |
| 60-64 | 9,352 | 4,948 | 4,404 | 6,902 | 3,914 | 2,988 |
| 65-69 | 7,368 | 3,807 | 3,561 | 5,370 | 2,968 | 2,402 |
| 70-74 | 5,486 | 2,839 | 2,647 | 4,050 | 2,194 | 1,856 |
| 75-79 | 3,706 | 2,043 | 1,663 | 2,943 | 1,594 | 1,349 |
| $80+$ | 5,587 | 2,824 | 2,763 | 4,351 | 2,209 | 2,142 |


| Age group | Northern region |  |  | Bombali |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female |
| All ages | 2,508,201 | 1,224,828 | 1,283,373 | 606,544 | 296,683 | 309,861 |
| 0-4 | 420,049 | 211,033 | 209,016 | 95,175 | 47,882 | 47,293 |
| 5-9 | 372,915 | 190,808 | 182,107 | 86,862 | 44,300 | 42,562 |
| 10-14 | 325,639 | 169,146 | 156,493 | 78,237 | 40,325 | 37,912 |
| 15-19 | 277,645 | 140,292 | 137,353 | 68,040 | 34,378 | 33,662 |
| 20-24 | 223,922 | 101,399 | 122,523 | 56,198 | 26,440 | 29,758 |
| 25-29 | 186,242 | 81,119 | 105,123 | 46,785 | 21,324 | 25,461 |
| 30-34 | 153,743 | 67,224 | 86,519 | 37,424 | 16,642 | 20,782 |
| 35-39 | 126,900 | 57,076 | 69,824 | 30,726 | 13,899 | 16,827 |
| 40-44 | 102,933 | 50,922 | 52,011 | 25,233 | 12,471 | 12,762 |
| 45-49 | 81,416 | 41,606 | 39,810 | 20,141 | 10,223 | 9,918 |
| 50-54 | 58,059 | 29,697 | 28,362 | 14,600 | 7,391 | 7,209 |
| 55-59 | 45,323 | 22,816 | 22,507 | 11,609 | 5,736 | 5,873 |
| 60-64 | 37,536 | 17,546 | 19,990 | 9,866 | 4,475 | 5,391 |
| 65-69 | 29,900 | 13,680 | 16,220 | 7,980 | 3,506 | 4,474 |
| 70-74 | 22,937 | 10,543 | 12,394 | 6,195 | 2,696 | 3,499 |
| 75-79 | 16,650 | 8,135 | 8,515 | 4,513 | 2,046 | 2,467 |
| $80+$ | 26,392 | 11,786 | 14,606 | 6,960 | 2,949 | 4,011 |


| Age group | Kambia |  |  | Koinadugu |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female |
| All ages | 345,474 | 165,541 | 179,933 | 409,372 | 204,498 | 204,874 |
| 0-4 | 62,259 | 31,378 | 30,881 | 63,928 | 31,807 | 32,121 |
| 5-9 | 52,505 | 26,822 | 25,683 | 63,240 | 32,586 | 30,654 |
| 10-14 | 43,170 | 22,291 | 20,879 | 61,149 | 32,361 | 28,788 |
| 15-19 | 35,946 | 17,893 | 18,053 | 52,045 | 27,113 | 24,932 |
| 20-24 | 29,169 | 12,687 | 16,482 | 36,661 | 17,444 | 19,217 |
| 25-29 | 24,421 | 10,112 | 14,309 | 28,894 | 13,002 | 15,892 |
| 30-34 | 20,658 | 8,621 | 12,037 | 23,471 | 9,980 | 13,491 |
| 35-39 | 17,209 | 7,418 | 9,791 | 19,295 | 8,326 | 10,969 |
| 40-44 | 13,930 | 6,698 | 7,232 | 16,325 | 7,919 | 8,406 |
| 45-49 | 11,106 | 5,501 | 5,605 | 12,778 | 6,532 | 6,246 |
| 50-54 | 8,054 | 3,885 | 4,169 | 8,364 | 4,543 | 3,821 |
| 55-59 | 6,452 | 3,050 | 3,402 | 6,286 | 3,515 | 2,771 |
| 60-64 | 5,616 | 2,528 | 3,088 | 5,305 | 2,859 | 2,446 |
| 65-69 | 4,542 | 2,024 | 2,518 | 4,101 | 2,230 | 1,871 |
| 70-74 | 3,473 | 1,564 | 1,909 | 2,953 | 1,658 | 1,295 |
| 75-79 | 2,410 | 1,150 | 1,260 | 1,858 | 1,143 | 715 |
| $80+$ | 4,554 | 1,919 | 2,635 | 2,719 | 1,480 | 1,239 |



| Age group | Port Loko |  |  | Tonkolili |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female |
| All ages | 615,376 | 294,954 | 320,422 | 531,435 | 263,152 | 268,283 |
| 0-4 | 103,824 | 52,188 | 51,636 | 94,863 | 47,778 | 47,085 |
| 5-9 | 89,335 | 45,423 | 43,912 | 80,973 | 41,677 | 39,296 |
| 10-14 | 75,410 | 38,624 | 36,786 | 67,673 | 35,545 | 32,128 |
| 15-19 | 64,302 | 31,652 | 32,650 | 57,312 | 29,256 | 28,056 |
| 20-24 | 53,831 | 23,076 | 30,755 | 48,063 | 21,752 | 26,311 |
| 25-29 | 45,950 | 19,034 | 26,916 | 40,192 | 17,647 | 22,545 |
| 30-34 | 39,478 | 17,085 | 22,393 | 32,712 | 14,896 | 17,816 |
| 35-39 | 32,985 | 14,855 | 18,130 | 26,685 | 12,578 | 14,107 |
| 40-44 | 26,279 | 13,015 | 13,264 | 21,166 | 10,819 | 10,347 |
| 45-49 | 20,888 | 10,635 | 10,253 | 16,503 | 8,715 | 7,788 |
| 50-54 | 15,371 | 7,657 | 7,714 | 11,670 | 6,221 | 5,449 |
| 55-59 | 12,090 | 5,854 | 6,236 | 8,886 | 4,661 | 4,225 |
| 60-64 | 9,779 | 4,346 | 5,433 | 6,970 | 3,338 | 3,632 |
| 65-69 | 7,843 | 3,411 | 4,432 | 5,434 | 2,509 | 2,925 |
| 70-74 | 6,168 | 2,729 | 3,439 | 4,148 | 1,896 | 2,252 |
| 75-79 | 4,756 | 2,299 | 2,457 | 3,113 | 1,497 | 1,616 |
| $80+$ | 7,087 | 3,071 | 4,016 | 5,072 | 2,367 | 2,705 |

Table A2.2 Adjusted population by age, region, district and sex (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  | Bo |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Bothern |  |  | Mexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female

Table A2.2 Adjusted population by age, region, district and sex (continued)

| Age group | Bonthe |  |  | Moyamba |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female |
| All ages | 200,781 | 99,014 | 101,767 | 318,588 | 153,699 | 164,889 |
| 0-4 | 33,175 | 16,677 | 16,498 | 55,729 | 28,184 | 27,545 |
| 5-9 | 29,331 | 14,970 | 14,361 | 46,096 | 23,693 | 22,403 |
| 10-14 | 25,515 | 13,176 | 12,339 | 37,033 | 19,309 | 17,724 |
| 15-19 | 21,831 | 10,947 | 10,884 | 30,806 | 15,451 | 15,355 |
| 20-24 | 17,816 | 7,963 | 9,853 | 25,469 | 11,026 | 14,443 |
| 25-29 | 15,005 | 6,543 | 8,462 | 22,008 | 9,149 | 12,859 |
| 30-34 | 12,700 | 5,796 | 6,904 | 19,774 | 8,525 | 11,249 |
| 35-39 | 10,526 | 5,003 | 5,523 | 17,119 | 7,682 | 9,437 |
| 40-44 | 8,390 | 4,347 | 4,043 | 14,431 | 7,127 | 7,304 |
| 45-49 | 6,587 | 3,547 | 3,040 | 11,820 | 6,005 | 5,815 |
| 50-54 | 4,636 | 2,567 | 2,069 | 8,813 | 4,454 | 4,359 |
| 55-59 | 3,655 | 1,982 | 1,673 | 7,098 | 3,483 | 3,615 |
| 60-64 | 3,191 | 1,528 | 1,663 | 5,938 | 2,625 | 3,313 |
| 65-69 | 2,563 | 1,189 | 1,374 | 4,851 | 2,080 | 2,771 |
| 70-74 | 1,939 | 910 | 1,029 | 3,862 | 1,668 | 2,194 |
| 75-79 | 1,317 | 690 | 627 | 2,969 | 1,388 | 1,581 |
| $80+$ | 2,604 | 1,179 | 1,425 | 4,772 | 1,850 | 2,922 |


| Age group | Pujehun |  |  | Western |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female |
| All ages | 346,461 | 168,869 | 177,592 | 1,500,234 | 749,558 | 750,676 |
| 0-4 | 53,588 | 26,281 | 27,307 | 170,067 | 84,795 | 85,272 |
| 5-9 | 51,926 | 26,203 | 25,723 | 173,150 | 83,667 | 89,483 |
| 10-14 | 49,365 | 25,446 | 23,919 | 175,749 | 82,907 | 92,842 |
| 15-19 | 42,298 | 21,287 | 21,011 | 175,918 | 83,981 | 91,937 |
| 20-24 | 30,940 | 13,847 | 17,093 | 185,967 | 92,154 | 93,813 |
| 25-29 | 25,253 | 10,811 | 14,442 | 162,499 | 81,968 | 80,531 |
| 30-34 | 21,861 | 9,426 | 12,435 | 117,870 | 60,944 | 56,926 |
| 35-39 | 17,948 | 8,059 | 9,889 | 91,391 | 48,451 | 42,940 |
| 40-44 | 13,906 | 7,141 | 6,765 | 68,155 | 37,786 | 30,369 |
| 45-49 | 10,624 | 5,733 | 4,891 | 51,832 | 29,010 | 22,822 |
| 50-54 | 7,093 | 3,852 | 3,241 | 38,194 | 20,520 | 17,674 |
| 55-59 | 5,381 | 2,881 | 2,500 | 28,502 | 14,923 | 13,579 |
| 60-64 | 4,571 | 2,232 | 2,339 | 20,410 | 10,321 | 10,089 |
| 65-69 | 3,652 | 1,744 | 1,908 | 14,770 | 7,209 | 7,561 |
| 70-74 | 2,802 | 1,355 | 1,447 | 10,250 | 4,780 | 5,470 |
| 75-79 | 2,024 | 1,067 | 957 | 6,853 | 3,036 | 3,817 |
| $80+$ | 3,229 | 1,504 | 1,725 | 8,657 | 3,106 | 5,551 |

Table A2.2 Adjusted population by age, region, district and sex (continued)

| Age group | Western Area Rural |  |  | Western Area Urban |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female |
| All ages | 444,270 | 221,351 | 222,919 | 1,055,964 | 528,207 | 527,757 |
| 0-4 | 58,405 | 28,980 | 29,425 | 111,662 | 55,815 | 55,847 |
| 5-9 | 56,096 | 27,384 | 28,712 | 117,054 | 56,283 | 60,771 |
| 10-14 | 53,767 | 25,849 | 27,918 | 121,982 | 57,058 | 64,924 |
| 15-19 | 51,334 | 24,620 | 26,714 | 124,584 | 59,361 | 65,223 |
| 20-24 | 51,071 | 24,527 | 26,544 | 134,896 | 67,627 | 67,269 |
| 25-29 | 44,137 | 21,519 | 22,618 | 118,362 | 60,449 | 57,913 |
| 30-34 | 32,749 | 16,609 | 16,140 | 85,121 | 44,335 | 40,786 |
| 35-39 | 25,801 | 13,605 | 12,196 | 65,590 | 34,846 | 30,744 |
| 40-44 | 19,979 | 11,320 | 8,659 | 48,176 | 26,466 | 21,710 |
| 45-49 | 15,212 | 8,783 | 6,429 | 36,620 | 20,227 | 16,393 |
| 50-54 | 10,543 | 5,813 | 4,730 | 27,651 | 14,707 | 12,944 |
| 55-59 | 7,733 | 4,129 | 3,604 | 20,769 | 10,794 | 9,975 |
| 60-64 | 5,689 | 2,883 | 2,806 | 14,721 | 7,438 | 7,283 |
| 65-69 | 4,178 | 2,032 | 2,146 | 10,592 | 5,177 | 5,415 |
| 70-74 | 2,962 | 1,384 | 1,578 | 7,288 | 3,396 | 3,892 |
| 75-79 | 2,044 | 940 | 1,104 | 4,809 | 2,096 | 2,713 |
| $80+$ | 2,570 | 974 | 1,596 | 6,087 | 2,132 | 3,955 |

## CHAPTER 3: POPULATION SIZE, COMPOSITION AND AGE-SEX DISTRIBUTION

### 3.1 Introduction

The size of a population is the basic demographic information that a government or any other planning or service delivery entity wants to obtain. A study of the distribution of population is important, because population is a critical factor in resource allocation and service delivery. Statistics on the distribution of the population among political or administrative areas are useful for administrative and planning purposes. Population size is used as a denominator in the computation of many service delivery indicators, to evaluate efficiency in service delivery.

Information on the distribution of the population by age and sex is of immense importance in making critical decisions in public administration, such as, apportionment of representation in legislative bodies, identification and registration of voters, provision of social services such as education, health services, food and shelter, and for making population forecasts.

Information on the distribution of the population by age and sex is also of foremost importance for the analysis of other types of data for socioeconomic planning. Many planning and service delivery decisions require population data presented separately for males and females, and for specific ages or age groups. Knowledge about the age-sex distribution of a population by various characteristics helps planners and policy makers to better target sub-populations requiring services.

The study of population composition allows for inter-population comparison of the population among the different traits or attributes. The study traits are usually those that have meaningful relationships on the behaviour of the population of the community. However, some would be useful traits, such as social class or extended kinship relationships, but are usually excluded because of problems of getting accurate data. In this report, the study of population composition is limited to nationality, ethnicity, languages spoken and religion.

### 3.2 Sources of data and their limitations

Information about the population size was obtained from the count of all household and institutional population. The 2015 Census was a de facto census, that is, persons were enumerated in the households where they spent the census night, while persons who spent the census night in hotels, hospital patients, prisoners and the like were enumerated in their respective institutions. The 2015 Census collected information on the age of all persons in households and institutions by asking for 'age as at last birthday (completed years)'. In cases where the age was not known, special efforts were made to estimate the age by using the national events calendar and relating the person's age to an event in the calendar.

The census collected information on the sex of every household members and residents of institutions, by asking the question 'Is this person male or female?'. To avoid errors of misclassification, the enumerators were trained to 'not guess from the name and relationship, which sex the person is and to be careful in dealing with names that are shared by both sexes'.

The previous censuses of 1963, 1974, 1985 and 2004 were also de facto in nature, just like the 2015 Census and hence the population counts from the five modern censuses of Sierra Leone are comparable.

The data have some limitations. Chapter Two of this report showed that the quality of the agesex data was classified as 'highly inaccurate' according to the United Nations age-sex accuracy index, and recommended the use of the adjusted age-sex compositions. Further, the census was de facto in nature and therefore the data reflect the situation as it was on the census night, and not necessarily what usually occurs in the area. In a case where the two are significantly different, the interpretation of the information may be misleading.

### 3.3 Population size and distribution

The 2015 Census recorded a total population of 7,092,113 persons, of whom 7,076,119 (99.8 perc ent) were enumerated in private households and the remaining 15,994 persons ( 0.2 per cent) were enumerated in institutions.

The distribution of the country's population among the different administrative or geographical units is affected by physical factors as well as social, political and historical factors, both past and present. The 1985 Population Census Analytical Report noted that 'the distribution of the population in 1985, appears to be associated with the nation's capital, Freetown, which is the most important centre of industrialization, modernization and in-migration in Sierra Leone'.

### 3.3.1 Population of the regions

The census found that the distribution of the population among regions in 2015 was even (Figure 3.1). The contribution of the regions to the total population varied between 21 per cent for the Western Region and 35 per cent for the Northern Region.

The overall pattern of distribution of the population among regions has remained similar in the three most recent censuses. The Northern Region has more than one third of the country's population, followed by the Eastern Region with the next largest share. However, its share declined from 27 per cent in 1985 to 23 per cent in 2015. In 2015, the Western Region, which had previously been the least populated up to the 2004 Census, marginally overtook the Southern Region.

Figure 3.1 Percentage distribution of the census population by region, 1963-2015


Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census Statistics Sierra Leone. 2008. Annual Statistical Digest 2005/2006 and Housing Census - Analytical Report

### 3.3.2 Population of the districts

The Western Area Urban district (Freetown City) was the most populous district in the country in 2015, with a population of 1.1 million persons, contributing 14.9 per cent of the total population (Table 3.1). Bonthe district was the least populous, with only 200,781 persons. Eight out of the 14 districts had a population of 500,000 persons or more, and these collectively contributed 70.9 per cent of the total population.


Table 3.1 Distribution of population size by district
$\left.\begin{array}{l|l|l|l|l}\hline \text { Population size } & & & & \\ \hline \text { Number of } \\ \text { districts }\end{array}\right)$

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 3.3.3 Changes in distribution of the population by region and district

The Western Region's share of the population has steadily increased from 8.9 per cent in 1963 to 21.2 per cent in 2015, while that for the Northern Region has declined from 35.8 per cent in 1985 to 35.4 per cent in 2015 (Table 3.2). The Eastern and Southern regions did not show any systematic pattern of change in their shares over the five censuses.

The share of the Western Area Urban district (Freetown City) increased up to 15.5 per cent in 2004 before declining back down to 14.9 per cent of the total population in 2015, while the Western Area Rural district increased throughout the five censuses. On the other hand, Bonthe district experienced a decline in its share of the national population throughout all the censuses. The rest of the districts did not show a consistent pattern.

Table 3.2 Population and percentage share of population by district, 1963 - 2015

| Region/district | Population <br> in 2015 | Share of the total population |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1963 | 1974 | 1985 | 2004 | 2015 |
| Total country | 7,092,113 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Eastern | 1,642,370 | 25.0 | 28.4 | 27.3 | 23.9 | 23.2 |
| Kailahun | 526,379 | 6.9 | 6.6 | 6.7 | 7.2 | 7.4 |
| Kenema | 609,891 | 10.4 | 9.7 | 9.6 | 10.0 | 8.6 |
| Kono | 506,100 | 7.7 | 12.0 | 11.1 | 6.7 | 7.1 |
| Northern | 2,508,201 | 41.2 | 38.2 | 35.8 | 35.1 | 35.4 |
| Bombali | 606,544 | 9.1 | 8.5 | 9.0 | 8.2 | 8.6 |
| Kambia | 345,474 | 6.3 | 5.7 | 5.3 | 5.4 | 4.9 |
| Koinadugu | 409,372 | 5.9 | 5.8 | 5.2 | 5.3 | 5.8 |
| Port Loko | 615,376 | 11.3 | 10.7 | 9.4 | 9.1 | 8.7 |
| Tonkolili | 531,435 | 8.5 | 7.5 | 6.9 | 7.0 | 7.5 |
| Southern | 1,441,308 | 24.9 | 21.8 | 21.1 | 22.0 | 20.3 |
| Bo | 575,478 | 9.6 | 8.0 | 7.6 | 9.3 | 8.1 |
| Bonthe | 200,781 | 3.7 | 3.2 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 2.8 |
| Moyamba | 318,588 | 7.7 | 6.9 | 7.1 | 5.2 | 4.5 |
| Pujehun | 346,461 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 3.3 | 4.6 | 4.9 |
| Western | 1,500,234 | 8.9 | 11.6 | 15.8 | 19.0 | 21.2 |
| Western Area Rural | 444,270 | 3.1 | 1.5 | 2.4 | 3.5 | 6.3 |
| Western Area Urban | 1,055,964 | 5.9 | 10.1 | 13.4 | 15.5 | 14.9 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census Statistics Sierra Leone, 2004 Population and Housing Census Report

### 3.3.4 Population of the chiefdoms

At the time of the 2015 Census, Sierra Leone was divided into 166 chiefdoms. The number of chiefdoms per district varied between 4 for Western Area Rural district and 17 for Kenema district. Table 3.3 shows that the population of the chiefdoms was quite varied. There were 11 chiefdoms with a population of more than 100,000 persons each, collectively constituting 27.8 per cent of the population. The 13 chiefdoms with less than 10,000 persons each constituted 1.3 per cent. Thirtyfive of the chiefdoms had a population of between 30,000 and 40,000 persons, with 17.1 per cent of the population. The population of the individual chiefdoms ranged from 3,584 for Langrama chiefdom in Keneman district to 447,840 persons for East 3 chiefdom in Western Area Urban district (see Appendix Table A3.3).

| Population size | Number of <br> chiefdoms | Population | Share of the population |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | :---: |
| All sizes | 166 | $7,092,113$ | 100.0 |
| More than 100,000 | 11 | $1,972,469$ | 27.8 |
| $50,000-100,000$ | 28 | $1,919,455$ | 27.1 |
| $40,000-50,000$ | 14 | 629,021 | 8.9 |
| $30,000-40,000$ | 35 | $1,209,696$ | 17.1 |
| $20,000-30,000$ | 32 | 792,135 | 11.2 |
| $10,000-20,000$ | 33 | 475,306 | 6.7 |
| Less than 10,000 | 13 | 94,031 | 1.3 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Table 3.4 shows that the chiefdoms of the Western Region were highly populous with 12 out the 14 chiefdoms each having 50,000 persons or more. Conversely, the Western Region had 25 out of its 54 chiefdoms having less than 25,000 persons each and another 25 chiefdoms had between 20,000 and 50,000 persons. The Northern Region had 33 of its 54 chiefdoms having between 20,000 and 50,000 persons.

The share of the chiefdom population to the population of the district was quite varied. Waterloo chiefdom contributed 48.2 per cent of the population of Western Area Rural district, closely followed by East 3 chiefdom which contributed 42.5 per cent of population of Western Area Urban district. The rest of the chiefdoms contributed less than one third of their respective district populations. The smallest contributors were Langarama and Nomo chiefdoms which contributed 0.6 and 0.9 per cent respectively of the Kenema district population (see Appendix Table A3.3).

Table 3.4 Number of chiefdoms by region, district and population size

| Region/district | Number of <br> chiefdoms |  | Population size |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total country |  |  | Less than 20,000 | $20,000-50,000$ |
| Eastern | 166 | 46 | 81 | More than 50,000 |
| Kailahun | 46 | 16 | 21 | 39 |
| Kenema | 14 | 1 | 9 | 8 |
| Kono | 17 | 8 | 4 | 4 |

$\left.\begin{array}{lccccc}\hline \text { Region/district } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Number of } \\ \text { chiefdoms }\end{array} & & & \text { Population size }\end{array}\right)$

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 3.4 Population growth

An increase or reduction in the size and composition of the population is brought about by an interaction of three demographic factors namely, fertility, mortality and migration into or out of a given area. Internal migration especially rural-urban migration plays a significant role in the growth of sub-nation population.

### 3.4.1 Growth of the total population (1963-2015)

The population of Sierra Leone increased from 2,180,355 in 1963 to 2,735,159 in 1974 and 3,515,812 in 1985. Between 2004 and 2015, the population increased by about 2.1 million persons from $4,976,871$ to $7,092,113$, representing an inter-censal percentage increase of 42.5 per cent.

The average annual growth rate is a more conventional measure of population change, which allows for comparison across space or time, irrespective of the size of the population. For purposes of this report, the exponential growth rate formula is used. From Table 3.5, it is seen that since 1963, the annual growth rates have been increasing except for the period 1985 to 2004.

The relatively low growth rate between 1985 and 2004 (1.8 per cent) could be attributed to the 11 -year Civil War. The average annual growth rate for the most recent inter-censal period (2004 to 2015) was 3.2 per cent. The growth rate for the period 2004-2015 was much higher than the 2.6 per cent estimated for the African continent in 2015 (United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, 2016).

The 1985 census report showed that the under-coverage of the census enumeration decreased from 9 per cent in the 1963 and 1974 Censuses to 5 per cent in the 1985 Census. This improvement in the enumeration coverage could, in part, explain the continuous increase in the population growth rates.
If the current growth rate continues unchecked, the population of Sierra Leone would double in the next 21.6 years. This high growth rate, coupled with an expansion of the population of reproductive age, would put a heavy burden on the service delivery.

## 통 <br> Table 3.5 Population size and inter-censal population growth rates, 1963-2015

| Census year | Population size | Inter-censal period | Percentage change | Average annual growth rate | Doubling time (years) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1963 | 2,180,355 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1963-1974 | 25.4 | 2.0 | 34.5 |
| 1974 | 2,735,159 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1974-1985 | 61.2 | 2.3 | 30.0 |
| 1985 | 3,515,812 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1985-2004 | 128.3 | 1.8 | 38.3 |
| 2004 | 4,976,871 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2004-2015 | 225.3 | 3.2 | 21.6 |
| 2015 | 7,092,113 |  |  |  |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census
Statistics Sierra Leone, 2004 Population and Housing Census Report

### 3.4.2 Growth of the sub-national population (1974-2015)

Between 1974 and 2015, all regions experienced an increase in their population and had positive growth rates. Figure 3.2 shows that during the period 2004 to 2015, the Western Region experienced the highest growth rate of 4.2 per cent while the Southern Region had the lowest growth rate of 2.5 per cent. The Western Region had the highest growth rates for the three most recent inter-censal periods.

The growth rates for the Northern and Southern regions increased throughout the period 1974 to 2015, with the growth being faster between 1985 and 2004. Conversely, the Eastern and Western regions had a sharp decline in the growth rates during the period 1985-2004, followed by a sharp increase during the period 2004-2015. The growth rates for all the regions for the period 2004-2015 were higher than those for the period 1985-2004.

Figure 3.2 Inter-censal population growth rates by region, 1974-2015


Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census Statistics Sierra Leone, 2004 Population and Housing Census Report

Table 3.6 gives the annual growth rates for the districts for the four inter-censal periods. The table shows that between 2004 and 2015, Western Area Rural district showed a very high growth rate of 8.5 per cent, while Moyamba district had the lowest growth rate of 1.8 per cent. During the same period one district had a growth rate higher than 4 per cent, seven districts had a growth rates between 3 per cent and 4 per cent, while another six districts had growth rates less than 3 per cent.

Between 1985 and 2004, Western Area Rural district exhibited the highest growth rate ( 3.8 per cent), while Kono district experienced a negative growth rate ( -0.8 per cent). The district specific growth rates were generally higher for the period 2004-2015 compared to 1985-2004, except for Bo and Kenema districts.


Table 3.6 Population growth rate by region and district, 1963-2015

| Region/ district | Average annual growth rate |  |  |  | Percentage change in population |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1963-1974 | 1974-1985 | 1985-2004 | 2004-2015 | Doubling time | 1985-2004 | 2004-2015 |
| Sierra Leone | 2.1 | 2.3 | 1.8 | 3.2 | 21.4 | 41.6 | 42.5 |
| Eastern | 3.2 | 1.9 | 1.1 | 2.9 | 23.7 | 24.0 | 37.8 |
| Kailahun | 1.7 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 3.5 | 19.7 | 53.2 | 47.0 |
| Kenema | 1.4 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 1.8 | 37.4 | 47.7 | 22.5 |
| Kono | 6.1 | 1.5 | -0.8 | 3.7 | 18.4 | -13.9 | 50.9 |
| Northern | 1.4 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 3.3 | 20.9 | 38.6 | 43.7 |
| Bombali | 1.5 | 2.8 | 1.3 | 3.6 | 19.2 | 28.5 | 48.5 |
| Kambia | 1.1 | 1.6 | 2.0 | 2.2 | 31.0 | 45.2 | 27.7 |
| Koinadugu | 1.9 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 3.9 | 17.6 | 45.0 | 54.0 |
| Port Loko | 1.5 | 1.1 | 1.7 | 2.8 | 24.9 | 37.8 | 35.6 |
| Tonkolili | 1.0 | 1.5 | 1.9 | 3.9 | 17.8 | 42.8 | 53.1 |
| Southern | 0.9 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 27.4 | 47.4 | 31.9 |
| Bo | 0.3 | 1.9 | 2.9 | 2.0 | 35.1 | 72.6 | 24.1 |
| Bonthe | 0.8 | 1.7 | 1.5 | 3.3 | 20.9 | 32.9 | 43.7 |
| Moyamba | 1.1 | 2.6 | 0.2 | 1.8 | 38.0 | 4.1 | 22.1 |
| Pujehun | 1.7 | 1.2 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 18.2 | 94.9 | 51.7 |
| Western | 4.4 | 5.1 | 2.8 | 4.2 | 16.5 | 70.9 | 58.4 |
| Western Area Rural | -4.7 | 6.8 | 3.8 | 8.5 | 8.1 | 106.3 | 155.0 |
| Western Area Urban | 7.0 | 4.8 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 24.3 | 64.5 | 36.6 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census Statistics Sierra Leone, 2004 Population and Housing Census Report

Table 3.7 shows that most of the chiefdoms ( 87 out of 166 ) experienced a growth rate between 2004 and 2015. However, a substantial number ( 79 out of 166 ) experienced a negative growth rate. This is not surprising given that chiefdoms are small administrative units with small populations and hence their population growth rates are sensitive to changes brought about by internal migration. This is even more pronounced given that the 2004 Census took place soon after the Civil War when some persons were possibly still displaced from their homes.

| Region/district | Annual growth rate (\%) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Less than 0\% | 0-3.2\% | More than 3.2\% |
| Total country | 79 | 75 | 12 |
| Eastern | 11 | 25 | 10 |
| Kailahun | 3 | 10 | 1 |
| Kenema | 6 | 4 | 7 |
| Kono | 2 | 11 | 2 |
| Northern | 27 | 27 | 0 |
| Bombali | 6 | 8 | 0 |
| Kambia | 5 | 2 | 0 |
| Koinadugu | 4 | 7 | 0 |
| Port Loko | 7 | 4 | 0 |
| Tonkolili | 5 | 6 | 0 |
| Southern | 34 | 18 | 2 |
| Bo | 10 | 5 | 1 |
| Bonthe | 6 | 6 | 0 |
| Moyamba | 11 | 2 | 1 |
| Pujehun | 7 | 5 | 0 |
| Western | 7 | 5 | 0 |
| Western Area Rural | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Western Area Urban | 7 | 1 | 0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 3.5 Area and population density

Population density is used in illustrating the relationship between the population and natural resources. In this case, it is computed as number of persons per square kilometre of land area.

Sierra Leone has a total land area of 72,929 square kilometres. The population density of Sierra Leone increased from 38 persons per square kilometre in 1974 to 97 persons per square kilometre in 2015, as shown in Figure 3.3. The population density of Sierra Leone in 2015 was much higher than for neighbouring countries Liberia (40.4) and Guinea (51.1), as well as for the continent as a whole (39.1).

Figure 3.3 Population density (persons per square kilometre), 1974-2015


Table 3.8 shows that nearly half of the land area ( 49.6 per cent) was in the Northern Region, while the Western Region had only 1.0 per cent. The Southern and Eastern regions collectively constituted half of the land area of the country. Koinadugu and Bombali districts were the largest districts with 17.1 and 11.4 per cent of the land area. The rest of the districts had less than 10 per cent of the land area, the smallest being Western Area Urban district with 0.1 per cent of the country's land area.

The population density in 2015 varied widely between regions and districts. The population density for the regions varied between 69 for the Northern Region and 2,156 for the Western Region. The population densities for the Southern and Eastern regions were 71 and 104 persons per square kilometre.

The districts in the Western Region had very high population densities of 12,878 for Western Area Urban and 724 for Western Area Rural. However, the population density was much lower for the other districts, ranging between 33 for Koinadugu district and 133 for Kailahun district. Six out of the 14 districts had population densities higher than the national average (97.2 persons per square kilometre).

Table 3.8 Population density by region and district

| Region/district | Land area (sq.kms.) Share of land area | Share of land area | Share of the population | Population density |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total country | 72,929 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 97 |
| Eastern | 15,740 | 21.6 | 23.2 | 104 |
| Kailahun | 3,959 | 5.4 | 7.4 | 133 |
| Kenema | 6,368 | 8.7 | 8.6 | 96 |
| Kono | 5,413 | 7.4 | 7.1 | 93 |
| Northern | 36,208 | 49.6 | 35.4 | 69 |
| Bombali | 8,289 | 11.4 | 8.6 | 73 |
| Kambia | 3,032 | 4.2 | 4.9 | 114 |
| Koinadugu | 12,443 | 17.1 | 5.8 | 33 |
| Port Loko | 5,978 | 8.2 | 8.7 | 103 |
| Tonkolili | 6,466 | 8.9 | 7.5 | 83 |
| Southern | 20,287 | 27.8 | 20.3 | 71 |
| Bo | 5,488 | 7.5 | 8.1 | 105 |
| Bonthe | 3,613 | 5.0 | 2.8 | 56 |
| Moyamba | 6,987 | 9.6 | 4.5 | 46 |
| Pujehun | 4,199 | 5.8 | 4.9 | 83 |
| Western | 696 | 1.0 | 21.2 | 2,156 |
| Western Area Rural | 614 | 0.8 | 6.3 | 724 |
| Western Area Urban | 82 | 0.1 | 14.9 | 12,878 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 3.6 Age and sex composition

The current age and sex composition of the population is determined by its past fertility, mortality and migration patterns. Most demographic and socio-economic analysis use population grouped in 5 -year age groups, and hence these are used in the study of the age composition of the population. This is in line with the United Nations Principles and Recommendations for Population and Housing Censuses, which recommends tabulating the total population by single ages and in five-year age groups for the country and major administrative divisions.

### 3.6.1 Distribution of total population by age

Table 3.9 presents the age distribution of the 2015 Sierra Leone census population by age group, place of residence and sex. It was observed in Chapter 2 that the population of the age group 0-4 years is smaller than that of the age group 5-9 years. This is contrary to the expected pattern given the recent demographic trends in the country, and therefore points to under enumeration or age shifting. The female population had another 'trough' for the age group 10-14 years while the one for males appears for the age group 30-34 years. Thereafter the population of either sex follows the expected pattern.

The median age is the age that divides the age distribution of the population into two groups of equal-size. The median age for the total population in 2015 was 18.7 years, and was slightly higher for females (19.1 years) compared to males (18.4 years). Similarly, the median age for the urban population ( 20.1 years) was higher than that for the rural population (17.6 years). The higher median age for the urban population is partly due to rural-urban migration of population in the middle ages. The rural-urban difference in the median age is higher among males ( 3.9 years) than females ( 1.3 years). This is partly because there are more male than female migrants.


Table 3.9 Percentage distribution of the total population by place of residence, age and sex

| Age | Total |  |  | Rural |  |  | Urban |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| All ages | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 0-4 | 13.2 | 13.4 | 13.0 | 14.5 | 14.9 | 14.2 | 11.3 | 11.4 | 11.3 |
| 5-9 | 15.6 | 15.9 | 15.4 | 17.5 | 18.2 | 16.8 |  |  |  |
| 10-14 | 11.9 | 12.4 | 11.5 | 11.9 | 12.9 | 10.9 | 12.0 | 11.6 | 12.4 |
| 15-19 | 12.3 | 12.3 | 12.3 | 11.6 | 11.8 | 11.4 | 13.4 | 13.1 | 13.6 |
| 20-24 | 9.3 | 8.8 | 9.8 | 7.9 | 7.1 | 8.6 | 11.5 | 11.2 | 11.7 |
| 25-29 | 8.6 | 8.0 | 9.2 | 7.7 | 6.6 | 8.7 | 9.9 | 9.8 | 9.9 |
| 30-34 | 6.1 | 5.7 | 6.5 | 5.8 | 5.0 | 6.5 | 6.6 | 6.8 | 6.5 |
| 35-39 | 5.9 | 5.8 | 6.1 | 5.8 | 5.4 | 6.1 | 6.2 | 6.3 | 6.1 |
| 40-44 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 4.7 | 3.8 |
| 45-49 | 3.4 | 3.8 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 3.8 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 3.8 | 3.0 |
| 50-54 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 2.4 |
| 55-59 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 1.4 |
| 60-64 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| 65-69 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| 70-74 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.8 |

Table 3.9 Percentage distribution of the total population by place of residence, age and sex (continued)

|  | Total |  |  |  | Rural |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Urban |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $75-79$ | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $80-84$ | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $85-89$ | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $90-94$ | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $95-99$ | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $100+$ | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median age | 18.7 | 18.4 | 19.1 | 17.6 | 16.7 | 18.5 | 20.1 | 20.6 | 19.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 3.6.2 Population of broad age groups

Socio-economic planning usually requires data for some special categories of population, for example: children aged under 5 years; women of reproductive age (15-49 years): the working age ( $15-64$ years) population; and the population out of the labour force, that is persons aged 65 years and over.

The relative sizes of these broad age groups for Sierra Leone are shown in Table 3.10. The table depicts a generally young population age structure, with 40.8 per cent of the population aged below 15 years, 3.5 per cent aged 65 years and above, while the working-age population (15-64 years) constituted 55.7 per cent. This is quite like the age distribution for Africa in 2015, whose respective shares were $40.7,55.8$ and 3.5 per cent.

The table also reveals some minor differences in the age structure of the male and female populations. The males had a slightly higher proportion of children less than 15 years ( 41.7 per cent) compared to females ( 39.9 per cent), while the females had higher proportions of older ages, probably due to higher male mortality. The women of reproductive age ( $15-49$ years) constituted 50.9 per cent of the female population in 2015 . This, coupled with a high fertility rate, will inevitably result in further population growth.

Comparing the age distributions for 2015 with those from the previous censuses, it can be seen that the share of the working age-group (15-64 years) is increasing, especially amongst the age group 15-24 years. This has resulted in a decline of the median age from 20.4 years in 1974 to 18.7 years in 2015. If this increase in the share of the working age population is sustained, then Sierra Leone is likely to benefit from the demographic dividend.

Table 3.10 Percentage distribution of the total population
by age and sex, 1974 - 2015

| Year/sex | $0-4$ | $0-14$ | $15-24$ | $25-49$ | $50-64$ | $65+$ | All ages | Median age |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1974 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 16.1 | 40.6 | 16.2 | 30.1 | 7.7 | 5.3 | 100.0 | 20.4 |  |
| Male | 16.0 | 41.4 | 14.9 | 29.7 | 8.4 | 5.6 | 100.0 | 20.4 |  |
| Female | 16.2 | 39.8 | 17.5 | 30.5 | 7.1 | 5.1 | 100.0 | 20.5 |  |
| 1985 | 16.5 | 41.5 | 17.6 | 27.9 | 7.3 | 5.8 | 100.0 | 19.4 |  |
| Total | 16.8 | 42.8 | 16.3 | 26.9 | 7.8 | 6.2 | 100.0 | 18.9 |  |
| Male | 16.1 | 40.2 | 18.8 | 28.9 | 6.9 | 5.3 | 100.0 | 19.8 |  |
| Female | 15.3 | 41.7 | 19.3 | 28.6 | 6.1 | 4.4 | 100.0 | 18.8 |  |
| 2004 | 15.6 | 43.1 | 18.8 | 27.6 | 6.1 | 4.3 | 100.0 | 18.2 |  |
| Total | 14.9 | 40.4 | 19.7 | 29.5 | 6.0 | 4.4 | 100.0 | 19.4 |  |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 13.2 | 40.8 | 21.7 | 28.3 | 5.8 | 3.5 | 100.0 | 18.7 |  |
| 2015 | 13.4 | 41.7 | 21.2 | 27.7 | 6.1 | 3.3 | 100.0 | 18.4 |  |
| Total | 13.0 | 39.9 | 22.1 | 28.8 | 5.5 | 3.6 | 100.0 | 19.1 |  |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census Statistics Sierra Leone, Annual Statistical Digest 2005/06

### 3.6.3 Age composition of the population of the regions

Table 3.11 presents selected summary measures of the age distribution of the population of the regions. The age distribution for the Eastern, Northern and Southern regions have remained similar over the past four censuses. However, the age distribution for the Western Region has changed over time, the biggest change coming between 2004 and 2015.

The share of children aged 14 years and under has been decreasing but that of the adolescents (15-24) has been increasing since 1985 for the Eastern, Southern and Western regions, while the Northern Region showed no clear pattern. The share of the population aged 50 years and above was less than 20 per cent for all the regions and for all censuses.

In 2015, the Western Region had a median age of 21.5 years, which was higher compared to the other three regions. The median ages for the other regions fell between 18 and 18.3 years - very close to the national average of 18.7 years.

Table 3.11 Percentage distribution of the total population by age and region, 1974-2015

| Region/year | Broad age groups (years) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0-14 | 15-24 | 25-49 | 50-64 | 65+ | All ages | Median age |
| Eastern |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1974 | 40.6 | 21.3 | 25.0 | 8.7 | 4.3 | 100.0 | 21.7 |
| 1985 | 43.8 | 20.2 | 22.1 | 10.1 | 3.8 | 100.0 | 20.0 |
| 2004 | 42.2 | 20.7 | 23.6 | 9.4 | 4.0 | 100.0 | 19.4 |
| 2015 | 41.3 | 21.9 | 24.3 | 9.1 | 3.4 | 100.0 | 18.3 |
| Northern |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1974 | 40.0 | 22.0 | 25.1 | 8.6 | 4.3 | 100.0 | 18.1 |
| 1985 | 41.8 | 21.1 | 23.0 | 10.4 | 3.7 | 100.0 | 18.2 |
| 2004 | 40.9 | 21.5 | 24.1 | 9.5 | 4.0 | 100.0 | 17.7 |
| 2015 | 43.8 | 20.3 | 23.2 | 9.1 | 3.7 | 100.0 | 17.6 |
| Southern |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1974 | 41.2 | 21.4 | 24.8 | 8.4 | 4.2 | 100.0 | 24.2 |
| 1985 | 44.3 | 19.8 | 22.2 | 9.9 | 3.8 | 100.0 | 21.1 |
| 2004 | 42.7 | 20.6 | 23.5 | 9.1 | 4.0 | 100.0 | 18.7 |
| 2015 | 42.2 | 20.7 | 23.6 | 9.4 | 4.0 | 100.0 | 18.2 |
| Western |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1974 | 40.2 | 18.5 | 25.3 | 10.5 | 5.5 | 100.0 | 19.8 |
| 1985 | 46.0 | 16.9 | 21.6 | 11.1 | 4.5 | 100.0 | 19.1 |
| 2004 | 43.0 | 17.7 | 23.5 | 10.8 | 5.0 | 100.0 | 20.4 |
| 2015 | 34.0 | 24.6 | 29.4 | 9.3 | 2.7 | 100.0 | 21.5 |

### 3.6.4 Age distribution of the population of the districts

All the districts of the Eastern, Northern and Southern regions had more than 40 per cent of their population aged less than 15 years. The districts of the Western Region had the lowest share of the population aged 65 years and above. The Western Area Urban district had the highest median age of 22.0 years, while Western Area Rural district had a median age of 20.2 years (Table 3.12). The rest of the districts had median ages between 16 and 19 years.

Koinadigu district stands out with the youngest age distribution with a median age of 16.8 years, the highest proportion of children less than 15 years ( 45.1 per cent) and the second lowest proportion of population aged 65 years and over ( 2.7 per cent).

Table 3.12 Percentage distribution of the total population by age, median age, dependency ratio, region and district

| Region/district | Age groups (years) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0-14 | 15-24 | 25-49 | 50-64 | $65+$ | Total | Median age |
| Total country | 40.8 | 21.7 | 24.9 | 9.2 | 3.5 | 100.0 | 18.7 |
| Eastern | 41.3 | 21.9 | 24.3 | 9.1 | 3.4 | 100.0 | 18.3 |
| Kailahun | 41.6 | 22.5 | 23.5 | 8.9 | 3.5 | 100.0 | 18.0 |
| Kenema | 40.3 | 22.1 | 24.8 | 9.4 | 3.5 | 100.0 | 18.8 |
| Kono | 42.1 | 21.1 | 24.6 | 9.0 | 3.3 | 100.0 | 18.1 |
| Northern | 43.8 | 20.3 | 23.2 | 9.1 | 3.7 | 100.0 | 17.6 |
| Bombali | 42.2 | 20.8 | 23.4 | 9.5 | 4.1 | 100.0 | 18.3 |
| Kambia | 44.7 | 19.4 | 22.6 | 9.2 | 4.1 | 100.0 | 17.3 |
| Koinadugu | 45.1 | 22.4 | 21.8 | 8.2 | 2.7 | 100.0 | 16.8 |
| Port Loko | 43.2 | 18.9 | 24.2 | 9.6 | 4.0 | 100.0 | 18.1 |
| Tonkolili | 44.8 | 20.1 | 23.3 | 8.6 | 3.2 | 100.0 | 17.2 |
| Southern | 42.2 | 20.7 | 23.6 | 9.4 | 4.0 | 100.0 | 18.2 |
| Bo | 40.9 | 21.5 | 24.1 | 9.5 | 4.0 | 100.0 | 18.7 |
| Bonthe | 42.7 | 20.6 | 23.5 | 9.1 | 4.0 | 100.0 | 18.0 |
| Moyamba | 43.0 | 17.7 | 23.5 | 10.8 | 5.0 | 100.0 | 18.4 |
| Pujehun | 43.2 | 22.3 | 23.1 | 8.2 | 3.2 | 100.0 | 17.5 |
| Western | 34.0 | 24.6 | 29.4 | 9.3 | 2.7 | 100.0 | 21.5 |
| Western Area Rural | 37.3 | 23.5 | 27.7 | 8.9 | 2.6 | 100.0 | 20.2 |
| Western Area Urban | 32.6 | 25.1 | 30.1 | 9.5 | 2.7 | 100.0 | 22.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 3.6.5 Age dependency ratios

The age dependency ratio jointly considers variations in the proportions of children, older persons, and persons of 'working age'. The dependent population are the children aged 0-14 years and older persons aged 65 years and over, while the working age population is aged 15-64 years.

The dependency ratio relates the sum of population in ages $0-14$ years and 65 years and over to the population aged 15-64 years, multiplied by a constant, usually 100 . Separate calculations can be made of the child dependency ratio or the old age dependency ratio by restricting the numerator only to ages under 15 years, or to 65 years and over.

Table 3.13 shows that the overall age dependency ratio from the 2015 Census was 79.5, implying that there were approximately four dependents for every five persons of working age. The trend over the past four censuses shows that between 1974 and 1985, the dependency ratio increased from 78.1 to 89.4 and then declined steadily to 79.5 per cent in 2015 . This same pattern is observed for both child and old person dependency ratios.

The children aged less than 15 years of age constituted the bulk of the dependent population. The contribution of children to the dependency burden was very high in 1974 ( 96.4 per cent) but dropped drastically to 87.8 per cent in 1985. It has since been increasing to 90.6 in 2004 and 92.2 in 2015. The enormous difference between the 1974 Census and the subsequent ones is likely to be due to poorer quality age data from the 1974 Census.

Table 3.13 Age dependency ratio, 1974-2015

| Census year | Age dependency ratio |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Overall | Child | Older <br> persons | Contribution <br> of children |
| 1974 | 78.1 | 75.3 | 2.8 | 96.4 |
| 1985 | 89.4 | 78.5 | 10.9 | 87.8 |
| 2004 | 85.4 | 77.3 | 8.1 | 90.6 |
| 2015 | 79.5 | 73.3 | 6.2 | 92.2 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census Statistics Sierra Leone, Annual Statistical Digest 2005/06

The dependency ratios for the regions and districts for the 1985 and 2005 censuses are presented in Table 3.14. In 2015, the dependency ratio was highest in Northern Region ( 90.4 per cent) and lowest for the Western Region ( 57.9 per cent). The dependency ratios for the Southern Region (85.9) and the Eastern Region (80.8) are closer to that for the Northern Region. Among the districts, the dependency ratio was highest for Kambia district ( 95.3 per cent) and lowest for the districts of the Western Region. Western Area Urban district had a dependency ratio of 54.6 per cent while that of the Western Area Rural district was 66.4 per cent.


| Region/ <br> district | Total | Child | Old age | Total | Child | Old age |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All ages | 89.4 | 78.5 | 10.9 | 79.5 | 73.3 | 6.2 |
| Eastern | $* * *$ | $* * *$ | $* * *$ | 80.8 | 74.6 | 6.2 |
| Kailahun | 94.5 | 80.4 | 14.1 | 82.2 | 75.9 | 6.3 |
| Kenema | 82.6 | 71.8 | 10.8 | 77.8 | 71.6 | 6.2 |
| Kono | 77.4 | 71.2 | 6.2 | 82.9 | 76.9 | 6.0 |

Table 3.14 Dependency ratio by region, district and age (continued)

| Region/ district | 1985 |  |  | 2015 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Child | Old age | Total | Child | Old age |
| Northern | *** | *** | *** | 90.4 | 83.4 | 7.0 |
| Bombali | 105.3 | 93.4 | 11.9 | 86.3 | 78.6 | 7.7 |
| Kambia | 103.8 | 91.5 | 12.3 | 95.3 | 87.2 | 8.1 |
| Koinadugu | 89.6 | 80.9 | 8.7 | 91.3 | 86.2 | 5.1 |
| Port Loko | 99.7 | 87.5 | 12.2 | 89.7 | 82.0 | 7.7 |
| Tonkolili | 93.8 | 82.5 | 11.3 | 92.4 | 86.2 | 6.2 |
| Southern | *** | *** | *** | 85.9 | 78.4 | 7.5 |
| Bo | 87.3 | 73.4 | 13.9 | 81.5 | 74.3 | 7.3 |
| Bonthe | 90.1 | 74.6 | 15.5 | 87.8 | 80.2 | 7.5 |
| Moyamba | 92.7 | 77.0 | 15.7 | 92.4 | 82.7 | 9.7 |
| Pujehun | 89.4 | 73.2 | 16.2 | 86.6 | 80.6 | 6.0 |
| Western | 77.9 | 72.2 | 5.7 | 57.9 | 53.7 | 4.2 |
| Western Area Rural | *** | *** | *** | 66.4 | 62.0 | 4.4 |
| Western Area Urban | *** | *** | *** | 54.6 | 50.4 | 4.2 |

*** Data not available
Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census National Statistics Office (Sierra Leone), 1985 Population Census - Analytical Report

### 3.6.6 Sex composition

Sex composition refers to the distribution of the population by sex and is undoubtedly one of the most important demographic characteristics. It directly affects the incidence of birth, marriage and is highly correlated with death rates. It is also used as a basis for disaggregation for almost every aspect of social studies.

Variations in area-specific sex ratios are the result of a combination of factors, including area differences in levels of fertility and mortality, and sex-selective migration arising out of regional variations in socio-economic conditions.

There are several measures that can be used for doing inter-area or intergroup comparisons, or comparisons over time of the sex composition of the population. These include the masculinity proportion (the percentage of males in the population), or the ratio of the excess or deficit of males to the total population, or the sex ratio (the ratio of males to females in a population). The sex ratio is the most commonly used measure of the sex composition. It is a more sensitive indicator of differences in sex composition because it has a relatively smaller denominator (the population of females).

## Sex ratios for rural and urban areas

The 2015 Census enumerated 2,905,097 persons in urban areas and 4,187,016 persons in rural areas. The sex composition of the population differs slightly between rural and urban areas. The urban areas had a sex ratio of 98.1 males per 100 females, while the rural population had a sex ratio of 96.1 males per 100 females (Table 3.15). Both the rural and urban populations had sex ratios lower than those before the war.


Table 3.15 Population and sex ratio by place of residence

| Place of <br> residence | Total | Male | Female | Sex ratio | Masculinity <br> proportion | Deficit of males <br> (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All places of <br> residence | $7,092,113$ | $3,490,978$ | $3,601,135$ | 96.9 | 49.2 | -1.6 |
| Rural | $4,187,016$ | $2,052,342$ | $2,134,674$ | 96.1 | 49.0 | -2.0 |
| Urban | $2,905,097$ | $1,438,636$ | $1,466,461$ | 98.1 | 49.5 | -1.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

## Sex ratio for the regions and districts

Table 3.16 gives the sex ratio by region and district for all five censuses. The sex ratio of the population in the Western Region in 2015 was highest at 99.9 males per 100 females - while the other three regions were between 95 and 98 per cent.

The sex composition of the districts in the Western Region was also different from the rest of the country. In 2015, the districts of the Western Region had high sex ratios (100.1 for West Area Urban and 99.3 for West Area Rural), while the rest of the districts had sex ratios ranging between 92 and 98 males per 100 females.

Between 2004 and 2015, the sex ratio for the country increased by 2.7 percentage points. The Eastern Region had a 2.2 percentage point drop in its sex ratio while the other three regions had their sex ratios increasing, with the Northern Region having the largest increase of 6.2 percentage points.

Between 2004 and 2015, Kono, Kenema and Bo districts experienced a drop in the sex ratios. All the other districts had an increase in sex ratios, with the largest increase being observed in the two Northern region districts of Koinadugu (11.5 percentage points) and Tonkolili District (10.5 percentage points).
$\left.\begin{array}{lcccccccc}\text { Region/district } & & & & & & & \\ \text { Change in sex ratio } \\ \text { (percentage points) }\end{array}\right)$

Data not available
Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census Statistics Sierra Leone, 2004 Population and Housing Census Report

### 3.7 Nationality

The 2015 Census collected information on the nationality of both household and non-household population. It found that 7,052,112 (99.4 percent) were Sierra Leoneans while 40,001 (0.6 percent) were non-Sierra Leoneans.

Table 3.17 shows that 58.4 per cent of the non-Sierra Leonean population were male, while 41.6 per cent were female. The table further shows that more than half ( 51.4 per cent) of the non-Sierra Leonean population were of the working ages of 25-64 years, with children below 15 years making up only 24.1 per cent of the population.

The non-Sierra Leoneans were mainly enumerated in urban areas ( 72.4 per cent). Among the regions, most of the non-Sierra Leoneans were enumerated in the Western Region (44.5 per cent), followed by the Eastern Region ( 22.7 per cent). The rest were enumerated in the Southern Region (13.3 per cent) and the Northern Region (14.2 per cent).

Table 3.17 Number and percentage distribution of non-Sierra Leonean population by selected characteristics

| Characteristics | Number | Percentage distribution |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total country | 40,001 | 100.0 |
| Sex |  |  |
| Male | 23,354 | 58.4 |
| Female | 16,647 | 41.6 |
| Residence |  |  |
| Rural | 8,931 | 22.3 |
| Urban | 28,972 | 72.4 |
| Region |  |  |
| Eastern | 9,086 | 22.7 |
| Northern | 5,673 | 14.2 |
| Southern | 5,328 | 13.3 |
| Western | 17,816 | 44.5 |
| Age |  |  |
| 0-14 | 9,636 | 24.1 |
| 15-24 | 8,160 | 20.4 |
| 25-64 | 20,551 | 51.4 |
| 65+ | 1,654 | 4.1 |
| Nationality |  |  |
| African | 36,244 | 90.6 |
| Non-African | 3,757 | 9.4 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census


Table 3.18 shows that most of the non-Sierra Leoneans ( 90.6 per cent) were from Africa and only 9.4 per cent were from outside Africa. The share of Africans was higher for females (93.8 per cent) than males ( 88.4 per cent). Regarding the individual countries, more than two-thirds of the non-Sierra Leoneans were from the neighbouring countries of Guinea Republic ( 56.3 per cent) and Liberia ( 8.6 per cent). India with 2.4 per cent and Lebanon with 2.2 per cent of the non-Sierra Leoneans had the biggest share among the non-African countries.

The non-Sierra Leonean population was highly male dominated with a sex ratio of 140.3 males per 100 females. The sex ratio was higher among the non-Africans ( 261.9 males per 100 females), nearly twice as high as that for the Africans (132.2 males per 100 females).

## E— Table 3.18 Distribution of non-Sierra Leonean population by nationality and sex

| Nationality | Percentage distribution |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Sex ratio |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 140.3 |
| African | 90.6 | 88.4 | 93.8 | 132.2 |
| Guinea Republic | 56.3 | 53.5 | 60.3 | 124.7 |
| Liberia | 8.6 | 7.1 | 10.7 | 92.8 |
| Nigeria | 8.0 | 9.3 | 6.2 | 210.2 |
| Mali | 4.0 | 3.6 | 4.5 | 112.0 |
| Ghana | 3.7 | 4.5 | 2.7 | 234.7 |
| Gambia | 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 158.9 |
| Guinea Bissau | 1.7 | 1.6 | 1.9 | 117.0 |
| Senegal | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.2 | 203.1 |
| Togo | 1.1 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 106.3 |
| Cote d'Ivoire | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 139.0 |
| Benin | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 279.5 |
| Cape Verde | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 105.3 |
| Niger | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 184.0 |
| Kenya | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 133.3 |
| Burkina Faso | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 108.7 |
| Zambia | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 141.7 |
| Other African countries | 1.1 | 1.4 | 0.8 | 232.8 |
| Non-African | 9.4 | 11.6 | 6.2 | 261.9 |
| United Kingdom | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 142.0 |
| Other European countries | 1.1 | 1.3 | 0.9 | 209.1 |
| United States of America | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 129.4 |
| India | 2.4 | 3.6 | 0.6 | 832.7 |
| Lebanon | 2.2 | 2.5 | 1.9 | 189.4 |
| Pakistan | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 179.5 |
| Other | 2.0 | 2.5 | 1.2 | 292.1 |



[^1]
### 3.8 Place of Birth

The 2015 Census collected information on the place of birth for both household and institutional population. For persons born in Sierra Leone, the chiefdom of birth was recorded. For those born outside the country, the country of birth was recorded. For the purposes of this report, the analysis was done for the household population only.

Table 3.19 shows that most of the household population of Sierra Leone were born in the country. Only 0.8 per cent of the household population were born elsewhere in Africa and 0.1 per cent were born outside Africa. However, the situation in the Western Region was slightly different from the other regions. The household population born from elsewhere in Africa constituted 1.7 per cent of its population, which is more than twice as high as the national average.

Eight out of ten people were enumerated in the same district of their birth. The same pattern was observed for the regions, the only exception being the Western Region which had less than half ( 45.5 per cent) of its enumerated household population having been born in the same district. The share of enumerated population that were born in other regions was much lower in the Northern Region compared to the other regions, while the percentage of those enumerated in the same district as they were born (92.4) was higher than the other regions. This suggests less internal migration to the Northern Region.

Table 3.19 Distribution of the household population by region, place of birth and place of enumeration

|  |  |  | Place of enumeration |  | Southern | Western |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Place of birth | Total country | Eastern | Northern | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |
| All places of birth | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 86.7 | 45.5 |  |
| Same as district <br> of enumeration | 80.1 | 87.2 | 92.4 | 5.8 | 4.7 |  |
| Elsewhere in the <br> region | 4.5 | 3.6 | 4.3 | 7.0 | 47.8 |  |
| Another region | 14.5 | 8.4 | 3.1 | 0.5 | 1.7 |  |
| Elsewhere in <br> Africa | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.2 |  |
| Outside Africa | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 3.9 Ethnicity

There are no universally accepted race and ethnic concepts or identities. Each nation develops and implements definitions and terms that address its own statistical and administrative needs. Many countries in the world collect vital statistics according to ethnic categories, but most countries do not compile data according to race. The 2015 Census collected information on ethnicity from the household population. The Sierra Leonean population were classified according to the 15 local ethnic groups while the non-Sierra Leoneans were classified according to their country of birth. The analysis of ethnicity was limited to the persons who belong to the local ethnic groups.

Table 3.20 shows that there were two dominant ethnic groups, each with a population of more than two million persons. The largest ethnic group was the Mende who are mainly found in the Southern and Eastern regions, followed by the Temne who are mainly found in the Northern Region. The two ethnic groups collectively constituted 63.8 per cent of the household population of the ethnic groups. The third largest group was the Limba, with 8.4 per cent of the household population, who are mainly found in the Northern Region. The four smallest ethnic groups were Vai, Krim, Yalunka and Krio, each with a population of less than 100,000 persons, and collectively constituted 2.3 per cent of the indigenous population.

Table 3.20 Classification of ethnic groups by population size

| Population size | Ethnic group | Number | Population | Percent of population |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All sizes |  | 15 | $7,016,957$ | 100.0 |
| $1,000,000$ or more | Mende, Temne | 2 | $4,478,443$ | 63.8 |
| $400,000-999,999$ | Limba | 1 | 592,190 | 8.4 |
| $300,000-399,999$ | Kono, Koranko | 2 | 676,435 | 9.6 |
| $200,000-299,999$ | Fullah, Susu | 2 | 470,360 | 6.7 |
| $100,000-199,999$ | Kisi, Loko, <br> Madingo, Sherbo | 4 | 636,221 | 9.1 |
| Less than 99,999 | Krio, Yalunka, <br> Krim, Vai | 4 | 163,308 | 2.3 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

The distribution and sex composition of the population of the ethnic groups is quite varied, as shown in Table 3.21. The overall sex ratio for the population of a given ethnic group is expected to fall within a limited range of 95 to 102 males per 100 females. However, the sex ratios of the population of the different ethnic groups vary widely from 84 for the Vai and 111 males per 100 females for the Fullah. Six out of the 15 ethnic groups had sex ratios higher than 100. From the table, it is noted that there is no relationship between population size of the ethnic group and its sex ratio.


|  |  |  |  | Percentage distribution |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ethnic group | Population | Sex ratio | Total | Male | Female |
| All ethnic groups | $7,016,957$ | 96.5 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Mende | $2,258,232$ | 94.3 | 32.2 | 31.8 | 32.6 |
| Temne | $2,220,211$ | 96.2 | 31.6 | 31.6 | 31.7 |
| Limba | 592,190 | 95.2 | 8.4 | 8.4 | 8.5 |
| Kono | 363,051 | 95.5 | 5.2 | 5.1 | 5.2 |
| Koranko | 313,384 | 100.3 | 4.5 | 4.6 | 4.4 |
| Fullah | 266,581 | 110.6 | 3.8 | 4.1 | 3.5 |
| Susu | 203,779 | 97.4 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.9 |
| Kissi | 175,843 | 100.8 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.5 |
| Loko | 165,692 | 94.2 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 2.4 |
| Madingo | 160,080 | 102.0 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.2 |
| Sherbro | 134,606 | 97.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 |
| Krio | 94,593 | 103.5 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.3 |
| Yalunka | 51,781 | 102.8 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.7 |
| Krim | 15,729 | 94.5 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Vai | 1,205 | 84.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 3.10 Language

Language is essentially a means of communication among members of a society. Sierra Leone is a multi-lingual country with English as the official language. The 2015 Census collected information on the main language and secondary language spoken by members of the household population. These included 15 local languages and three international languages. The census did not ask for the total number of languages spoken by an individual.

The most commonly spoken language nationally was Mende, spoken as the main language by 29.2 per cent (Table 3.22). This is followed by Temne ( 26.6 per cent) and Krio (18.2 per cent). The three dominant languages collectively were spoken as the main language by 74.5 per cent of the population. Thus, the remaining 15 local languages and international languages were spoken by about one quarter of the population.

The local language spoken reflects the ethnic composition of the area, except for the Krio language. Although only 1.3 per cent of the population were of Krio ethnic origin, Krio language was reported as the main language by 18.4 per cent of the household population.

| Main language | Population | Percentage of the population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All languages | 6,954,702 | 100.0 |
| Local language |  |  |
| Mende | 2,065,349 | 29.7 |
| Temne | 1,851,300 | 26.6 |
| Krio | 1,265,295 | 18.2 |
| Limba | 380,060 | 5.5 |
| Kono | 306,824 | 4.4 |
| Koranko | 277,356 | 4.0 |
| Fullah | 173,003 | 2.5 |
| Susu | 155,175 | 2.2 |
| Kissi | 154,341 | 2.2 |
| Loko | 91,668 | 1.3 |
| Madingo | 88,650 | 1.3 |
| Sherbro | 81,304 | 1.2 |
| Yalunka | 44,935 | 0.6 |
| Krim | 1,669 | 0.0 |
| Vai | 1,043 | 0.0 |
| Foreign language | 11,231 | 0.2 |
| Other | 5,499 | 0.1 |



Table 3.23 shows that the Mende language was most commonly spoken as the main language in the Southern and Eastern regions, while Temne was the most commonly spoken language in the Northern Region and Krio was most dominant in the Western Region. The districts are smaller in size and generally presumed to be more homogeneous, with most of the household population speaking one of the three most common languages. The table shows that Pujehun was the most homogeneous with 93.8 per cent of the household population reporting Mende as the main language. This is followed by Port Loko ( 81.7 per cent) and Tonkolili ( 80.3 per cent) reporting Temne as the main language, while Bonthe ( 80.4 per cent) and Kenema ( 80.2 per cent) reported Mende as the main language.

Western Area Rural district had the smallest share of its population speaking one main language (Krio language) which was reported by only 38.4 per cent of the population as the main language. This was followed by Bombali district whose most dominant language was Temne (42.8 per cent) and Koinadugu district which reported 49.3 per cent speaking Koranko as the main language. The rest of the districts had more than 50 per cent of the household population reporting one language as the same main language.

Table 3.23 Distribution of the household population
by region, district and most common main language

|  | Percentage distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region/district | Most spoken language | \% | Second most spoken language | \% | Third most spoken language | \% | Others | Total |
| Total country | Mende | 29.2 | Temne | 26.2 | Krio | 17.9 | 26.8 | 100.0 |
| Eastern | Mende | 53.0 | Kono | 17.6 | Kissi | 9.1 | 20.3 | 100.0 |
| Kailahun | Mende | 69.8 | Kissi | 22.0 | Krio | 3.0 | 5.2 | 100.0 |
| Kenema | Mende | 80.2 | Krio | 7.2 | Temne | 3.9 | 8.7 | 100.0 |
| Kono | Kono | 56.0 | Krio | 11.1 | Temne | 7.4 | 25.6 | 100.0 |
| Northern | Temne | 55.3 | Limba | 11.4 | Koranko | 9.5 | 23.8 | 100.0 |
| Bombali | Temne | 42.8 | Limba | 20.0 | Krio | 11.8 | 25.4 | 100.0 |
| Kambia | Temne | 53.7 | Susu | 20.6 | Limba | 15.7 | 10.0 | 100.0 |
| Koinadugu | Koranko | 49.3 | Limba | 14.2 | Fullah | 11.2 | 25.2 | 100.0 |
| Port Loko | Temne | 81.7 | Krio | 6.2 | Susu | 3.7 | 8.3 | 100.0 |
| Tonkolili | Temne | 80.3 | Limba | 6.9 | Koranko | 6.4 | 6.3 | 100.0 |
| Southern | Mende | 76.4 | Temne | 6.9 | Krio | 6.0 | 10.2 | 100.0 |
| Bo | Mende | 76.5 | Krio | 10.7 | Temne | 5.0 | 7.8 | 100.0 |
| Bonthe | Mende | 80.4 | Sherbro | 12.0 | Krio | 2.8 | 4.7 | 100.0 |
| Moyamba | Mende | 54.8 | Temne | 20.7 | Sherbro | 12.5 | 12.0 | 100.0 |
| Pujehun | Mende | 93.8 | Krio | 2.2 | Time | 0.6 | 3.4 | 100.0 |
| Western | Krio | 59.9 | Temne | 20.3 | Mende | 5.3 | 14.5 | 100.0 |
| Western Area Rural | Krio | 38.4 | Temne | 34.6 | Mende | 7.1 | 19.8 | 100.0 |
| Western Area Urban | Krio | 69.0 | Temne | 14.2 | Mende | 4.6 | 12.2 | 100.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

The findings in Table 3.24 show that 65 per cent of the population speak at least two local languages while 27.7 per cent speak only one local language. Only 0.1 per cent of the population speak only an international language. This is mainly due to the very small proportion ( 0.6 per cent) of the population who are non-Sierra Leoneans. There was a small proportion ( 5.4 per cent) who spoke a mixture of local and foreign languages.

The Western Region had 18.1 per cent of the population speak a mixture of both local and foreign languages, compared to less than 4 per cent for the other districts or regions. The pattern by districts is fairly similar to the country as a whole, except for Bonthe and Pejehun districts which have higher proportions of persons who speak only one local language (45.6 and 46.4 per cent respectively).

Table 3.24 Distribution of the household population by region, district and number of languages spoken

|  | Percentage distribution |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region/district | One local language | Two local languages | International languages | Mixed languages | Others | Total |
| Total country | 27.7 | 65.0 | 0.1 | 5.4 | 1.7 | 100.0 |
| Eastern | 25.0 | 71.4 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 1.2 | 100.0 |
| Kailahun | 33.6 | 62.8 | 0.1 | 2.3 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| Kenema | 27.1 | 69.3 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 1.0 | 100.0 |
| Kono | 13.5 | 82.8 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| Northern | 29.2 | 67.1 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 2.3 | 100.0 |
| Bombali | 21.3 | 74.2 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 100.0 |
| Kambia | 34.3 | 61.6 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 3.2 | 100.0 |
| Koinadugu | 24.3 | 73.8 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 1.2 | 100.0 |
| Port Loko | 32.7 | 62.6 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 3.3 | 100.0 |
| Tonkolili | 34.5 | 62.7 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| Southern | 34.9 | 60.5 | 0.1 | 2.5 | 2.1 | 100.0 |
| Bo | 28.4 | 66.8 | 0.1 | 3.1 | 1.6 | 100.0 |
| Bonthe | 45.6 | 49.9 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 1.7 | 100.0 |
| Moyamba | 27.1 | 67.9 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 3.8 | 100.0 |
| Pujehun | 46.4 | 49.3 | 0.1 | 2.7 | 1.5 | 100.0 |
| Western | 21.5 | 59.0 | 0.3 | 18.1 | 1.1 | 100.0 |
| Western Area Rural | 18.1 | 67.0 | 0.2 | 13.1 | 1.6 | 100.0 |
| Western Area Urban | 23.0 | 55.6 | 0.3 | 20.3 | 0.9 | 100.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 3.11 Religious affiliation

Religion can be defined as a belief in, and reverence for, supernatural powers. It is a system of thought, feeling and action that is shared by a group and that gives the members an object of devotion and a code of behaviour by which individuals may judge the personal and social consequences of their actions. It is a frame of reference by which individuals relate to their group and the universe.

The 2015 Census collected information on the religious affiliation of all household populations. Table 3.25 shows that Islam was the most dominant faith ( 77 per cent) of the Sierra Leonean household population. Those of the Christian faith combined were 21.9 per cent of the household population. A small proportion ( 0.3 per cent) reported having 'no religion'. There were no differences in the distribution of the population of the religious groups by sex.

|  | Percentage distribution |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Religious affiliation | Total | Male | Female | Sex ratio | Percentage aged <br> less than 15 years |
| Total country | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 96.8 | 40.9 |
| Catholic | 7.0 | 7.1 | 7.0 | 98.2 | 38.8 |
| Anglican | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 91.0 | 36.9 |
| Methodist | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 95.0 | 37.3 |
| SDA | 8.0 | 9.3 | 6.2 | 210.2 | 41.2 |
| 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 96.6 | 41.2 | 37.6 |
| Pentecostal | 5.3 | 5.0 | 5.6 | 86.5 | 37.6 |
| Other Christian | 4.7 | 4.5 | 4.8 | 89.1 | 39.6 |
| Islam | 77.0 | 77.5 | 76.6 | 98.0 | 41.4 |
| Bahai | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 98.1 | 36.7 |
| Traditional | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 106.5 | 30.5 |
| Other | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 94.9 | 40.7 |
| No Religion | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 106.8 | 87.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Figure 3.4 shows that the age distribution of the population of the major religious groups is quite similar. Forty one per cent of Muslims were children aged less than 15 years. The corresponding figures for Christians and those of other religious groups were slightly lower at 38.4 and 39.8 per cent respectively. The major deviation is for the persons with 'no religion', 87 per cent of whom are children aged below 15 years. This could be because they are still young and are yet to choose which religious group they wish to belong to.


Figure 3.4 Distribution of the household population by age and religious affiliation


Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 3.12 Summary, conclusion and recommendations

### 3.12.1 Summary

The 2015 Census enumerated a total of 7.1 million persons, of whom 3.5 million were males and 3.6 million were females.

The distribution of the population among regions did not change much between 1963 and 2004, with the Northern Region having the biggest share of the population and the Western Region having the smallest share. In 2015, however, there was a slight change with the Western Region having a marginally bigger share than the Southern Region. This shift could be partially attributed to high urbanization, especially in Freetown city.

The distribution of the population by district has also been changing. The distribution of the population among districts is not as even as it is with the regions and more uneven among the chiefdoms. In 2015, the share of the district population ranged between 2.8 per cent for Bonthe district and 14.9 per cent for Western Area Urban district.

The population of Sierra Leone has been growing since the first modern census in 1963. Between 2004 and 2015, the population increased by about 2 million persons, giving a growth rate of 3.2 per cent per annum. If this rate is maintained, the population will double in less than 22 years. The growth rate between 2004 and 2015 was much higher than the 1.8 per cent observed between 1985 and 2004.

Between 2004 and 2015, all districts experienced an increase in their respective population. The rate of increase in the district population varied widely between districts from as low as 1.8 per cent for Moyamba district to as high as 8.5 per cent for Western Area Rural district. The population density of Sierra Leone in 2015 was 97.2 persons per square kilometre.

The population density of Sierra Leone was much higher than those for the neighbouring countries of Liberia and Guinea, as well as for Africa. The population density was not uniform across the country. Koinadugu district was sparsely populated with a population density of only 33 persons per square kilometer, while Western Area Urban district, which had the least share of the land area and the biggest share of the population, had a population density of 12,878 persons per square kilometre.

Prior to the civil of 1991 to 2002, the population of Sierra Leone was almost numerically balanced between the sexes, with the sex ratios close to 100. The 2004 Census, which was conducted after the Civil War, gave a lower sex ratio of 94.2 males per 100 females. The 2015 Census gave a higher sex ratio of 96.9 males per 100 females, but still lower than those of the pre-war era.
The age composition shows that the population is quite young with 40.8 per cent of the population being aged below 15 years and only 3.5 per cent aged 65 years and above. The working-age population (15-64 years) constituted 55.7 per cent. The median age of the population was 18.7 years, a decrease from 19.4 years in 1985. The age distribution of Sierra Leone was quite like the age distribution for Africa as whole in 2015.

Between 2004 and 2015, the share of the working age population increased from 53.9 to 55.7 per cent. Most of this increase was among the population aged $15-24$ years. The increase in the proportion of the population in the working age group resulted in a decrease in the dependency ratio from 89.4 per cent in 1985 to 79.5 per cent in 2015. The age structure of the Western Region was quite different from the rest of the country. The region had its population concentrated in the working ages, leading to its median age being higher than the other three regions.

Most of the population of were of Sierra Leonean origin, with only 40,001 out of the 7.1 enumerated population ( 0.6 per cent) being non-Sierra Leoneans. The majority (72.9 per cent) of the non-Sierra Leoneans were from neighbouring countries of Guinea Republic, Liberia and Nigeria.

Sierra Leone has 15 local ethnic groups, but nearly three-quarters of the population belonged to the three dominant ethnic groups namely Mende, Temne and Limba, and the most dominant main languages were Mende, Temne and Krio. The Mende language was the most commonly spoken main language in Southern and Eastern regions, while Temne was most commonly spoken in the Northern Region and Krio was most dominant in the Western Region. More than three-quarters of the population were of the Islamic faith.

### 3.12.2 Conclusion

The population of Sierra Leone has continued to grow, with the rate of growth varying between districts. The rapid growth of the Western Region has led to a shift in the fifty-year old pattern of distribution of the population, with the Southern Region becoming the least populous region.

The age distribution of Sierra Leonean population is becoming younger, arising out of an increased share of the working age population, especially adolescents (15-24 years). This has led to a reduction in the overall and child dependency burden. This provides potential for the country to reap the benefits of the demographic dividend.

The population of Sierra Leone is homogeneous in terms of nationality, ethnicity, languages spoken and religion. This eases the process of implementing changes for socio-economic development.

### 3.12.3 Recommendations

The population of Sierra Leone is growing at a very fast rate. If the growth rate continues unchecked, the population will double in the next 22 years. This would put a heavy burden on service delivery. Appropriate fertility reduction measures should be put in place to manage the population growth.
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## APPENDIX



Table A3.1 Total population by region, district and sex, 1963-2015

|  | Percentage distribution |  |  |  | 2015 Census |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region/district | 1963 | 1974 | 1985 | 2004 | Total | Male | Female |
| Sierra Leone | 2,180,355 | 2,735,159 | 3,515,812 | 4,976,871 | 7,092,113 | 3,490,978 | 3,601,135 |
| Eastern | 545,579 | 775,931 | 960,551 | 1,191,539 | 1,642,370 | 814,441 | 827,929 |
| Kailahun | 150,236 | 180,365 | 233,839 | 358,190 | 526,379 | 260,586 | 265,793 |
| Kenema | 227,428 | 266,636 | 337,055 | 497,948 | 609,891 | 301,104 | 308,787 |
| Kono | 167,915 | 328,930 | 389,657 | 335,401 | 506,100 | 252,751 | 253,349 |
| Northern | 897,566 | 1,046,158 | 1,259,641 | 1,745,553 | 2,508,201 | 1,224,828 | 1,283,373 |
| Bombali | 198,776 | 233,626 | 317,729 | 408,390 | 606,544 | 296,683 | 309,861 |
| Kambia | 137,806 | 155,341 | 186,231 | 270,462 | 345,474 | 165,541 | 179,933 |
| Koinadugu | 129,061 | 158,626 | 183,286 | 265,758 | 409,372 | 204,498 | 204,874 |
| Port Loko | 247,463 | 292,244 | 329,344 | 453,746 | 615,376 | 294,954 | 320,422 |
| Tonkolili | 184,460 | 206,321 | 243,051 | 347,197 | 531,435 | 263,152 | 268,283 |
| Southern | 542,187 | 596,758 | 741,377 | 1,092,657 | 1,441,308 | 702,151 | 739,157 |
| Bo | 209,754 | 217,711 | 268,671 | 463,668 | 575,478 | 280,569 | 294,909 |
| Bonthe | 80,139 | 87,561 | 105,107 | 139,687 | 200,781 | 99,014 | 101,767 |
| Moyamba | 167,425 | 188,745 | 250,514 | 260,910 | 318,588 | 153,699 | 164,889 |
| Pujehun | 84,869 | 102,741 | 117,185 | 228,392 | 346,461 | 168,869 | 177,592 |
| Western | 195,023 | 316,312 | 554,243 | 947,122 | 1,500,234 | 749,558 | 750,676 |
| Western Area Rural | 67,106 | 40,065 | 84,467 | 174,249 | 444,270 | 221,351 | 222,919 |
| Western Area Urban | 127,917 | 276,247 | 469,776 | 772,873 | 1,055,964 | 528,207 | 527,757 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Table A3.2 Total population by age group and sex, Sierra Leone 1985-2015

| Age group | $1974$ |  |  | 1985 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| All age groups | 4,963,000 | 1,359,000 | 1,376,000 | 3,491,913 | 1,724,908 | 3,601,135 |
| 0-4 | 440,000 | 217,000 | 223,000 | 574,756 | 289,402 | 285,354 |
| 5-9 | 418,000 | 210,000 | 208,000 | 528,725 | 266,126 | 262,599 |
| 10-14 | 252,000 | 135,000 | 117,000 | 344,065 | 182,381 | 161,684 |
| 15-19 | 238,000 | 110,000 | 129,000 | 341,742 | 160,005 | 181,737 |
| 20-24 | 204,000 | 93,000 | 111,000 | 271,890 | 121,648 | 150,242 |
| 25-29 | 233,000 | 108,000 | 125,000 | 281,649 | 125,241 | 156,408 |
| 30-34 | 185,000 | 87,000 | 98,000 | 219,607 | 99,682 | 119,925 |
| 35-39 | 166,000 | 83,000 | 83,000 | 197,844 | 97,345 | 100,499 |
| 40-44 | 129,000 | 66,000 | 63,000 | 146,662 | 72,488 | 74,174 |
| 45-49 | 108,000 | 59,000 | 50,000 | 128,636 | 69,636 | 59,000 |
| 50-54 | 87,000 | 47,000 | 40,000 | 103,525 | 53,820 | 49,705 |
| 55-59 | 58,000 | 32,000 | 26,000 | 73,923 | 40,485 | 33,438 |
| 60-64 | 66,000 | 35,000 | 32,000 | 77,824 | 39,791 | 38,033 |
| 65+ | 146,000 | 76,000 | 70,000 |  |  |  |
| 65-69 | *** | *** | *** | 55,952 | 29,445 | 26,507 |
| 70-74 | *** | *** | *** | 45,199 | 24,604 | 20,595 |
| 75-79 | *** | *** | *** | 33,393 | 8,491 | 14,902 |
| 80-84 | *** | *** | *** | 25,696 | 13,104 | 2,592 |
| 85-89 | *** | *** | *** | 18,141 | 9,634 | 8,507 |
| 90+ | *** | *** | *** | 22,684 | 11,580 | 11,104 |

not available
Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census, Annual Statistical Digest 2005/2006, The 1985 Census Analytical Report

E(T) Table A3.2 Total population by age group and sex,
Sierra Leone 1985-2015 (continued)

|  | 2004 |  |  | $2015$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| All age groups | 4,963,000 | 2,410,000 | 2,553,000 | 7,092,113 | 3,490,978 | 3,601,135 |
| 0-4 | 758,000 | 377,000 | 381,000 | 938,453 | 469,092 | 469,361 |
| 5-9 | 743,000 | 369,000 | 374,000 | 1,108,715 | 555,292 | 553,423 |
| 10-14 | 569,000 | 293,000 | 276,000 | 847,292 | 431,588 | 415,704 |
| 15-19 | 540,000 | 263,000 | 277,000 | 873,620 | 430,792 | 442,828 |
| 20-24 | 417,000 | 190,000 | 227,000 | 662,819 | 308,135 | 354,684 |
| 25-29 | 408,000 | 183,000 | 225,000 | 607,983 | 277,618 | 330,365 |
| 30-34 | 315,000 | 142,000 | 173,000 | 434,203 | 199,964 | 234,239 |
| 35-39 | 302,000 | 140,000 | 162,000 | 421,172 | 201,459 | 219,713 |
| 40-44 | 215,000 | 106,000 | 109,000 | 299,215 | 154,121 | 145,094 |
| 45-49 | 178,000 | 95,000 | 83,000 | 242,188 | 133,783 | 108,405 |
| 50-54 | 129,000 | 65,000 | 64,000 | 186,793 | 99,050 | 87,743 |
| 55-59 | 85,000 | 44,000 | 41,000 | 110,449 | 59,261 | 51,188 |
| 60-64 | 88,000 | 39,000 | 49,000 | 112,682 | 53,987 | 58,695 |
| 65+ | 216,000 | 104,000 | 112,000 |  |  |  |
| 65-69 | *** | *** | *** | 73,722 | 36,414 | 37,308 |
| 70-74 | *** | *** | *** | 65,568 | 30,606 | 34,962 |
| 75-79 | *** | *** | *** | 39,728 | 20,044 | 19,684 |
| 80-84 | *** | *** | *** | 31,359 | 13,177 | 18,182 |
| 85-89 | *** | *** | *** | 15,888 | 7,258 | 8,630 |
| 90+ | *** | *** | *** | 20,264 | 9,337 | 10,927 |

*** Data not available
Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census, Annual Statistical Digest 2005/2006, The 1985 Census Analytical Report

Table A3.3 Selected characteristics of the population of chiefdoms, Sierra Leone 2004-2015

| District/ chiefdom | 2004 <br> Population | $2015$ <br> Population | Sex <br> ratio | Share of the district population | Percentage change | Annual growth rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sierra Leone | 4,976,871 | 7,092,113 | 96.8 |  | 42.5 | 3.2 |
| Kailahun |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dea | 9,876 | 13,414 | 98.4 | 2.5 | 35.8 | 2.8 |
| Jawie | 42,639 | 50,951 | 95.8 | 9.7 | 19.5 | 1.6 |
| Kissi Kama | 12,972 | 20,421 | 99.8 | 3.9 | 57.4 | 4.1 |
| Kissi Teng | 30,455 | 45,149 | 103.3 | 8.6 | 48.2 | 3.6 |
| Kissi Tongi | 33,457 | 50,950 | 102.6 | 9.7 | 52.3 | 3.8 |
| Kpeje Bongre | 12,700 | 25,169 | 91.5 | 4.8 | 98.2 | 6.2 |
| Kpeje West | 13,010 | 27,544 | 105.4 | 5.2 | 111.7 | 6.8 |
| Luawa | 65,500 | 81,044 | 91.0 | 15.4 | 23.7 | 1.9 |
| Malema | 23,298 | 37,095 | 104.8 | 7.0 | 59.2 | 4.2 |
| Mandu | 19,708 | 30,984 | 91.3 | 5.9 | 57.2 | 4.1 |
| Njaluahun | 37,484 | 61,216 | 102.3 | 11.6 | 63.3 | 4.5 |
| Penguia | 12,518 | 26,272 | 100.9 | 5.0 | 109.9 | 6.7 |
| Upper Bambara | 28,438 | 26,848 | 91.0 | 5.1 | -5.6 | -0.5 |
| Yawei | 16,135 | 29,322 | 96.7 | 5.6 | 81.7 | 5.4 |
| Kenema |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dama | 26,157 | 30,751 | 91.8 | 5.0 | 17.6 | 1.5 |
| Dodo | 14,194 | 22,858 | 105.6 | 3.7 | 61.0 | 4.3 |
| Gaura | 17,361 | 18,217 | 91.6 | 3.0 | 4.9 | 0.4 |
| Gorama Mende | 32,539 | 43,359 | 99.4 | 7.1 | 33.3 | 2.6 |
| Kandu <br> Lekpeama | 21,743 | 18,229 | 103.6 | 3.0 | -16.2 | -1.6 |
| Koya | 10,184 | 13,482 | 99.7 | 2.2 | 32.4 | 2.6 |
| Langrama | 4,356 | 3,584 | 87.5 | 0.6 | -17.7 | -1.8 |
| Lower <br> Bambara | 78,389 | 76,281 | 105.7 | 12.5 | -2.7 | -0.2 |
| Malegohun | 12,224 | 20,544 | 98.5 | 3.4 | 68.1 | 4.7 |
| Niawa | 8,496 | 7,815 | 88.1 | 1.3 | -8.0 | -0.8 |
| Nomo | 4,105 | 5,491 | 107.0 | 0.9 | 33.8 | 2.6 |

Table A3.3 Selected characteristics of the population of chiefdoms, Sierra Leone 2004-2015 (continued)

| District/ chiefdom | 2004 <br> Population | 2015 <br> Population | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sex } \\ & \text { ratio } \end{aligned}$ | Share of the district population | Percentage change | Annual growth rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kenema |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nongowa | 51,486 | 45,562 | 93.5 | 7.5 | -11.5 | -1.1 |
| Simbaru | 18,375 | 17,397 | 98.7 | 2.9 | -5.3 | -0.5 |
| Small Bo | 31,193 | 29,498 | 92.0 | 4.8 | -5.4 | -0.5 |
| Tunkia | 21,330 | 36,054 | 98.0 | 5.9 | 69.0 | 4.8 |
| Wandor | 17,414 | 20,326 | 102.2 | 3.3 | 16.7 | 1.4 |
| Kenema City | 128,402 | 200,443 | 95.1 | 32.9 | 56.1 | 4.0 |
| Kono |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fiama | 9,091 | 15,455 | 95.4 | 3.1 | 70.0 | 4.8 |
| Gbane | 14,813 | 24,404 | 99.2 | 4.8 | 64.7 | 4.5 |
| Gbane Kandor | 4,163 | 11,903 | 90.7 | 2.4 | 185.9 | 9.6 |
| Gbense | 24,599 | 15,864 | 96.5 | 3.1 | -35.5 | -4.0 |
| Penguia | 12,518 | 26,272 | 100.9 | 5.0 | 109.9 | 6.7 |
| Gorama Kono | 11,643 | 18,294 | 102.1 | 3.6 | 57.1 | 4.1 |
| Kamara | 12,538 | 19,412 | 111.1 | 3.8 | 54.8 | 4.0 |
| Lei | 16,452 | 26,966 | 93.2 | 5.3 | 63.9 | 4.5 |
| Mafindor | 6,801 | 13,703 | 95.3 | 2.7 | 101.5 | 6.4 |
| Nimikoro | 44,295 | 61,225 | 108.7 | 12.1 | 38.2 | 2.9 |
| Nimiyama | 26,140 | 28,168 | 106.2 | 5.6 | 7.8 | 0.7 |
| Sandor | 49,971 | 89,879 | 97.0 | 17.8 | 79.9 | 5.3 |
| Soa | 21,249 | 39,250 | 94.7 | 7.8 | 84.7 | 5.6 |
| Tankoro | 11,014 | 8,501 | 103.9 | 1.7 | -22.8 | -2.4 |
| Toli | 2,607 | 5,046 | 91.4 | 1.0 | 93.6 | 6.0 |
| Koidu/New | 80,025 | 128,030 | 99.4 | 25.3 | 60.0 | 4.3 |
| Bombali |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Biriwa | 28,175 | 47,305 | 92.4 | 7.8 | 67.9 | 4.7 |
| Bombali Sebora | 22,802 | 36,413 | 95.3 | 6.0 | 59.7 | 4.3 |
| Gbanti- <br> Kamaranka | 26,126 | 28,491 | 96.8 | 4.7 | 9.1 | 0.8 |

Table A3.3 Selected characteristics of the population of chiefdoms, Sierra Leone 2004-2015 (continued)

| District/ chiefdom | $2004$ <br> Population | $2015$ <br> Population | Sex <br> ratio | Share of the district population | Percentage change | Annual growth rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bombali |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gbendembu Ngowahun | 29,971 | 38,800 | 91.1 | 6.4 | 29.5 | 2.3 |
| Libeisaygahun | 13,355 | 16,199 | 92.8 | 2.7 | 21.3 | 1.8 |
| Magbaimba Ndorhahun | 8,655 | 12,688 | 100.1 | 2.1 | 46.6 | 3.5 |
| Makari Gbanti | 41,186 | 81,345 | 95.7 | 13.4 | 97.5 | 6.2 |
| Paki <br> Masabong | 17,320 | 19,880 | 91.3 | 3.3 | 14.8 | 1.3 |
| Safroko Limba | 21,199 | 31,256 | 88.6 | 5.2 | 47.4 | 3.5 |
| Sanda Loko | 27,667 | 45,075 | 97.7 | 7.4 | 62.9 | 4.4 |
| Sanda Tendaren | 18,840 | 26,228 | 101.0 | 4.3 | 39.2 | 3.0 |
| Sella Limba | 52,579 | 58,401 | 95.3 | 9.6 | 11.1 | 1.0 |
| Tambakka | 17,675 | 38,493 | 102.2 | 6.3 | 117.8 | 7.1 |
| Makeni City | 82,840 | 125,970 | 97.0 | 20.8 | 52.1 | 3.8 |
| Kambia |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bramaia | 25,392 | 36,764 | 89.5 | 10.6 | 44.8 | 3.4 |
| Gbinle-Dixing | 19,569 | 23,433 | 91.1 | 6.8 | 19.7 | 1.6 |
| Magbema | 67,211 | 92,165 | 92.3 | 26.7 | 37.1 | 2.9 |
| Mambolo | 33,825 | 37,952 | 89.4 | 11.0 | 12.2 | 1.0 |
| Masungbala | 28,502 | 31,797 | 87.0 | 9.2 | 11.6 | 1.0 |
| Samu | 56,857 | 64,790 | 91.5 | 18.8 | 14.0 | 1.2 |
| Tonko Limba | 39,106 | 58,573 | 98.0 | 17.0 | 49.8 | 3.7 |
| Koinadugu |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dembelia Sinkunia | 13,921 | 21,449 | 102.2 | 5.2 | 54.1 | 3.9 |
| Diang | 19,700 | 29,063 | 102.3 | 7.1 | 47.5 | 3.5 |
| Follosaba Dembelia | 14,552 | 20,919 | 98.6 | 5.1 | 43.8 | 3.3 |
| Kasunko | 20,357 | 24,796 | 89.8 | 6.1 | 21.8 | 1.8 |
| Mongo | 29,294 | 47,836 | 97.0 | 11.7 | 63.3 | 4.5 |


| District/ chiefdom | $2004$ <br> Population | $2015$ <br> Population | Sex <br> ratio | Share of the district population | Percentage change | Annual growth rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Koinadugu |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Neya | 33,426 | 42,704 | 103.7 | 10.4 | 27.8 | 2.2 |
| Nieni | 39,107 | 78,199 | 98.5 | 19.1 | 100.0 | 6.3 |
| Sengbe | 22,458 | 38,016 | 96.0 | 9.3 | 69.3 | 4.8 |
| Sulima | 20,062 | 35,639 | 110.2 | 8.7 | 77.6 | 5.2 |
| Wara Wara Bafodia | 25,713 | 34,606 | 100.2 | 8.5 | 34.6 | 2.7 |
| Wara Wara Yagala | 27,168 | 36,145 | 98.0 | 8.8 | 33.0 | 2.6 |
| Port Loko |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bkm | 32,174 | 40,179 | 91.3 | 6.5 | 24.9 | 2.0 |
| Buya Romende | 27,881 | 34,281 | 88.4 | 5.6 | 23.0 | 1.9 |
| Dibia | 15,077 | 15,519 | 87.7 | 2.5 | 2.9 | 0.3 |
| Kaffu Bullom | 69,637 | 120,490 | 96.4 | 19.6 | 73.0 | 5.0 |
| Koya | 63,614 | 85,177 | 89.0 | 13.8 | 33.9 | 2.7 |
| Lokomasama | 72,348 | 78,276 | 90.7 | 12.7 | 8.2 | 0.7 |
| Maforki | 68,042 | 86,764 | 90.6 | 14.1 | 27.5 | 2.2 |
| Marampa | 36,108 | 59,323 | 94.1 | 9.6 | 64.3 | 4.5 |
| Masimera | 32,845 | 40,843 | 89.8 | 6.6 | 24.4 | 2.0 |
| Sanda <br> Magbolontor | 15,088 | 23,731 | 88.8 | 3.9 | 57.3 | 4.1 |
| Tms | 20,932 | 30,793 | 97.4 | 5.0 | 47.1 | 3.5 |
| Tonkolili |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gbonkolenken | 47,838 | 67,705 | 97.9 | 12.7 | 41.5 | 3.2 |
| Kafe Simira | 19,817 | 36,670 | 101.5 | 6.9 | 85.0 | 5.6 |
| Kalansogoia | 16,406 | 35,864 | 100.5 | 6.7 | 118.6 | 7.1 |
| Kholifa Mabang | 12,460 | 16,666 | 92.2 | 3.1 | 33.8 | 2.6 |
| Kolifa Rowalla | 47,675 | 66,128 | 98.1 | 12.4 | 38.7 | 3.0 |
| Kunike Barina | 13,411 | 25,245 | 109.0 | 4.8 | 88.2 | 5.8 |
| Kunike Sanda | 42,968 | 74,415 | 101.7 | 14.0 | 73.2 | 5.0 |

Table A3.3 Selected characteristics of the population of chiefdoms, Sierra Leone 2004-2015 (continued)

| District/ chiefdom | 2004 Population | $2015$ <br> Population | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Sex } \\ \text { ratio } \end{array}$ | Share of the district population | Percentage change | Annual growth rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tonkolili |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Malal Mara | 14,025 | 30,953 | 95.1 | 5.8 | 120.7 | 7.2 |
| Sambaya | 22,728 | 31,993 | 96.2 | 6.0 | 40.8 | 3.1 |
| Tane | 22,242 | 33,285 | 96.1 | 6.3 | 49.6 | 3.7 |
| Yoni | 87,627 | 112,511 | 94.3 | 21.2 | 28.4 | 2.3 |
| Bo |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Badjia | 7,698 | 8,135 | 95.9 | 1.4 | 5.7 | 0.5 |
| Bagbo | 24,834 | 25,884 | 97.9 | 4.5 | 4.2 | 0.4 |
| Bagbwe | 10,904 | 20,926 | 99.6 | 3.6 | 91.9 | 5.9 |
| Baoma | 50,937 | 45,835 | 96.3 | 8.0 | -10.0 | -1.0 |
| Bumpe Ngawo | 35,642 | 44,279 | 96.4 | 7.7 | 24.2 | 2.0 |
| Gbo | 5,050 | 5,403 | 98.1 | 0.9 | 7.0 | 0.6 |
| Jaiama-Bongor | 26,067 | 31,298 | 94.5 | 5.4 | 20.1 | 1.7 |
| Kakua | 29,770 | 51,074 | 91.3 | 8.9 | 71.6 | 4.9 |
| Komboya | 15,616 | 15,623 | 97.0 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Lugbu | 23,639 | 25,453 | 96.7 | 4.4 | 7.7 | 0.7 |
| Niawa Lenga | 11,109 | 13,955 | 94.8 | 2.4 | 25.6 | 2.1 |
| Selenga | 5,412 | 9,175 | 91.2 | 1.6 | 69.5 | 4.8 |
| Tikonko | 39,399 | 53,206 | 96.2 | 9.2 | 35.0 | 2.7 |
| Valunia | 17,741 | 35,558 | 104.6 | 6.2 | 100.4 | 6.3 |
| Wunde | 9,893 | 15,305 | 89.8 | 2.7 | 54.7 | 4.0 |
| Bo City | 149,957 | 174,369 | 92.4 | 30.3 | 16.3 | 1.4 |
| Bonthe |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bendu Cha | 4,680 | 7,168 | 95.4 | 3.6 | 53.2 | 3.9 |
| Bum | 18,827 | 24,339 | 94.7 | 12.1 | 29.3 | 2.3 |
| Dema | 5,301 | 7,411 | 102.4 | 3.7 | 39.8 | 3.0 |
| Imperi | 17,576 | 33,394 | 103.9 | 16.6 | 90.0 | 5.8 |

Table A3.3 Selected characteristics of the population of chiefdoms, Sierra Leone 2004-2015 (continued)

| District/ chiefdom | $2004$ <br> Population | $2015$ <br> Population | Sex <br> ratio | Share of the district population | Percentage change | Annual growth rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bonthe |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jong | 28,495 | 33,816 | 95.4 | 16.8 | 18.7 | 1.6 |
| Kpanga Kemo | 7,661 | 10,438 | 94.0 | 5.2 | 36.2 | 2.8 |
| Kwamebai <br> Krim | 7,715 | 14,289 | 95.4 | 7.1 | 85.2 | 5.6 |
| Nongoba Bullom | 13,617 | 20,060 | 99.6 | 10.0 | 47.3 | 3.5 |
| Sittia | 13,449 | 21,347 | 97.2 | 10.6 | 58.7 | 4.2 |
| Sogbini | 7,853 | 10,863 | 93.1 | 5.4 | 38.3 | 2.9 |
| Yawbeko | 4,773 | 7,581 | 93.8 | 3.8 | 58.8 | 4.2 |
| Bonthe Municipal | 9,740 | 10,075 | 95.6 | 5.0 | 3.4 | 0.3 |
| Moyamba |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bagruwa | 18,989 | 27,623 | 98.5 | 8.7 | 45.5 | 3.4 |
| Bumpeh | 32,363 | 37,445 | 90.8 | 11.8 | 15.7 | 1.3 |
| Dasse | 10,879 | 13,217 | 93.0 | 4.1 | 21.5 | 1.8 |
| Fakunya | 22,327 | 27,646 | 90.5 | 8.7 | 23.8 | 1.9 |
| Kagboro | 31,150 | 34,862 | 93.1 | 10.9 | 11.9 | 1.0 |
| Kaiyamba | 21,669 | 25,749 | 91.4 | 8.1 | 18.8 | 1.6 |
| Kamajei | 8,549 | 10,165 | 94.3 | 3.2 | 18.9 | 1.6 |
| Kongbora | 11,331 | 10,328 | 93.1 | 3.2 | -8.9 | -0.8 |
| Kori | 29,043 | 30,514 | 94.1 | 9.6 | 5.1 | 0.4 |
| Kowa | 7,082 | 9,752 | 90.8 | 3.1 | 37.7 | 2.9 |
| Lower Banta | 25,954 | 37,317 | 94.5 | 11.7 | 43.8 | 3.3 |
| Ribbi | 25,163 | 33,165 | 90.2 | 10.4 | 31.8 | 2.5 |
| Timdale | 8,192 | 10,292 | 100.4 | 3.2 | 25.6 | 2.1 |
| Upper Banta | 8,219 | 10,513 | 99.6 | 3.3 | 27.9 | 2.2 |
| Pujehun |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Barri | 32,245 | 36,905 | 92.1 | 10.7 | 14.5 | 1.2 |
| Gallinas Peri | 27,072 | 54,691 | 95.5 | 15.8 | 102.0 | 6.4 |


| District/ chiefdom | $2004$ <br> Population | $2015$ <br> Population | Sex <br> ratio | Share of the district population | Percentage change | Annual growth rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pujehun |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kpaka | 12,827 | 16,468 | 88.3 | 4.8 | 28.4 | 2.3 |
| KpangaKabonde | 33,270 | 49,340 | 94.0 | 14.2 | 48.3 | 3.6 |
| Makpele | 21,955 | 31,080 | 98.3 | 9.0 | 41.6 | 3.2 |
| Malen | 22,090 | 49,263 | 104.4 | 14.2 | 123.0 | 7.3 |
| Mano Sakrim | 7,536 | 12,893 | 89.4 | 3.7 | 71.1 | 4.9 |
| Panga Krim | 6,651 | 8,969 | 91.9 | 2.6 | 34.9 | 2.7 |
| Pejeh | 10,334 | 13,600 | 93.6 | 3.9 | 31.6 | 2.5 |
| Soro Gbema | 31,977 | 42,292 | 92.2 | 12.2 | 32.3 | 2.5 |
| Sowa | 15,402 | 17,136 | 96.8 | 4.9 | 11.3 | 1.0 |
| Ykk | 7,033 | 13,824 | 90.5 | 4.0 | 96.6 | 6.1 |
| Western Area Rural |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Koya | 22,996 | 70,423 | 95.4 | 15.9 | 206.2 | 10.2 |
| Mountain | 9,925 | 30,488 | 110.4 | 6.9 | 207.2 | 10.2 |
| Waterloo | 77,791 | 213,778 | 96.4 | 48.1 | 174.8 | 9.2 |
| York Rural | 63,537 | 129,581 | 103.3 | 29.2 | 103.9 | 6.5 |
| Western Area Urban |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Central 1 | 50,271 | 62,499 | 103.2 | 5.9 | 24.3 | 2.0 |
| Central 2 | 20,135 | 21,413 | 104.5 | 2.0 | 6.3 | 0.6 |
| East 1 | 55,166 | 61,244 | 97.9 | 5.8 | 11.0 | 1.0 |
| East 2 | 79,934 | 89,530 | 101.9 | 8.5 | 12.0 | 1.0 |
| East 3 | 316,409 | 448,572 | 98.3 | 42.5 | 41.8 | 3.2 |
| West 1 | 46,319 | 53,981 | 96.5 | 5.1 | 16.5 | 1.4 |
| West 2 | 91,345 | 130,149 | 98.2 | 12.3 | 42.5 | 3.2 |
| West 3 | 113,294 | 188,576 | 101.5 | 17.9 | 66.4 | 4.6 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

# CHAPTER 4: HOUSEHOLD SIZE, STRUCTURE AND COMPOSITION 

### 4.1 Introduction

The household is the basic socio-economic unit in many communities and is central to the study of social and economic development. The study of household structures provides information about residence patterns and social organization of the population. The population of any given community is largely an aggregation of the population of the individual households. Therefore, characteristics of the population are reflected within households. Households are also useful in investigating individual relationships. In Africa generally, social intervention and development programmes are targeted at the household.

Household members are not necessarily related by blood or marriage but live together and belong to one consumption unit. Households have been used in data collection exercises because they are handy in ensuring no omission or double counting, which is one of the primary objectives in data collection.

Households are also important not only as a way of organizing the population but as economic entities. Households are producers of different goods and services as well as being the final consumers of goods and services produced by firms. Differences in household structure reflect major differences between societies: in culture and norms; in the cost and availability of housing; in the economic means available to diverse groups in society; and in social policy, where differences in tax and benefit regimes may lead to radically different patterns of household structure. Therefore, the size and structure of households and changes in the rate of household formation are useful for development planning and service delivery.

Families on the other hand are kinship groupings that are related, but not necessarily localized. The family remains the central element of contemporary life, despite the changing lifestyles and ever-increasing personal mobility that characterize modern society. It offers
companionship, security, and a measure of protection against an often-uncaring world.
There are two major types of family ties that inform household formation, namely the nuclear and extended family systems. The nuclear family is made up of the head, spouse and children (adopted and/or biological), while the extended family consists of the nuclear family and other relatives.

### 4.2 Definition of concepts

The 2015 Census defined a household as 'a person or group of persons who normally eat and live together and recognize a particular person as the head'. In the case of a man with several wives who maintains separate living quarters for his wives and their children, each wife and her children were enumerated as a separate household. Visitors who spent the census night with the household were also enumerated as members of the household.

A household member is any person who spent the census night in the household, and any persons who would normally have slept there but were absent on census night and did not sleep in any other house. These persons included night watchmen, police officers on night duty, persons on fishing expeditions and persons who were working in hospitals, hotels or prisons throughout the night.

The census defined the head of household as that person whom the members of the household accept as their head'. He or she may or may not be the sole provider for the household.

The household size refers to the number of usual members of a household. The mean household size is obtained by dividing the total household population by the number of households.

Household structure refers to the type of relationship (whether related or unrelated) between household members who were present on census night, while household composition refers to the patterns of relationships between the head of household and other members of the household. This includes relationships such as spouse (wife/husband), child (son/daughter), grandchild, parent/parent-in-law, brother/sister, other relative and non-relative.

The 2015 Census used similar definitions for the household and household head used in the 1985 Census, making both sets of data comparable. However, the detailed analysis of the 1974, 1985 and 2004 data are retained only as an indicator of trends in household size, structure and family composition for the total country.

### 4.3 Sources of data and their limitations

The household questionnaire is the source of the information used to analyse the household size, structure and composition. Information was collected on the relationship of every household member to the head of household. This is the basis for constituting the households and hence this study.

The 2015 Census enumeration was of a de facto nature, and therefore the resultant data have some limitations, as listed below:
a) The household is defined in a census setting, to ensure completeness of enumeration and to avoid omission or double counting of persons. Thus, the census exercise cannot be used to identify persons who belong to more than one household simultaneously, such as a polygamous man, even though such situations are known to exist.
b) Some usual household members may not have been enumerated in the household while some non-members were enumerated within the household. Therefore, the definition and analysis of the household size, structure and composition
is for the de facto households as they were composed on the census night, which is not necessarily their usual structure. Because of the high sensitivity of the household structures, inclusion or exclusion of an individual may lead to a change in the structure of the household. A more complicated form of this limitation is when the de jure household head is absent, and the headship is temporarily assumed by another household member on the census night. This may result in a complete transformation of the household structure.
c) The classification of households is based on the question on 'relationship to household head'. This has the limitation that one cannot identify and study relationships of sub-families within the household.

### 4.4 Distribution of households

The 2015 Census enumerated a total of 1.3 million households. The number of households enumerated in the different censuses has been increasing over time (Table 4.1). The number of households increased from 485,711 in 1985 to 819,854 in 2004 and nearly 1.3 million in 2015. Between 1985 and 2004, the number of households increased by 68.8 per cent while between 2004 and 2015, the increase was 54.4 per cent.

The proportional increase in the number of households between 2004 and 2015 was higher than the corresponding increase in the household population. Whereas the number of households increased by 54.4 per cent, the household population increased by 43.5 per cent. The same pattern was observed during the period 1985 to 2004.

Table 4.1 Number of households and household population, 1985-2015

|  | Census year |  |  | Percentage change |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Characteristic | 1985 | 2004 | 2015 | $1985-2004$ | $2004-2015$ |
| Households | 485,711 | 819,854 | $1,265,468$ | 68.8 | 54.4 |
| Rural | $* * *$ | $* * *$ | 697,734 | $* * *$ | $* * *$ |
| Urban | $* * *$ | $* * *$ | 567,734 | $* * *$ | $* * *$ |
| Household <br> population | $3,211,239$ | $4,930,532$ | $7,076,119$ | 53.5 | 43.5 |
| Rural | $* * *$ | $* * *$ | $4,182,612$ | $* * *$ | $* * *$ |
| Urban | $* * *$ | $* * *$ | $2,893,507$ | $* * *$ | $* * *$ |
| Total population | $3,515,812$ | $4,976,871$ | $7,092,113$ | 41.6 | 42.5 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census
*** Data not available

### 4.4.1 Distribution of households by region and district

According to Table 4.2, nearly one third of the households (32.7 per cent) in 2015, were found in the Northern Region while about one quarter ( 25.4 per cent) were found in the Western Region. The Southern Region had the least share of the households (19.6 per cent). More than half of the urban households ( 55.0 per cent) were found in the Western Region whereas the Northern Region had the biggest share ( 44.0 per cent) of the rural households.

Out of the 1.3 million households enumerated, 567,734 (44.9 per cent) were numerated in urban areas. Almost all households in the Western Region ( 97.2 per cent) were enumerated in urban areas, compared to only 19.9 per cent in the Southern Region.

## EC <br> Table 4.2 Distribution of households by region and place of residence

|  |  | Place of residence |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region | All places of <br> residence | Rural | Urban | Percent urban |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 44.9 |
| Eastern | 22.2 | 26.2 | 17.4 | 35.1 |
| Northern | 32.7 | 44.0 | 18.9 | 25.9 |
| Southern | 19.6 | 28.6 | 8.7 | 19.9 |
| Western | 25.4 | 1.3 | 55.0 | 97.2 |



Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Table 4.3 shows that among the districts, Western Area Urban district had the largest share of households ( 18.2 per cent) in 2015, while Bonthe district had the lowest share in 2015 (2.6 per cent). The rest of the districts had between 4 and 9 per cent of the households.

Between 2004 and 2015, Western Area Rural district experienced the highest increase in the number of households (204 per cent), leading to an increase in its share from 3.7 per cent in 2004 to 7.2 per cent in 2015. The other districts with substantial relative increases in the number of households between 2004 and 2015 were Western Area Urban district ( 71.4 per cent), Bombali (71.1 per cent) and Port Loko (70.3 per cent).

The rest of the districts had increases during 2004 to 2015 of between 26 and 65 per cent. Kenema district had the lowest relative increase in the number of households of 26.2 per cent. Most districts had a higher relative increase in the number of households during the period 2004 to 2015 compared to the period 1985 to 2004. The only exceptions to this were Kono and Moyamba districts.

Table 4.3 Distribution and percentage change in number of households by region and district, 1985-2015

| Region/district | Number of households in 2015 | Distribution of households |  |  | Percentage change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1985 | 2004 | 2015 | 1985-2004 | 2004-2015 |
| Total | 1,265,468 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 68.8 | 54.4 |
| Eastern | 281,201 | 29.3 | 25.9 | 22.2 | 52.7 | 32.4 |
| Kailahun | 83,348 | 7.5 | 7.9 | 6.6 | 82.6 | 28.4 |
| Kenema | 111,734 | 11.1 | 10.8 | 8.8 | 67.8 | 26.2 |
| Kono | 86,119 | 10.7 | 7.2 | 6.8 | 16.1 | 46.4 |
| Northern | 414,377 | 30.8 | 31.9 | 32.7 | 78.3 | 58.6 |
| Bombali | 105,902 | 7.3 | 7.6 | 8.4 | 78.3 | 71.1 |
| Kambia | 53,826 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.3 | 74.3 | 44.9 |
| Koinadugu | 56,108 | 6.7 | 5.3 | 4.4 | 38.2 | 28.4 |
| Port Loko | 111,701 | 6.2 | 8.0 | 8.8 | 122.8 | 70.3 |
| Tonkolili | 86,840 | 6.2 | 6.4 | 6.9 | 79.5 | 64.3 |
| Southern | 248,655 | 24.0 | 22.2 | 19.6 | 60.0 | 36.5 |
| Bo | 102,723 | 9.2 | 9.2 | 8.1 | 72.8 | 35.5 |
| Bonthe | 32,538 | 3.5 | 3.1 | 2.6 | 51.5 | 27.7 |
| Moyamba | 61,880 | 7.0 | 5.5 | 4.9 | 35.9 | 36.8 |
| Pujehun | 51,514 | 3.9 | 4.3 | 4.1 | 90.9 | 44.5 |
| Western | 321,235 | 15.9 | 20.0 | 25.4 | 117.0 | 95.6 |
| Western Area Rural | 91,284 | 1.9 | 3.7 | 7.2 | 236.7 | 203.7 |
| Western Area Urban | 229,951 | 14.1 | 16.4 | 18.2 | 101.0 | 71.4 |

### 4.5 Household size

The 2015 Sierra Leone census was of a de facto nature. Therefore, the household size presented in this section refers to the number of persons who spent the census night in the household, irrespective of whether it was their usual household or not. Table 4.4 shows the distribution of the households by number of persons present on the census night. The table shows that 6.4 per cent of all households were single-person households, compared to 11.1 per cent in 1985. The single person households were more common in urban areas ( 10.4 per cent) as well as among male-headed households ( 6.8 per cent).

Sierra Leone has traditionally had large household sizes. The proportion of households with 10 or more persons was 11.6 (about one in every nine households), although it is a substantial reduction from the 21.5 per cent from the 1985 Sierra Leone census. The very large households with 15 or more persons constituted 1.3 per cent of the households in 2015. The most common household size was five persons, although they constituted 14.0 per cent of all households. Among the female-headed households, the largest share ( 15.3 per cent) was a household with four persons. The modal household size for urban areas was four persons while that for rural areas was five persons.


Table 4.4 Distribution of households by household size, place of residence and sex of household head

| Household size | All places of residence |  |  | Rural |  |  | Urban |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male headed | Female headed | Total | Male headed | Female headed | Total | Male headed | Female headed |
| All sizes | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 1 | 6.4 | 6.8 | 5.5 | 3.2 | 2.9 | 4.0 | 10.4 | 11.7 | 7.2 |
| 2 | 8.3 | 7.8 | 9.8 | 5.9 | 5.0 | 8.3 | 11.3 | 11.2 | 11.7 |
| 3 | 11.9 | 11.1 | 14.2 | 10.5 | 9.3 | 13.7 | 13.7 | 13.2 | 14.8 |
| 4 | 13.7 | 13.1 | 15.3 | 13.4 | 12.6 | 15.6 | 14.1 | 13.8 | 15.0 |
| 5 | 14.0 | 13.7 | 14.6 | 14.8 | 14.6 | 15.5 | 12.9 | 12.6 | 13.4 |
| 6 | 11.8 | 12.0 | 11.5 | 13.2 | 13.4 | 12.4 | 10.2 | 10.2 | 10.4 |
| 7 | 9.4 | 9.8 | 8.6 | 10.8 | 11.4 | 9.3 | 7.8 | 7.8 | 7.7 |
| 8 | 7.5 | 7.9 | 6.7 | 8.9 | 9.5 | 7.4 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 5.9 |
| 9 | 5.2 | 5.5 | 4.5 | 6.2 | 6.7 | 4.8 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| 10 | 7.8 | 8.4 | 6.4 | 9.9 | 10.9 | 7.2 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 5.3 |
| 11 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.0 |
| 12 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| 13 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.7 |
| 14 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| 15+ | 1.3 | 1.4 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.4 |
| Mean size | 5.6 | 5.7 | 5.3 | 6.0 | 6.2 | 5.4 | 5.1 | 5.1 | 5.2 |
| Modal size | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |

The mean household size for the Sierra Leonean population has been declining consistently overtime from 6.6 persons in 1985 to 6.0 persons in 2004 and 5.6 persons in 2015. The mean household size in 2015 was smaller for urban areas ( 5.1 persons) compared to the rural areas ( 6.0 persons), as well as for female-headed households ( 5.3 persons) compared to male-headed households ( 5.7 persons). There is a very small difference ( 0.1 persons) in mean household size by sex of household head in the urban areas compared to the one for rural areas ( 0.8 persons).

### 4.5.1 Household size by region and district

Household sizes tend to differ by place of residence and geographical location. Table 4.5 shows that single-person households were more common in the Western Region (12.4 per cent) compared to the other three regions. The Northern Region had the least proportion of singleperson households ( 3.9 per cent). The districts of the Western Region had high shares of singleperson households. Among the 12 districts of the other three regions, six districts of Port Loko, Kono, Bombali, Kenema, Bo and Moyamba had single-person households, constituting between five and nine persons of their total households.

Koinadugu district had about one quarter ( 24.6 per cent) of its households having 10 or more persons. This was closely followed by Pejehun district with 21.0 per cent of the households having 10 or more persons. The rest of the districts had less than 20 per cent of their households with 10 persons or more. The districts of Moyamba, Western Area Rural and Western Area Urban had less than 10 per cent of their households with 10 or more persons.

Wide variability was observed in the mean household size of the districts. Generally, the districts of the Eastern and Northern regions (except Kenema and Port Loko districts) had mean household sizes bigger than the national average ( 5.6 persons), while those of the Western Region had mean household sizes lower than the national average. The Southern Region had half of the districts with household sizes bigger than the national average.

Table 4.5 Distribution of households and mean household size by region and district

| Region/district | Number of persons in the household |  |  |  |  |  |  | Mean household <br> size |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 1 | $2-3$ | $4-5$ | $6-7$ | $8-9$ | $10+$ | Total |  |
| Eastern | 6.4 | 20.3 | 27.7 | 21.3 | 12.7 | 11.6 | 100.0 | 5.6 |
| Kailahun | 4.5 | 16.8 | 28.3 | 24.0 | 14.8 | 11.6 | 100.0 | 5.8 |
| Kenema | 2.0 | 11.8 | 26.7 | 27.3 | 19.6 | 12.7 | 100.0 | 6.3 |
| Kono | 5.8 | 21.1 | 30.4 | 21.3 | 11.3 | 10.1 | 100.0 | 5.5 |
| Northern | 5.3 | 16.2 | 27.2 | 24.3 | 14.7 | 12.4 | 100.0 | 5.9 |
| Bombali | 3.9 | 16.3 | 27.5 | 23.5 | 15.2 | 13.7 | 100.0 | 6.0 |
| Kambia | 5.8 | 18.5 | 28.1 | 23.0 | 13.2 | 11.4 | 100.0 | 5.7 |
| Koinadugu | 2.5 | 14.8 | 27.0 | 23.8 | 15.3 | 16.6 | 100.0 | 6.4 |
| Port Loko | 1.0 | 6.4 | 18.9 | 25.9 | 23.2 | 24.6 | 100.0 | 7.3 |
| Tonkolili | 5.2 | 21.8 | 30.3 | 20.8 | 11.3 | 10.5 | 100.0 | 5.5 |


| Region/district | Number of persons in the household |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Mean household <br> size |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | $2-3$ | $4-5$ | $6-7$ | $8-9$ | $10+$ | Total |  |  |
| Southern | 5.2 | 19.5 | 27.6 | 21.6 | 12.7 | 13.4 | 100.0 | 5.8 |  |
| Bo | 6.6 | 21.3 | 27.9 | 20.7 | 11.6 | 11.9 | 100.0 | 5.6 |  |
| Bonthe | 3.0 | 16.0 | 27.5 | 24.0 | 14.1 | 15.5 | 100.0 | 6.2 |  |
| Moyamba | 6.8 | 25.6 | 29.5 | 19.3 | 10.4 | 8.5 | 100.0 | 5.1 |  |
| Pujehun | 2.0 | 10.9 | 24.8 | 24.6 | 16.8 | 21.0 | 100.0 | 6.7 |  |
| Western | 12.4 | 29.0 | 27.5 | 15.9 | 7.7 | 7.4 | 100.0 | 4.7 |  |
| Western Area <br> Rural | 9.5 | 27.4 | 29.1 | 17.6 | 8.7 | 7.6 | 100.0 | 4.9 |  |
| Western Area <br> Urban | 13.6 | 29.7 | 26.9 | 15.2 | 7.4 | 7.3 | 100.0 | 4.6 |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 4.5.2 Mean household size by characteristics of household head

The demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the household head are believed to have an influence on the size of the household. Table 4.6 shows that the mean household size for households headed by adolescents and youth (15-24 years) was as low as 3.5 persons, and the mean household size increases with increasing age of the household head. Households headed by persons aged 65 years or more were the biggest ( 6.4 persons). The non-Sierra Leoneans had relatively smaller households but because they constituted less than 1 per cent of the total number of households, they do not have any noticeable effect on the overall mean household size.

Household heads with secondary education had smaller mean household sizes than those with no education or with vocational and tertiary education. There is no clear relationship between level of education of the household head and the mean household size, or between economic activity status and mean household size. Table 4.6 also shows that the religion of the household head does not have a strong effect on the mean household size. However, it is noted that the mean household size of households headed by persons with 'no religion' was very low (3.8 persons).

Table 4.6 Households, household population and mean household size by selected characteristics of the household head

| Characteristic | Households |  | Household population |  | Mean household size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage |  |
| Total | 1,265,468 | 100.0 | 7,076,119 | 100.0 | 5.6 |
| Age group |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-24 years | 77,972 | 6.2 | 275,472 | 3.9 | 3.5 |
| 25-64 years | 1,039,832 | 82.2 | 5,854,204 | 82.7 | 5.6 |
| $65+$ years | 147,664 | 11.7 | 946,443 | 13.4 | 6.4 |
| Highest educational level attained |  |  |  |  |  |
| No Education | 717,782 | 56.7 | 4,263,874 | 60.3 | 5.9 |
| Basic School | 246,229 | 19.5 | 1,289,531 | 18.2 | 5.2 |
| SSS | 167,969 | 13.3 | 788,318 | 11.1 | 4.7 |
| Vocational/Technical/ Nursing/Teacher Training | 58,085 | 4.6 | 309,148 | 4.4 | 5.3 |
| University ${ }^{1}$ | 46,550 | 3.7 | 236,779 | 3.4 | 5.1 |
| Other | 28,853 | 2.3 | 188,469 | 2.7 | 6.5 |
| Economic activity status |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employed | 1,051,315 | 83.1 | 6,008,738 | 84.9 | 5.7 |
| Looking for work | 38,766 | 3.1 | 180,181 | 2.5 | 4.6 |
| Not in labour force | 175,387 | 13.9 | 887,200 | 12.5 | 5.1 |
| Religion |  |  |  |  |  |
| Islam | 969,917 | 76.6 | 5,506,388 | 77.8 | 5.7 |
| Christian | 284,508 | 22.5 | 1,510,004 | 21.3 | 5.3 |
| Other | 10,224 | 0.8 | 56,646 | 0.8 | 5.5 |
| No Religion | 819 | 0.1 | 3,081 | 0.0 | 3.8 |
| Nationality |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sierra Leonean | 1,254,108 | 99.1 | 7,024,632 | 99.3 | 5.6 |
| Other African | 10,372 | 0.8 | 47,873 | 0.7 | 4.6 |
| Non- African | 988 | 0.1 | 3,614 | 0.1 | 3.7 |

${ }^{1}$ Includes first degree, post graduate and PhD

[^2]
### 4.6 Household structure

The two major types of family ties are the nuclear and extended family systems. The nuclear family is made up of the head, spouse and children (whether biological or adopted). The extended family consists of the nuclear family and other relatives. Both nuclear and extended families may have non-relatives.

The 2015 Census collected information on the relationship of all household members to the household head. This information is used to construct the household structure in line with the United Nations Principles and Recommendations for Population and Housing Censuses. Four categories of household structure were identified namely single-person households, nuclear households, extended households and composite households.

Table 4.7 shows that the structure of the female-headed households is different from male-headed households. Most of the female-headed households were either 'extended with no spouse' (56.4 per cent) or 'nuclear with no spouse' ( 25.8 per cent). The two collectively constitute 82.2 per cent of the female-headed households. Conversely, most of the male- headed households are either 'extended with spouse' (36.1 per cent) or 'nuclear with spouse' ( 35.6 per cent). The two collectively constitute 71.7 per cent of the male-headed households. The rural areas generally had higher proportions of 'nuclear' households compared to urban areas.


Table 4.7 Distribution of households by household structure, place of residence and sex of household head

| Household structure | All places of residence |  |  | Rural |  |  | Urban |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male headed | Female headed | Total | Male headed | Female headed | Total | Male headed | Female headed |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Head only | 6.4 | 6.8 | 5.5 | 3.2 | 2.9 | 4.0 | 10.4 | 11.7 | 7.2 |
| Head with only one spouse | 3.2 | 4.3 | 0.5 | 2.5 | 3.3 | 0.4 | 4.0 | 5.5 | 0.5 |
| Head with multiple spouse only | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Nuclear with no spouse | 8.8 | 2.2 | 25.8 | 9.4 | 2.0 | 28.8 | 8.2 | 2.5 | 22.2 |
| Nuclear with spouse(s) | 26.5 | 35.6 | 3.2 | 30.6 | 40.9 | 3.5 | 21.5 | 29.1 | 2.8 |
| Extended with no spouse | 22.8 | 9.6 | 56.4 | 20.4 | 7.3 | 54.7 | 25.7 | 12.5 | 58.4 |
| Extended with spouse(s) | 27.1 | 36.1 | 4.0 | 29.0 | 38.5 | 4.1 | 24.7 | 33.1 | 3.9 |
| Composite with spouse(s) | 2.7 | 3.6 | 0.4 | 2.8 | 3.7 | 0.4 | 2.5 | 3.3 | 0.3 |
| Composite with no spouse | 2.4 | 1.7 | 4.3 | 1.9 | 1.1 | 4.1 | 3.0 | 2.4 | 4.5 |

Figure 4.1 shows that in 2015, 38.6 per cent of the households in Sierra Leone were nuclear households while 49.9 per cent were extended households. The phenomenon of extended households was more common among female-headed households ( 60.4 per cent) than male headed households ( 45.7 per cent). About one in every 20 households ( 5.1 per cent) were composite households, with the proportions for the female-headed households being slightly lower than those for the male-headed households.


There was minimal variation in the general pattern of household structures by district or region. Table 4.8 shows that single-person households were more common in the Western Region (12.4 per cent) compared to the other regions. The Northern Region had the least share of single person households ( 3.9 per cent). The districts in the Western Region had large shares of the single-person households, while those of the other three regions had less than seven per cent of households as single-person households. Koinadugu district had the lowest share of singleperson households ( 1.0 per cent) while Western Area Rural district had the highest share (13.6 per cent).

The extended households (with or without a spouse) were more common in the Northern and Southern regions ( 52.8 and 50.2 per cent respectively), while they constituted less than half of the households in Eastern and Western regions. All the districts of the Northern and Southern regions, except Moyamba district, had more than half of their households of an extended nature. The phenomenon of extended households was more common among the districts of Northern and Southern regions compared to the situation in Eastern and Western regions.


| Region/ district | Single-person households | Nuclear households | Extended households | Composite households | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 6.4 | 38.6 | 49.9 | 5.1 | 100.0 |
| Eastern | 4.5 | 43.5 | 47.5 | 4.5 | 100.0 |
| Kailahun | 2.0 | 44.3 | 49.6 | 4.1 | 100.0 |
| Kenema | 5.8 | 43.6 | 46.0 | 4.7 | 100.0 |
| Kono | 5.3 | 42.6 | 47.5 | 4.6 | 100.0 |
| Northern | 3.9 | 38.1 | 52.8 | 5.3 | 100.0 |
| Bombali | 5.8 | 37.5 | 51.6 | 5.1 | 100.0 |
| Kambia | 2.5 | 34.3 | 56.7 | 6.5 | 100.0 |
| Koinadugu | 1.0 | 38.6 | 54.6 | 5.8 | 100.0 |
| Port Loko | 5.2 | 39.8 | 50.5 | 4.5 | 100.0 |
| Tonkolili | 2.3 | 38.9 | 53.4 | 5.4 | 100.0 |
| Southern | 5.2 | 39.6 | 50.2 | 5.0 | 100.0 |
| Bo | 6.6 | 37.4 | 50.9 | 5.0 | 100.0 |
| Bonthe | 3.0 | 42.1 | 50.3 | 4.6 | 100.0 |
| Moyamba | 6.8 | 39.9 | 48.1 | 5.2 | 100.0 |
| Pujehun | 2.0 | 42.1 | 51.1 | 4.8 | 100.0 |
| Western | 12.4 | 34.2 | 47.9 | 5.4 | 100.0 |
| Western Area Rural | 9.5 | 37.8 | 47.2 | 5.6 | 100.0 |
| Western Area Urban | 13.6 | 32.8 | 48.2 | 5.4 | 100.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 4.7 Household composition

Individuals typically live in domestic groups or households whose members share characteristics, including the resources they can access, and acknowledge the same authority hierarchy. The characteristics of the household head are believed to have a strong bearing on the demographic, social, health and economic processes of the other household members. The 2015 Census collected information on the relationship of the household members to the household head. The household head was defined as 'the person whom the members of the household accept as their head'.

The household members are categorized into three broad groups: members of the family nucleus, other relatives (not members of the family nucleus) and those 'not related' to the household head. For the purposes of this report, only the family nucleus of the household head is considered, because it is the only one that can be identified from the data.

Table 4.9 shows that less than 2 per cent of the household population were not related to the household head. Most of the household members ( 71.9 per cent) were members of the family nucleus of the household head. The urban households had a slightly lower proportion (67.6 per cent) of persons within the family nucleus of the household head, compared to the rural households ( 74.8 per cent). The sons and daughters of the household head constituted 40.8 per cent of the household population. The dominance of the sons and daughters was observed irrespective of sex or place of residence. However, it was less pronounced in the urban areas ( 35.5 per cent) compared to the rural areas ( 44.4 per cent).

More than one quarter ( 26.5 per cent) of the household population was 'other relatives'. This points to the sustenance of social support through the extended family system, as already shown in Section 4.6. Among the 'other relatives', persons in the unspecified category (other relationship) were most dominant (10.2 per cent). The 'sisters/brothers' of the household head comprised 6.5 per cent of the household population while the 'nephew/niece' of the household head constituted 4.9 per cent of the household population. The households in the urban areas had a slightly higher proportion of 'other relatives' ( 30.5 per cent) compared to those in the rural areas (23.7 per cent).

## 启

 Table 4.9 Distribution of the household population by relationship to household head, place of residence and sex| Household <br> structure | All places of residence |  |  | Rural |  |  | Urban |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

[^3]Table 4.10 shows that the composition of the households in Eastern, Northern and Southern regions is similar to the country as a whole. The Western Region had a slightly different household composition with higher proportions of household heads ( 21.5 per cent) and 'other relatives' ( 30.2 per cent). The wide variation in household composition between the Western Region and the other regions reflects the effects of the high urbanization levels.

In general, the composition of the population of the households among districts is quite similar. However, the composition of the household population in Koinadugu and Pujehun districts was different from the rest of the districts, with very low proportions of household heads (13.7 and 14.9 per cent respectively) and spouses ( 9.8 and 10.5 per cent respectively) and high proportions of 'son/daughter' ( 51.0 and 48.4 per cent respectively). This is not surprising given that these two districts had high proportions of extended households.


Table 4.10 Distribution of household population by region, district and relationship to household head

| Region/district | Relationship to household head |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Head | Spouse | Child | Other relative | Not related | Total household population |
| Total | 17.9 | 11.6 | 42.4 | 26.5 | 1.7 | 100.0 |
| Eastern | 17.1 | 11.7 | 46.3 | 23.4 | 1.5 | 100.0 |
| Kailahun | 15.9 | 10.8 | 49.1 | 22.9 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| Kenema | 18.3 | 12.5 | 43.3 | 24.1 | 1.7 | 100.0 |
| Kono | 17.0 | 11.6 | 47.0 | 22.9 | 1.5 | 100.0 |
| Northern | 16.6 | 11.6 | 44.0 | 26.3 | 1.5 | 100.0 |
| Bombali | 17.5 | 11.4 | 42.9 | 26.7 | 1.6 | 100.0 |
| Kambia | 15.6 | 12.3 | 41.9 | 28.5 | 1.7 | 100.0 |
| Koinadugu | 13.7 | 9.8 | 51.0 | 24.0 | 1.4 | 100.0 |
| Port Loko | 18.2 | 12.7 | 40.9 | 26.9 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| Tonkolili | 16.3 | 11.5 | 44.7 | 25.8 | 1.6 | 100.0 |
| Southern | 17.3 | 11.5 | 43.1 | 26.5 | 1.6 | 100.0 |
| Bo | 17.9 | 11.4 | 40.7 | 28.4 | 1.6 | 100.0 |
| Bonthe | 16.2 | 11.9 | 45.9 | 24.6 | 1.4 | 100.0 |
| Moyamba | 19.5 | 12.8 | 39.7 | 26.0 | 2.0 | 100.0 |
| Pujehun | 14.9 | 10.5 | 48.4 | 24.8 | 1.5 | 100.0 |
| Western | 21.5 | 11.4 | 34.8 | 30.2 | 2.1 | 100.0 |
| Western Area Rural | 20.6 | 12.2 | 37.2 | 27.8 | 2.1 | 100.0 |
| Western Area Urban | 21.9 | 11.0 | 33.8 | 31.2 | 2.1 | 100.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Table 4.11 shows the distribution of the household population by age and relationship to the household head. Most of the household heads ( 61.8 per cent) were aged $25-49$ years while the equivalent share for the spouses was 69.6 per cent. Conversely, most of the children ( 91 per cent) and 'other relatives' ( 73.6 per cent) were aged less than 25 years.

The median age for the household heads was 42.4 years, which was 9.5 years older than that of the spouses ( 32.9 years). The children and the 'other relatives' were much younger than the heads or spouses with median ages of 10.7 and 16.2 years respectively.

Table 4.11 Distribution of household population by age group and relationship to household head

|  | Relationship to household head |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Total household population | Household head | Spouse | Child | Other relative | Not related |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 0-14 | 41.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 66.4 | 46.1 | 29.4 |
| 0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 2.4 | 3.9 |
| 1-4 | 10.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 18.0 | 11.6 | 4.4 |
| 5-9 | 15.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 25.3 | 17.9 | 10.1 |
| 10-14 | 12.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 18.9 | 14.1 | 11.0 |
| 15-24 | 21.6 | 6.2 | 19.6 | 24.6 | 27.5 | 32.0 |
| 15-19 | 12.3 | 1.2 | 4.9 | 16.4 | 16.2 | 16.0 |
| 20-24 | 9.3 | 5.0 | 14.7 | 8.2 | 11.3 | 16.0 |
| 25-49 | 28.2 | 61.8 | 69.6 | 8.7 | 18.4 | 33.3 |
| 25-29 | 8.6 | 11.0 | 20.7 | 4.6 | 7.6 | 13.3 |
| 30-34 | 6.1 | 11.7 | 16.3 | 2.2 | 4.1 | 7.9 |
| 35-39 | 5.9 | 15.1 | 16.1 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 5.7 |
| 40-44 | 4.2 | 12.4 | 9.7 | 0.5 | 2.2 | 4.0 |
| 45-49 | 3.4 | 11.6 | 6.7 | 0.2 | 1.6 | 2.5 |
| 50-64 | 5.8 | 20.4 | 8.5 | 0.2 | 3.8 | 3.6 |
| 50-54 | 2.6 | 9.1 | 4.4 | 0.1 | 1.5 | 1.8 |
| 55-59 | 1.6 | 5.7 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.9 |
| 60-64 | 1.6 | 5.5 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.9 |

Table 4.11 Distribution of household population by age group and relationship to household head (continued)

|  |  | Relationship to household head |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Total <br> household <br> population | Household <br> head | Spouse | Child | Other <br> relative | Not related |  |
| 65 and over | 3.5 | 11.7 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 4.2 | 1.6 |  |
| $65-69$ | 1.0 | 3.8 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.5 |  |
| $70-74$ | 0.9 | 3.1 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.5 |  |
| $75-79$ | 0.6 | 2.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.2 |  |
| $80+$ | 1.0 | 2.8 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.4 |  |
| Median age | 18.7 | 42.4 | 32.9 | 10.7 | 16.2 | 21.4 |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 4.8 Household heads

It is generally believed that the characteristics of the household head have a strong influence on the behaviour of the entire household, as well as the way household resources are utilized and disbursed within the household, and the way households are networked for exchange of resources with other households. An analysis of the characteristics of household heads is crucial to understanding the behaviour of households and, subsequently, the entire population.

### 4.8.1 Household heads by sex and place of residence

The distribution of the household heads is presented in Figure 4.2. It is seen that household headship is male dominated with 71.9 per cent of the household heads being males as compared to 28.1 per cent females. The male domination was observed for both rural and urban areas.

Figure 4.2 Distribution of households by place of residence and sex of household head


Table 4.12 shows that there were very few youths (15-24 years) who were household heads ( 6.2 per cent), while the older persons ( 65 years and above) constituted 12 per cent of the household heads. Thus, the majority ( 82.2 per cent) of household heads were in the age range of 25-64 years. The age distribution of the female household heads was slightly younger than that for male household heads. The median age for the female household heads was 44.1 years compared to 41.9 years for the male-headed households.

Household headship was highly male dominated. The overall sex ratio for the household heads was 256 males per 100 females. The sex ratio was higher for the rural household heads (262) compared to the urban household heads (248). The sex ratio was highest for the household heads aged $25-64$ years (277).

Table 4.12 Distribution of households, sex ratio and headship rates by place of residence and age of the household head

| Characteristic | Household head |  |  | Sex ratio | Headship rates |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female |  | Total | Male | Female |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 255.5 | 17.9 | 26.1 | 9.9 |
| Place of <br> residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rural | 55.1 | 55.5 | 54.2 | 261.7 | 16.7 | 24.6 | 9.0 |
| Urban | 44.9 | 44.5 | 45.8 | 248.3 | 19.6 | 28.3 | 11.1 |
| Age group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $15-24$ years | 6.2 | 5.6 | 7.6 | 188.7 | 5.1 | 6.9 | 3.4 |
| $25-64$ years | 82.2 | 84.0 | 77.5 | 277.0 | 43.2 | 65.1 | 22.4 |
| $65+$ years | 11.7 | 10.4 | 14.9 | 177.8 | 60.0 | 81.0 | 41.0 |
| Median age | 42.4 | 41.9 | 44.1 | $* * *$ | $* * *$ | $* * *$ | $* * *$ |

*** Not applicable
Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 4.8.2 Household headship

The headship rate is the proportion of household heads relative to the household population in each sub-group. It is computed by dividing the number of persons of a population sub-group who are household heads by the total household population of the same population sub-group. For ease of reporting, the rates have been multiplied by 100 . The headship rate gives the chances for a person of a given population sub-group to become a household head.

Table 4.13 shows that more than half ( 56.7 per cent) of the household heads had never had any education and more than half of the household heads ( 55.5 per cent) were not literate. Household heads with vocational, tertiary or university education constituted 8.3 per cent of the total. Persons with vocational, tertiary or university education were more likely to become household heads, with headship rates higher than 40 per cent compared to less than 25 per cent for those with no education or only basic education.

| Characteristic | Household head |  |  | Sex ratio | Headship rates |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female |  | Total | Male | Female |
| Literacy status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not literate | 55.5 | 49.1 | 71.6 | 175.3 | 29.0 | 45.3 | 17.8 |
| Literate - in a local language | 3.8 | 3.9 | 3.6 | 279.6 | 26.2 | 38.7 | 13.7 |
| Literate - not in local language | 40.3 | 46.6 | 24.3 | 489.1 | 21.2 | 31.0 | 8.4 |
| Highest educational level attained |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No education | 56.7 | 51.6 | 69.8 | 188.9 | 24.5 | 36.4 | 15.1 |
| Basic school | 19.5 | 20.6 | 16.6 | 316.9 | 9.1 | 14.0 | 4.3 |
| SSS | 13.3 | 15.4 | 7.8 | 504.3 | 25.2 | 34.4 | 10.8 |
| Vocational/ Technical/ Nursing/ Teacher Training | 4.6 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 364.9 | 42.8 | 56.5 | 22.7 |
| University ${ }^{1}$ | 3.7 | 4.4 | 1.8 | 617.5 | 47.3 | 58.4 | 21.7 |
| Other | 2.3 | 3.0 | 0.5 | 1,697.7 | 47.4 | 53.2 | 16.7 |

${ }^{1}$ Includes Higher (first degree) and
Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census Tertiary (Post-graduate) \& PhD

Table 4.14 shows that about two thirds ( 66.8 per cent) of the household heads were in selfemployment, 12.7 per cent were employees and 16.7 per cent were not working. The employed persons were more likely to be household heads as shown by a hardship rate of 58.3 per cent, while those 'not working' or 'other working persons' were less likely to be household heads.

The headship rates for 'not working' and 'other working persons' were 8.0 and 22.5 per cent respectively. The low skill jobs such as elementary occupations, agricultural workers and service workers had a higher share of female household heads compared to male heads. The same categories had low headships rates (less than 40 per cent) compared to the other occupations whose headship rate were 45 per cent or higher. This means that persons doing low-skill jobs were less likely to become household heads.

Table 4.14 Distribution of households and headship rates by employment characteristics of household head

| Characteristic | Household head |  |  | Sex ratio | Headship rates |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female |  | Total | Male | Female |
| Economic activity status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employee | 12.7 | 15.2 | 6.3 | 620.0 | 58.3 | 68.9 | 29.8 |
| Self-employment | 66.8 | 67.7 | 64.4 | 269.0 | 37.4 | 57.0 | 19.4 |
| Other working persons | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.3 | 282.8 | 22.5 | 32.6 | 12.0 |
| Looking for work | 3.1 | 3.5 | 2.0 | 441.6 | 32.7 | 42.6 | 16.2 |
| Not working | 13.6 | 9.7 | 23.6 | 104.6 | 8.0 | 8.9 | 7.2 |
| Occupation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Legislators, senior officials and managers | 1.4 | 1.6 | 0.9 | 551.8 | 52.7 | 67.8 | 23.7 |
| Professionals | 6.8 | 7.5 | 4.7 | 474.0 | 57.2 | 69.9 | 30.7 |
| Technicians and associate professionals | 3.0 | 3.4 | 1.7 | 607.1 | 52.7 | 63.6 | 25.9 |
| Clerks | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 378.1 | 50.0 | 63.6 | 27.6 |
| Service workers and shop and market sales workers | 16.4 | 12.7 | 27.7 | 137.4 | 35.8 | 59.0 | 23.2 |
| Agricultural and fishery workers | 54.2 | 53.8 | 55.6 | 289.8 | 34.5 | 53.7 | 17.0 |
| Craft and related trade workers | 9.3 | 11.2 | 3.8 | 871.6 | 45.2 | 53.0 | 19.9 |
| Plant and machine operators and assemblers | 4.3 | 5.6 | 0.3 | 5,362.7 | 56.8 | 58.7 | 20.4 |
| Elementary occupations | 2.7 | 2.2 | 4.2 | 155.1 | 35.0 | 55.5 | 22.3 |
| Other occupation | 0.9 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 888.5 | 61.4 | 74.9 | 23.6 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Table 4.15 shows that most household heads ( 72.6 per cent) were 'currently married' persons. Among the female heads, the share of the currently married females was lower (50.1 per cent) than that for males ( 81.5 per cent). The 'never married' persons, especially the females, were less likely to be household heads. The headship rate was 4.3 for 'never married' females and 9.7 for the 'never married' males. The headship rates for the currently married and formerly married (widowed, divorced or separated) persons were quite high at 42.5 per cent for the currently married persons and 51.1 per cent for the 'formerly married' persons. Among the 'formerly married' persons, the females had a marginally higher chance of being household heads compared to the males, while the reverse is true among the currently married persons.

There were no major differentials in household headship by religion, except for persons with 'no religion' whose headship rate was 4.1 per cent, while the headship rates for persons of the other religious groups were between 18.4 for the Christians and 17.6 for those of the 'other' religion. The non-Sierra Leoneans were more likely to be household heads with headship rates of 29.9 per cent for the 'other Africans' and 31.2 per cent for the 'non-Africans'.

Table 4.15 Distribution of households and headship rates by selected socio-economic characteristics of household head, Sierra Leone, 2015

| Characteristic | Household head |  |  | Sex ratio |  | Headship rates |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female |  | Total | Male | Female |  |
| Marital status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never married <br> (including engaged) | 14.5 | 14.8 | 13.6 | 279.5 | 7.3 | 9.7 | 4.3 |  |
| Cohabiting | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 68.0 | 17.9 | 17.3 | 18.3 |  |
| Currently married | 72.6 | 81.5 | 50.1 | 415.8 | 42.5 | 76.1 | 15.0 |  |
| Formerly married | 12.4 | 3.4 | 35.4 | 24.8 | 51.1 | 47.4 | 52.0 |  |
| Not working | 13.6 | 9.7 | 23.6 | 104.6 | 8.0 | 8.9 | 7.2 |  |
| Religion |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Christian | 22.5 | 21.7 | 24.5 | 225.7 | 18.4 | 26.5 | 10.9 |  |
| Islam | 76.6 | 77.5 | 74.6 | 265.4 | 17.8 | 26.1 | 9.6 |  |
| Other religion | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 245.8 | 17.6 | 25.6 | 10.0 |  |
| No religion | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 331.1 | 4.1 | 6.1 | 2.0 |  |
| Nationality |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sierra Leonean | 99.1 | 99.0 | 99.5 | 254.2 | 17.8 | 26.0 | 9.9 |  |
| Other African | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 487.6 | 29.9 | 43.9 | 11.7 |  |
| Non- African | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 768.2 | 31.2 | 38.3 | 12.6 |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Generally, household headship was highly male dominated. The overall sex ratio for the household heads was 256 males per 100 females. Tables 4.10, 4.11, 4.12 and 4.13 show that the sex ratios of the different subpopulations were above 150 males per 100 females. The few exceptions were household heads who were cohabiting, formerly married (widowed, divorced or separated), persons 'not working' or persons employed as service workers. The headship rates for males were more than twice as high as those for females, except for persons formerly married, those cohabiting and those 'not working'.

### 4.9 Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations

### 4.9.1 Summary

The total number of households in Sierra Leone increased from 485,711 in 1985 to 1.3 million in 2015. All districts and regions experienced an increase in the number of households between 2004 and 2015.

Most of the population of Sierra Leone (99.8 per cent) was enumerated in households. The proportion of the one-person households fell from 11 per cent in 1985 to 6.4 per cent in 2015. Sierra Leone has large households with 11.6 per cent of the households having 10 or more members in 2015. However, the mean household size has consistently declined from 6.6 persons in 1985 to 5.6 persons in 2015. The districts of the Western Region had household sizes much smaller than the national average, while those for the other three regions were quite close to the national average. Religion, employment and level of education showed no effect on the mean household size.

Nearly half of the households were of the extended household structure while 38.6 per cent were nuclear households. The population of Sierra Leone predominantly lives in a family set-up. Most of the household members were relatives of the household head. Nearly twothirds (64 per cent) of the household members were members of the head's family nucleus that is their spouse or children. The other relatives constituted only 26.5 per cent. The share of the 'other relatives' was higher in urban areas
(30.5 per cent) compared to the rural areas (23.7 per cent). Household headship was highly male dominated with 72 per cent of the households being headed by males. Where females were household heads, the household was more likely to be without a spouse.

### 4.9.2 Conclusion

Though Sierra Leone has large households, the average household size has consistently shown a decrease in size to 5.6 in 2015. Headship of households was highly male dominated with nearly three-quarters of the household heads being males. The extended family is still valued, especially in the urban areas.

### 4.9.3 Recommendations

A population census is not the best way to study the household and family structure. A detailed understanding of the complexities of household and family structure and its impact on socio-economic development should be addressed through a household based sample survey, which can identify the complicated interrelationships between household members. Such a survey could be undertaken by Statistics Sierra Leone or a research institution within the country.

## APPENDIX

## Table A.4.1 Classification of households ${ }^{1}$

Households should be classified by type according to the number of family nuclei they contain and the relationship, if any, between the family nuclei and the other members of the household. The relationship should be through blood, adoption or marriage, to whatever degree is considered pertinent by the country. Given the complexity of this item, it is important that information on relationship to the household reference person be properly processed. The types of household to be distinguished could be:
a)Single-person household.
b)Nuclear household, defined as a household consisting entirely of a single family nucleus. It may be classified into:
(i) Married-couple family:
a.With children;
b. Without children.
(ii) Partner in consensual union (cohabiting partner):
a. With children;
b. Without children.
(iii) Father with children.
(vi) Mother with children.
c) Extended household, defined as a household consisting of any one of the following ${ }^{2}$ :
(i) A single family nucleus and other persons related to the nucleus, for example, a father with child/children and other relative(s) or a married couple with other relative(s) only;
(ii) Two or more family nuclei related to each other without any other persons, for example, two or more married couples with children only;
(iii) Two or more family nuclei related to each other plus other persons related to at least one of the nuclei, for example, two or more married couples with other relative(s) only;
(iv) Two or more persons related to each other, none of whom constitute a family nucleus;
d) Composite household, defined as a household consisting of any of the following:
(i) A single family nucleus plus other persons, some of whom are related to the nucleus and some of whom are not, for example, mother with a child/children and other relatives and non-relatives;
(ii) A single family nucleus plus other persons, none of whom is related to the nucleus, for example, father with children and non-relatives;
(iii) Two or more family nuclei related to each other plus other persons, some of whom are related to at least one of the nuclei and some of whom are not related to any of the nuclei, for example, two or more couples with other relatives and non-relatives only;
(iv) Two or more family nuclei related to each other plus other persons, none of whom is related to any of the nuclei, for example, two or more married couples one or more of which with children and non-relatives;
(v) Two or more family nuclei not related to each other, with or without any other persons;
(vi) Two or more persons related to each other but none of whom constitute a family nucleus, plus other unrelated persons;
(vii) Non-related persons only.
e) Other/unknown.
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## CHAPTER 5: FERTILITY

### 5.1 Introduction

Fertility as a component of demographic change is important in understanding population trends. Fertility indicators are also important for monitoring population policies and programmes. Although total fertility rates have been declining globally, most countries in sub-Saharan Africa, including Sierra Leone, still have relatively high fertility and the rate of fertility decline has been slower compared to other developing countries. Some of the reasons for persisting high fertility include early childbearing, the desire to have large families, and little or no contraception provision.

There are some government initiatives aimed at addressing the issue of high fertility in Sierra Leone. Since 2013, there has been a National Strategy for the Reduction of Teenage Pregnancy specifically aimed at reducing teenage pregnancies. There is also a National Population Policy that was launched in 2009. One of the goals of the policy is to achieve low birth and death rates, and consequently low population growth, through the spread of voluntary family planning and small family norms to achieve national economic targets.

The 2013 Sierra Leone Demographic and Health Survey (SLDHS) found that use of contraceptives remains low in Sierra Leone with only 15.6 per cent of married women using modern contraceptives. Furthermore, women who have not had a proper education have been shown to be less likely to use contraception. This chapter presents the pattern, levels and differentials of fertility.

### 5.2 Definition of measures of fertility

Fertility refers to the frequency of occurrence of live births among women in a population. The crude birth rate (CBR) is the number of live births per thousand mid-year population during
a specified period. The number of live births per thousand women of reproductive age (1549 years) is known as the general fertility rate (GFR).

Age specific fertility rate (ASFR) is the number of live births per thousand women of a specific age group. The ASFRs show the age pattern of fertility and are used to calculate total fertility rate (TFR) which is the number of children that a woman would have by the end of her childbearing period if she were to experience the currently observed ASFRs.

Another measure of fertility is the child-woman ratio also known as the fertility ratio which is the number of children aged below 5 years per 1,000 women of childbearing age. However, underenumeration or over-enumeration affects the ratio, such that it is important to assume these were constant if data are compared at different time periods.

Taking female births only into consideration, gross reproduction rate (GRR) and net reproduction rate (NRR) can be calculated. GRR is the average number of female births that a woman would give birth to by the time she reached the end of her reproduction, if she experienced ASFRs prevailing in that year. NRR refers to the average number of female births born to women aged 15-49, that would survive to the end of their reproductive period after experiencing the prevailing fertility and mortality levels.

Completed family size, also known as the mean parity, is the number of children ever born to women who have completed their reproduction (those aged 45-49). Parity progression ratio is the proportion of women of a specific parity who progress to the next parity. Based on ASFR schedule, the mean age at childbearing can be calculated. This indicator is the average age of mothers at the birth of their children, if women were subject throughout their lives to the ASFRs observed in each year.

### 5.3 Sources and quality of fertility data

Sierra Leone, like most developing countries, does not have a complete registration system for births and deaths. As such, the important sources of information on fertility in the country is obtained from censuses and surveys. Previous fertility indicators were obtained from surveys such as 2008 and 2010 Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS), 2010 Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS) and the 2004 Census.

The 2015 Census collected data on current and completed fertility of women aged 10-54 years. Specifically, the information collected was whether the woman had ever given birth; how many children were born alive during her lifetime; and how many children were born in the 12 months before the census.

The question on children ever born provides required information for estimating lifetime fertility of women. The estimates of completed family size were derived using data from this question. The information collected using the question on births in the 12 months prior to the census is useful in estimating current fertility. Data collected using this question were used in the computation of ASFRs, TFRs, GRRs and NRRs.

The fertility information collected through censuses is known to be inaccurate due to underreporting of births at the time of data collection, resulting in lower estimates than the actual levels. As a result, indirect methods are used to estimate the fertility levels.

To assess data quality of current fertility from censuses, the checks can include comparison of the total reported births with total expected births and assessment of the plausibility of the distribution of ASFRs calculated directly from the data.

The census data show that 87,302 births were reported for the 12 months before the census among 1, 831,953 women aged 15-49 years. The results show that the reported total births in 2015 were much lower than in the 2004 Census. The data also show much lower ASFRs, compared to those from the 2013 DHS. However,
the pattern of fertility is similar. As such, indirect methods were used for fertility estimation.

### 5.4 Methods of analysis

The analysis of fertility in this chapter involved calculation of rates, ratios and proportions. Also included were indirect fertility estimation using the Trussell variant of the Brass P/F ratio method and Brass relational Gompertz model.

The Brass P/F ratio technique assumes that the level of completeness of fertility is the same for all age groups of women. The method also assumes that the reporting of the average number of children ever born per woman is complete, at least up to ages 30 or 35 years, and that there is no age misreporting of women in the childbearing years. Lastly, the method assumes that the pattern and level of fertility have not changed during the 10 to 15 years prior to the census or survey.

The P/F ratios themselves serve as a useful tool to analyze the quality of data and determine a possible recent trend in fertility. For instance, typical results may show similar P/F ratios for the age groups 20-24, 25-29, and 30-34 years, with ratios becoming smaller for the older ages. This could indicate that fertility has been constant in the past as assumed in the technique; that any underreporting of births in the last year occurred equally at all ages of women; and that any underreporting of children ever born occurred only with respect to women aged 35 years and over. However, older women tend to underreport their lifetime fertility. Secondly, women of all ages tend to under-report recent births.

The Brass relational Gompertz model is an improved method over the P/F ratio method and it does not assume that fertility has been constant in the past. The estimates pertaining to ages 20-24 years and 25-29 years are mostly taken as the actual levels of the TFR.

Population Analysis System (PASEX) spread sheets developed by the United States Bureau of the Census (International Programs Centre) were used for estimation of fertility. For TFR calculation using Gompertz relational model, the FE_Relational Gompertz spreadsheet developed by T. Moultrie was used.

### 5.5 Fertility levels and pattern

The reported 87,302 births were adjusted to 328,433 births, based on adjusted ASFRs presented later in this chapter. Table 5.1 shows adjusted CBR and GFR for 2004 and 2015. The 2015 census data show that adjusted CBR was 46.4 births per 1,000 population. The adjusted general fertility rate was estimated at 179.3 per 1,000 women. The rates for 2015 were lower than 2004, whose GFR was 192.0 and CBR was 48.2.

There is variation by place of residence with both CBR and GFR being higher in rural than urban areas as shown in Table 5.1. In 2015, CBR in rural areas was 49.2 per 1,000 population compared to 41.0 per 1,000 population in urban areas. GFR was 199.4 per 1,000 women in rural areas compared to 148.4 per 1,000 women in urban areas. The reported child-woman ratio for Sierra Leone was estimated at 512 children aged under-five per 1,000 women of childbearing age. This was also lower than the 2004 estimate of 603.


Table 5.1 Adjusted crude birth rates and general fertility rates by place of residence, 2004 and 2015

|  |  | Total | Urban | Rural |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2004 | CBR | 48.2 | - | - |
|  | GFR | 192.0 | - | - |
| 2015 | CBR | 46.4 | 41.0 | 49.2 |
|  | GFR | 179.3 | 148.5 | 199.4 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census


Table 5.2 shows the estimated TFR from the Brass P/F ratio method and Gompertz relational model for comparison. The estimate from the P/F ratio method was slightly higher at 5.8 compared to 5.6 from the Gompertz method. The TFR presented in this chapter has been adjusted using the Gompertz relational model as the values are closer to the TFR published for Sierra Leone in recent years. As such, according to the 2015 census results, the adjusted TFR is 5.6.

As a measure of completed fertility, the average number of children ever born to women age 45-49 tends to exhibit much more stability than ASFRs from year to year. Also known as the completed family size, the average number of children ever born to women aged 45-49 years was 5.4. which was lower than the 2004 estimate of 6.0.

| Age group | Relational <br> Gompertz model | Brass P/F ratio <br> (Trussell variant) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $15-19$ | 0.1230 | 0.1013 |
| $20-24$ | 0.2451 | 0.2335 |
| $25-29$ | 0.2548 | 0.2704 |
| $30-34$ | 0.2222 | 0.2348 |
| $35-39$ | 0.0859 | 0.1825 |
| $40-44$ | 0.0128 | 0.0871 |
| $45-49$ | 5.6 | 0.0518 |
| TFR |  | 5.8 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census


### 5.6 Age pattern of fertility

The pattern of reported fertility in the 12 months before the census shows a sharp fertility increase from age 15-19 years to 20-24 years, suggesting rapid childbearing at younger ages (Table 5.3). Fertility peaked among women aged 25-29 years after which it started to decline.


| Age group | Year of census |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1974 | 1985 | 2004 | 2015 |
| $15-19$ | 0.186 | 0.1255 | 0.065 | 0.0232 |
| $20-24$ | 0.26 | 0.2039 | 0.1405 | 0.0602 |
| $25-29$ | 0.246 | 0.1981 | 0.1492 | 0.0728 |
| $30-34$ | 0.1438 | 0.1578 | 0.1308 | 0.0645 |
| $35-39$ | 0.071 | 0.1223 | 0.1074 | 0.0511 |
| $40-44$ | 0.0472 | 0.0625 | 0.0547 | 0.0259 |
| $45-49$ | 5.7 | 4.5 | 0.0342 | 0.0157 |
| TFR |  |  | 3.4 | 1.6 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

The reported and adjusted ASFRs and TFRs from 1985 to 2015 are presented in Table 5.4. The adjusted ASFR for women aged 15-19 years was 123 births per 1,000 and it rose to 245 per 1,000 for women aged 20-24 years. Fertility peaked later among women aged 25-29 years after which it started to decline.

The age pattern of fertility is similar to the 2004 census results, but there is a decline in ASFR at each age group. The highest fertility decline was observed for women aged 45-49 where ASFR had declined by 78 per cent.

Of all the births that were reported among women aged 45-49 years in the year preceding the census, 64 per cent occurred among women aged 15-29, which was about 62 per cent of the women. The data further show that 12 per cent of the total births were from women aged 1519 and the proportion of these teenagers to women of childbearing age was 24 per cent.


| Age group | Year of census |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1985 |  | 2004 |  | 2015 |  |
|  | Observed ASFR | Adjusted ASFR | Observed ASFR | Adjusted ASFR | Observed ASFR | Adjusted ASFR |
| 15-19 | 0.1255 | 0.2 | 0.065 | 0.1364 | 0.0232 | 0.123 |
| 20-24 | 0.2039 | 0.28 | 0.1405 | 0.2581 | 0.0602 | 0.2451 |
| 25-29 | 0.1981 | 0.27 | 0.1492 | 0.2665 | 0.0728 | 0.2548 |
| 30-34 | 0.1578 | 0.21 | 0.1308 | 0.2307 | 0.0645 | 0.2222 |
| 35-39 | 0.1223 | 0.16 | 0.1074 | 0.1857 | 0.0511 | 0.1709 |
| 40-44 | 0.0625 | 0.08 | 0.0547 | 0.0891 | 0.0259 | 0.0859 |
| 45-49 | 0.0389 | 0.05 | 0.0342 | 0.0545 | 0.0157 | 0.0128 |
| Reported TFR | 4.5 | 6.3 | 3.4 | 6.1 | 1.6 | 5.6 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Age specific parity is the average number of children per woman of a specified age group. Figure 5.1 shows the parity of women by age and place of residence. The parity of women aged $15-19$ years was 0.3 and rose to 2.4 for women aged $25-29$ years. The average number of children ever born for women aged 35-39 years was 4.4.

The parity of women in rural areas was higher than that of women in urban areas. The gap in parity widens as women get older. For example, the parity for women aged 15-19 in urban areas was 0.2 compared to 0.4 in rural areas. For older women aged 45-49 years, the parity for women in urban areas was 4.7 compared to 5.9 in rural areas.

Figure 5.1 Mean children ever born alive among women aged 15-49 years by place of residence, 2015


Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 5.7 Fertility trends, 1974-2015

The trends in TFRs from 1974 to 2015 are presented in Figure 5.2. In general, there has been a fertility decline, as shown by the downward trend of TFRs. The DHS estimates of TFR are much lower than the census estimates but they also show a decline in fertility. The TFRs for 2008 and 2013 DHS were 5.1 and 4.9 respectively. The rate of fertility decline was faster between the 2004 Census and the 2008 DHS and the fertility increase between the 2013 DHS and 2015 census is unlikely.

It is possible that data quality may have been an issue with the two surveys, as the fertility information was collected through a very detailed birth history of the woman. In the past 40 years, fertility had declined from 6.5 in 1974 to 5.6 in 2015, showing that the TFR had declined by an average of one child during this period.

Figure 5.2 Trends in total fertility rate, 1974-2015


Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 5.8 Fertility differentials

An analysis of fertility differentials shows variation in fertility for different subgroups of women. Table 5.5 shows ASFRs and TFRs by selected characteristics of women, which include place of residence, region, marital status and education level.

### 5.8.1 Place of residence

The results show that fertility was higher in rural areas with TFR of 6.2 compared to 4.6 in urban areas. Fertility among urban women was lower at all ages compared to that of rural women. The age pattern of fertility between urban and rural areas was similar, as the fertility peaked among women aged 25-29 years.

The largest variation in ASFRs between the urban and rural areas was among women aged 20-29 years. The TFR in the urban areas was lower at 4.6 compared to 6.2 in rural areas, suggesting that in urban areas, women have one child less by the time they reach the end of their reproductive life than women in rural areas.

### 5.8.2 Region

Fertility was highest for the Northern and Southern regions at 6.0 respectively and lowest in the Western Region at 4.1. The Western Region had much lower ASFRs for all age groups. The age pattern of fertility also shows that the fertility rate of adolescents (15-19 years) in the Western Region was lower than in the other regions. For example, adolescent fertility in the Western Region was 36 per cent lower than in the Southern Region.

The Western Region had a total fertility of 4.1 compared to 6.0 for both Northern and Southern regions. The 2004 Census also showed a similar regional TFR pattern, with the TFR being highest in the Southern Region (6.9) and lowest in the Western Region (4.2).
and widows, 5.5 and 5.4 respectively. Among women who have never been married, the TFR was 3.6. The fertility pattern by age shows that ASFRs for widows exceeded those of women of other marital categories at ages 20-34 years, while ASFRs for women who have never been married exceeded those of the other women at older ages (40-49 years).

Younger women who have ever been married had high fertility. ASFR for married women aged 15-19 years was 233 per 1,000 women; 200 per 1,000 women for divorced women; and 218 per 1,000 women for widows, compared to 58 per 1,000 among women who have never been married.

It is interesting to note that the age pattern of fertility for divorced women shows that fertility declined steadily from young women aged 1519 years, while ASFR for married and widows declined from age 20-24. Married women and widows had TFRs of 5.5 and 5.4 respectively while women who have never been married had a TFR of 3.6.

### 5.8.4 Educational attainment

The results in Table 5.5 show that there is an inverse relationship between education and fertility. Fertility was lowest among women with tertiary education, with a TFR of 3.0 children per woman. The TFR among women with secondary education was 3.9 while women who have never attended school had a TFR of 6.2. Women with only primary education had a TFR of 5.5.

Completed family size also varied by education of the woman. Women with secondary education or higher had the smallest completed family size of 3.9. Women who have never attended school had a completed family size of 5.7 , which does not vary much from that of women with primary education, who had a completed family size of 5.4.

### 5.8.3 Marital status

Fertility was higher among married women

Table 5.5 Age specific fertility rates and total fertility rates by selected background characteristics, 2015

| Background characteristics | TFR | Age group |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 15-19 | 20-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | 40-44 | 45-49 |
| Total | 5.6 | 0.1230 | 0.2451 | 0.2548 | 0.2222 | 0.1709 | 0.0859 | 0.0128 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 4.6 | 0.0919 | 0.1979 | 0.2129 | 0.1888 | 0.1463 | 0.0737 | 0.0109 |
| Rural | 6.2 | 0.1492 | 0.2814 | 0.2831 | 0.2412 | 0.1819 | 0.0897 | 0.0131 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Northern | 6.0 | 0.139 | 0.2654 | 0.2728 | 0.238 | 0.1844 | 0.0941 | 0.0144 |
| Southern | 6.0 | 0.1425 | 0.2756 | 0.2785 | 0.2366 | 0.1772 | 0.0863 | 0.0123 |
| Eastern | 5.8 | 0.123 | 0.2623 | 0.2731 | 0.2332 | 0.173 | 0.0822 | 0.0112 |
| Western | 4.1 | 0.0842 | 0.1754 | 0.1877 | 0.1671 | 0.131 | 0.0671 | 0.0103 |
| Marital Status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never married | 3.6 | 0.0582 | 0.1221 | 0.1459 | 0.1494 | 0.139 | 0.0897 | 0.0194 |
| Married | 5.5 | 0.2331 | 0.2459 | 0.2092 | 0.1738 | 0.1393 | 0.0806 | 0.0160 |
| Divorced | 4.1 | 0.1999 | 0.1854 | 0.1492 | 0.1201 | 0.0944 | 0.054 | 0.0107 |
| Widowed | 5.4 | 0.2182 | 0.2696 | 0.2253 | 0.1742 | 0.1243 | 0.0598 | 0.0087 |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Never | 6.2 | 0.1772 | 0.2814 | 0.2693 | 0.2281 | 0.1755 | 0.0908 | 0.0145 |
| Primary | 5.5 | 0.1269 | 0.2587 | 0.2604 | 0.2164 | 0.1566 | 0.0723 | 0.0095 |
| Secondary | 3.9 | 0.0825 | 0.1647 | 0.1758 | 0.1583 | 0.1266 | 0.0671 | 0.0108 |
| Tertiary | 3.0 | 0.0593 | 0.1046 | 0.1181 | 0.1195 | 0.1129 | 0.0765 | 0.0182 |
| Other | 5.3 | 0.1205 | 0.2371 | 0.2421 | 0.2073 | 0.1563 | 0.0766 | 0.0110 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 5.9 Other fertility measures

### 5.9.1 Mean age at childbearing

The mean age at childbearing by place of residence and region is presented in Figure 5.3. The mean age of a woman at childbearing was estimated at 29.2 years using adjusted fertility data. Compared to the 2004 estimate of 30.0 years, there was a minimal change in the mean age at childbearing over the last decade.

The mean age of childbearing varies by place of residence and region. For urban women, the mean age at childbearing was 29.5 years compared to 28.9 years for rural women. An analysis by region shows that the mean age at childbearing varies from 28.9 years in the Southern Region to 29.5 years in the Western Region.

Figure 5.3 Mean age at childbearing by place of residence and region


Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 5.9.2 Gross and net reproduction rates

The GRR, which measures the average number of daughters to a woman with a given ASFR schedule, was 2.67 in 2015 compared to 3.05 in 2004 (Table 5.6). The NRR, which shows the average number of daughters that a woman can have given an age specific mortality and fertility schedule, was 2.04. which has changed minimally from the 2004 estimate of 2.1.


| Age group | Age specific <br> fertility rate | Women in station- <br> ary population <br> Lx/l0* | Births |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $15-19$ | 0.123 | 4.03 | 0.4960 |
| $20-24$ | 0.245 | 3.95 | 0.9682 |
| $25-29$ | 0.255 | 3.86 | 0.9824 |
| $30-34$ | 0.222 | 3.75 | 0.8331 |
| $35-39$ | 0.171 | 3.63 | 0.6205 |
| $40-44$ | 0.086 | 3.50 | 0.3007 |
| $45-49$ | 5.6 | 3.35 | 0.0430 |
| Total |  |  | 4.2 |
| GRR* |  |  | 2.67 |
| NRR* |  |  | 2.04 |

*Lx values are obtained from lifetable for females in the mortality chapter and the proportion of female births used in this calculation is calculated from the reported births in the 12 months before the census

### 5.9.3 Parity progression ratios

The parity progression ratios (PPRs) are presented in Table 5.7 for women aged 45-49 who are assumed to have completed childbearing. The census shows that 64 per cent of women aged 45-49 years who had nine children will proceed to have 10 or more children while the probability of progressing from childlessness to first birth was 92 per cent. The probability of a woman with parity six or less to have an additional child was high, ranging between 80 to 95 per cent. For example, 95 per cent of women with one child will have a second child while 84 per cent of women with four children will only have one more child.

The PPRs were higher in rural than in urban areas for women aged 45-49 years. While 84 per cent of the urban women with parity three will proceed to have an additional child, for rural women it was 91 per cent. The PPRs also indicate that 71 per cent of the women in the urban areas with seven children will have another child compared to 79 per cent of the women in the rural areas.


Table 5.7 Parity progression ratios for women aged 45-49 years, 2015

|  |  | Parity progression ratio |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CEB | Total | Urban | Rural |
| 1 | 0.9201 | 0.9138 | 0.9242 |
| 2 | 0.9522 | 0.9335 | 0.9644 |
| 3 | 0.9173 | 0.8845 | 0.9382 |
| 4 | 0.8820 | 0.8421 | 0.9058 |
| 5 | 0.8387 | 0.7876 | 0.8670 |
| 7 | 0.7984 | 0.7446 | 0.8254 |
| 8 | 0.7224 | 0.7070 | 0.7888 |
| 9 | 0.6599 | 0.6626 | 0.7460 |
| $10+$ | 0.6401 | 0.6010 | 0.6797 |
|  |  | 0.5982 | 0.6510 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 5.9.4 Childlessness

The proportion of women who remain childless through to the end of the reproductive age is taken as an indirect measure of primary infertility. However, according to Rutstein et. al., this measure does not reflect current trends in infertility. Since censuses are mostly only able to provide information on children ever born to a woman, childlessness is calculated based on women with zero parity. As such in this chapter, childlessness by age was computed like in most censuses, as the number of women in an age group who have never had a live birth divided by the number of all women in an age group. Table 5.8 shows the proportion of childless women by age in Sierra Leone.

Table 5.8 Proportion of childless women by age, 2004 and 2015

|  | Year of census |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age of <br> woman | 2004 | 2015 |
| $15-19$ | 83.6 | 42.9 |
| $20-24$ | 43.3 | 20.4 |
| $25-29$ | 17.6 | 11.9 |
| $30-34$ | 10.7 | 9.0 |
| $35-39$ | 7.9 | 7.2 |
| $40-44$ | 8.6 | 7.3 |
| $45-49$ |  | 6.8 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census


As expected. the proportion of childless women declined with an increase in age of the woman. The pattern of age specific childlessness rate shows that 81 per cent of women aged 15-19 years were childless and this declined to 43 per cent among women aged 20-24 years. The table further shows that 8 per cent of women aged 45-49 years were childless and among women aged $40-44$ years it was 8.8 per cent. Compared to the 2004 Census, 8.6 per cent of women aged $40-44$ years reported being childless and 8.1 per cent of women aged 45-49 years were childless.


Table 5.9. Proportion of all childless women and married childless women by age and place of residence

|  | All women |  |  | Married women |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age group | Total | Urban | Rural |  |
| $15-19$ | 81.2 | 85.5 | 77.7 | 42.9 |
| $20-24$ | 42.5 | 48.1 | 37.3 | 20.4 |
| $25-29$ | 21.6 | 25.6 | 18.4 | 11.9 |
| $30-34$ | 13.1 | 15.1 | 11.8 | 9.0 |
| $35-39$ | 9.3 | 10.5 | 8.5 | 7.2 |
| $40-44$ | 8.8 | 9.2 | 8.6 | 7.3 |
| $45-49$ | 8.0 | 8.6 | 7.6 | 6.8 |
| $50-54$ | 8.8 | 8.9 | 8.7 | 7.5 |

[^4]Table 5.9 shows childlessness among all women and married women by place of residence. Among all women, the proportion that was childless ranges from 81.2 per cent for women aged 15-19 years and rapidly declines to 21.6 per cent for women aged $25-29$ years. It is seen that by age 45-49 years, just 8.8 per cent of all women were still childless.

Among married women, the proportion who were childless was lower for all age groups. Only 42.9 per cent of the married women aged 1519 years were childless and by the age 25-29, 11.9 per cent of married women were childless. Regarding older women, 7.3 per cent of women aged 40-44 were childless while 6.8 per cent of women aged 45-49 years were childless.

An analysis of childlessness by place of residence shows that in the urban areas women were more likely to be childless than in the rural areas. It is also noted that as the women get older, the difference in the proportion of childlessness between urban and rural women becomes smaller. By age 45-49 years, the proportion of childless women in the urban areas was 8.6 per cent compared to 7.6 per cent in the rural areas. Among the younger women, 85.5 per cent of married women aged 15-19 in rural areas were childless compared to 77.7 per cent of women of the same age in the rural areas.

### 5.10 Summary

The analysis shows that fertility has slowly declined in Sierra Leone, with the TFR dropping from 6.5 in 1974 to 5.6 in 2015. The age pattern of fertility also shows a rapid increase in childbearing from age 15-19 years to 2024 years after which the fertility rate starts to decline. The fertility data for educational attainment shows an inverse relationship between fertility and level of education of a woman. The TFR by educational attainment of the woman shows that it was 6.2 for women who have never been to school compared to 3.0 for those with tertiary education.

The TFR was also higher in the rural areas (6.2) than in the urban areas (4.6). In terms of PPR for women who have completed childbearing aged 45-49 years, it was shown that the probability of a woman with parity six or less to have an
additional child was high, ranging between 80 and 95 per cent. There is minimal change in the mean age at childbearing ( 29.2 years) from the 2004 Census figure of 30.0 years. Childlessness as a measure of primary infertility in the population shows that 81 per cent of all women aged 15-19 years were childless but by age 4549 years only 8 per cent of all women were still childless. Among married women aged 15-19, 42.9 per cent were childless and 11.9 per cent of women aged 25-29 years were childless.

### 5.11 Conclusion

There is variation in fertility among the various subgroups of women. The analysis shows high ASFRs among young women who are either married, divorced or widowed, suggesting early childbearing from early marriages.

It shows that once a woman marries, there is little or no effort to delay having children, implying the importance of children in families, even in young families. The data on ASFRs and TFRs further show that more educated women prefer small families.

The differentials by educational attainment show that women who are empowered by education are more likely to control their family size. The high PPR from parity five to six supports progression to an additional child even among women who have large families. The level of childlessness suggests that there is early childbearing, as fewer young married women were childless.

### 5.12 Recommendations

There is need for improvement in policies that address delayed childbearing among adolescents. Reducing fertility will require multi-sectoral approach to ensure that these young women have opportunities.

Government should take the lead in implementing policies and programmes aimed at empowering young women and should focus on encouraging them to delay having children. Education remains the key to building a generation of empowered women, because staying longer in school will delay childbearing among young women and subsequently reduce fertility among all women.

In order to effectively monitor and evaluate the policies and programmes for fertility reduction, there is a need to regularly collect high-quality data. To this end, national data systems need to be strengthened.
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## CHAPTER 6: MORTALITY AND ORPHANHOOD

### 6.1 Introduction

The level of mortality reflects the health status of a population, including its health services. The risk of dying is also known to vary with age and sex. Deaths in children is a critical indicator of the level of socio economic development. In developing countries, children die of diseases that are preventable so targeted health programmes are able to dramatically reduce child deaths. Reduction in childhood mortality is associated with gains in life expectancy at birth, which makes it important to understand the dynamics in the population.

This chapter presents the levels and trends of childhood and adult mortality including maternal mortality and the mortality differentials. It also presents life tables which help mortality analysis, as well as information on orphanhood status of children under age 18.

### 6.2 Sources of data

Censuses and surveys remain the primary sources of mortality data in most developing countries due to incomplete death registration systems. Sierra Leone is not an exception. While censuses are able to provide mortality rates and levels, death registration systems have additional information such as detailed causes of death. Information on child and adult mortality from censuses is used to estimate life tables which show the probability of dying at each age.

There are already efforts being made to strengthen the vital registration system in the country. In 2016, a bill was passed which made registration of events such as deaths compulsory. In the absence of a complete registration system, the 2015 Census provided useful information for computing the mortality indicators.

Data on children born in the 12 months prior to the census, children ever born and children surviving, were collected to measure childhood mortality. Information on maternal and general
deaths in the 12 months prior to the census date was also collected. Details of the deceased taken included sex, age at death, cause of death and if the death was reported to any authority or hospital.

For women who died while aged 10-54 years during the period, the respondent was asked whether she died during pregnancy or during childbirth, or during the six weeks after the end of pregnancy. This information was used for estimating maternal mortality

Information on orphanhood included questions on the survivorship of the biological parents (father and mother) of every household member aged 0 to 17 years.

### 6.3 Definition of concepts

Mortality refers to the occurrence of deaths in a population. A death is a complete absence of any signs of life at any time after a live birth has occurred.

Infant mortality rate (IMR): Is the probability for a newborn to die before his or her first birthday. It is expressed per 1,000 live births occurring during a specified reference period. In the case of a census, it is the preceding year. It is usually denoted IMR or by the life table notation (1q0).

Child mortality rate (CMR) is the probability for a child aged one year to die before its fifth birthday. It is expressed per 1,000 and covers a specified reference period which is one year prior to the census. It is usually denoted by CMR or the life table notation (4q1).

Under-five mortality rate (U5MR) Is the probability for a newborn to die before his or her fifth birthday. It is expressed per 1,000 live births occurring during a specified reference period, in this case taken to be one year prior to the census. It is usually denoted U5MR or by the life table notation (5q0).

Crude death rate (CDR) is the total number of deaths in a given year among a population divided by the mid-year population, expressed per 1,000 population.

Age specific death rate (ASDR) is the number of deaths in a population of a given age (or age-group) in a given year, divided by the estimated mid-year population in that age (agegroup), expressed per 1,000 population.

Life expectancy at birth (e0) is the average number of years a hypothetical cohort of people born in a specific year could expect to live if they were subject to the current mortality level at each age throughout their life. Life expectancy at a specific age is the number of additional years a person could expect to live if he or she was subject to the current mortality at each age for the rest of his or her life.

Maternal mortality rate (MMRate) measures the number of maternal death per 1,000 aged 15-49.

Maternal mortality ratio (MMRatio) is the number of maternal deaths per 100,000 live births.

Orphan is a child under 18 years who has lost at least one biological parent.

### 6.4 Methods of analysis

Mortality measures can be estimated using direct estimation techniques or indirect estimation techniques where data are not reliable or not available. CDRs and ASDRs were calculated directly from the census data.

Regarding indirect estimation, Trussell's variant to Brass's method was used to estimate infant, child and under 5 mortality. The technique is based on the assumptions that fertility and mortality levels and patterns have remained constant in the recent past and the risk of a child dying is a function only of the age of the child and not of other factors.

Estimates of infant and childhood mortality should be interpreted with caution. This is because estimates in 2015 are based on information obtained from women aged 15-19 years. Women in this age group are known to have high child mortality because of their biological and socioeconomic characteristics. As such the indicators need to be interpreted with caution.

The QFIVE programme developed by United Nations (UN) was used to estimate infant and child mortality using the census data of children ever born and children still surviving. It was assumed that adult mortality follows the CoaleDemeny North pattern based on previous mortality analysis in Sierra Leone, which also used the North model. Abridged life tables were obtained using LIFTB application in MORTPAK.

### 6.5 Quality of data

Mortality data from censuses are known to suffer from misreporting. For example, household members may not be ready to report the death of a household member or women may not be ready to give information about their dead children. For maternal mortality, household members may not have the relevant information on the cause of death of a female member that died while pregnant or at childbirth. This may result in misclassifying a death.

### 6.5.1 Evaluation of the completeness of death reporting by sex

The sex ratio at death by age is one of the indicators to examine potential sex-differences in mortality. It is expected that the sex ratios curve follows a classical well-known pattern that reflects the differences in mortality risk by sex and age group. For instance, mortality below age one is expected to be higher among boys than girls. Mortality risk is generally higher among females during childbearing age, especially in countries where maternal mortality is very high.

Figure 6.1 Sex ratio at death


Figure 6.1 shows the sex ratios at death. The graph shows that the sex ratio at death is higher from birth to age 14 , reflecting high male mortality, after which female mortality exceeds male mortality up to age 29 . One probable reason could be that maternal deaths are more frequent among these younger women as this is the peak of childbearing in Sierra Leone. The sex ratio at death also starts to increase from age 50 through to the very old ages due to higher male mortality at the older ages.

### 6.5.2 Evaluation of the completeness and accuracy of the deaths reporting by age

Age specific mortality in developing countries is generally U-shaped due to very high child mortality and also high mortality at the older ages. With the U-shaped mortality pattern, the high mortality in children rapidly declines and reaches the minimum around 10 years. After this is starts to increase through the teenage years. Mortality starts to increase from early thirties and rapidly increases at older ages. Deviation from this expected pattern may be an indication of problems with the data on deaths. Figure 6.2 shows the expected U-shaped pattern of mortality by age for both males and females. This suggests that the quality of reported deaths from the census is of reasonably good quality.


### 6.6 Levels of mortality

### 6.6.1 Crude death rate

There were 104,019 deaths reported in the 2015 Census making the reported CDR 14.7 per 1000. The Eastern Region had the highest CDR at 18.4 per 1000 and it was lowest in the Western Region at 10.3 per 1000 (Table 6.1). The CDR is higher among males than females.

| Fable 6.1 Reported crude death rates by sex |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| and region | Tatal |  |  |
| Total | 14.7 | 15.4 | Female |
| Region | 18.4 | 19.4 | 14.0 |
| Eastern | 14.2 | 14.9 | 17.4 |
| Northern | 16.0 | 16.6 | 13.5 |
| Southern | 10.3 | 10.8 | 15.5 |
| Western |  |  | 9.8 |

[^5]
### 6.6.2 Age pattern of mortality

Age and sex specific death rates by place of residence are presented in Table 6.2. The results show that in Sierra Leone, mortality is high in very young children (as expected in most developing countries) and starts declining after age 5 until age 24, after which mortality starts increasing. ASDRs for males were higher at young ages but ASDRs for females started getting higher than those for males from age 15 to 29. This is most likely due to an increase in maternal deaths among childbearing women as previously seen in most censuses in developing countries. Urban-rural residence shows that ASDRs were higher in rural than urban areas. However overall female mortality only exceeds that for males in the younger childbearing age groups (15-29 years). There are sex differentials in mortality by place of residence. Male ASDR mortality is much higher among urban men from ages 65-69 through to the oldest ages.

## Table 6.2 Reported age specific death rates by place of residence and sex

| Age group | Total |  |  | Urban |  |  | Rural |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Under 1 | 50.4 | 53.3 | 47.5 | 40.7 | 44.6 | 36.7 | 56.6 | 58.7 | 54.5 |
| 1-4 | 20.2 | 21.5 | 18.9 | 16.6 | 17.6 | 15.6 | 22.2 | 23.6 | 20.7 |
| 5-9 | 4.8 | 5.0 | 4.6 | 4.4 | 4.7 | 4.1 | 5.0 | 5.1 | 4.8 |
| 10-14 | 4.1 | 4.4 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.1 | 4.5 | 4.6 | 4.3 |
| 15-19 | 5.6 | 5.5 | 5.8 | 4.8 | 4.7 | 5.0 | 6.3 | 6.1 | 6.4 |
| 20-24 | 7.4 | 6.9 | 7.8 | 6.2 | 5.5 | 6.9 | 8.5 | 8.4 | 8.6 |
| 25-29 | 10.2 | 9.9 | 10.5 | 8.9 | 8.2 | 9.6 | 11.4 | 11.7 | 11.2 |
| 30-34 | 13.0 | 13.4 | 12.6 | 11.7 | 11.2 | 12.2 | 14.0 | 15.5 | 12.8 |
| 35-39 | 13.4 | 14.1 | 12.7 | 13.6 | 13.4 | 13.8 | 13.2 | 14.6 | 12.0 |
| 40-44 | 18.6 | 18.9 | 18.3 | 17.7 | 18.0 | 17.4 | 19.3 | 19.7 | 18.9 |
| 45-49 | 18.7 | 18.9 | 18.5 | 19.3 | 19.3 | 19.1 | 18.4 | 18.6 | 18.1 |
| 50-54 | 26.7 | 28.5 | 24.7 | 24.9 | 26.8 | 22.7 | 28.0 | 29.7 | 26.1 |
| 55-59 | 24.4 | 26.4 | 22.0 | 24.9 | 26.8 | 22.7 | 24.0 | 26.1 | 21.5 |
| 60-64 | 42.2 | 47.8 | 36.9 | 42.6 | 48.1 | 37.2 | 41.9 | 47.7 | 36.8 |
| 65-69 | 38.4 | 43.7 | 33.3 | 40.8 | 45.8 | 36.0 | 36.9 | 42.4 | 31.6 |
| 70-74 | 66.9 | 78.4 | 56.9 | 67.1 | 83.1 | 53.9 | 66.8 | 76.2 | 58.4 |
| 75-79 | 67.9 | 76.2 | 59.6 | 71.1 | 84.4 | 59.4 | 66.3 | 72.4 | 59.6 |
| 80+ | 169.8 | 186.2 | 156.7 | 175.2 | 203.9 | 156.9 | 167.5 | 180.2 | 156.7 |

### 6.6.3 Maternal mortality

The main indicators for measuring maternal mortality are maternal mortality ratio, maternal mortality rate and the proportion of maternal deaths among females at reproductive age. The other indicator of maternal mortality is the lifetime risk of maternal death.

There were 19,136 reported deaths among women aged $15-49$. Out of these, 3,275 were reported as maternal deaths of which 2,017 occurred during pregnancy, 801 deaths during childbirth and 401 deaths occurred six weeks after childbirth. The P/F ratio method of indirect fertility estimation by Brass, using data on children ever born, was used to adjust upwards the reported number of births that occurred in the year prior to the census.

The adjusted ASFR are presented in the previous chapter on fertility. Using direct methods, the MMRatio is calculated using both adjusted and unadjusted births. The births among women aged $15-49$ were adjusted to 328,433 births. Table 6.3 shows the MMRate, proportion of maternal deaths and unadjusted MMRatio. The data show that 17.1 per cent of deaths among females aged 15-49 years were maternal deaths. The results also show that the MMRate was 1.8 deaths per 100,000 women. The unadjusted MMRatio is 3,751 . The adjusted MMRatio is estimated at 997 maternal deaths per 100,000 births, as shown in Table 6.4.

Table 6.3 Unadjusted maternal mortality indicators

| Age of <br> woman | Women | Unadjusted <br> births | Female <br> deaths | Maternal <br> deaths | Proportion <br> of maternal <br> deaths | MMRate | Unadjusted <br> MMRatio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $15-19$ | 442,164 | 10,242 | 2,551 | 552 | 0.22 | 1.25 | 5390 |
| $20-24$ | 354,119 | 21,332 | 2,752 | 674 | 0.24 | 1.90 | 3160 |
| $25-29$ | 329,751 | 24,008 | 3,454 | 790 | 0.23 | 2.40 | 3291 |
| $30-34$ | 233,693 | 15,074 | 2,935 | 565 | 0.19 | 2.42 | 3748 |
| $35-39$ | 219,218 | 11,202 | 2,791 | 412 | 0.15 | 1.88 | 3678 |
| $40-44$ | 144,803 | 3,747 | 2,650 | 203 | 0.08 | 1.40 | 5418 |
| $45-49$ | 108,205 | 1,701 | 2,003 | 79 | 0.04 | 0.73 | 4644 |
| Total | $1,831,953$ | 87,306 | 19,136 | 3,275 | 0.17 | 1.8 | 3751 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

| Age of <br> woman | Adjusted <br> births | Adjusted <br> Mmratio |
| ---: | ---: | :---: |
| $15-19$ | 54,394 | 1015 |
| $20-24$ | 86,793 | 777 |
| $25-29$ | 84,022 | 940 |
| $30-34$ | 51,926 | 1088 |
| $35-39$ | 37,466 | 1100 |
| $40-44$ | 12,445 | 1631 |
| $45-49$ | 1,388 | 5691 |
| Total | 328,433 | 997 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 6.6.4 Infant and under-five mortality

The indirect estimates of IMR using Trussell variant of Brass method are presented in Table 6.5. The final estimate of IMR was obtained by averaging data for women in the 20-29 age groups from the North Model. The choice of the age group is based on the fact that very young women aged under 25 years and older women aged over 30 years are known to experience very high child mortality, which in turn affects the overall child mortality among women in the childbearing ages. The results show that IMR was 96 deaths per 1000 live births while the CMR was 67 deaths per 1000. The U5MR was 157 deaths per 1000.

Table 6.5 Estimates of infant mortality rate, child mortality rate and under 5 mortality rate using Trussell variant of Brass method, North pattern (both sexes)

| Age group | Infant <br> mortality <br> rate | Child mortality <br> rate | Under 5 <br> mortality <br> rate | Reference <br> Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $15-19$ | 0.1123 | 0.0846 | 0.1874 | 2014.6 |
| $20-24$ | 0.0976 | 0.0689 | 0.1598 | 2013.3 |
| $25-29$ | 0.0977 | 0.0653 | 0.1531 | 2011.5 |
| $30-34$ | 0.0998 | 0.0712 | 0.1599 | 2009.5 |
| $35-39$ | 0.1050 | 0.0767 | 0.1640 | 2007.3 |
| $40-44$ | 0.1050 | 0.0768 | 0.1737 | 2004.9 |
| $45-49$ | 96 | 0.1737 | 2002.1 |  |
| Both sexes |  |  | 157 |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Figure 6.3 presents the U5MR showing the reference period 2002 to 2014, estimated from the same Trussell variant of Brass method. As previously mentioned, the latest period refers to under 5 mortality for young women and as the reference period moves back in time, the data were for older women, as shown in Table 6.5. The graph shows a decline in mortality between 2002 and 2014.

However, the lowest mortality rates can be seen for the period 2011. This is because data on children ever born from older women suffer from higher rates of misreporting. The high under 5 mortality rates in 2014 were for young women age 15-19 who usually have a higher risk of child mortality.

Figure 6.3 Under 5 mortality (q(5)) using Trussell variant of Brass method by reference date, North pattern (both sexes)


Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 6.6.5 Trends in child mortality

Trends for infant, child and under 5 mortality are presented in Table 6.6. For the past 30 years, IMR has declined from 194 deaths per 1,000 to 96 deaths per 1,000 and U5MR has declined from 327 deaths per 1,000 to 157 deaths per 1,000.

Estimates from 2008 and 2013 DHS are much lower compared to all the census estimates. However, taking into account the different estimation methodologies between census and DHS, the trend still shows that the child mortality indicators are declining.

| Year | Infant mortality <br> rate | Child mortality <br> rate | Under 5 mortality <br> rate |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1985 | Census | 194 | 163 | 327 |
| 2004 | Census | 115 | 87 | 194 |
| 2008 | DHS | 89 | 56 | 140 |
| 2013 | DHS | 92 | 70 | 156 |
| 2015 | Census | 96 | 67 | 157 |

### 6.7 Mortality differentials

Mortality is known to vary according to various factors. Some of these factors are related to the characteristics of the child such as sex; characteristics of the child's mother and father such as education and occupation; and lastly the place of residence of the child, typically being urbanrural residence and region. Table 6.7 presents child mortality indicators by sex of the child, place of residence, region and education of the mother.


Table 6.7 Infant, child and under 5 mortality
by selected background characteristics, 2015

| Characteristics | Infant mortality <br> rate | Child mortality <br> rate | Under 5 mortality <br> rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex of child | 103 | 68 | 164 |
| Male | 89 | 66 | 148 |
| Female | 88 | 60 | 143 |
| Place of residence | 99 | 70 | 162 |
| Urban | 102 | 73 | 167 |
| Rural | 102 | 73 | 167 |
| Region | 87 | 59 | 141 |
| Northern | 85 | 56 | 136 |
| Southern |  |  |  |
| Eastern | 94 | 65 | 153 |
| Western | 108 | 81 | 180 |
| Education of mother | 79 | 63 | 38 |
| No education |  |  | 125 |
| Primary | Secondary | Tertiary |  |

### 6.7.1 Sex of child

All childhood mortality indicators show that the rates for male children are higher than for female children. IMR among male children is 103 per 1,000 compared to 89 per 1,000 for females and U5MR for males is 164 per 1,000 compared to 148 per 1,000 for females. The variation between males and females is quite small for children aged one to four years ,as reflected in the CMR, 68 and 66 per 1,000 respectively.

### 6.7.2 Place of residence

The data show that IMR was higher in rural areas at 99 per 1,000 compared to 88 per 1,000 in urban areas. There was also notable variation in CMR and the overall U5MR. In urban areas, the U5MR was estimated at 143 per 1,000 and in rural areas it was higher at 162 per 1,000.
6.7.3 Region

There were regional differences in child mortality with the Western Region having the lowest rates. The IMR is 85 per 1,000 in the Western Region and it was highest in the Southern Region at 102 per 1,000. The U5MR was 136 per 1,000 in the Western Region and it rose to 167 per 1,000 in the Southern Region.

### 6.7.3 Educational attainment of mother

The inverse relationship between child mortality rate and level of maternal education was shown in the 2015 census data. This is consistent with previous data for Sierra Leone, as child mortality rates decline with an increase in the mother's education. IMR among women with tertiary education is 63 per 1.000 and it rises to 108 per 1,000 among women with primary education. Child mortality ranges from 38 among women with tertiary education to 81 among women with primary education. The same trend is observed for U5MRs. It is interesting to note that women with no education have lower mortality than women with primary education. This is a pattern which has been observed in other surveys in Sierra Leone, such as the 2013 DHS.

### 6.8 Construction of empirical life tables

Life tables are important in the analysis of mortality patterns by age. One of the important measures presented in the life table is the life expectancy at birth and at all other ages. All the life tables presented in this chapter are abridged life tables which show the mortality measures by age. The life tables are presented separately for males and females. Reported deaths for the 12 month period before the census were used for the calculation of ASDRs, which was input into the tables.

The life tables were firstly constructed based on the observed ASDRs ( mx ) values using the application LIFTB in Mortpak. The life table method used was based on the approach of Greville, which allows calculation of age-specific separation factors based on the age pattern of the mortality rates. The central death rates in the life table are assumed to be the same with that of the population. It also has to be noted that the value of $m(x)$ for the last age group ( $80+$ ) is calculated by the LIFTB procedure. After the life table was constructed, smoothing of the probability of dying ( $q(x)$ ) was done using the procedure UNABR also available in Mortpak. The smoothed $q(x)$ values were used in the construction of the final life tables.

For comparison, Coale-Demeny model life tables following North pattern were constructed for males and females at national level. The IMR from indirect method presented earlier in this chapter was used as input. The estimated life expectancies at birth from these model life tables were higher, with males having 51.1 years compared to 54.3 years for females. The difference in the male and female life expectancies at birth was 3.2 years, which is not very different from age gap in life expectancies by sex from empirical life tables. Life expectancy from the empirical life tables is summarised in Table 6.8. The results show that life expectancy at birth for males was 47.6 years compared with a higher life expectancy for females at 51.3 years. The difference between the life expectancy at birth of males and females was 3.7 years.

The life expectancy at birth is higher in urban areas than rural areas. There are also regional variations in life expectancies at birth, with the Western Region having the highest life expectancy while the Eastern Region has the lowest life expectancy. The regional differences could be due to the differences in urban population, the Western Region being predominantly urban compared to all the other regions. An urban population is likely to have better access to social services such as health, which reduces their chances of dying.

There is slight improvement from 2004, where the male life expectancy at birth was estimated at 47.5 years and 49.4 years for females with an age gap difference of 1.9 years.


Table 6.8 Life expectancy at birth for males and females

|  | Males | Females |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| National | 47.6 | 51.3 |
| Place of residence | 48.4 | 53.1 |
| Urban | 47.5 | 50.3 |
| Rural | 44.1 |  |
| Region | 48.0 | 52.5 |
| Eastern | 48.3 | 50.2 |
| Northern | 55.1 | 59.3 |
| Southern |  |  |
| Western |  |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census


### 6.8.1 Empirical life tables

Empirical life tables for males and females are presented in Tables 6.9 and 6.10 respectively. The age pattern of mortality presented in the life tables is $U$ shaped, similar to that for the reported ASDR. Life expectancy at birth is one of the most important pieces of information presented in the lifetable.

Male life expectancy at birth is 47.6 years and females is 51.3 years. Based on the 2015 death rates, a male aged 25 is expected to live 35.8 years if the mortality conditions remained constant, while a female of the same age is expected to live another 37.6 years. The gap in life expectancy between males and females narrows at the older ages, from age 60 . Life tables by place of residence are presented in the appendix.

## 통 <br> Table 6.9 Empirical life tables for males

| Age | $m(x, n)$ | $\mathrm{q}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{n})$ | I(x) | d( $\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{n}$ ) | $L(x, n)$ | T(x) | e(x) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0.0703 | 0.0667 | 100000 | 6667 | 94894 | 4762252 | 47.6 |
| 1 | 0.0241 | 0.0909 | 93333 | 8479 | 351728 | 4667357 | 50.0 |
| 5 | 0.0059 | 0.0292 | 84854 | 2478 | 418074 | 4315630 | 50.9 |
| 10 | 0.0044 | 0.0217 | 82376 | 1791 | 407403 | 3897555 | 47.3 |
| 15 | 0.0056 | 0.0276 | 80585 | 2222 | 397583 | 3490153 | 43.3 |
| 20 | 0.0073 | 0.0361 | 78363 | 2826 | 385012 | 3092570 | 39.5 |
| 25 | 0.0093 | 0.0457 | 75538 | 3450 | 369323 | 2707558 | 35.8 |
| 30 | 0.0116 | 0.0563 | 72088 | 4056 | 350549 | 2338235 | 32.4 |
| 35 | 0.0141 | 0.0681 | 68032 | 4631 | 328818 | 1987686 | 29.2 |
| 40 | 0.0170 | 0.0815 | 63401 | 5170 | 304301 | 1658868 | 26.2 |
| 45 | 0.0205 | 0.0974 | 58231 | 5671 | 277183 | 1354567 | 23.3 |
| 50 | 0.0248 | 0.1167 | 52560 | 6131 | 247658 | 1077384 | 20.5 |
| 55 | 0.0303 | 0.1408 | 46429 | 6539 | 215956 | 829726 | 17.9 |
| 60 | 0.0376 | 0.1721 | 39890 | 6864 | 182402 | 613770 | 15.4 |
| 65 | 0.0477 | 0.2132 | 33026 | 7041 | 147555 | 431368 | 13.1 |
| 70 | 0.0619 | 0.2677 | 25984 | 6956 | 112422 | 283814 | 10.9 |
| 75 | 0.0821 | 0.3392 | 19029 | 6454 | 78633 | 171392 | 9.0 |
| 80 | 0.1356 | ... | 12574 | 12574 | 92759 | 92759 | 7.4 |

Table 6.10 Empirical life tables for females

| Age | $m(x, n)$ | $q(x, n)$ | I(x) | $d(x, n)$ | L(x,n) | T(x) | e(x) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0.0475 | 0.0457 | 100000 | 4574 | 96282 | 5129356 | 51.3 |
| 1 | 0.0190 | 0.0725 | 95426 | 6914 | 364071 | 5033074 | 52.7 |
| 5 | 0.0046 | 0.0226 | 88512 | 2000 | 437561 | 4669002 | 52.7 |
| 10 | 0.0038 | 0.0188 | 86512 | 1624 | 428500 | 4231441 | 48.9 |
| 15 | 0.0057 | 0.0281 | 84888 | 2388 | 418811 | 3802941 | 44.8 |
| 20 | 0.0079 | 0.0390 | 82500 | 3215 | 404795 | 3384130 | 41.0 |
| 25 | 0.0101 | 0.0494 | 79285 | 3915 | 386906 | 2979335 | 37.6 |
| 30 | 0.0122 | 0.0592 | 75370 | 4463 | 365897 | 2592429 | 34.4 |
| 35 | 0.0142 | 0.0688 | 70907 | 4880 | 342489 | 2226533 | 31.4 |
| 40 | 0.0164 | 0.0787 | 66027 | 5199 | 317259 | 1884043 | 28.5 |
| 45 | 0.0188 | 0.0898 | 60828 | 5461 | 290594 | 1566784 | 25.8 |
| 50 | 0.0217 | 0.1030 | 55367 | 5702 | 262687 | 1276189 | 23.0 |
| 55 | 0.0255 | 0.1198 | 49666 | 5950 | 233562 | 1013503 | 20.4 |
| 60 | 0.0306 | 0.1422 | 43715 | 6215 | 203152 | 779941 | 17.8 |
| 65 | 0.0377 | 0.1725 | 37501 | 6469 | 171427 | 576789 | 15.4 |
| 70 | 0.0479 | 0.2139 | 31032 | 6637 | 138601 | 405362 | 13.1 |
| 75 | 0.0624 | 0.2697 | 24395 | 6579 | 105363 | 266761 | 10.9 |
| 80 | 0.1104 | ... | 17816 | 17816 | 161398 | 161398 | 9.1 |

### 6.9 Levels of orphanhood

In Sierra Leone, 13 per cent of children aged below 18 years were orphans, as shown in Table 6.11. Most of the orphans had lost their father with 8.6 per cent of children having only the mother alive, while 2.5 per cent of the children had only the father alive. The proportion of children who have lost at least one parent, also known as single orphanhood ,was 11.1 per cent. The results also show that 1.9 per cent of the children had lost both parents, also known as double orphanhood.

### 6.9.1 Differentials of orphanhood

Table 6.11 also presents information on orphanhood by age, sex of child, place of residence and region. Orphanhood varies with age, with older children being more likely to be orphans. While 6.5 per cent of children aged below the age of 5 were orphans, a higher proportion, 22.7 per cent of those aged between 15-17 years are orphans. There is minimal variation in orphanhood by sex of child and place of residence. However, orphanhood is slightly higher in urban areas. The analysis by region shows that the proportion of orphans among children ranges from 10.6 per cent in the Southern Region to 14.7 per cent in the Northern Region. The regional pattern shows that most orphans have only their mother alive.


Table 6.11 Orphanhood by selected characteristics among children aged $0-17$ years

|  | Number |  |  | Percent |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Only mother alive | Only father alive | Both parents dead | Only mother alive | Only father alive | Single orphan | Double orphan | Orphan |
| Total | 291,820 | 84,399 | 66,093 | 8.6 | 2.5 | 11.1 | 1.9 | 13.0 |
| Age of Child |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0-4 | 39,703 | 10,449 | 9,864 | 4.3 | 1.1 | 5.4 | 1.1 | 6.5 |
| 5-9 | 83,416 | 24,836 | 18,342 | 7.5 | 2.2 | 9.8 | 1.7 | 11.5 |
| 10-14 | 91,707 | 27,256 | 19,896 | 10.9 | 3.2 | 14.1 | 2.4 | 16.5 |
| 15-17 | 76,994 | 21,858 | 17,991 | 15.0 | 4.2 | 19.2 | 3.5 | 22.7 |
| Sex of child |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 145,661 | 43,097 | 33,704 | 8.5 | 2.5 | 11.0 | 2.0 | 13.0 |
| Female | 146,159 | 41,302 | 32,389 | 8.6 | 2.4 | 11.1 | 1.9 | 13.0 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 110,304 | 32,934 | 25,321 | 8.7 | 2.6 | 11.3 | 2.0 | 13.3 |
| Rural | 181,516 | 51,465 | 40,772 | 8.5 | 2.4 | 11.0 | 1.9 | 12.9 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Eastern | 67,874 | 18,144 | 15,273 | 8.5 | 2.3 | 10.7 | 1.9 | 12.6 |
| Northern | 124,502 | 34,424 | 28,589 | 9.8 | 2.7 | 12.5 | 2.2 | 14.7 |
| Southern | 49,587 | 15,848 | 9,672 | 7.0 | 2.2 | 9.2 | 1.4 | 10.6 |
| Western | 49,857 | 15,983 | 12,559 | 8.2 | 2.6 | 10.8 | 2.1 | 12.9 |

### 6.10 Summary, conclusion and recommendations

### 6.10.1 Summary

The reported CDR is 14.7 per 1000 population. The results also show that the IMR for Sierra Leone is 96 deaths per 1000 while the CMR is 67 deaths per 1000. The U5MR is 157 deaths per 1000. The educational attainment of a mother affects her child's survival rates, with women with tertiary education having an IMR of 63 per 1,000 compared to 108 per 1,000 among women with primary education.

The results show that women have a higher life expectancy at birth of 51.3 years, compared to 47.6 years for men. The difference between the life expectancy at birth of males and females is 3.7 years. MMRate is 1.8 deaths per 100,000 women while the adjusted MMRatio is estimated at 997 maternal deaths per 100,000 births. Most maternal deaths occur during pregnancy. The data also show that 13 per cent of children aged below 18 years are orphans.

### 6.10.2 Conclusion

The CDRs and ASDR confirm that female mortality is lower than male mortality. For the past 30 years, all the child mortality indicators show that mortality is improving, even though child mortality remains high. There is still significant variation in child mortality by various subgroups, such as education of the mother.

There has been improvement in life expectancy at birth in the last decade but maternal mortality remains high. Orphaned children are more likely to have lost their father than their mother. There is minimal variation by age of the child, place of residence and region.

### 6.10.3 Recommendations

The results show that more needs to be done to improve living standards which in turn affects the levels of mortality. There is also a need to improve health services for children, as excess mortality at this age is caused by easily preventable diseases such as diaorrhea and malaria. The high maternal mortality implies that pregnant women are at high risk of death and need better health services. There need to be better basic health care centres so that women can attend antenatal clinics to reduce child and maternal mortality.

These improvements would help the country achieve the sustainable goal of ensuring healthy lives and promoting well-being for all, at all ages. The country also has a substantial number of orphans and must support these children with extra support, including education.
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## APPENDIX

The following life table functions are defined as follows:
$n m x=$ Age-specific mortality rates, that is, death rates calculated of each age groups (from $x$ to $x+n$ )
$\mathrm{nqx}=$ Probability of dying between exact ages x and $\mathrm{x}+\mathrm{n}$
Ix $=$ Number of survivors at age $x$ out of 100,000 birth
$n d x=$ Number of deaths occurring between age $x$ and $x+n$
$n L x=$ Number of person-years lived between ages $x$ and $x+n$
Tx = Number of person-years lived afer age x
ex = Life expectancy at age x

## 통 <br> Table A6.1 Empirical life tables, males (urban)

| Age | $\mathrm{m}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{n})$ | $\mathrm{q}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{n})$ | $\mathrm{I}(\mathrm{x})$ | $\mathrm{d}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{n})$ | $\mathrm{L}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{n})$ | $\mathrm{T}(\mathrm{x})$ | $\mathrm{e}(\mathrm{x})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | 0.0594 | 0.0567 | 100000 | 5670 | 95495 | 4836179 | 48.4 |
| 1 | 0.0182 | 0.0694 | 94330 | 6550 | 360827 | 4740684 | 50.3 |
| 5 | 0.0053 | 0.0260 | 87780 | 2280 | 433200 | 4379856 | 49.9 |
| 10 | 0.0041 | 0.0202 | 85500 | 1726 | 423185 | 3946657 | 46.2 |
| 15 | 0.0052 | 0.0255 | 83774 | 2133 | 413754 | 3523472 | 42.1 |
| 20 | 0.0070 | 0.0344 | 81641 | 2808 | 401489 | 3109718 | 38.1 |
| 25 | 0.0093 | 0.0454 | 78833 | 3580 | 385549 | 2708229 | 34.4 |
| 30 | 0.0120 | 0.0582 | 75254 | 4377 | 365658 | 2322681 | 30.9 |
| 35 | 0.0151 | 0.0727 | 70877 | 5151 | 341821 | 1957022 | 27.6 |
| 40 | 0.0187 | 0.0893 | 65725 | 5867 | 314245 | 1615202 | 24.6 |
| 45 | 0.0229 | 0.1085 | 59859 | 6493 | 283303 | 1300957 | 21.7 |
| 50 | 0.0281 | 0.1312 | 53366 | 7004 | 249509 | 1017653 | 19.1 |
| 55 | 0.0345 | 0.1590 | 46362 | 7372 | 213503 | 768145 | 16.6 |
| 60 | 0.0429 | 0.1939 | 38990 | 7560 | 176087 | 554642 | 14.2 |
| 65 | 0.0543 | 0.2389 | 31430 | 7508 | 138298 | 378555 | 12.0 |
| 70 | 0.0701 | 0.2978 | 23922 | 7123 | 101559 | 240257 | 10.0 |
| 75 | 0.0929 | 0.3746 | 16799 | 6293 | 67749 | 138698 | 8.3 |
| 80 | 0.1481 | $\ldots$ | 10506 | 10506 | 70949 | 70949 | 6.8 |

## E <br> Table A6.2. Empirical life tables, females (urban)

| Age | $m(x, n)$ | $q(x, n)$ | I(x) | $d(x, n)$ | L(x,n) | T(x) | e(x) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0.0367 | 0.0356 | 100000 | 3563 | 96996 | 5308298 | 53.1 |
| 1 | 0.0155 | 0.0597 | 96437 | 5753 | 371169 | 5211302 | 54.0 |
| 5 | 0.0041 | 0.0204 | 90684 | 1846 | 448802 | 4840133 | 53.4 |
| 10 | 0.0031 | 0.0155 | 88837 | 1374 | 440750 | 4391331 | 49.4 |
| 15 | 0.0048 | 0.0240 | 87463 | 2095 | 432421 | 3950581 | 45.2 |
| 20 | 0.0072 | 0.0353 | 85368 | 3013 | 419692 | 3518160 | 41.2 |
| 25 | 0.0096 | 0.0468 | 82356 | 3853 | 402474 | 3098468 | 37.6 |
| 30 | 0.0119 | 0.0578 | 78503 | 4535 | 381434 | 2695994 | 34.3 |
| 35 | 0.0142 | 0.0684 | 73968 | 5059 | 357386 | 2314559 | 31.3 |
| 40 | 0.0165 | 0.0792 | 68908 | 5458 | 331048 | 1957173 | 28.4 |
| 45 | 0.0191 | 0.0910 | 63450 | 5775 | 302938 | 1626126 | 25.6 |
| 50 | 0.0221 | 0.1049 | 57675 | 6051 | 273361 | 1323188 | 22.9 |
| 55 | 0.0261 | 0.1223 | 51624 | 6316 | 242441 | 1049826 | 20.3 |
| 60 | 0.0313 | 0.1451 | 45308 | 6572 | 210213 | 807385 | 17.8 |
| 65 | 0.0384 | 0.1753 | 38736 | 6791 | 176775 | 597172 | 15.4 |
| 70 | 0.0483 | 0.2157 | 31945 | 6890 | 142500 | 420398 | 13.2 |
| 75 | 0.0623 | 0.2689 | 25055 | 6738 | 108235 | 277898 | 11.1 |
| 80 | 0.1080 | ... | 18317 | 18317 | 169663 | 169663 | 9.3 |

Table A6.3. Empirical life tables, males (rural)

| Age | $m(x, n)$ | $q(x, n)$ | I(x) | $\mathrm{d}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{n})$ | L(x,n) | T(x) | $e(x)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0.0594 | 0.0567 | 100000 | 5674 | 95493 | 4751363 | 47.5 |
| 1 | 0.0230 | 0.0869 | 94326 | 8200 | 356657 | 4655871 | 49.4 |
| 5 | 0.0052 | 0.0258 | 86126 | 2220 | 425080 | 4299213 | 49.9 |
| 10 | 0.0043 | 0.0215 | 83906 | 1803 | 415022 | 3874133 | 46.2 |
| 15 | 0.0065 | 0.0319 | 82103 | 2615 | 404329 | 3459111 | 42.1 |
| 20 | 0.0089 | 0.0434 | 79488 | 3446 | 389151 | 3054782 | 38.4 |
| 25 | 0.0111 | 0.0542 | 76042 | 4121 | 370164 | 2665631 | 35.1 |
| 30 | 0.0133 | 0.0646 | 71921 | 4643 | 348197 | 2295467 | 31.9 |
| 35 | 0.0156 | 0.0751 | 67279 | 5053 | 323921 | 1947270 | 28.9 |
| 40 | 0.0181 | 0.0868 | 62226 | 5398 | 297775 | 1623349 | 26.1 |
| 45 | 0.0212 | 0.1006 | 56828 | 5718 | 269980 | 1325573 | 23.3 |
| 50 | 0.0251 | 0.1181 | 51110 | 6036 | 240595 | 1055593 | 20.7 |
| 55 | 0.0303 | 0.1409 | 45074 | 6349 | 209627 | 814998 | 18.1 |
| 60 | 0.0374 | 0.1709 | 38726 | 6620 | 177172 | 605372 | 15.6 |
| 65 | 0.0471 | 0.2107 | 32106 | 6764 | 143636 | 428199 | 13.3 |
| 70 | 0.0605 | 0.2625 | 25342 | 6652 | 109960 | 284564 | 11.2 |
| 75 | 0.0789 | 0.3284 | 18691 | 6139 | 77757 | 174604 | 9.3 |
| 80 | 0.1296 | ... | 12552 | 12552 | 96847 | 96847 | 7.7 |


| Age | $m(x, n)$ | $q(x, n)$ | I(x) | $d(x, n)$ | L( $\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{n}$ ) | T(x) | e(x) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0.0543 | 0.0521 | 100000 | 5206 | 95867 | 5028334 | 50.3 |
| 1 | 0.0208 | 0.0791 | 94794 | 7495 | 359983 | 4932466 | 52.0 |
| 5 | 0.0048 | 0.0238 | 87299 | 2081 | 431290 | 4572484 | 52.4 |
| 10 | 0.0043 | 0.0214 | 85217 | 1825 | 421524 | 4141194 | 48.6 |
| 15 | 0.0064 | 0.0315 | 83392 | 2630 | 410725 | 3719670 | 44.6 |
| 20 | 0.0086 | 0.0421 | 80762 | 3398 | 395608 | 3308945 | 41.0 |
| 25 | 0.0106 | 0.0516 | 77363 | 3992 | 377056 | 2913336 | 37.7 |
| 30 | 0.0124 | 0.0603 | 73371 | 4423 | 355958 | 2536280 | 34.6 |
| 35 | 0.0142 | 0.0687 | 68949 | 4735 | 333022 | 2180322 | 31.6 |
| 40 | 0.0161 | 0.0776 | 64213 | 4980 | 308715 | 1847300 | 28.8 |
| 45 | 0.0184 | 0.0878 | 59234 | 5200 | 283263 | 1538586 | 26.0 |
| 50 | 0.0212 | 0.1006 | 54033 | 5434 | 256689 | 1255323 | 23.2 |
| 55 | 0.0249 | 0.1173 | 48600 | 5702 | 228866 | 998634 | 20.5 |
| 60 | 0.0301 | 0.1399 | 42898 | 6003 | 199612 | 769768 | 17.9 |
| 65 | 0.0373 | 0.1708 | 36895 | 6300 | 168836 | 570156 | 15.5 |
| 70 | 0.0475 | 0.2125 | 30595 | 6503 | 136762 | 401321 | 13.1 |
| 75 | 0.0620 | 0.2682 | 24092 | 6462 | 104155 | 264559 | 11.0 |
| 80 | 0.1099 | $\cdots$ | 17630 | 17630 | 160403 | 160403 | 9.1 |

## CHAPTER 7: MIGRATION AND URBANIZATION

### 7.1 Introduction

Migration, alongside fertility and mortality, is a major component of population change. As more people move from one place to another in search of new opportunities, their movement migration - has great implications for a country's housing, services and employment provision.

There are many factors that force or encourage people to move out of or to an area, called push and pull factors. As cities grow, many countries experience rural to urban migration. Urbanization happens when economic opportunities draw people from rural areas to urban areas. This results in a growing urban population and requires proper planning of services such as housing, water and sanitation. As such, there is linkage between internal migration and urbanization.
Previous censuses have shown that there has been notable migration within the country. During the Civil War, there was population displacement with most people moving to the capital city, resulting in rapid population growth. Since the war, migration from rural to urban areas for economic opportunities has continued.

The Government realizes that well-managed migration within and between countries greatly contributes to economic development. It has begun many initiatives to address migration and urbanization. There is a 2010 national decentralisation policy which aims at addressing the inequality in regional resource distribution. It is also in the process of developing a national labour migration policy to benefit from the development impact of labour migration. This chapter presents information on levels and trends of migration and urbanization.

### 7.2 Definitions of concepts

Migration is defined as a move from one migration defining area to another (or a move of some specified minimum distance) made during a given migration interval and that involved a change of residence (UN, 1970). A life-time migrant is one
who has moved from his place of birth to the place where he is enumerated at the time of the census, irrespective of the number of times he migrates. A recent migrant is one whose place of residence five years ago was different to where he is enumerated at the time of the census.

In-migrants are defined as those internal migrants who have migrated to the destination from the origin. All migrants who may have migrated and settled in the destination from various origins are called in-migrants to the destination. Outmigrants are those internal migrants who leave their place of origin and migrate to different destination areas. For the district or the place of origin, they are defined as out-migrants. Nonmovers are those people who did not change their residence during the reference period.

Net-migration is the difference between outmigration and in-migration in any defined geographical areas within a specified period. With positive net-migration, the region gains more population than it sends out and with net negative migration, the region loses more population than it receives. Net-migration makes a difference to the size of the population in a region, but nationally the balance between in and out-migration is zero.

Urbanization is characterized by population growth in urban areas, mostly due to migration from rural areas. Countries are becoming more urbanized because of the increase in the proportion of urban population to the total population. The level of urbanization is defined as the percentage of urban population to the total population for a specific period. The tempo of urbanization is the rate of change in the level of urbanization or simply how rapidly it is taking place. One of the measures of urbanization is the urban-rural ratio which is the number of urban residents for each person living in the rural areas. Thus, if the index has a value of 1 (or 100), it means that the urban population is equal to the rural population.

### 7.3 Sources of migration and urbanization data

A census is a more reliable source for measuring internal migration than international migration. Migration is measured in terms of stocks and flows. Any change in the volume and flow of migration will change the size, growth and characteristics of the population, both in the place of origin and place of destination.

The 2015 Census collected information on place of current residence, place of birth and place of residence five years before the census from all persons. This information is useful for analysing life-time migration by looking at place of birth with the place of enumeration during the census. Recent migration was analysed by looking at place of previous residence five years prior to the census with the place of enumeration during the census.

The basic measures of migration, in-migration rate, out-migration rate and net migration rate, were computed from the census. The foreignborn population constitutes migration stock while in and out-migration rates measure migration flow. Considering that the definition of migration focuses on change in usual residence, the measurement is a problem as a person can move several times. Therefore, duration at a place of residence becomes important during analysis of recent migration. The 2015 Census, like the previous census, did not collect information on usual place of residence and duration at the current place of residence. In this case, the place of enumeration has been used instead.

Globally, there is no single definition of an urban area which makes country comparisons of urbanization difficult. The common measures are level of urbanization measured by percentage of urban population of the total population. Another measure is tempo of urbanization measured as rate of change of urban population growth, and finally ratio of urban to rural population.

### 7.4 Limitations of data

One of the limitations of measuring volume of migration using the place of birth is that it does not capture the exact time of arrival of the migrants
or previous migratory data (Kpedekpo, 1982). Between birth and the time of enumeration, a person may have migrated several times. For example, in terms of district data, in places where migration is seasonal, the migrants and non-migrants are not fully distinguished, for the same reason that multiple movements are not captured in the census.

The other limitation is that censuses are regular but not frequent. In Sierra Leone they only take place every 10 years. Consequently, the migration indicators refer to the census year only.

Lastly, the comparison of internal migration indicators between censuses may be a challenge due to changes in sub-national boundaries. These include changes in district and lower level geographic areas, including changes in urban boundaries, which hinder comparison of internal migration. However, despite all these limitations, the census remains an important source of migration data.

### 7.5 Internal migration

### 7.5.1 Current distribution of population in Sierra Leone

There were 7,076,119 persons enumerated during the census in Sierra Leone of which 37,503 were non-Sierra Leoneans. In terms of percentage, 99.5 percent were Sierra Leoneans while nonSierra Leoneans constituted 0.5 percent. Table 7.1 shows the distribution of Sierra Leoneans and non-Sierra Leoneans in the regions by sex. The results show that a high proportion of Sierra Leoneans were in the Northern region (35.5 percent) followed by the Eastern region (23.2 percent), the Southern region 20.4 percent and lastly the Western region (21 percent). NonSierra Leoneans were mostly in the Western region (47 percent) followed by the Eastern region (24 percent).

Table 7.1 Distribution of Sierra Leoneans and non-Sierra Leoneans by region and sex

| Region |  | Sierra Leoneans |  |  | Non-Sierra Leoneans |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eastern | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Northern | 23.2 | 23.4 | 23.0 | 24.0 | 23.4 | 24.8 |
| Southern | 35.5 | 35.2 | 35.7 | 15.0 | 14.3 | 15.8 |
| Western | 20.4 | 20.2 | 20.6 | 14.1 | 13.5 | 14.8 |
| Total | 21.0 | 21.2 | 20.7 | 47.0 | 48.7 | 44.6 |
| Number | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 7.5.2 Population redistribution

The information presented in Table 7.2 shows the population by place of birth, place of residence and sex. The place of birth is analysed at the district level. The data show that 80.1 per cent of the population did not move from their district of birth. While 13.7 per cent of the population was born in other regions, only 4.5 per cent of the population had moved to another district within the same region of birth. A higher proportion ( 92.7 per cent) of the rural population had not moved from their district of birth, compared to 61.5 per cent in the urban areas. Only 3.4 per cent of the rural population was born in other regions, compared to 28.5 per cent of the urban population that was born in other regions. There is minimal variation in the migration pattern between males and females.

An analysis of inter-regional migration shows that there were 5,989,354 persons who had not moved from their region of birth, representing 84.6 per cent of the population.

| Region | Total country | Rural |  |  | Urban |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Total | 7,076,119 | 4,182,612 | 2,049,590 | 2,133,022 | 2,893,507 | 1,430,043 | 1,463,464 |
| Born in place of enumeration | 5,670,753 | 3,891,321 | 1,900,547 | 1,990,774 | 1,779,432 | 873,050 | 906,382 |
| Born elsewhere in region of enumeration | 318,601 | 113,503 | 54,386 | 59,117 | 205,098 | 99,254 | 105,844 |
| Born in other regions | 966,874 | 141,975 | 76,527 | 65,448 | 824,899 | 412,684 | 412,215 |

Table 7.2 Population classified by place of birth, place of residence and sex (continued)

| Region | Total country | Rural |  |  | Urban |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Others | 119,891 | 35,813 | 18,130 | 17,683 | 84,078 | 45,055 | 39,023 |
| Percentages |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Born in place of enumeration | 80.1 | 93.0 | 92.7 | 93.3 | 61.5 | 61.1 | 61.9 |
| Born elsewhere in region of enumeration | 4.5 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 7.1 | 6.9 | 7.2 |
| Born in other regions | 13.7 | 3.4 | 3.7 | 3.1 | 28.5 | 28.9 | 28.2 |
| Others | 1.7 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 2.9 | 3.2 | 2.7 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census
There were 119,891 persons who were foreign born or who did not indicate their exact place of birth in Sierra Leone. In terms of proportion, they made up 1.7 per cent of the total enumerated population. They were excluded from subsequent analysis.

### 7.5.3 Lifetime migration

Table 7.3 presents the population by region of birth. The Northern Region had 2,418,215 non-movers, the largest at the regional level, followed by the Eastern Region with 1,489,537. Migration was lowest in the Western Region, with 750,136 non-movers. An analysis of interregional migration shows there were 5,989,354 persons who had not moved from their region of birth, representing 84.6 per cent of the population.


Table 7.3 Population by region of residence during enumeration and place of birth

|  |  |  | Place of birth |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region | Total | Eastern | Northern | Southern | Western |  |
| Total | $7,076,119$ | $1,664,587$ | $2,977,009$ | $1,519,945$ | 794,687 |  |
| Eastern | $1,613,439$ | $1,489,537$ | 75,387 | 41,011 | 7,504 |  |
| Northern | $2,481,622$ | 21,063 | $2,418,215$ | 17,672 | 24,672 |  |
| Southern | $1,423,298$ | 42,147 | 37,310 | $1,331,466$ | 12,375 |  |
| Western | $1,437,869$ | 111,840 | 446,097 | 129,796 | 750,136 |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Table 7.4 shows lifetime in-migration, out-migration and net migration rates at the regional level. Each region has had lifetime out-migrants and in-migrants. The in-migration rate ranged from 2.6 per cent in the Northern Region to 47.8 per cent in the Western Region. One half of the population in the Western Region was born elsewhere. The lifetime out-migration rate was much higher in the Northern Region (18.8 per cent) compared to the Western Region ( 5.6 per cent).

In terms of volume, each region except the Western Region had negative net migration, meaning that these regions were net losers of lifetime migrants. The net gain of lifetime migrants in the Western Region was 643,182 persons and the net loss of lifetime migrants in the Northern Region was 495,387 persons. This translates to a net lifetime migration rate of 43 per cent in the Western Region and -19.8 per cent in the Northern Region.


| Region | Enumerated <br> population | In- <br> migrants | Out- <br> migrants | In- <br> migration <br> rate | Out- <br> migration <br> rate | Net <br> migration | Net <br> migra-tion <br> rate |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eastern | $1,640,592$ | 123,902 | 175,050 | 7.7 | 10.5 | $-51,148$ | -3.1 | $1,489,537$ |
| Northern | $2,502,583$ | 63,407 | 558,794 | 2.6 | 18.8 | $-495,387$ | -19.8 | $2,418,215$ |
| Southern | $1,439,165$ | 91,832 | 188,479 | 6.5 | 12.4 | $-96,647$ | -6.7 | $1,331,466$ |
| Western | $1,493,779$ | 687,733 | 44,551 | 47.8 | 5.6 | 643,182 | 43.1 | 750,136 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census
Lifetime in-migration was highest in the Western Rural district with in-migration rate of 63.4 per cent, followed by Western Urban at 48.1 per cent (Table 7.5). Only four districts, namely Kenema, Bo, Western Rural and Western Urban, were net gainers of lifetime migrants. The biggest net gainer was Western Urban, with net lifetime migrants of 396,663 , followed by Western Rural with 246,519 net migrants. Western Rural had the highest net migration rate of 55.6 per cent followed by Western Urban ( 37.8 per cent) and Bombali had a net migration rate of -24.7 per cent.


| Districts | Enumerated <br> population | In- <br> migrants | Out- <br> migrants | In- <br> migration <br> rate | Out- <br> migration <br> rate | Net <br> migration | Net <br> migra-tion <br> rate | Non- <br> movers |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kailahun | 574,334 | 22,325 | 78,112 | 4.3 | 13.6 | $-55,787$ | -10.6 | 518,547 |
| Kenema | 589,618 | 98,736 | 88,565 | 16.5 | 15.0 | 10,171 | 1.7 | 599,789 |
| Kono | 500,635 | 61,416 | 66,948 | 12.4 | 13.4 | $-5,532$ | -1.1 | 495,103 |
| Bombali | 749,716 | 60,961 | 210,403 | 10.2 | 28.1 | $-149,442$ | -24.7 | 600,274 |

Table 7.5 Lifetime in-migration, out-migration and net migration by district (continued)

| District | Enumerated population | Inmigrants | Outmigrants | Inmigration rate | Outmigration rate | Net migration | Net migra-tion rate | Nonmovers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kambia | 424,488 | 16,230 | 99,327 | 4.8 | 23.4 | -83,097 | -24.1 | 341,391 |
| Koinadugu | 458,169 | 10,518 | 63,557 | 2.6 | 13.9 | -53,039 | -13.0 | 405,130 |
| Port Loko | 721,593 | 56,351 | 168,760 | 9.3 | 23.4 | -112,409 | -18.3 | 609,184 |
| Tonkolili | 623,043 | 26,073 | 123,473 | 5.0 | 19.8 | -97,400 | -18.3 | 525,643 |
| Bo | 559,074 | 104,813 | 99,440 | 18.6 | 17.8 | 5,373 | 0.9 | 564,447 |
| Bonthe | 225,276 | 16,785 | 42,041 | 8.4 | 18.7 | -25,256 | -12.6 | 200,020 |
| Moyamba | 373,959 | 28,358 | 87,268 | 9.0 | 23.3 | -58,910 | -18.5 | 315,049 |
| Pujehun | 361,636 | 24,920 | 42,774 | 7.2 | 11.8 | -17,854 | -5.2 | 343,782 |
| Western Rural | 185,833 | 274,274 | 27,755 | 63.4 | 14.9 | 246,519 | 55.6 | 432,352 |
| Western Urban | 608,854 | 483,715 | 87,052 | 48.1 | 14.3 | 396,663 | 37.8 | 1,005,517 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 7.5.4 Recent migration

Table 7.6 shows that 5,769,799 persons, representing 81.5 per cent of the population, did not move from their region in the five-year period before the enumeration.


Table 7.6 Population by region of residence during enumeration and region of residence five years before enumeration

|  |  | Region of residence five years before enumeration |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region | Total | Eastern | Northern | Southern | Western |
| Total | $1,417,062$ | $1,390,914$ | 11,276 | 8,206 | 6,666 |
| Eastern | $2,111,568$ | 8,887 | $2,074,136$ | 5,785 | 22,760 |
| Northern | $1,214,495$ | 12,713 | 5,960 | $1,184,663$ | 11,159 |
| Southern | $1,239,705$ | 22,745 | 71,760 | 25,114 | $1,120,086$ |
| Western | $1,437,869$ | 111,840 | 446,097 | 129,796 | 750,136 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Table 7.7 shows the recent migration indicators by region. While 119,619 persons recently migrated into the Western Region, 88,998 migrated out of the Northern Region. The recent net migration rate for the Northern Region was -2.1 per cent compared with 5.3 per cent for the Western Region.

## E(A) Table 7.7 Recent in-migration, out-migration and net migration by region

| Region | Enumerated <br> population | In- <br> migrants | Out- <br> migrants | In- <br> migration <br> rate | Out- <br> migration <br> rate | Net <br> migration | Net <br> migra-tion <br> rate | Non- <br> movers |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eastern | $1,640,592$ | 26,148 | 44,345 | 1.8 | 3.1 | $-18,197$ | -1.1 | $1,390,914$ |
| Northern | $2,502,583$ | 37,432 | 88,996 | 1.8 | 4.1 | $-51,564$ | -2.1 | $2,074,136$ |
| Southern | $1,439,165$ | 29,832 | 39,105 | 2.5 | 3.2 | $-9,273$ | -0.6 | $1,184,663$ |
| Western | $1,493,779$ | 119,619 | 40,585 | 9.6 | 3.5 | 79,034 | 5.3 | $1,120,086$ |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Table 7.8 presents the recent migration indicators by district. It is interesting to note that only three districts namely, Western Rural, Pujehun and Kailuhun, were net gainers of recent migrants. Western Rural had the most notable net migration rate of 21.7 per cent. The districts with notable negative net migration rates were Kambia ( -3.4 per cent), Kenema ( -2.6 per cent), Port Loko ( -2.6 per cent), Tonkolili ( -2.4 per cent) and Bombali ( -2.4 per cent).

Table 7.8 Recent in-migration, out-migration and net migration by district

| District | Enumerated population | Inmigrants | Outmigrants | Inmigration rate | Outmigration rate | Net migration | Net migration rate | Nonmovers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kailahun | 458,919 | 13,190 | 11,106 | 2.9 | 2.4 | 2,084 | 0.4 | 445,729 |
| Kailahun | 458,919 | 13,190 | 11,106 | 2.9 | 2.4 | 2,084 | 0.4 | 445,729 |
| Kenema | 523,511 | 17,599 | 31,428 | 3.4 | 5.8 | -13,829 | -2.6 | 505,912 |
| Kono | 434,632 | 11,828 | 18,280 | 2.7 | 4.1 | -6,452 | -1.5 | 422,804 |
| Bombali | 513,144 | 22,540 | 35,029 | 4.4 | 6.7 | -12,489 | -2.4 | 490,604 |
| Kumbia | 286,477 | 5,573 | 15,374 | 1.9 | 5.2 | -9,801 | -3.4 | 280,904 |
| Koinadugu | 354,863 | 4,860 | 9,689 | 1.4 | 2.7 | -4,829 | -1.3 | 350,003 |
| Port Loko | 512,524 | 18,111 | 31,822 | 3.5 | 6.0 | -13,711 | -2.6 | 494,413 |
| Tonkolili | 444,560 | 9,767 | 20,501 | 2.2 | 4.5 | -10,734 | -2.4 | 434,793 |
| Bo | 479,290 | 22,270 | 32,208 | 4.6 | 6.6 | -9,938 | -2.0 | 457,020 |
| Bonthe | 171,791 | 6,522 | 7,866 | 3.8 | 4.5 | -1,344 | -0.8 | 165,269 |


| District | Enumerated population | Inmigrants | Outmigrants | Inmigration rate | Outmigration rate | Net migration | Net migra-tion rate | Nonmovers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Moyamba | 264,218 | 9,456 | 14,940 | 3.6 | 5.5 | -5,484 | -2.1 | 254,762 |
| Pujehun | 299,196 | 13,482 | 5,989 | 4.5 | 2.1 | 7,493 | 2.5 | 285,714 |
| Western Rural | 372,464 | 99,338 | 15,753 | 26.7 | 5.5 | 83,585 | 21.7 | 273,126 |
| Western Urban | 867,241 | 78,765 | 83,316 | 9.1 | 9.6 | -4,551 | -0.5 | 788,476 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 7.6 Migration effectiveness

Migration effectiveness ratio (MER) is the ratio of net migration to gross migration. It compares the total net gain or loss to the gross migration. Essentially it helps to assess how effective migration has been in redistributing the population. In general, values under 15 indicate relatively ineffective population redistribution due to migration; values over 15 indicate that migration, in the reference period, had a significant effect in redistributing the population in the region.

All the other three regions had negative MERs. The Northern Region had the biggest net losses in terms of both recent and lifetime migration with MERs of -40.8 per cent and -79.6 per cent respectively. For recent migration, the Eastern Region followed the Northern Region in experiencing losses with MER of - 25.8 per cent. For lifetime migration, the Southern Region followed the Northern Region with MER of -34.5 per cent. In general, the regions showed that there was effective contribution to population distribution by lifetime, as well as recent migration.

| Net migration | Table 7.9 Net migration, gross migration and migration <br> effective ratios for lifetime and recent migration by region <br> Region <br> Lifetime migration |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Eastern | $-51,148$ | 298,952 | -17.1 |
| Northern | $-495,387$ | 622,201 | -79.6 |
| Southern | $-96,647$ | 280,311 | -34.5 |
| Western | 643,182 | 732,284 | 87.8 |

Table 7.9 Net migration, gross migration and migration effective ratios for lifetime and recent migration by region (continued)

| Region | Net migration | In + out-migrants | Migration effectiveness ratio |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Recent migration |  |  |  |
| Eastern | $-18,197$ | 70,493 | -25.8 |
| Northern | $-51,564$ | 126,428 | -40.8 |
| Southern | $-9,273$ | 68,937 | -13.5 |
| Western | 79,034 | 160,204 | 49.3 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 7.7 International migration

### 7.7.1 Characteristics of foreign-born population (immigrants)

There were 58,053 persons born outside Sierra Leone in 2015, representing 0.8 per cent of the population (Table 7.10). The proportion of males ( 56.3 per cent) was higher than females. The sex ratio was 129 males per 100 females, much higher than the national sex ratio. The results also show that 74.4 per cent of the population was within the working age of 15-64 years. The highest proportion ( 63.9 per cent) of foreign-born people were from Guinea Republic, followed by Liberia ( 11.9 per cent) and Nigeria ( 4.9 per cent). The sex composition by country of origin generally shows the same pattern of more male than female immigrants. Liberia is the only country where there were more female immigrants than males ( 55 per cent compared with 45 per cent).


| Country of birth | Total | Male | Female | Proportion foreign born |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Guinea Republic | 37,085 | 62.2 | 66.1 | 63.9 |
| Liberia | 6,937 | 9.5 | 15.1 | 11.9 |
| Nigeria | 2,851 | 6.2 | 3.2 | 4.9 |
| Gambia | 1,737 | 3.1 | 2.8 | 3.0 |
| Rest of African <br> countries | 5,249 | 10.2 | 7.5 | 9.0 |
| Non-African <br> countries | 4,194 | 8.7 | 5.3 | 7.2 |
| Total | 58,053 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number | 32,703 | 25,350 |  |  |

An analysis by region and district shows that the proportion of foreign-born population ranged from 0.3 per cent in the Northern Region to 2 per cent in the Western Region. At the district level, 2.2 per cent of the population in Western Urban were foreign-born, while in Bonthe, Moyamba Port Loko and Tonkolili, the proportion was 0.2 per cent or less.

The population born outside Sierra Leone has been declining. The 2004 Census showed that 1.8 per cent of the population was foreign born, compared with 2.9 per cent in 1974 and 2.8 per cent in 1985.

Table 7.11 presents percentage of economically active foreign-born population aged 15 years and over by age, sex and employment status. It is noted that 62.5 per cent of the foreign-born population aged 15 years and over were employed and 3.1 per cent were unemployed. The majority ( 72.9 per cent) of the foreign-born population was self-employed, 17.1 per cent of the population were in paid employment and apprentices constituted 2.9 per cent.

Of the economically active foreign-born population, 4.7 per cent were unemployed. Analysis of the various employment status categories by age shows that the proportion of the selfemployed increased with age. The data also show that the proportion in apprenticeships and unemployment declined with age.

A comparison by sex of the foreign-born population shows that there were more men in paid employment than women ( 20.2 per cent versus 9.9 per cent). However, slightly more foreignborn women than men were self-employed or unpaid family workers. Even though overall unemployment was higher among foreign-born women, analysis by age shows that after age 39 , unemployment among the women was lower than among the men.

## 硅 Table 7.11 Economically active foreign-born population aged 15 years and over by age, sex and employment status

| Sex | Age group | Number | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Paid } \\ & \text { employee } \end{aligned}$ | Selfemployed | Unpaid family worker | Apprentice | Looking for work |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Both sexes | 15-19 | 1,652 | 5.7 | 64.3 | 6.8 | 13.7 | 9.4 |
|  | 20-24 | 3,379 | 12.5 | 68.2 | 3.5 | 7.0 | 8.8 |
|  | 25-29 | 4,767 | 18.1 | 70.4 | 2.2 | 3.4 | 6.0 |
|  | 30-34 | 4,185 | 20.9 | 70.8 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 4.4 |
|  | 35-39 | 4,180 | 19.9 | 72.4 | 2.2 | 1.5 | 4.0 |
|  | 40-44 | 3,190 | 19.5 | 74.1 | 1.8 | 1.3 | 3.4 |
|  | 45-49 | 2,593 | 18.8 | 76.1 | 1.8 | 1.0 | 2.3 |
|  | 50-54 | 2,094 | 19.5 | 74.8 | 2.1 | 0.7 | 3.0 |
|  | 55-59 | 1,308 | 18.2 | 77.4 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 2.4 |
|  | 60-64 | 1,072 | 14.7 | 80.9 | 1.3 | 1.1 | 2.0 |
|  | 65+ | 1,806 | 8.5 | 84.5 | 3.5 | 0.9 | 2.6 |
|  | Total | 30,226 | 17.1 | 72.9 | 2.5 | 2.9 | 4.7 |

(1) Table 7.11 Economically active foreign-born population aged 15 years and over by age, sex and employment status (continued)

| Sex | Age group | Number | Paid employee | Selfemployed | Unpaid family worke | Apprentice | Looking for work |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 15-19 | 961 | 7.8 | 57.6 | 5.4 | 19.6 | 9.6 |
|  | 20-24 | 1,973 | 17.6 | 61.7 | 2.4 | 9.8 | 8.5 |
|  | 25-29 | 3,000 | 22.0 | 66.6 | 1.2 | 4.5 | 5.7 |
|  | 30-34 | 2,783 | 25.3 | 67.3 | 1.1 | 2.1 | 4.2 |
|  | 35-39 | 2,883 | 23.6 | 69.6 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 3.7 |
|  | 40-44 | 2,329 | 22.0 | 71.5 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 3.6 |
|  | 45-49 | 1,945 | 22.0 | 73.6 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 2.4 |
|  | 50-54 | 1,657 | 21.2 | 73.3 | 1.6 | 0.8 | 3.1 |
|  | 55-59 | 1,083 | 19.4 | 76.5 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 2.2 |
|  | 60-64 | 847 | 15.6 | 80.4 | 0.8 | 1.2 | 2.0 |
|  | 65+ | 1,499 | 9.1 | 84.9 | 2.9 | 0.9 | 2.2 |
|  | Total | 20,960 | 20.2 | 70.3 | 1.7 | 3.4 | 4.3 |
| Female | 15-19 | 691 | 2.7 | 73.7 | 8.8 | 5.6 | 9.1 |
|  | 20-24 | 1,406 | 5.4 | 77.4 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 9.2 |
|  | 25-29 | 1,767 | 11.5 | 76.8 | 3.8 | 1.5 | 6.3 |
|  | 30-34 | 1,402 | 12.2 | 77.7 | 3.9 | 1.4 | 4.8 |
|  | 35-39 | 1,297 | 11.7 | 78.6 | 3.8 | 1.2 | 4.7 |
|  | 40-44 | 861 | 12.7 | 81.0 | 2.9 | 0.8 | 2.7 |
|  | 45-49 | 648 | 9.4 | 83.6 | 3.5 | 1.4 | 2.0 |
|  | 50-54 | 437 | 12.8 | 80.5 | 3.9 | 0.2 | 2.5 |
|  | 55-59 | 225 | 12.4 | 81.3 | 2.7 | 0.4 | 3.1 |
|  | 60-64 | 225 | 11.6 | 82.7 | 3.1 | 0.9 | 1.8 |
|  | 65+ | 307 | 5.5 | 82.7 | 6.5 | 0.7 | 4.6 |
|  | Total | 9,266 | 9.9 | 78.5 | 4.3 | 1.8 | 5.5 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 7.8 Urbanization

Urbanization can indicate a situation existing at any moment, in which instance it is best to speak of a level of urbanization; or it can be used to express the trend of urban developments, in which instance it is better to speak of the tempo of urbanization (UN, 1970). Urban areas in Sierra Leone are defined as localities with a minimum threshold of 2,000 persons, a criterion developed by Statistics Sierra Leone. This definition of urban was used during the previous census in 2004.

### 7.9 Levels and trends of urbanization

### 7.9.1 Proportion of urban population

Out of the 7,092,113 persons enumerated in Sierra Leone, 2,905,097 or 41 per cent were in the urban areas, while 59 per cent were in the rural areas (Table 7.12). At the regional level, the Western Region was predominantly urban with 97.1 per cent of the population in urban areas. The Eastern Region had the next highest proportion of urban population ( 33.4 per cent), followed by the Northern Region ( 24.5 per cent) and the Southern Region (19.6 per cent). The results further show that the Western Region constituted half of the total urban population in Sierra Leone. The Southern Region only had 10 per cent of its population in urban areas compared to 19 per cent in the Eastern Region and 21 per cent in the Northern Region.

At the district level, Western Urban was totally urban and Western Rural also had a high urban population ( 90.2 per cent). Among the rest of the districts, the urban population ranged from 7.1 per cent in Moyamba to 44.5 per cent in Kenema. Regarding the cities, Freetown in the Western Region had the largest population of 1,055,964; Kenema in the Eastern Region had a population of 200,443; Bo in the Southern Region had a population of 174,369; and Makeni in the Northern Region had the smallest population of 124,634 .

The urban population has been increasing over the years. The 2004 Census showed that 36.7 per cent of the population were in urban areas, an increase from 27.6 per cent in 1974 to 32.2 per cent in 1985.


Table 7.12 Urban population by sex, region and district

| Region/district |  | Region/district |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Sex Ratio | Percent Urban |
| Eastern | 548,722 | 270,397 | 278,325 | 0.98 | 33.4 |
| Northern | 612,015 | 300,310 | 311,705 | 0.99 | 24.5 |
| Southern | 282,543 | 137,080 | 145,463 | 0.98 | 19.6 |
| Western | $1,450,227$ | 722,256 | 727,971 | 0.99 | 97.1 |

Table 7.12 Urban population by sex, region and district (continued)

| Region/district | Region/district |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Sex Ratio | Percent Urban |
| Kailahun | 153,102 | 74,930 | 78,172 | 0.97 | 29.1 |
| Kenema | 271,321 | 133,560 | 137,761 | 0.96 | 44.5 |
| Kono | 124,299 | 61,907 | 62,392 | 0.97 | 24.6 |
| Bombali | 172,597 | 85,168 | 87,429 | 0.96 | 28.5 |
| Kambia | 100,479 | 48,480 | 51,999 | 0.97 | 29.2 |
| Koinadugu | 73,035 | 36,275 | 36,760 | 0.93 | 17.9 |
| Port Loko | 158,657 | 77,336 | 81,321 | 0.99 | 25.9 |
| Tonkolili | 107,247 | 53,051 | 54,196 | 0.95 | 20.2 |
| Bo | 194,017 | 93,708 | 100,309 | 0.94 | 33.8 |
| Bonthe | 37,975 | 18,821 | 19,154 | 0.93 | 18.9 |
| Moyamba | 22,469 | 10,601 | 11,868 | 0.98 | 7.1 |
| Pujehun | 28,082 | 13,950 | 14,132 | 0.89 | 8.1 |
| Western Rural | 399,516 | 198,375 | 201,141 | 0.99 | 90.2 |
| Western Urban | 1,050,711 | 523,881 | 526,830 | 0.99 | 100.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 7.9.2 Trends in urban growth rate

The urban growth rate is an important indicator in measuring urbanization as it reflects the expansion of urban areas. Table 7.13 presents trends in urbanization from 1974 to 2015. The intercensal urban growth rate between 2004 and 2015 was 4.2 per cent. This is much higher than the rural growth rate of 2.6 per cent for the same period. The urban growth rate also exceeded the national population growth rate which was estimated at 3.2 per cent for the period 2004-2015.

The growth rate has been increasing over the years as the urban growth rate was 3.7 per cent between 1974 and 1985. However, the urban growth rate slowed down to 2.5 per cent between 1985 and 2004, the period of the Civil War. Among the cities, Makeni was the fastest growing city with an annual growth rate of 3.7 per cent compared with 2.8 per cent for Freetown.

To measure the tempo of urbanization it is advisable to take the difference between the urban and rural growth rates. Based on this, the tempo of urbanization in Sierra Leone was 1.6 per cent. Compared to 2004, the tempo was 1.0 per cent meaning that the rate of change of urbanization was slower between 1985 and 2004 than 2004 to 2015.

| Census year | Urban population | Proportion <br> urban | Annual growth <br> rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1974 | 756,126 | 27.6 | - |
| 1985 | $1,133,773$ | 32.2 | 3.7 |
| 2004 | $1,825,246$ | 36.7 | 2.5 |
| 2015 | $2,905,097$ | 40.1 | 4.2 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 7.9.3 Urban-rural ratio

The urban-rural ratios presented in Table 7.14 shows that in Sierra Leone, the ratio was 0.69, an increase from 0.58 in 2004. This means that for every 69 persons in urban areas, there were 100 persons in rural areas. At the regional level, the urban-rural ratio ranged from 0.24 in the Southern Region to 33.3 in the Western Region. Since the Western Region is predominantly urban, a ratio above 1 is expected. At the district level, Moyamba and Pujehun had the lowest urban-rural ratios, 0.08 and 0.09 respectively.

Table 7.14 Urban-rural ratio by region and district

| Region/district | Urban-rural ratio |
| :--- | :--- |
| Total | 0.69 |
| Region |  |
| Eastern | 0.50 |
| Northern | 0.32 |
| Southern | 0.24 |
| Western | 33.30 |
| District | 0.41 |
| Kailahun | 0.80 |
| Kenema | 0.33 |
| Kono | 0.40 |
| Bombali | 0.41 |
| Kambia | 0.22 |
| Koinadugu |  |


| Region／district | Urban－rural ratio |
| :--- | :--- |
| Port Loko | 0.35 |
| Tonkolili | 0.25 |
| Bo | 0.51 |
| Bonthe | 0.23 |
| Moyamba | 0.08 |
| Pujehun | 0.09 |
| Western Rural | 9.17 |
| Western Urban | 0.41 |

Source：Statistics Sierra Leone， 2015 Population and Housing Census

Figure 7.1 Pyramid for the urban population


Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 7.10 Summary, conclusion and recommendations

### 7.10.1 Summary and conclusion

The results show that 84.6 per cent of the population did not move from their district of birth. The regional comparison shows that most non-movers were in the Northern Region $(2,418,215)$ while the Western Region had the lowest number of non-movers $(750,136)$. The recent migration rates show that the Western Region continued to receive people from the other regions with a net migration of 79,034.

All the other regions experienced a net loss of people. There were 58,053 persons born outside Sierra Leone representing 0.8 per cent of the population. Most of these lifetime migrants were born in Guinea Republic and there were more males than females.

The urban growth rate shows that the urban population was growing at a faster rate than the rural population ( 4.2 per cent compared with 2.6 per cent). The dependent population aged below 15 years and 64 years and above was around 40 per cent, which is slightly lower than the national dependency rate at 44 per cent.

In terms of size, the urban population was largest in the Western Region. The ratio of urban to rural population was 0.69, an increase from 0.58 in 2004, and this shows that the urban population is increasing in Sierra Leone.

Migration within the country continues. It is likely that people will continue to migrate to urban areas in the next few years, especially into the Western Region. The fertility rate in the Western Region is lower than the other regions but its population continues to grow.

### 7.10.2 Recommendations

There is need for the Government to plan for the increasingly young population and put in place more education infrastructure, especially primary schools. There will also be an increased need for health services for both children and adults.

The Government should ensure that people in urban areas have a decent standard of living, by creating more economic opportunities. More importantly, it must keep up with the increase in demand for housing as the population size increases in urban areas. Already there are many apartments in Western Urban district where multiple households can stay in one building. This is a good way to maximise space in such an overpopulated urban area, rather than building separate structures for each household. The Government should encourage the building of such types of housing arrangements.
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## CHAPTER 8 : MARITALCHARACTERISTICS

### 8.1 Introduction

Many non-African cultures define marriage as a union of two persons of the opposite sex. However, this definition is not directly applicable in the African context. Marriage in Africa is a 'developing process', rather than an event at a point in time marking the cohabitation of husband and wife. There are variations between and within cultures and marriage can be formal or informal, depending on the norms of a particular society. It is not mandatory in Sierra Leone, except in some circumstances where marriage is expected, for instance for clergy, chiefs or politicians. But legally-speaking marriage is not compulsory.

In spite of the definitional problems of marriage in Sierra Leonean society, it is seen as the main socially-sanctioned institution for couples wishing to have children. An individual's role in society is, to a large extent, dependent on their marital status. However, this does not mean that premarital births do not occur.

Marital status composition has also been recognized as the most important factor in population dynamics affecting fertility and, to a lesser extent, mortality and migration. Its effect is also felt on other socio-economic phenomenon such as school attendance, family formation, households, and other labour force participation in late adolescent and young adult age groups.

The importance of the institution of marriage in Serra Leone lies in the fact that it incorporates all the social, economic, legal, cultural and other factors that society considers vital for its existence. It is therefore seen as an integral part of the socio-economic and cultural cycle through which everyone is expected to pass, because it upholds certain norms which every member should observe. The violations of such prohibitive norms such as incest or cross-cousin marriages are expiated according to the prescribed norms of the ethnic group in question.

The types of marriage are:
(a) traditional or cultural marriages are contracted based on the various traditions of the people concerned. These can be registered at local council level to make them legally binding;
(b) Christian and Muslim marriages. These can also be registered;
(c) civil or registry marriage; and
(d) cohabitation for five years and above. This is actually not a marriage in the strict sense but it is part of the constitution that if people cohabit for that period of time then they are considered to be husband and wife. In such cases, the woman is entitled to benefit from whatever the man possesses if he dies, or she is liable to compensation if he abandons her. It is designed to protect women from abuse by men.

In most cases, people marry as adults. However, there are also exceptional cases of child marriages.

### 8.2. Sources of data

The question on marital status in the 2015 Census to all persons aged at least 10 years was: 'What is (Name)'s current marital status?'. The marital status categories are: never married
i. engaged
ii. married monogamous
iii. married polygamous
iv. co-habitation - less than 5 years
v. co-habitation -5 years or more
vi. separated
vii. divorced
viii. widowed
ix. don't know

All these categories were clearly defined for the interviewers.
It should be noted that the marital status categories used in the 1985 Census were not the same as those used for this census. The 1985 marital status categories were:
i. never married
ii. married
iii. separated
iv. divorced
v. widowed
vi. not stated

For comparative purposes the following categories were used:
19852015

Never married Never married, engaged
Married Married monogamous, polygamous, cohabitation
Separated Separated
Divorced Divorced
Widowed Widowed
Not stated Not stated
It is worth noting that polygamy, in the Sierra Leonean sense, is actually polygyny - that is, the spouse who has more than one mate is always a man. Polyandry, where a woman has more than one mate, is not sanctioned.

It should also be noted that, for females, no information was collected on age at first marriage, re-marriage, number of times married, nor age at first live birth.

This analysis looks at marital status categories to see how these are influenced by the socioeconomic characteristics of the target population under examination. These characteristics include, among others, age groups, sex, place of residence (urban or rural areas), different religious groups, employment status and economic activity. Comparisons with data from previous censuses should be handled with care, because, as already observed, the marital status categories are not the same.

### 8.3. Marital status for the population aged 10 years and above by residence, region and district

The proportion of the population never married is the highest in the country with 46 per cent. This ranges from 43 per cent in the Northern Region to 55 per cent in the Southern Region (Table 8.1). Married polygamous follows with 30 per cent, ranging from 22 per cent in the Southern Region to 32 per cent in the Northern Region. The monogamously married category follows with proportions ranging from 9 to 16 per cent respectively in the Northern and Western regions. The pattern is not the same across all of the regions.

There are notable differences between rural and urban areas. The proportions never married are 41 and 52 per cent respectively for the rural and urban areas. The proportions in polygamous unions are 34 and 25 per cent respectively for the two areas. The proportion widowed ranges between 3 and 4 per cent for the total country, rural and urban areas, as well as regions. The proportion separated is less than 2 per cent for the total country, rural and urban areas, as well as for the regions. With regard to the divorced population, the proportions are 1 per cent or less in all areas.


| Place of Residence/ Region | Total | Marital status |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Never Married | Engaged | Married Monogamous | Married Polygamous | Co-habitation (< 5 years) |
| All Residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 5030016 | 45.9 | 4.0 | 13.0 | 30.0 | 0.4 |
| Eastern | 1167420 | 46.0 | 3.0 | 12.3 | 31.4 | 0.5 |
| Northern | 1709916 | 43.1 | 3.1 | 15.5 | 31.7 | 0.3 |
| Southern | 1001795 | 55,2 | 4.8 | 10.9 | 22.4 | 0.6 |
| Western | 1150885 | 52.5 | 7.0 | 9.0 | 24.7 | 0.4 |
| Rural |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 2843126 | 41.2 | 3.0 | 14.9 | 33.7 | 0.4 |
| Eastern | 761186 | 46.0 | 3.0 | 12.3 | 31.4 | 0.5 |
| Northern | 1262168 | 43.2 | 3.4 | 13.9 | 31.8 | 0.5 |
| Southern | 788288 | 43.2 | 3.4 | 13.9 | 31.8 | 0.5 |
| Western | 31484 | 52.5 | 7.0 | 9.0 | 24.7 | 0.4 |
| Urban |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 2186890 | 52.1 | 5.4 | 10.4 | 25.3 | 0.5 |
| Eastern | 406234 | 51.1 | 3.5 | 11.1 | 27.7 | 0.5 |
| Northern | 447748 | 40.7 | 2.9 | 16.2 | 33.6 | 0.2 |
| Southern | 213507 | 55.2 | 4.8 | 10.9 | 22.4 | 0.6 |
| Western | 1119401 | 52.8 | 7.0 | 8.9 | 24.6 | 0.4 |

Table 8.1 Percentage distribution of the population aged 10 years and above by marital status, residence and region (continued)

| Place of Residence/ Region | Marital status |  |  |  |  | Total \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Co-habitation (= >5 years) | Separated | Divorced | Widowed | Don't know |  |
| All Residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 0.2 | 1.4 | 0.8 | 4.0 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| Eastern | 0.2 | 1.4 | 0.7 | 4.1 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| Northern | 0.1 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 4.1 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| Southern | 0.3 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 3.7 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| Western | 0.2 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 3.2 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| Rural |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 0.1 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 4.4 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| Eastern | 0.2 | 1.4 | 0.7 | 4.1 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| Northern | 0.2 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 4.5 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| Southern | 0.2 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 4.5 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| Western | 0.2 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 3.2 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| Urban |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 0.2 | 1.4 | 0.9 | 3.4 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| Eastern | 0.3 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 3.7 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| Northern | 0.1 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 4.2 | 0.2 | 100.0 |
| Southern | 0.3 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 3.7 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| Western | 0.2 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 3.2 | 0.4 | 100.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

In general, the marital status pattern for the districts follows the national one (Table 8.2). The proportions never married dominate across all districts, ranging from 36 to 55 per cent in Moyambe and Western Area Urban districts respectively. The latter is the only district where the proportion never married exceeds 50 per cent. This district also has the lowest proportion, 8 per cent, of monogamous marriages. Polygamous marriages range from 23 per cent in Western Area Urban to 37 per cent in Moyambe. The district of Konaidugu has the lowest proportion of widowed marriages at 2 per cent, while Moyambe has the highest proportion at 6 per cent.

Table 8.2 Percentage distribution of the population aged 10 years and above by district, marital status and sex

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District |  |  |  |  | Marital status |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

| District | Marital Status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Married Polygamous |  |  | Co-habitation ( $<5$ years) |  |  | Co-habitation ( $=>5$ years) |  |  |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Total Country | 30.0 | 29.8 | 30.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Kailahun | 28.6 | 27.9 | 29.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Kenema | 33.5 | 32.8 | 34.3 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| Kono | 31.6 | 30.8 | 32.5 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Bombali | 31.1 | 30.6 | 31.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Kambia | 33.8 | 33.6 | 33.9 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Koinadugu | 29.8 | 27.9 | 31.6 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Port Loko | 32.4 | 35.4 | 29.8 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Tonkolili | 31.8 | 31.9 | 31.7 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Bo | 29.6 | 29.6 | 29.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| Bonthe | 32.8 | 32.5 | 33.0 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Moyamba | 37.1 | 37.0 | 37.1 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Pujehun | 30.2 | 29.4 | 30.8 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Western Area Rural | 28.5 | 28.3 | 28.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census


Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 8.4. Marital status for the population aged 10 years and above by age group and sex

The proportion of the population never married is the most dominant marital category with 46 per cent, followed by polygamous marriages with 30 per cent and monogamous marriages at 13 per cent (Table 8.3). The proportion never married declines as people grow older, from 95 per cent in age group 10-14 years to 9 per cent in age group 35-39 years. On the other hand, widowhood increases with age from 7 per cent in age group 45-49, to 38 per cent for those aged 75 years and above.

Table 8.3 Percentage distribution of the population aged 10 years and above by marital status and age group

| Age Group | Total <br> Population | Never <br> Married | Engaged | Married <br> Monogamous | Married <br> Polygamous | Marital status (percent) <br> Cohabitation <br> (< years) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Country | 5030016 | 45.9 | 4.0 | 13.0 | 30.0 | 0.4 |
| $10-14$ | 846137 | 96.5 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 0.6 | 0.3 |
| $15-19$ | 871348 | 85.5 | 2.3 | 5.8 | 4.7 | 0.5 |
| $20-24$ | 660438 | 58.8 | 5.9 | 13.4 | 19.1 | 0.8 |
| $25-29$ | 605621 | 33.6 | 7.5 | 18.7 | 36.4 | 0.7 |
| $30-34$ | 432373 | 16.9 | 7.2 | 21.8 | 48.6 | 0.5 |
| $35-39$ | 419485 | 8.9 | 6.0 | 20.0 | 58.4 | 0.3 |
| $40-44$ | 297997 | 5.6 | 4.8 | 19.9 | 60.0 | 0.2 |
| $45-49$ | 241362 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 18.0 | 62.6 | 0.2 |
| $50-54$ | 186285 | 3.5 | 3.1 | 18.2 | 58.6 | 0.1 |
| $55-59$ | 110200 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 17.1 | 57.0 | 0.1 |
| $60-64$ | 112486 | 2.7 | 2.2 | 16.9 | 50.7 | 0.1 |
| $65-69$ | 73617 | 2.4 | 2.0 | 15.4 | 49.1 | 0.1 |
| $70-74$ | 65495 | 2.7 | 1.7 | 14.9 | 43.1 | 0.1 |
| $75+$ | 107172 | 3.3 | 1.4 | 13.3 | 38.7 | 0.1 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

| Age group | Marital status (percent) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Co-habitation <br> $(=>5$ years $)$ | Separated | Divorced | Widowed | Don't know | Total \% |
| Total Country | 0.2 | 1.4 | 0.8 | 4.0 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| $10-14$ | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 100.0 |
| $15-19$ | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 100.0 |
| $20-24$ | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| $25-29$ | 0.3 | 1.3 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 100.0 |
| $30-34$ | 0.3 | 2.1 | 1.0 | 1.5 | 0.1 | 100.0 |
| $35-39$ | 0.2 | 2.4 | 1.3 | 2.5 | 0.1 | 100.0 |
| $40-44$ | 0.1 | 2.9 | 1.6 | 4.7 | 0.1 | 100.0 |
| $45-49$ | 0.1 | 2.8 | 1.7 | 6.7 | 0.1 | 100.0 |
| $50-54$ | 0.1 | 2.9 | 2.0 | 11.4 | 0.1 | 100.0 |
| $55-59$ | 0.1 | 3.0 | 2.1 | 14.9 | 0.1 | 100.0 |
| $60-64$ | 0.1 | 2.8 | 2.1 | 22.3 | 0.2 | 100.0 |
| $65-69$ | 0.1 | 2.7 | 2.2 | 25.8 | 0.2 | 100.0 |
| $70-74$ | 0.1 | 2.6 | 2.2 | 32.3 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| $75+$ | 0.1 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 38.3 | 0.4 | 100.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census
An attempt has been made to make some comparisons with the 1985 Census (Table 8.4). However, the data available are for females only. There are notable differences between 1985 and 2015. The proportion never married has doubled from 22 to 43 per cent. The proportion married, which is made up of married monogamous, polygamous and cohabitation, has declined from 67 to 47 per cent respectively between 1985 and 2015. The proportions separated, divorced or widowed have remained constant during the period of the two censuses with respective percentages of 2,1 and 7 .

Table 8.4 Percentage distribution of marital status for females aged 10 years and above by age group, total country, 1985 and 2015 Censuses

| Age Group | Marital Status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never married, engaged |  | Married monogamous, polygamous or cohabitation |  | Separated |  |  |  | Widowed |  | Don't know |  |
|  | 2015 | 1985 | 2015 | 1985 | 2015 | 1985 | 2015 | 1985 | 2015 | 1985 | 2015 | 1985 |
| All age groups | 43 | 22 | 47 | 67 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 0 | 1 |
| 10-14 | 97 | 90 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 15-19 | 81 | 40 | 18 | 58 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 20-24 | 49 | 15 | 49 | 81 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 25-29 | 28 | 7 | 69 | 89 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 30-34 | 16 | 4 | 78 | 90 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| 35-39 | 11 | 3 | 81 | 90 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| 40-44 | 8 | 2 | 78 | 87 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 1 |
| 45-49 | 6 | 2 | 75 | 83 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 13 | 10 | 0 | 1 |
| 50-54 | 6 | 2 | 66 | 76 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 22 | 17 | 0 | 1 |
| 55-59 | 5 | 2 | 59 | 69 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 29 | 24 | 0 | 1 |
| 60-64 | 5 | 2 | 51 | 61 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 39 | 32 | 0 | 1 |
| 65-69 | 4 | 2 | 44 | 40 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 47 | 53 | 0 | 1 |
| 70-74 | 4 | . | 35 | . | 2 | .. | 2 | . | 55 | . | 0 | . |
| $75+$ | 5 | .. | 27 | .. | 2 | .. | 2 | .. | 64 | .. | 0 | .. |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Table 8.5 presents selected marital status categories by age and sex. These categories are never married, polygamous and widowed. They make up 80 per cent of all marital categories. These categories appear to have significantly different patterns by age. For the never married category, the proportions for males and females are 44 and 39 per cent respectively. However, there are significant differences in the trend by age. For the 10-14 year age group, the percentages never married are 97 and 96 respectively for both males and females. However, the trend by age group differs significantly for the two sexes. By age group 20-24 the respective proportions are 79 and 41 per cent. At age group 25-29 the proportions never married have declined to 50 and 41 per cent respectively, an indication that females get married at a faster rate than males. By age group 45-49 the gap has narrowed to 4.5 and 3.2 per cent respectively for the two sexes.

By the age of 75 , the proportions never married have declined to 3.0 and 3.5 per cent respectively for males and females. There are notable sex differences in polygamous unions with more men (36 per cent) than women ( 30 per cent) involved in such unions. It can be observed in the table that such unions commence at relatively earlier ages for women than for men. By age group 25-29 the proportions of married women and men in polygamous unions are 47 and 24 per cent respectively.

The proportion of married men in polygamous unions keeps on rising from 24 per cent in age group 25-29 to 75 per cent in age group 55-59 and then declines to 70 per cent by the age of 70 . In the case of women, the proportion of married women in polygamous unions keeps on rising from 24 per cent in age group 25-29 to 58 per cent in age group 35-39 and then starts declining to 12 per cent by the age of 75 . Such a decline for the women may be attributable to relatively higher male mortality at older ages.

It can further be observed in Table 8.5 that widowhood for women is relatively higher than that for men across all age groups. The overall proportion of widows is 7 per cent of all marital status categories compared to 1 per cent for widowers. At age group 40-44 the proportions of widows and widowers are respectively 9 and 1 per cent. By age group 75+ the corresponding percentages are 64 and 9 respectively for women and men. As mentioned earlier, this may be due to men having a lower life expectancy.

At district level, widowhood ranges from 2 to 6 per cent for the districts of Koinadugu and Moyambe respectively (Table 8.6). Polygamous unions dominate in all the districts, with proportions ranging from 23 to 37 per cent respectively in the districts of Western Area Urban and Moyambe.

## E Table 8.5 Percentage distribution of selected marital status categories by age group and sex

| Age Group | Selected marital statuses (Percent) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never married |  | Married polygamous |  | Widowed |  |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| Total | 43.8 | 39.1 | 36.0 | 30.3 | 1.0 | 7.0 |
| 10-14 | 96.9 | 96.0 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| 15-19 | 94.3 | 77.1 | 0.8 | 8.4 | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| 20-24 | 79.2 | 41.2 | 6.4 | 30.1 | 0.2 | 0.6 |
| 25-29 | 50.1 | 19.8 | 24.0 | 46.8 | 0.3 | 1.1 |
| 30-34 | 25.2 | 9.9 | 42.8 | 53.5 | 0.5 | 2.4 |
| 35-39 | 12.5 | 5.6 | 59.2 | 57.6 | 0.6 | 4.1 |
| 40-44 | 7.1 | 4.0 | 66.0 | 53.7 | 1.0 | 8.7 |
| 45-49 | 4.5 | 3.2 | 72.4 | 50.6 | 1.3 | 13.3 |
| 50-54 | 3.8 | 3.1 | 72.7 | 42.7 | 2.0 | 22.1 |
| 55-59 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 74.7 | 36.4 | 2.4 | 29.4 |
| 60-64 | 2.5 | 2.8 | 74.0 | 29.3 | 3.8 | 39.2 |
| 65-69 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 74.8 | 24.1 | 4.3 | 46.8 |
| 70-74 | 2.3 | 3.0 | 72.3 | 17.6 | 6.0 | 55.3 |
| $75+$ | 3.0 | 3.5 | 69.5 | 12.0 | 8.9 | 63.9 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

| District | Married Monogamous |  |  | Married Polygamous |  |  | Widowed |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Total Country | 13.0 | 9.8 | 15.9 | 30.0 | 29.8 | 30.3 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 7.0 |
| Kailahun | 12.2 | 10.5 | 13.9 | 28.6 | 27.9 | 29.3 | 4.5 | 1.1 | 7.9 |
| Kenema | 12.2 | 9.8 | 14.5 | 33.5 | 32.8 | 34.3 | 4.1 | 1.0 | 7.1 |
| Kono | 12.7 | 10.9 | 14.5 | 31.6 | 30.8 | 32.5 | 3.8 | 1.0 | 6.7 |
| Bombali | 12.5 | 9.1 | 15.7 | 31.1 | 30.6 | 31.5 | 4.9 | 0.8 | 8.6 |
| Kambia | 17.2 | 11.2 | 22.4 | 33.8 | 33.6 | 33.9 | 4.0 | 0.5 | 7.0 |
| Koinadugu | 15.3 | 10.7 | 19.8 | 29.8 | 27.9 | 31.6 | 2.2 | 0.6 | 3.7 |
| Port Loko | 17.8 | 11.0 | 23.8 | 32.4 | 35.4 | 29.8 | 4.6 | 0.7 | 8.0 |
| Tonkolili | 15.1 | 11.0 | 19.1 | 31.8 | 31.9 | 31.7 | 4.3 | 0.9 | 7.6 |
| Bo | 12.8 | 10.2 | 15.3 | 29.6 | 29.6 | 29.7 | 4.6 | 1.0 | 8.0 |
| Bonthe | 15.3 | 12.6 | 17.9 | 32.8 | 32.5 | 33.0 | 4.1 | 1.1 | 6.9 |
| Moyamba | 14.7 | 11.7 | 17.4 | 37.1 | 37.0 | 37.1 | 5.8 | 1.2 | 9.9 |
| Pujehun | 14.3 | 11.5 | 16.9 | 30.2 | 29.4 | 30.8 | 3.6 | 0.8 | 6.2 |
| Western Area Rural | 11.0 | 8.8 | 13.1 | 28.5 | 28.3 | 28.6 | 3.2 | 0.7 | 5.7 |
| Western Area Urban | 8.2 | 6.7 | 9.7 | 23.2 | 22.9 | 23.5 | 3.2 | 0.8 | 5.6 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 8.4.1. Age at marriage for females

Age at marriage, length of marriage and the proportion who ultimately marry, affects the fertility level of the population. A woman's age at first entry into unions has been used as an approximate indicator of her exposure to the risk of child bearing. Early child marriages, which occur in most African cultures, take place soon after puberty.

The singulate mean age at marriage (SMAM) measures the mean number of years spent in a single state among women who ultimately marry. It measures the mean age at marriage among those females who ever marry, by some pre-defined age limit. It is assumed that the mean age at marriage is equal to the mean duration of single life. The latter can be calculated from the proportion of single persons at successive ages, if there have been no changes of age patterns of marriage in the recent past and if differential mortality and net migration rates by marital status may be considered negligible. Under these conditions, a cohort moving through life would have the same proportion single at successive ages as persons at the same ages in the present population.

Table 8.7 presents the female SMAM for the whole country by residence, region and districts for the 1985 and 2015 Censuses. It can be observed that, for the total country, the SMAM has gone up from 18 to 22 years, indicating that women are generally marrying later. Regionally, the SMAM ranged from 22 to 27 years respectively for the Northern and Western regions. There are no comparable figures from the previous census.

With regard to the districts, the 1985 SMAMs ranged from 17 to 22 years for the districts of Kambia and Western Area Rural. The SMAMs have gone up in all the districts between 1985 and 2015. The age of entry into a marital union has gone up by about 4 years. total country, residence, region and district, 2015 and 1985

| Area |  | SMAG |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2015 | 1985 |
| Total Country | 22.3 | 18.0 |
| Urban | 21.0 | .. |
| Rural | 24.0 | - |
| Regions |  |  |
| Eastern | 24.7 | . |
| Northern | 22.2 | - |
| Western | 27.2 | .. |
| Southern | 24.1 | .. |
| Districts |  |  |
| Kailahun | 22.8 | 17.1 |
| Kenema | 21.8 | 17.0 |
| Kono | 22.1 | .. |
| Bombali | 24.9 | 17.6 |
| Kambia | 20.1 | 16.9 |
| Konaidugu | 22.0 | 17.4 |
| Port Loko | 20.6 | 17.2 |
| Tonkolili | 20.7 | 17.5 |
| Bombali | 22.5 | 17.6 |
| Bonthe | 28.3 | 17.3 |
| Moyamba | 22.5 | 17.8 |
| Pujuhun | 24.3 | 17.1 |
| Western Area Rural | 22.5 | 22.5 |
| Western Area Urban | 25.4 | 20.1 |



Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census Analytical Report: Chapter 4, 1985 Population and Housing Census, Sierra Leone

### 8.5 Marital status and employment status

The percentage distribution of the population aged 10 years and above by marital status and employment status is presented in Table 8.8. For the country as a whole, 43 per cent of the population are self-employed without other employees, followed by full-time students at 30 per cent. In the never married group, 61 per cent are full-time students. It can further be observed that self-employment dominates in both the monogamous and polygamous groups with proportions of over 60 per cent in each group. Table 8.9 present marital status categories by selected employment status categories. These are paid employees, self-employed, household work and full-time students. These together make up 85 per cent of all the employees. There is a clear dominance of the selfemployed without employees and the full-time student groups.

Table 8.8 Percentage distribution of the population aged 10 years and above by marital status and employment status

| Employment Status | Total | Never <br> Married | Engaged | Married <br> Monogamous | Married <br> Polygamous | Co-habitation <br> $(<5$ years) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Country | 5030016 | 2310448 | 203010 | 651433 | 1511418 | 20541 |
| Paid employee | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Self-employed <br> without employees | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Self-employed with <br> employees <br> (employer) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Unpaid family <br> worker | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Paid apprentice | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Unpaid apprentice | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Worked before but <br> currently looking for <br> work | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Looking for work <br> for the first time | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Household work | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Not working \& not <br> looking for work | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Full time student | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Retired/pensioner | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Don't know | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Percent) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |


| Employment Status | Co-habitation <br> $(=>5$ years) | Separated | Divorced | Widowed | Don't know |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Country | 8739 | 67932 | 39191 | 200984 | 16320 |
| Paid employee | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Self-employed <br> without employees | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Self-employed with <br> employees <br> (employer) | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Unpaid family <br> worker | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Paid apprentice | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Unpaid apprentice | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Worked before but <br> currently looking for <br> work | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Looking for work <br> for the first time | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Household work | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Not working \& not <br> looking for work | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Full time student | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Retired/pensioner | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Don't know | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Percent) | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Table 8.9 Percentage distribution of marital status categories by selected employment status categories

| Employment Status | Total | Never <br> Married | Engaged | Married <br> Monogamous | Married <br> Polygamous | Co-habitation <br> $(<5$ years) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Paid employee | 5.5 | 2.7 | 10.7 | 7.4 | 8.2 | 6.3 |
| Self-employed <br> without employees | 42.5 | 19.3 | 51.7 | 63.0 | 66.1 | 37.0 |
| Household work | 6.8 | 4.2 | 9.2 | 8.8 | 8.7 | 10.1 |
| Full time student | 30.0 | 61.3 | 8.6 | 4.1 | 1.8 | 27.4 |
| Total | 84.8 | 87.5 | 80.3 | 83.3 | 84.8 | 80.8 |
| Paid apprentice | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Unpaid apprentice | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 |


|  | Marital Status |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Employment Status | Co-habitation <br> $(=>5$ years $)$ | Separated | Divorced | Widowed | Don't know |
| Paid employee | 10.1 | 8.5 | 8.9 | 3.2 | 2.3 |
| Self-employed <br> without employees | 39.0 | 60.5 | 56.8 | 49.8 | 18.5 |
| Household work | 9.3 | 7.6 | 8.2 | 13.8 | 4.3 |
| Full time student | 19.3 | 2.7 | 2.2 | 1.1 | 50.5 |
| Total | 77.8 | 79.3 | 76.1 | 67.9 | 75.5 |
| Paid apprentice | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Unpaid apprentice | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 8.6 Marital status and religion

Religion plays a big role in influencing a person's type of marriage. For example, Christian beliefs do not accept polygamous marriages, while Moslem beliefs embrace them. However, these norms are not strictly followed in African countries.

Tables 8.10 a and b present the distribution of the population aged 10 years and above by marital status and religion. Table 8.10a shows that the dominant religion is Islam with 76 per cent of the population aged 10 years and above. The percentage of the population belonging to all Christian faiths is 23 . The same trend can be observed for all marital status categories where Islam dominates, ranging from 65 per cent for those who have co-habited for more than 5 years to 80 per cent for those married monogamously.

Table 8.11 presents the distribution of selected marital status categories by religion. These are never married, monogamous, polygamous and widowed. They are all dominated by Moslems, where the proportions range from 72 to 80 per cent. There are no notable differences between men and women in the selected marital categories.

Table 8.10a Percentage distribution of the population aged 10 years and above by marital status and main religions

| Religion | Total <br> population | Never <br> married | Engaged | Married <br> monogamous | Married <br> polygamous | Co-habitation <br> $(<5$ years) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 5030016 | 45.9 | 4.0 | 13.0 | 30.0 | 0.4 |
| Catholic | 365304 | 48.7 | 4.4 | 11.8 | 27.7 | 0.5 |
| Anglican | 63743 | 50.5 | 4.9 | 10.7 | 25.9 | 0.5 |
| Methodist | 158840 | 49.9 | 4.2 | 11.6 | 26.3 | 0.5 |
| SDA | 34237 | 46.3 | 5.2 | 11.5 | 29.3 | 0.5 |
| Pentecostal | 278315 | 53.9 | 5.1 | 9.4 | 24.6 | 0.6 |
| Other Christian | 239929 | 50.9 | 4.7 | 10.7 | 26.1 | 0.6 |
| Islam | 3844615 | 44.5 | 3.8 | 13.6 | 31.2 | 0.4 |
| Bahai | 1997 | 49.0 | 6.9 | 11.4 | 25.6 | 0.4 |
| Traditional | 2832 | 34.2 | 5.6 | 16.7 | 30.1 | 0.8 |
| Other | 37139 | 47.9 | 4.5 | 12.3 | 27.6 | 1.0 |
| No Religion | 3065 | 50.0 | 4.3 | 14.0 | 21.3 | 0.8 |


| Religion | Co-habitation <br> $(=>5$ years $)$ | Separated | Divorced | Widowed | Don't know | Total (Row) <br> Percent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 0.2 | 1.4 | 0.8 | 4.0 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| Catholic | 0.2 | 1.5 | 0.8 | 4.0 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| Anglican | 0.3 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 4.1 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| Methodist | 0.2 | 1.6 | 0.9 | 4.5 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| SDA | 0.2 | 1.5 | 0.8 | 4.4 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| Pentecostal | 0.3 | 1.6 | 0.9 | 3.5 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| Other Christian | 0.3 | 1.5 | 0.9 | 4.0 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| Islam | 0.1 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 4.0 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| Bahai | 0.4 | 2.0 | 0.8 | 3.1 | 0.6 | 100.0 |
| Traditional | 0.6 | 2.3 | 1.6 | 7.9 | 0.2 | 100.0 |
| Other | 0.2 | 1.3 | 0.9 | 3.6 | 0.7 | 100.0 |
| No Religion | 0.4 | 2.4 | 1.5 | 4.4 | 0.8 | 100.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

|  | All statuses |  |  | Never Married |  |  | Engaged |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Religion | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Catholic | 7.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Anglican | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Methodist | 3.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| SDA | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Pentecostal | 5.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other Christian | 4.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Islam | 76.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Bahai | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Traditional | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| No Religion | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total \% | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |


|  | Married monogamous |  |  | Married polygamous |  |  | Co-habitation (< 5 years) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Religion | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Catholic | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Anglican | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Methodist | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| SDA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Pentecostal | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other Christian | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Islam | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Bahai | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Traditional | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| No Religion | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total \% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census


|  |  | Widowed |  |  | Don't know |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Religion | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Catholic | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Anglican | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Methodist | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| SDA | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Pentecostal | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Christian | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Islam | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Bahai | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Traditional | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| No Religion | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total \% | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 8.7 Marital status and economic activity status

There are differences in marital status when categorized by activity status and sex (Table 8.11). For employed men, the proportion who are polygamous dominates with 47 per cent compared with 23 per cent for polygamous females. For the unemployed category, 49 per cent of men and 40 per cent of women belong to the never married status. With regard to the population not in the labour force, the never married category dominates with 87 and 65 per cent for men and women respectively.

Table 8.11 Percentage distribution of the population aged 10 years and above by marital status and economic activity status

| Marital status | Total males \& females | Total employed |  | Total unemployed |  | Total not in labour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| All marital statuses | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Never married | 45.9 | 28.8 | 16.1 | 48.8 | 40.2 | 87.2 | 65.4 |
| Engaged | 4.0 | 5.2 | 5.4 | 7.8 | 9.2 | 1.3 | 3.0 |
| Married monogamous | 13.0 | 14.6 | 22.9 | 12.0 | 15.7 | 3.1 | 7.9 |
| Married polygamous | 30.0 | 47.2 | 43.8 | 26.3 | 24.7 | 5.9 | 15.0 |
| Co-habitation (< 5 years) | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.5 |
| Co-habitation (= >5 years) | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Separated | 1.4 | 1.7 | 2.1 | 1.8 | 2.1 | 0.4 | 0.8 |
| Divorced | 0.8 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 0.3 | 0.5 |
| Widowed | 4.0 | 1.0 | 7.8 | 0.8 | 4.9 | 0.7 | 6.2 |
| Don't know | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.5 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 8.8 Marital status by heads of households

The percentage distribution of marital status by heads of households is presented in Table 8.12. For the total country as a whole, 72 per cent of all households are headed by men compared to just 18 per cent headed by women. These proportions remain the same for the urban and rural areas.

It can be observed that for the total country, 75 per cent of the polygamous households are maleheaded as compared to only 18 per cent for female-headed ones. In the case of rural areas, the respective percentages are 84 and 22 , while for urban they are 63 and 13 . It should be noted that slightly over a quarter of the widowed households are headed by females.

| Marital status | Sex/Place of Residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Both Sexes |  |  | Male Head |  |  | Female Head |  |  |
|  | Total | Rural | Urban | Total | Rural | Urban | Total | Rural | Urban |
| Total | 1265468 | 697734 | 567734 | 909535 | 504818 | 404717 | 355933 | 192916 | 163017 |
| Never Married | 8.9 | 3.4 | 15.6 | 8.8 | 3.4 | 15.5 | 9.0 | 3.2 | 16.0 |
| Engaged | 5.6 | 3.2 | 8.6 | 6.0 | 3.3 | 9.5 | 4.5 | 3.0 | 6.3 |
| Married Monogamous | 13.8 | 13.5 | 14.1 | 6.6 | 5.5 | 8.0 | 32.0 | 34.5 | 29.1 |
| Married Polygamous | 58.8 | 67.4 | 48.3 | 74.8 | 84.7 | 62.5 | 18.0 | 22.2 | 13.1 |
| Co-habitation (< 5 years) | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.7 |
| Co-habitation ( $=>5$ years) | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.5 |
| Separated | 2.4 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 1.9 | 5.0 | 4.2 | 5.9 |
| Divorced | 1.6 | 1.3 | 1.9 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 3.3 | 2.7 | 3.9 |
| Widowed | 8.4 | 9.0 | 7.8 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 27.2 | 29.5 | 24.4 |
| Don't know | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Total \% | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 8.9 Conclusion and recommendations

This analytical report on marital characteristics is based on the data collected during the Sierra Leone 2015 Population and Housing Census. It attempts to present an overview of the marital status situation and its related characteristics at the time of the census. It does not answer the questions on how and why. More detailed information is usually collected in the inter-censal demographic and health surveys.

The main findings were:
vii. The proportion never married is the highest in the country with 46 per cent of all marital status categories. Polygamous marriages follow with an overall proportion of 30 per cent, ranging from 43 to 55 per cent respectively in the Northern and Southern Regions.
viii. There are notable differences between urban and rural areas where the proportions never married are 52 and 41 per cent respectively.
ix. The pattern for the districts follows the national one with the proportions never married dominating in all districts.
x . The proportion widowed is four per cent and does not vary between the regions.
xi. The SMAM, which measures the mean number of years spent in a single state, has been used to estimate the age at first marriage for females. For the total country, the SMAM is 22.3. The estimated figure for the 1985 Census was 18.0, an indication women are now marrying on average four years later. At the regional level, the SMAM ranges from 22 to 27 years respectively for the Northern and Western regions. There are no comparable figures for the 1985 Census. At district level, the SMAM ranges from 17 to 22 years respectively for the districts of Kambia and Western Area Rural.
xii. With regard to employment status, 43 per cent of all employed are in self-employment, followed by full-time students at 30 per cent.
xiii. Religion does not appear to influence the type of marital status. The Islamic faith is dominant with 76 per cent of the population, while the proportion of the Christian faith is 23 per cent. Islam dominates in all marital status categories, ranging from 65 per cent for those co-habiting for 5 years or more to 80 per cent for those monogamously married.
xiv. On economic activity status, in the case of employed men, the proportion who are polygamous dominates with 47 per cent, compared to 23 per cent for polygamous women. For the unemployed category, 49 per cent of men and 40 per cent of women belong to the never married category. xv. As far as household headship is concerned, 72 per cent of all the households are male headed, as opposed to 18 per cent which are female headed.

It is strongly recommended that, in planning for the next population and housing census, definitions and population coverage in terms of age and marital status categories should be the same as those used in the 2015 Census. This approach will allow for comparisons to be made between the two censuses and with others in the future.

## CHAPTER 9 : EDUCATION AND LITERACY

### 9.1 Introduction

Recognizing the importance of education, and more so, following the 1991-2002 civil wars the government enacted measures intended to strengthen the education system. The Sierra Leone Education Act 2004 stipulates that all children should have access to basic education of nine years which covers six years of primary school and three years of junior secondary school. Also, gender equalities across the 6-3-3-4 formal education structure that is, six years of primary school, three years of junior secondary, three years of senior secondary and four years of vocational or other form of professional specialization should be maintained. These two education priorities, universal basic education and equal access to schooling for boys and girls, are consistent with the 2000 United Nations declaration of Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) of achieving universal primary education and achieving gender equality at all levels of education by 2015.

In this chapter, the 2015 Population and Housing Census data on educational attainment and literacy were analyzed to illustrate what has been achieved in providing universal basic education and gender equality in access to education at the time the census was undertaken. The analysis covers the reported school attendance and the educational attainment of the population three years and older as well as literacy levels of the population 10 years and older. Existing differences among different groups of the population, such as, age, sex, place of residence, geographical region and district are reflected. This is achieved by using proportionate distribution of the population according to the specified groupings of educational attainment and literacy. Also, the success of the government's efforts in expanding access to education is highlighted by comparing information on school attendance from the 1985 and the 2015 censuses and that on current school attendance from the 2004 and 2015 censuses on primary, junior secondary, senior secondary as well as literacy.

### 9.2 Source of data

The census data provide specific details about
the education of every person three years and older. Such details include school attendance, past and current enrollment, and the highest level of education completed. Information on school attendance further distinguishes between those who have ever attended school, those who have never attended school and those who do not know whether they ever attended school. In this analysis, the never been to school population also includes the population that did not know whether they have ever been to school.

The ever attended school, were asked whether they were attending school and if so, had to specify the highest level attended and grade completed. Data from the census are categorized into nine levels of formal education system. These levels are, namely, kindergarten, age 3-5 years; primary age 6-11 years; junior secondary age 12-14 years; senior secondary age 15-18 years; vocational age 19-21 years; first degree age 1922 years; and post-graduate age 23-24 years. In addition to these nine categories, some people indicated that they were attending Koranic or other form of schooling.

The analysis on educational attainment by age, residence, region, district and sex of the population that has ever been to school covers only those who have gone through the country's formal education system. Percentages of the population three years and older who have ever been to school and also of those who have never been to school are calculated for different analytical groupings. Further analysis of the population ever been to school and currently attending school by their level of education is also presented.

The census also collected information on literacy status of every household member aged 10 years and older. Each person was asked about their literacy status, that is, whether that person can read and write a text in: local language; English; French; Arabic; or Other. The data for these five groups therefore constitute the "literate" population and persons who responded to the question as "None or Don't know" is classified as "not-literate".

### 9.3 School Attendance

The analysis is in four parts. First, schooling opportunities and progress made over the years for the population 3 years and older is shown in Table 9.1 by age and sex, in Table 9.2 by district, region, place of residence and sex. Second, levels and differences in school attendance of the population 6 years and older ever been to school by sex, region and level of education completed are in Table 9.3, those currently not in school in Table 9.4 and persons currently enrolled in school in Table 9.5. Values of the net and the gross enrollment ratios for primary, junior secondary school (JSS) and senior secondary school (SSS) for the 2004 and the 2015 censuses are shown in Table 9.6 by region and sex. This is followed by a summary of the impact of education on employment in Tables 9.7 and on occupation in Table 9.8, for the population 10 years and older ever been to school.

Table 9.1 shows the pattern of age and sex differences in access to schooling in Sierra Leone. Overall, majority of the total population in Sierra Leone had been to school of which 18.2 percent were in school in the past and 37.3 percent were enrolled in school. Regarding age, the proportion of ever been to school, that is, the total of past and current enrollment, of the population in the ages $6-11$ years was 73.8 percent, $12-14$ years was 82.3 percent, $15-18$ years was 76.4 percent, $19-22$ years was 68.3 percent and $23-29$ years was 56.9 percent. Some of them had left school and the proportion of those in the older three age groups increased with age ranging from 11 percent to 37.3 percent.

Table 9.1 also suggests possible differences between males and females in access to education. The overall proportion of the male population ever been to school was 60 percent out of which only 39 percent were still enrolled in school and 21 percent attended school in the past. For the female population, 51 percent had been to school but 35 percent were currently enrolled and 16 percent were enrolled in the past.

By age, about a third of the males and of the females aged 3-5 years were currently enrolled
in school. Also, percentages of the male and the female population in the ages $6-11$ and 12-14 years enrolled in school were above 70 percent and that of females exceeded that of males by about three percentage points. At older age groups, specifically, from age 15-18 years, the percentage of the population that was enrolled in school for males consistently exceeded that of females and in both sexes it declined with age and more significantly among females. By age 60 years and older, the proportion of females that had been to school in the past was 10 percent compared to 27.5 percent for males.

| Age group | Sex/ School attendance status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Both sexes |  |  |  | Male |  |  |  | Female |  |  |  |
|  | Total | Never | In the past | Currently | Total | Never | In the past | Currently | Total percent | Never | In the past | Currently |
| All ages | 100.0 | 44.5 | 18.2 | 37.3 | 100.0 | 39.8 | 21.0 | 39.2 | 100.0 | 49.0 | 15.6 | 35.4 |
| 3-5 | 100.0 | 66.7 | 0.7 | 32.6 | 100.0 | 67.7 | 0.7 | 31.6 | 100.0 | 65.7 | 0.7 | 33.6 |
| 6-11 | 100.0 | 26.2 | 1.6 | 72.2 | 100.0 | 27.6 | 1.6 | 70.9 | 100.0 | 24.9 | 1.5 | 73.6 |
| 12-14 | 100.0 | 17.7 | 3.6 | 78.7 | 100.0 | 18.9 | 3.6 | 77.6 | 100.0 | 16.5 | 3.7 | 79.8 |
| 15-18 | 100.0 | 23.6 | 11.0 | 65.4 | 100.0 | 22.9 | 9.2 | 67.8 | 100.0 | 24.3 | 12.7 | 63.0 |
| 19-22 | 100.0 | 31.7 | 25.7 | 42.6 | 100.0 | 26.0 | 22.3 | 51.7 | 100.0 | 36.6 | 28.6 | 34.8 |
| 23-29 | 100.0 | 43.2 | 37.3 | 19.6 | 100.0 | 31.5 | 42.3 | 26.1 | 100.0 | 53.1 | 32.9 | 14.0 |
| 30-34 | 100.0 | 58.7 | 35.0 | 6.3 | 100.0 | 46.2 | 44.8 | 9.0 | 100.0 | 69.3 | 26.7 | 4.1 |
| 35-39 | 100.0 | 62.5 | 33.9 | 3.5 | 100.0 | 51.7 | 43.5 | 4.8 | 100.0 | 72.4 | 25.2 | 2.4 |
| 40-44 | 100.0 | 64.3 | 33.1 | 2.6 | 100.0 | 54.2 | 42.4 | 3.4 | 100.0 | 74.9 | 23.2 | 1.9 |
| 45-49 | 100.0 | 64.5 | 33.3 | 2.2 | 100.0 | 55.3 | 41.9 | 2.8 | 100.0 | 75.8 | 22.7 | 1.5 |
| 50-54 | 100.0 | 67.8 | 30.3 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 58.3 | 39.3 | 2.4 | 100.0 | 78.4 | 20.2 | 1.4 |
| 55-59 | 100.0 | 67.3 | 31.0 | 1.7 | 100.0 | 56.9 | 40.8 | 2.3 | 100.0 | 79.3 | 19.6 | 1.1 |
| 60+ | 100.0 | 80.5 | 18.1 | 1.4 | 100.0 | 70.6 | 27.5 | 1.9 | 100.0 | 89.4 | 9.7 | 0.9 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Table 9.2 reveals that close to 60 percent of the population 6 years and older had been to school, 20 percent in the past and 38 percent were currently enrolled. There are substantial differences between males and females. Almost two thirds of the male population had been to school relative to 53 percent for females. The proportion of the male population that was enrolled in school in the past but was now out of school was 23 percent while 40 percent were still attending school. These two percentages are above the corresponding proportions for the female population, which are 17 percent and 36 percent.

At the regional level, the Northern region had the lowest proportion of its population ever been to school, as low as 48.7 percent while the proportions of the other three regions ranged between 54.4 percent in the Southern region and 77.5 percent in the Western region.

The regional differences among the population that had ever been to school but were no longer enrolled in the Eastern, Northern and Southern regions are very minimal, ranging from 14.1 percent in the Northern region to 18.2 percent in the Southern region. For the population enrolled in school the percentages ranged from 34.6 percent in the Northern region to 41.7 percent in the Eastern region. In terms of place of residence, 46 percent of the rural population had ever been to school compared to 75 percent of the urban population. In all the 14 districts, the proportion of the male population that had been to school exceeded that of the female population. It is also evident from Table 9.2 that the proportions of males who had left school are consistently higher than those for females.

Table 9.2 Population 6 years and older by school attendance, region, place of residence, district and sex

| Region/ place <br> of residence/ <br> district |  |  |  |  |  | Sex/School attendance |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Table 9.2 Population 6 years and older by school attendance, region, place of residence, district and sex (continued)
$\left.\begin{array}{l|llll} & & & \text { Sex/School attendance } \\ \text { Region/ place of } \\ \text { residence/ district }\end{array}\right)$

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census


Compared to the 1985 and the 2004 censuses, school attendance in Sierra Leone had increased in 2015. As shown in Table 9.3, the proportion of the population five years and older who had never been to school had decreased from 70.7 percent in 1985 to 42.3 percent in 20215 and the proportion attending school more than doubled from 14.7 percent to 38.2 percent over the two periods. In terms of sex, 18.1 percent of the males and 11.3 percent of the females were attending school in 1985 and these percentages increased to 40.4 and 36.1 in 2015, respectively. Between the 1985 and the 2015 censuses, the most notable improvement in access to education was observed in the northern region, in particular, among females where in 1985 only 10.6 percent were attending school and by 2015 it was 31.1 percent. Changes in access to education between the 2004 and 2015 census are summarized on Table 9.7 showing ratios of current school attendance in primary, junior secondary and senior secondary.

Table 9.3 Population 5 years and older by school attendance, region, and sex in 1985 and 2015

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Region/ Sex |  |  |  | School attendance |  |  |  |

[^6]
### 9.4 Levels of education attained

The percentages shown in Table 9.4 indicate that the proportion of the population that had ever been to school is declining starting from primary up to the tertiary level, possibly, because of inadequate education facilities and or other circumstances that encourage school drop-out. It is also evident that there are no major differences in the level of education completed among the population that had ever been to school between the Northern, Eastern and the Southern regions.

A lower proportion of the male population had no education, 36 percent compared to 47 percent among the female population. Across the regions, the proportion of females without education was 13 percentage points in the Northern region and 9 percentage points in the Eastern and Southern regions above the levels for males. At the primary level of education, the percentages for females in the Eastern, Southern and Western regions were higher than those for males, while in the Northern region the proportions were 26.3 percent for males and 24.2 percent for females. For junior secondary, the range of differences between males and females were very minimal, except in the Northern region where the proportion for males was two percentage points above that of females of 9.8 percent. The percentages of the population with senior secondary education up to the tertiary education decreased with level of education; those for males being above those for females by about twice as much or more. Also, the disparity between females' and males' level of educational attained was more pronounced at the first degree and tertiary education level.


Table 9.4 Population 6 years and older by level of education, region and sex

| Level of education |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sex/ } \\ & \text { Region } \end{aligned}$ | Total | No education | Kinder garten | Primary | Junior secondary | Senior secondary |
| Total | 0.2 | 1.5 | 0.8 | 4.0 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| Northern | 0.3 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 4.1 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| Eastern | 0.2 | 1.6 | 0.9 | 4.5 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| Southern | 0.2 | 1.5 | 0.8 | 4.4 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| Western | 0.3 | 1.6 | 0.9 | 3.5 | 0.3 | 100.0 |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 100.0 | 36.4 | 2.6 | 25.8 | 14.1 | 14.1 |
| Northern | 100.0 | 44.5 | 2.2 | 26.3 | 12.3 | 10.1 |
| Eastern | 100.0 | 38.4 | 2.8 | 26.9 | 14.9 | 11.9 |
| Southern | 100.0 | 40.9 | 2.2 | 26.3 | 12.7 | 10.8 |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 100.0 | 47.1 | 2.3 | 26.3 | 12.6 | 8.6 |
| Northern | 100.0 | 57.5 | 1.8 | 24.2 | 9.8 | 5.2 |
| Eastern | 100.0 | 47.4 | 2.5 | 28.3 | 13.4 | 6.7 |
| Southern | 100.0 | 50.0 | 2.0 | 27.9 | 11.7 | 6.1 |
| Western | 100.0 | 27.1 | 3.3 | 26.0 | 17.1 | 18.3 |

Table 9.4 Population 6 years and older by level of education, region and sex (continued)

| Sex/ <br> Region | Level of Education |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Vovational/ technical/ nursing/ teacher | First degree | Post-graduate \& PHD | Koranic | Other |
| Total | 2.3 | 1.3 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.2 |
| Northern | 1.6 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.1 |
| Eastern | 1.7 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 0.1 |
| Southern | 1.9 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 1.6 | 0.1 |
| Western | 4.4 | 3.9 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 2.8 | 1.8 | 0.6 | 1.6 | 0.2 |
| Northern | 2.2 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 0.1 |
| Eastern | 2.4 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 1.6 | 0.1 |
| Southern | 2.3 | 1.3 | 0.3 | 3.0 | 0.1 |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 1.8 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Northern | 1.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Eastern | 1.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Southern | 1.4 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Western | 4.3 | 2.6 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.4 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 9.5 Past School Attendance

During the 2015 Population and Housing Census, the head of household was required to provide information on school attendance for each member aged 3 years and older. If the response was affirmative then the level of education completed had to be specified regardless of whether that person was still enrolled in school. Clarification was also sought to ascertain the number of people who were enrolled in school at the time of the census. Past school attendance of the population 6 years and older by level of education, region and sex is presented in Table 9.5.

As shown in Table 9.5, for both sexes and for all regions, the percentages of the population 6 years and older who had left school having attained primary, junior secondary or senior secondary school level of education were 26.2 percent, 27.2 percent and 26.1 percent, respectively. In the regions, the percentage of persons who had attained primary education in the Eastern, the Northern and the Southern regions ranged from 31.3 percent to 31.9 percent and these percentages were substantially above that of the Western region which was 17.5 percent.

In contrast, 34.4 percent of the Western region population had attained senior secondary education level which was more than 10 percentage points higher relative to the Eastern, the Northern and the Southern regions. Compared to males, a higher proportion of females had left school, having completed primary, junior secondary and senior secondary levels of education. The percentages of females who had left school having attained primary level of education were 32.5 percent, junior secondary 30.6 percent senior secondary 20.8 percent, while for males the respective proportions were 21.3 percent, 24.6 percent and 30.2 percent.


Table 9.5 Past school attendance of population 6 years and older by level of education, region and sex

|  | Level of education |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex/ Region | Total | Kindergarten | Primary | Junior secondary | Senior secondary |
| Both sexes |  |  |  |  |  |
| All regions | 100.0 | 4.4 | 26.2 | 27.2 | 26.1 |
| Eastern | 100.0 | 5.5 | 31.7 | 30.0 | 20.5 |
| Northern | 100.0 | 4.9 | 31.9 | 28.8 | 20.8 |
| Southern | 100.8 | 4.9 | 31.3 | 27.5 | 21.6 |
| Western | 100.0 | 3.7 | 17.5 | 24.7 | 34.4 |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |
| All regions | 100.0 | 4.2 | 21.3 | 24.6 | 30.2 |
| Eastern | 100.0 | 5.2 | 25.9 | 27.4 | 25.0 |
| Northern | 100.0 | 4.7 | 25.6 | 26.4 | 25.3 |
| Southern | 100.0 | 4.0 | 24.6 | 24.5 | 26.1 |
| Western | 100.0 | 3.5 | 14.7 | 22.1 | 38.0 |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |
| All regions | 100.0 | 4.7 | 32.5 | 30.6 | 20.8 |
| Eastern | 100.0 | 5.8 | 39.6 | 33.6 | 14.3 |
| Northern | 100.0 | 5.3 | 40.4 | 32.0 | 14.9 |
| Southern | 100.0 | 4.4 | 39.7 | 31.3 | 15.9 |
| Western | 100.0 | 4.0 | 21.0 | 28.1 | 29.9 |

[^7]|  | Level of education |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex/ Region | Vocational/ technical/ nursing/ teacher | First Degree | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Post-graduate \& } \\ & \text { PHD } \end{aligned}$ | Koranic | Other |
| Both sexes |  |  |  |  |  |
| All regions | 7.3 | 3.9 | 1.4 | 2.6 | 0.7 |
| Eastern | 6.1 | 2.0 | 0.9 | 3.0 | 0.4 |
| Northern | 6.8 | 1.8 | 0.7 | 3.5 | 0.5 |
| Southern | 7.0 | 2.9 | 0.9 | 4.3 | 0.5 |
| Western | 8.3 | 6.7 | 2.5 | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |
| All regions | 7.9 | 5.0 | 1.8 | 4.0 | 0.8 |
| Eastern | 7.5 | 2.7 | 1.1 | 4.7 | 0.4 |
| Northern | 8.4 | 2.6 | 1.0 | 5.4 | 0.6 |
| Southern | 8.1 | 4.0 | 1.2 | 7.0 | 0.5 |
| Western | 7.8 | 8.3 | 3.1 | 1.5 | 1.2 |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |
| All regions | 6.5 | 2.5 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.6 |
| Eastern | 4.2 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.3 |
| Northern | 4.7 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 0.4 |
| Southern | 5.6 | 1.5 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 0.4 |
| Western | 9.0 | 4.8 | 1.7 | 0.5 | 1.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 9.6 Current school attendance

The percentage distribution of the population 6 years and older enrolled in school at the time of the census in Table 9.6, shows that more than 50 percent of both males and females had completed primary education and close to 20 percent had attained junior secondary school level. The regional average of the population that had attained primary school level was 55 percent for both sexes, 52 percent for males and 58 percent for females. Combined with those who had completed junior secondary and senior secondary, the proportions were 91 percent for both sexes, 90 percent for males and 93 percent for females. Thus, only 10 percent of the males and 7 percent of the females had attained any level of education beyond senior secondary school.

Among the population that had attained primary education level, regional differences are also noticeable. In the Northern region, 57 percent of the males and 63 percent of the females have completed primary education while in the Southern region, 55 percent of the males and 63 percent of the females had completed primary education. Across the regions, there were no major differences in the proportions of males and females who had completed junior secondary education. The proportions ranged from 21 percent in the Northern region to 23 percent in the Eastern region for males and 20 percent in the Northern region to 23 percent in the Eastern region for females.

## EO <br> Table 9.6 Current school attendance of population 6 years and older by level of education, region and sex

| Level of education |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex/ Region | Total | Kindergarten | Primary | Junior secondary | Senior secondary |
| Both sexes |  |  |  |  |  |
| All regions | 100.0 | 4.1 | 54.9 | 20.6 | 15.8 |
| Eastern | 100.0 | 3.6 | 59.7 | 20.1 | 13.4 |
| Northern | 100.0 | 4.3 | 55.3 | 22.7 | 14.4 |
| Southern | 100.0 | 3.8 | 59.2 | 19.9 | 12.3 |
| Western | 100.0 | 4.8 | 44.6 | 19.6 | 23.3 |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |
| All regions | 100.0 | 4.0 | 51.9 | 20.7 | 17.6 |
| Eastern | 100.0 | 3.6 | 56.8 | 20.5 | 15.1 |
| Northern | 97.9 | 4.1 | 51.9 | 22.8 | 16.6 |
| Southern | 100.0 | 3.7 | 55.4 | 19.9 | 13.9 |
| Western | 100.0 | 4.7 | 42.2 | 19.3 | 25.1 |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |
| All regions | 100.0 | 4.2 | 58.1 | 20.5 | 13.9 |
| Eastern | 100.0 | 3.7 | 63.2 | 19.6 | 11.3 |
| Northern | 100.0 | 4.4 | 59.0 | 22.6 | 12.2 |
| Southern | 100.0 | 3.8 | 63.1 | 19.9 | 10.6 |
| Western | 100.0 | 4.9 | 47.0 | 20.0 | 21.4 |

Table 9.6 Current school attendance of population 6 years and older by level of education, region and sex (continued)

| Sex/ Region | Level of education |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Vocational/ technical/ nursing/ teacher | First Degree | Post-graduate \& PHD | Koranic | Other |
| Both sexes |  |  |  |  |  |
| All regions | 2.2 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 0.0 |
| Eastern | 1.8 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
| Northern | 1.8 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.0 |
| Southern | 1.6 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 2.2 | 0.0 |
| Western | 3.5 | 3.5 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |
| All regions | 2.3 | 1.6 | 0.3 | 1.6 | 0.0 |
| Eastern | 2.1 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 1.1 | 0.0 |
| Northern |  | 0.6 | 0.2 | 1.6 | 0.0 |
| Southern | 1.6 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 4.1 | 0.0 |
| Western | 3.5 | 4.2 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |
| All regions | 2.0 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| Eastern | 1.5 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.0 |
| Northern | 1.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| Southern | 1.6 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.0 |
| Western | 3.5 | 2.7 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Table 9.7 compares gross and net enrollment ratios for primary, junior secondary and senior secondary that were calculated from the 2004 and the 2015 censuses data. The gross enrollment ratio (GER) is equal to total enrolment regardless of age, as a percentage of the official school-age population corresponding to that level of education. The GER is intended to show the general level of participation at a given level of education. It indicates the capacity of the education system to enroll students of a particular age group and complements the net enrolment ration (NER) by indicating the extent of over-aged and under-aged enrolment. The NER only accounts for the same age group in both the numerator and the denominator, and thus excludes the under-aged and over-aged enrolled at a given level of education. For example, the GER for primary is the total population attending primary school divided by the total population aged 6-11 years times 100 and for the NER, the numerator will only include persons aged 6-11 years currently enrolled in primary school and the denominator will be inclusive of the total population aged 6-11 years.

At the national level, the pattern of the GER and the NER values for the primary level of education are relatively similar, suggesting that between 2004 and 2015 the capacity of the education system at that level has not changed much. On the other hand, at the JSS and SSS levels of education, the capacity of the education system in 2015 has more than doubled relative to what it was in 2004. For both sexes, in 2004, the GER for JSS was 12 percent and for SSS it was six percent; while in 2015 the percentages were 91 and 56, respectively. In all the regions, the capacity of the JSS and SSS to accommodate the 12-14 and 15-17 year olds has expanded but very few of them are enrolled at these levels.


Table 9.7 Comparison of the 2004 and 2015 enrollment ratios by region, level of education and sex

| Region/ <br> Level of <br> education |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Region/ Level <br> of education |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

A comparison of the pattern of net enrollment ratios between the 2004 and the 2015 censuses is shown in Figure 9.1 by level of education and sex, for the primary, junior secondary and senior secondary school age populations. It is noted that the net enrollment ratios for primary were relatively similar, however, the ratio for the males exceeded that for the females in 2004 and the reverse is the case in 2015. Furthermore, between the 2004 and the 2015 censuses, substantial progress has been achieved in expanding the capacity of both the junior and senior secondary education systems. A higher proportion of the 6-11 year olds were enrolled in junior secondary school and more 12-14 year olds were enrolled in senior secondary in 2015 than it was in 2004. In both 2004 and 2015 the net enrollment ratios for males were above those for females.

Figure 9.1 Comparison of the 2004 and 2015 net enrollment ratios by level of education and sex


Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Further evidence of expansion in junior and senior secondary education system is presented in Figure 9.2 which shows the gross enrollment ratios for 2004 and 2015. In line with the government's policy of providing basic education, that is, primary and junior secondary for every child in the country, the gross enrollment ratios for 2015 had more than twofold of the levels for 2004 and this change is more pronounced among the females.

Figure 9.2 Comparison of the 2004 and 2015 gross enrollment ratios by level of education and sex


Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 9.7 Educational attainment by selected economic characteristics

The analysis of selected economic characteristics of the population 10 years and older presented in Table 9.7, sheds light on the importance of education and employment opportunities. Three quarters of the population in Sierra Leone were self-employed without employees and combined with selfemployed with employees constituted 79.2 percent of the population age 10 years and older. Paid employment accounted for 9.6 percent and unpaid family workers constituted 5.1 percent. The percentage of these four employment status categories was 94 percent.

The percentages of self-employed and paid family worker decreased with educational level, while. the reverse prevails among paid employees ranging from 2.5 percent for no education to 70 percent of the population with tertiary education. The percentage of males working as paid employees was consistently higher than that of the female population ranging from 4.1 percent for males with no education to 71.9 percent of males with tertiary education. The respective percentages for females are 1.3 percent and 65.7 percent.

Table 9.8 Economically active population 10 years and older
by level of education, employment and sex

| Level of education |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex/ Employment | Total | No education | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Primary \& } \\ & \text { junior } \\ & \text { secondary } \end{aligned}$ | Senior secondary | Vocational/ technical/ nursing/ teacher | First degree | Postgraduate \& PHD | Other |
| Both sexes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total percent | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Paid employee | 9.6 | 2.5 | 9.3 | 27.0 | 63.1 | 68.3 | 70.3 | 9.0 |
| Self-employed without employees | 74.9 | 83.4 | 72.9 | 53.1 | 20.9 | 15.3 | 16.6 | 77.5 |
| Self-employed with employees | 4.3 | 4.2 | 4.5 | 4.6 | 3.6 | 4.2 | 5.4 | 4.3 |
| Unpaid family worker | 5.1 | 6.0 | 5.0 | 2.1 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 5.2 |
| Paid apprentice | 0.6 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.6 |
| Unpaid apprentice | 1.4 | 1.2 | 2.1 | 1.4 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 1.0 |
| worked before but currently looking for work | 0.8 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 2.1 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.1 | 0.8 |
| Looking for work for the first time | 3.4 | 2.0 | 4.3 | 8.7 | 7.7 | 8.3 | 4.3 | 1.6 |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Paid employee | 13.8 | 4.1 | 12.9 | 29.2 | 62.7 | 69.2 | 71.9 | 9.1 |
| Self-employed without employees | 69.5 | 80.8 | 67.4 | 50.7 | 22.0 | 15.0 | 15.4 | 77.4 |
| Self-employed with employees | 4.6 | 4.5 | 5.0 | 4.8 | 3.9 | 4.5 | 5.5 | 4.4 |
| Unpaid family worker | 4.4 | 5.4 | 4.3 | 1.8 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 5.1 |
| Paid apprentice | 0.9 | 0.7 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.6 |
| Unpaid apprentice | 1.8 | 1.7 | 2.9 | 1.5 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 1.0 |
| Worked before but currently looking for work | 1.1 | 0.5 | 1.3 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 0.8 |
| Looking for work for the first time | 4.0 | 2.4 | 4.7 | 8.6 | 6.8 | 7.6 | 3.7 | 1.5 |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Paid employee | 5.4 | 1.3 | 5.1 | 21.7 | 63.8 | 65.6 | 65.7 | 8.6 |
| Self-employed without employees | 80.5 | 85.5 | 79.3 | 59.0 | 19.1 | 16.3 | 20.0 | 78.1 |
| Self-employed with employees | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 5.0 | 3.7 |
| Unpaid family worker | 6.0 | 6.5 | 5.8 | 2.9 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 5.5 |
| Paid apprentice | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| Unpaid apprentice | 0.8 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.8 |
| Worked before butcurrently looking for work | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 1.6 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 1.4 | 0.7 |
| Looking for work for the first time | 2.7 | 1.6 | 3.8 | 9.1 | 9.3 | 10.4 | 6.2 | 2.2 |

As shown in Table 9.9, agricultural and fishery activities were the major occupations and they employed 59.9 percent followed by services, shops and market sales workers employing 17.5 percent of the employed population. These two occupational groups also dominated employees with no education, basic education and senior secondary level of education. For persons with no education the percentages were 74.2 and 13.4, with basic education 47.0 and 24.7 and with senior secondary education 17.4 and 33.0, accordingly. At the higher levels of education attainment, the dominant occupation was professionals.

The percentages of employed males and females by occupation were not uniform across the different educational levels. The only similarities between the two sexes were among those with no education or had completed basic education and were employed in agricultural and fishery occupations. The respective proportions at each of the two educational levels were 74 percent and 47 percent. Of the remaining occupations, females dominate service, shop and market sales workers, particularly those with basic and senior secondary level of education and professional occupation by females who had completed vocational, technical, nursing and teaching education. At the first degree and tertiary level both males and females were equally likely to be employed in professional occupation. The proportion of males in professional occupations with first degree was 46.7 percent and the proportion with tertiary education level was 49 percent while for females the percentages were 47 percent and 48.7 percent, respectively.

Table 9.9 Economically active population 10 years and older
by level of education, occupation and sex

| Sex | Occupation | Level of education |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | No Education | Primary \& junior secondary | Senoir secondary | Vocational/ technical/ nursing/ teacher | First Degree | Postgraduate \& PHD | Other |
| Both sexs | Total percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Legislators senior officials \& managers | 0.5 | 0.9 | 2.0 | 3.7 | 10.7 | 14.4 | 1.0 |
|  | Professionals | 0.8 | 2.9 | 10.1 | 50.4 | 46.8 | 48.9 | 5.2 |
|  | Technicians \& associate professionals | 0.9 | 2.5 | 6.9 | 9.2 | 8.8 | 7.4 | 2.0 |
|  | Clerks | 0.2 | 0.5 | 2.3 | 4.0 | 6.7 | 4.4 | 0.5 |
|  | Service \& shop \& market sales workers | 13.4 | 24.7 | 33.0 | 14.0 | 13.1 | 11.0 | 15.5 |
|  | Agricultural and fishery workers | 74.2 | 47.0 | 17.4 | 6.5 | 4.1 | 4.9 | 60.5 |
|  | Craft and related trade workers | 6.3 | 11.4 | 12.4 | 5.8 | 4.2 | 3.8 | 8.9 |
|  | Plant \& machine operators \& assemblers | 1.5 | 4.8 | 8.1 | 2.9 | 2.4 | 2.1 | 3.4 |
|  | Elementary occupations | 2.2 | 4.4 | 5.6 | 2.1 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 2.5 |
|  | Other | 0.2 | 0.8 | 2.3 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 1.5 | 0.4 |
| Male | Total percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Legislators senior officials \& managers | 0.5 | 1.1 | 2.1 | 4.1 | 10.9 | 15.3 | 1.0 |
|  | Professionals | 1.1 | 3.7 | 9.5 | 48.6 | 46.7 | 49.0 | 5.4 |
|  | Technicians \& associate professionals | 1.2 | 3.3 | 7.5 | 9.2 | 9.4 | 8.0 | 2.0 |
|  | Clerks | 0.2 | 0.6 | 2.2 | 3.4 | 5.6 | 3.8 | 0.4 |
|  | Service \& shop \& market sales workers | 8.0 | 14.8 | 26.3 | 11.9 | 12.1 | 9.2 | 12.1 |
|  | Agricultural and fishery workers | 73.8 | 47.2 | 19.3 | 8.1 | 4.3 | 5.0 | 63.6 |
|  | Craft and related trade workers | 10.3 | 16.4 | 14.7 | 7.0 | 4.8 | 4.2 | 9.3 |
|  | Plant \& machine operators \& assemblers | 3.1 | 8.6 | 11.0 | 4.1 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 3.9 |
|  | Elementary occupations | 1.5 | 3.0 | 4.6 | 1.8 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 1.9 |
|  | Other | 0.2 | 1.1 | 2.7 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 0.4 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Table 9.9 Economically active population 10 years and older by level of education, occupation and sex (continued)

|  |  | Level of education |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex | Occupation | No Education | Primary \& junior secondary | Senoir secondary | Vocational/ technical/ nursing/ teacher | First Degree | Postgraduate \& PHD | Other |
| Female | Total percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Legislators senior officials \& managers | 0.4 | 0.7 | 1.6 | 3.1 | 10.0 | 11.8 | 0.9 |
|  | Professionals | 0.5 | 1.9 | 11.6 | 53.6 | 47.0 | 48.7 | 4.2 |
|  | Technicians \& associate professionals | 0.6 | 1.5 | 5.3 | 9.2 | 7.1 | 5.7 | 2.3 |
|  | Clerks | 0.1 | 0.4 | 2.4 | 5.3 | 9.7 | 6.3 | 1.0 |
|  | Service \& shop \& market sales workers | 17.8 | 36.1 | 49.7 | 17.9 | 16.2 | 16.7 | 37.5 |
|  | Agricultural and fishery workers | 74.4 | 46.8 | 12.6 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 4.6 | 40.5 |
|  | Craft and related trade workers | 3.1 | 5.5 | 6.6 | 3.5 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 6.5 |
|  | Plant \& machine operators \& assemblers | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.5 |
|  | Elementary occupations | 2.7 | 6.1 | 8.1 | 2.7 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 6.0 |
|  | Other | 0.2 | 0.5 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.6 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 9.8 Literacy

The 2015 Population and Housing Census collected information on literacy from persons 10 years or older who can read and write with understanding in any language. Table 9.10 highlights the prevailing levels of and differences in literacy in the country. A distinction is made between those who can read and write as "literate" and those who cannot read and write as "not-literate". In Table 9.10, the total literate proportion was about equal to that of the not-literate, that is, 51 percent and 49 percent respectively. In the rural areas, 37 percent of the population was literate, which is almost half of the urban proportion of 70 percent. A higher proportion of the male population was literate, 59 percent compared to 44 percent for females.

The most literate population was in the age group 15-19 years followed by the 20-24 years and 10-14 years. For the older population, aged 30-34 years and older the percentage literate was consistently below 50 percent and by age 60 years and older, only 24 percent of the population was literate. Regarding place of residence, up to age 55-59 years, more than 50 percent of the urban population was literate while in the rural areas the proportions were below 50 percent starting from the age group 25-29 years. At age 30-34 years and onwards, the percentage literate among urban population was more than twice that of the rural population. At younger ages, 1014, 15-19 and 20-24 years differences by place of residence or by sex were not as pronounced. Between males and females high variations are reflected starting from age 25-29 years and over with percentages ranging from 36.6 to 64.5 percent for males, while for females the corresponding range was 12.5 to 38.7 percent.

Table 9.10 Economically active population 10 years and older by level of education, occupation and sex

| Age <br> group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note: The sum of the not literate and literate at each age group and by place of residence or sex equals 100 percent.

Table 9.11 shows the situation of literacy in the different regions and districts in Sierra Leone. In the five regions, three quarters of the population in the Western region were literate while in the remaining three regions the percentages of the literate population ranged between 42.2 percent in the Northern region and 47.5 percent in the Eastern region. In these same three regions, the proportions literate for male were above 50 percent and those for female were relatively low, ranging from 34 percent in the Northern region to 40 percent in the Eastern region. In contrast, the not-literate population in the Northern, Southern and the Eastern regions was consistently higher among females with a margin of at least 15 percentage points higher relative to males.

Among the 14 districts, percentage of literate population was below 50 percent except in Bo, Western Area Rural and Western Area Urban with 51.2 percent, 66.2 percent and 77.8 percent respectively. Of the remaining districts, about 47 percent of the population in Kailahun, Kenema and Kono were literate with the percentages ranging from 39.3 percent in Kambia to 46.1 percent in Bombali district. In all the districts, the percentage of literate males was consistently above that of females and varied between 11.7 percentage points in the Western urban area district to 23 percentage points in the Kambia district.

Table 9.11 Population 10 years and older by literacy status, place of residence, region, disctrict and sex

| Place of <br> residence/ <br> Region/ <br> District |  |  |  |  |  | Sex/ Literacy status |  |  |  | Female |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

[^8]The percentages of the literate population, for the 2004 and 2015 censuses, are presented in Table 9.12 by region, district and sex. The level of literate population in the country had increased from 39 percent in 2004 to 51 percent in 2015. The females had achieved the highest increase, by 15 percentage points above the 2004 level of 29 percent, compared to the males with only 10 percentage points above their 49 percent level in 2004. Within the regions, the increases in literacy levels were not the same.

The Eastern region showed the highest gains in literacy, more so among the females, while the increases in the Northern and the Southern regions were the least especially among the males. By district, the proportion of literate population in 2004 in the Western Area Rural district had decreased by three percentage points to 73 percent for males and by one percentage point to 59 percent for the males in 2015. For the rest of the districts, between 2004 and 2015, the percentage of the literate population had increased by at least 10 percentage points except in Moyamba and Kambia districts with seven percentage points.


| Place of residence/ | Literate |  |  |  |  |  | Change between 2004 and 2015 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2004 |  |  | 2015 |  |  |  |  |
| Region/ District | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female |
| Total | 39 | 49 | 29 | 51 | 59 | 44 | 12 | 10 | 15 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Eastern | 31 | 40 | 22 | 47 | 55 | 40 | 16 | 15 | 18 |
| Northern | 31 | 43 | 20 | 42 | 51 | 34 | 11 | 8 | 14 |
| Southern | 34 | 45 | 25 | 45 | 53 | 38 | 11 | 8 | 13 |
| Western | 65 | 62 | 57 | 75 | 81 | 68 | 10 | 19 | 11 |
| District |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kailahun | 32 | 43 | 22 | 47 | 55 | 40 | 15 | 12 | 18 |
| Kenema | 21 | 30 | 13 | 48 | 55 | 40 | 27 | 25 | 27 |
| Kono | 27 | 35 | 19 | 47 | 53 | 41 | 20 | 18 | 22 |
| Bombali | 29 | 40 | 18 | 46 | 55 | 38 | 17 | 15 | 20 |
| Kambia | 32 | 48 | 18 | 39 | 52 | 29 | 7 | 4 | 11 |
| Koinadugu | 21 | 30 | 14 | 40 | 47 | 33 | 19 | 17 | 19 |
| Port Loko | 32 | 45 | 21 | 43 | 53 | 34 | 11 | 8 | 13 |
| Tonkolili | 30 | 41 | 21 | 40 | 47 | 33 | 10 | 6 | 12 |
| Bo | 29 | 40 | 19 | 51 | 59 | 44 | 22 | 19 | 25 |
| Bonthe | 24 | 34 | 16 | 41 | 48 | 34 | 17 | 14 | 18 |
| Moyamba | 33 | 45 | 24 | 40 | 49 | 32 | 7 | 4 | 8 |
| Pujehun | 26 | 36 | 17 | 42 | 51 | 34 | 16 | 15 | 17 |
| Western Area Rural | 68 | 76 | 60 | 66 | 73 | 59 | -2 | -3 | -1 |
| Western Area Urban | 52 | 62 | 42 | 78 | 84 | 72 | 26 | 22 | 30 |

[^9]Table 9.13 presents the distribution of the population age 10 years and older by literacy level. Out of the 51 percent literate population, 44 percent were literate in English only, about 3 percent in Arabic only and the remaining 4 percent were literate in other languages. English is more used in the urban areas by 62.4 percent of its population relative to 30.3 percent in the rural area. Arabic is used more by males than females and more so in the rural than urban areas.

## EC <br> Table 9.13 Population 10 years and older by literacy level, place of residence and sex

| Literacy | Sex/ Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Both sexes |  |  | Male |  |  | Female |  |  |
|  | Total | Rural | Urban | Total | Rural | Urban | Total | Rural | Urban |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Local language only | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 3.0 |
| English only | 44.2 | 30.3 | 62.4 | 50.0 | 35.8 | 68.0 | 38.8 | 25.2 | 56.9 |
| Local language and English only | 0.9 | 0.6 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 1.5 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 1.1 |
| French only | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 |
| Local language and French only | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| English and French only | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Local language English and French only | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Arabic only | 2.7 | 3.2 | 2.0 | 4.6 | 5.9 | 3.1 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.9 |
| Local language and Arabic only | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| English and Arabic only | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Local language English and Arabic only | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other <br> Languages | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 |
| Not Literate | 48.6 | 62.7 | 30.3 | 40.6 | 54.4 | 23.3 | 56.1 | 70.4 | 37.1 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census
The dominance of English language among males relative to females is also seen in Table 9.14. In all the regions a higher proportion of males were literate in English with a regional average of 50 percent relative to 39 percent for females. The dominance of males in the use of English also prevails in all the regions and the percentages for males ranged from 42 percent in the Northern and Southern regions to 72 percent in the Western region. For females the range was from 29 percent in Northern region to 62 percent in the Western region. Arabic is used more by the male population and local language only by the female population and in all the regions.

Table 9.14 Population 10 years and older by literacy level, region and sex

| Literacy | Region/ Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total |  |  | Eastern |  |  | Northern |  |  |
|  | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Local language only | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 2.5 |
| English only | 44.2 | 50.0 | 38.8 | 41.1 | 46.2 | 36.1 | 35.1 | 41.8 | 29.0 |
| Local language and English only | 0.9 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 0.8 |
| French only | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Local language and French only | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| English and French only | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Local language <br> English and <br> French only | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Arabic only | 2.7 | 4.6 | 0.8 | 2.6 | 4.5 | 0.6 | 2.8 | 4.8 | 1.0 |
| Local language and Arabic only | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| English and Arabic only | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Local language English and Arabic only | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other <br> Languages | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Table 9.14 Population 10 years and older by literacy level, region and sex (continued)

| Literacy | Region/ Sex |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Southern |  |  | Western |  |  |
|  | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Local language only | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.7 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.3 |
| English only | 37.2 | 41.9 | 32.8 | 67.2 | 72.3 | 62.0 |
| Local language and English only | 1.0 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 0.8 |
| French only | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.5 |
| Local language and French only | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| English and French only | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Local language English and French only | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Arabic only | 3.6 | 6.9 | 0.6 | 1.8 | 2.7 | 0.9 |
| Local language and Arabic only | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| English and Arabic only | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Local language English and Arabic only | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 9.9 Summary, conclusion and Recommendation

### 9.9.1 Summary

An analysis of the 2015 Population and Housing Census data on education and literacy covers school attendance, levels of education attained, past school attendance, current school attendance, educational attainment by selected economic characteristics, and literacy. The results on school attendance reveal that 55.5 percent of the population aged 3 years and older had been to school, of which 18.2 attended school in the past and 37.3 percent were attending school at the time of the census. Regarding sex, 60.2 percent of the males had been to school, of which, 21.0 percent had attended school in the past and 39.2 were attending school at the time of the census. For females, the corresponding proportions were 51.0 percent, 15.6 percent and 35.4.

The highest proportion of the population attending school at the time of the census was in the age groups $3-5,6-11,12-14,15-18,19-22$ and 23-29 years. For both sexes, the respective proportions were 32.6 percent, 72.2 percent, 78.7 percent, 65.4 percent, 42.6 percent and 19.6 percent. For the same age groups, in that same order, 0.7 percent, 1.6 percent, 3.6 percent, 11.0 percent, and 25.7 percent, had left school. For the age groups 30-34 and older, the proportion of the population attending school was below 10 percent, declining from 6.3 percent to 1.4 percent for the population 60 years and older.

Forty two percent of persons aged six years and above had no education, 20.3 attended school in the past and 37.8 were attending school at the time of the census. The corresponding proportions for males were 36.4 percent, 23.4 percent and 40.2 , while those for females were 47.1 percent, 17.3 percent and 35.6 . For both sexes, the proportions that had ever been to school were, 26.1 percent, 13.3 percent and 11.3 percent for completed primary, junior secondary or senior secondary levels of education, respectively. The percentages for the males were 25.8 percent for primary level, 14.1 percent for junior secondary and 14.1 percent for senior secondary. For the females, the respective proportions were 26.3 percent, 12.6 percent and 8.6 percent.

A possible explanation for school drop-out was sought by analyzing past school attendance by level of education completed. For both sexes, 26.2 percent, 27.2 percent and 26.1 percent of the population six years and older who had school left school, did so, having attained primary, junior secondary or senior secondary school levels of education, respectively. Similar proportions for the males were 21.3 percent, 24.6 percent and 30.2 percent, while for the females the percentages were 32.5, 30.6 and 20.8 .

The distribution of the population six years and older attending school by level of education suggests that 54.9 percent of both sexes had completed primary education, 20.6 percent junior secondary and 15.8 percent senior secondary education. The proportions for the
males were 51.9 percent, 20.7 percent and 17.6 percent; and for the females the proportions were 58.1 percent, 20.5 percent and 13.9 percent, respectively.

A comparison of the 2004 and 2015 enrollment ratios for the population aged 6-11 years, 12-14 years and 15-17 years suggests that the capacity of the education system at the junior secondary and senior secondary levels of education has expanded between the two periods. For both sexes, the gross enrollment ratios (GER) for junior secondary and senior secondary were 41 and 22 in 2004 and 91 and 56 in 2015, respectively. The implication is that in 2004, only 41 percent of the population 1214 could be accommodated in junior secondary and 22 percent of the 15-17-year-old in senior secondary school and by 2015 the proportions were 91 percent and 56 percent.

The analysis of educational attainment by selected economic characteristics of the economically active population reveals that 74.9 of the population 10 years and older were self-employed without employees, 9.6 percent were paid employees and 5.1 percent were unpaid family workers. By level of education, self-employed dominated among those with no education by as high as 83.4 percent while paid employees accounted for 63.2 percent of those with vocational, technical, nursing or teaching skills; 68.3 percent of those with first degree and 70.3 percent of those with higher levels of education.

In terms of occupation, 74.2 percent of the population with no education was engaged in agricultural and fishery activities and 13.4 percent were service workers. Similar percentages for persons with basic education were 47.0 percent and 24.7 percent; and for those with senior secondary education the proportions were 17.4 percent and 33.0 percent. Professional occupations prevail among those with vocational, technical, nursing and teaching skills at 50.4 percent, first degree at 46.8 percent and higher levels of education at 48.9 percent.

The results of analysis of literacy levels indicate that 51.4 percent were literate with the majority in the urban areas where 69.7 percent were literate and 37.3 percent of the rural population were literate. The literate male population exceeded that of the females and the respective proportions were 59.4 percent and 43.9 percent.

More than 50 percent of the population in the 10-14, 15-19, 20-24 and 25-29 age groups were literate and the corresponding percentages were 63.1 percent, 70.3 percent 63.8 percent and 50.5 percent. For the older population, the proportion literate ranged from 23.9 percent among those aged 60 years and older to 40.0 percent among those aged 30-34 years.

The overall level of literacy has improved between 2004 and 2015. In 2004, the literate population accounted for 39 percent of both sexes, 49 percent of the males and 29 percent of the females and these percentages were 12 points, 10 points, and 15 points below those for 2015, respectively.

English is the most common language and is used by 44.2 percent of both sexes, 50.0 percent of the males and 38.8 percent of the females. The next most used languages are Arabic followed by local languages. For Arabic, the percentages were 2.7 percent for both sexes, 4.6 percent for the males and 0.8 percent for the females and for local languages the respective percentages were 2.6 percent, 2.5 percent and 2.8 percent

### 9.9.2 Conclusion

Three main conclusions can be drawn from the analysis of the 2015 Population and Housing Census data on education and literacy. Firstly, access to education has increased. The results of the analysis reveal that more than 65 percent of the population aged 6-11 years, 12-14 years and $15-18$ years were attending school. At the time, the Education Act 2004 was enacted, the population in the last two age groups were around 2-4 and 5-8 years of age and they had benefited from the introduction and or implementation of new education policies.

Secondly, gender equality in primary, and junior secondary is being achieved and lastly there is unequal access to education by place of residence. Close to 75 percent of the urban population had been to school, 44.8 percent were attending school at the time of the census and 69.7 percent were literate. In contrast, 46.2 of the rural population had been to school, 32.8 percent were attending school at the time of the census and 37.3 percent were literate. This strongly suggests that there is unequal access to education between the rural and urban areas. .9.8.3 Recommendation

The data on literacy were generated from responses to a question on whether the respondent can read and write with understanding in any language and without being tested. Out of pride, some respondents may falsify their answers, thereby inflating the proportion of the literate population. As far as possible, pertinent data from administrative records, for example, on school enrollment or from surveys should be used to validate the accuracy of census data.
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| Aged Region | Population | Current Attendance | Place of esisidence/ Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | All Residence |  |  | Runal |  |  | Urian |  |  |
|  |  |  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Total | 6598938 | 2455978 | 37.3 | 39.2 | 35.4 | 32.2 | 34.9 | 29.6 | 44.4 | 45.2 | 43.6 |
| Eastem | 1539163 | 616932 | 40.1 | 41.5 | 38.7 | 53.5 | 55.7 | ${ }^{51.3}$ | 69.4 | 71.4 | 67.6 |
| Northern | 2316308 | 779452 | 33.7 | 37.2 | 30.3 | 45.3 | 49.4 | 41.2 | 64.8 | 67.7 | 61.9 |
| Southern | 1336078 | 477705 | 35.8 | 37.2 | 34.4 | 49.4 | 50.4 | 48.4 | 69.3 | 70.1 | 68.5 |
| Western | 1398289 | 581889 | 41.6 | 41.9 | 41.3 | 54.3 | 57.7 | 50.9 | 62.4 | 63.8 | 61.0 |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 233552 | 39736 | 17.0 | 16.0 | 18.0 | 14.5 | ${ }^{13.6}$ | 15.3 | 22.2 | 21.1 | 23.3 |
| Eastem | 53380 | 10778 | 20.2 | 18.8 | 21.5 | 17.8 | 16.4 | 19.1 | 26.1 | 24.9 | 27.3 |
| Nothern | 91339 | 11731 | 12.8 | 12.6 | 13.1 | 11.2 | 11.1 | 11.4 | 19.3 | 18.8 | 19.7 |
| Southern | 51251 | 9034 | 17.6 | 15.9 | 19.3 | 16.7 | 15.1 | 18.3 | 23.1 | 20.9 | 25.2 |
| Western | 37582 | 8193 | 21.8 | 20.7 | 22.9 | 21.8 | 21.6 | 22.1 | 21.8 | 20.7 | 22.9 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 218140 | 70708 | 32.4 | 31.4 | 33.5 | 28.0 | 27.0 | 29.1 | 41.4 | 40.4 | 42.3 |
| Eastern | 4969 | 18861 | 38.0 | 36.6 | 39.4 | 33.9 | 32.4 | 35.3 | 47.9 | 46.7 | 49.1 |
| Nothern | 87171 | 22317 | 25.6 | 25.2 | 26.1 | 23.2 | 22.9 | 23.6 | 35.2 | 34.5 | 36.0 |
| Southem | 46898 | 15361 | 32.8 | 30.9 | 34.6 | 30.9 | 29.2 | 32.7 | 43.3 | 41.2 | 45.2 |
| Western | 34402 | 14169 | 41.2 | 40.5 | 4.9 | 39.7 | 38.9 | 40.5 | 41.2 | 40.5 | 41.9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 24882 | 115979 | 47.8 | 46.3 | 49.3 | 42.0 | 40.4 | ${ }^{43.6}$ | 60.3 | 59.4 | 61.1 |
| Eastern | 58598 | 31046 | 53.0 | 50.9 | 55.1 | 47.9 | 45.9 | 50.0 | 65.9 | 63.9 | 67.9 |
| Northem | 95663 | 38346 | 40.1 | 39.6 | 40.6 | 36.9 | 36.4 | 37.5 | 53.4 | 53.5 | 53.3 |
| Southem | 52435 | 24724 | 47.2 | 44.3 | 50.2 | 44.7 | 41.6 | 47.9 | 62.5 | 61.2 | 63.8 |
| Western | 36126 | 21863 | 60.5 | 60.0 | 61.0 | 55.2 | 56.9 | 53.2 | 60.7 | 60.1 | 61.3 |


| Age/ Region | Population | Current Attendance | Place of residence/ Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | All Residence |  |  | Rural |  |  | Urban |  |  |
|  |  |  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 219569 | 135946 | 61.9 | 60.4 | 63.4 | 54.9 | 53.2 | 56.6 | 75.9 | 75.5 | 76.3 |
| Eastern | 51346 | 33953 | 66.1 | 64.2 | 68.0 | 60.3 | 58.1 | 62.5 | 80.4 | 80.2 | 80.6 |
| Northern | 86409 | 46575 | 53.9 | 53.2 | 54.6 | 49.7 | 49.3 | 50.2 | 70.5 | 69.6 | 71.5 |
| Southern | 47043 | 29038 | 61.7 | 58.6 | 64.9 | 58.6 | 55.3 | 61.9 | 78.6 | 77.2 | 79.9 |
| Western | 34771 | 26380 | 75.9 | 76.0 | 75.7 | 67.4 | 69.2 | 65.7 | 76.2 | 76.3 | 76.1 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 231567 | 161307 | 69.7 | 68.3 | 71.1 | 62.5 | 60.9 | 64.2 | 83.3 | 83.2 | 83.3 |
| Eastern | 57493 | 41645 | 72.4 | 70.2 | 74.7 | 66.6 | 64.2 | 69.1 | 85.7 | 84.7 | 86.6 |
| Northern | 87065 | 54619 | 62.7 | 62.4 | 63.1 | 58.3 | 58.2 | 58.4 | 79.2 | 78.5 | 79.8 |
| Southern | 49836 | 34063 | 68.4 | 65.2 | 71.6 | 65.0 | 61.5 | 68.7 | 85.7 | 86.1 | 85.3 |
| Western | 37173 | 30980 | 83.3 | 84.0 | 82.7 | 75.8 | 77.8 | 73.6 | 83.6 | 84.2 | 83.1 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 231262 | 170827 | 73.9 | 72.5 | 75.2 | 66.5 | 64.9 | 68.2 | 87.6 | 87.7 | 87.5 |
| Eastern | 57586 | 44323 | 77.0 | 75.1 | 78.8 | 71.5 | 69.4 | 73.5 | 89.2 | 88.5 | 89.9 |
| Northern | 87215 | 58201 | 66.7 | 66.4 | 67.0 | 62.2 | 62.1 | 62.3 | 83.4 | 83.3 | 83.4 |
| Southern | 49738 | 35921 | 72.2 | 68.9 | 75.5 | 68.4 | 64.9 | 72.0 | 90.2 | 90.2 | 90.1 |
| Western | 36723 | 32382 | 88.2 | 88.8 | 87.6 | 82.9 | 81.4 | 84.3 | 88.4 | 89.1 | 87.7 |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 182910 | 139340 | 76.2 | 74.9 | 77.5 | 68.4 | 67.0 | 69.8 | 89.8 | 89.7 | 90.0 |
| Eastern | 43671 | 34440 | 78.9 | 77.1 | 80.6 | 73.5 | 71.8 | 75.3 | 90.4 | 89.6 | 91.1 |
| Northern | 71530 | 49508 | 69.2 | 69.0 | 69.5 | 64.4 | 64.3 | 64.4 | 86.1 | 85.9 | 86.3 |


| Age/ Region | Population | Current Attendance | Place of residence/ Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | All Residence |  |  | Rural |  |  | Urban |  |  |
|  |  |  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| 10-14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 846137 | 659294 | 77.9 | 76.7 | 79.2 | 69.4 | 68.5 | 70.5 | 90.1 | 89.8 | 90.3 |
| Eastern | 204173 | 161682 | 79.2 | 77.5 | 80.9 | 73.3 | 71.9 | 75.0 | 89.8 | 88.6 | 91.0 |
| Northern | 305679 | 217584 | 71.2 | 71.4 | 70.9 | 65.8 | 66.5 | 65.1 | 87.1 | 87.1 | 87.0 |
| Southern | 169936 | 128805 | 75.8 | 72.6 | 79.2 | 71.2 | 68.0 | 74.9 | 92.1 | 91.7 | 92.5 |
| Western | 166349 | 151223 | 90.9 | 91.0 | 90.8 | 84.5 | 84.2 | 84.9 | 91.1 | 91.2 | 91.0 |
| 15-19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 871348 | 555531 | 63.8 | 67.1 | 60.5 | 53.4 | 58.2 | 48.7 | 76.7 | 78.7 | 74.8 |
| Eastern | 215777 | 143379 | 66.4 | 69.1 | 63.8 | 59.5 | 63.0 | 56.0 | 77.9 | 79.4 | 76.4 |
| Northern | 296676 | 167080 | 56.3 | 61.9 | 50.8 | 48.8 | 55.3 | 42.3 | 75.3 | 78.8 | 71.9 |
| Southern | 174853 | 105954 | 60.6 | 63.1 | 58.2 | 54.5 | 57.7 | 51.3 | 80.0 | 80.8 | 79.2 |
| Western | 184042 | 139118 | 75.6 | 77.4 | 73.9 | 60.5 | 67.0 | 54.4 | 76.0 | 77.7 | 74.5 |
| 20-24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 660438 | 244141 | 37.0 | 45.6 | 29.5 | 27.7 | 37.7 | 19.8 | 46.2 | 52.9 | 39.8 |
| Eastern | 143389 | 57336 | 40.0 | 49.8 | 31.6 | 33.5 | 43.4 | 25.3 | 50.2 | 59.6 | 42.0 |
| Northern | 210194 | 67576 | 32.1 | 42.6 | 23.5 | 25.1 | 35.6 | 16.6 | 48.3 | 57.4 | 40.1 |
| Southern | 123396 | 40315 | 32.7 | 41.1 | 25.8 | 26.5 | 35.3 | 19.7 | 50.1 | 55.7 | 44.8 |
| Western | 183459 | 78914 | 43.0 | 48.6 | 37.6 | 26.2 | 35.8 | 17.1 | 43.4 | 48.9 | 38.1 |
| 25-29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 25-29 | 139340 | 76.2 | 74.9 | 77.5 | 68.4 | 67.0 | 69.8 | 89.8 | 89.7 | 90.0 |
| Eastern | 43671 | 34440 | 78.9 | 77.1 | 80.6 | 73.5 | 71.8 | 75.3 | 90.4 | 89.6 | 91.1 |
| Northern | 71530 | 49508 | 69.2 | 69.0 | 69.5 | 64.4 | 64.3 | 64.4 | 86.1 | 85.9 | 86.3 |
| Southern | 37082 | 27593 | 74.4 | 71.1 | 77.7 | 70.2 | 66.7 | 73.9 | 92.0 | 91.6 | 92.2 |


| Age/ Region | Population | Current <br> Attendance | Place of residence/ Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | All Residence |  |  | Rural |  |  | Urban |  |  |
|  |  |  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| 30-34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 434203 | 27435 | 6.3 | 9.0 | 4.1 | 4.6 | 7.4 | 2.5 | 8.5 | 10.7 | 6.3 |
| Eastern | 98243 | 6739 | 6.9 | 10.2 | 4.2 | 5.6 | 8.6 | 3.2 | 9.5 | 13.2 | 6.2 |
| Northern | 141717 | 7546 | 5.3 | 8.4 | 3.0 | 4.1 | 6.9 | 2.0 | 9.0 | 12.3 | 5.9 |
| Southern | 84097 | 4586 | 5.5 | 8.0 | 3.4 | 4.5 | 7.0 | 2.6 | 9.4 | 11.4 | 7.3 |
| Western | 110146 | 8564 | 7.8 | 9.2 | 6.2 | 3.8 | 4.6 | 3.0 | 7.9 | 9.3 | 6.3 |
| 35-39 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 421172 | 14885 | 3.5 | 4.8 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 3.7 | 1.5 | 4.9 | 6.0 | 3.8 |
| Eastern | 99268 | 3548 | 3.6 | 4.9 | 2.3 | 2.7 | 3.9 | 1.7 | 5.3 | 7.0 | 3.6 |
| Northern | 138925 | 4068 | 2.9 | 4.3 | 1.8 | 2.3 | 3.6 | 1.3 | 4.8 | 6.3 | 3.4 |
| Southern | 83864 | 2567 | 3.1 | 4.2 | 2.1 | 2.5 | 3.6 | 1.6 | 5.3 | 6.4 | 4.3 |
| Western | 99115 | 4702 | 4.7 | 5.5 | 3.9 | 2.3 | 3.3 | 1.2 | 4.8 | 5.6 | 4.0 |
| 40-44 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 299215 | 7895 | 2.6 | 3.3 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 2.6 | 1.0 | 3.8 | 4.3 | 3.3 |
| Eastern | 69238 | 1670 | 2.4 | 3.1 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 2.4 | 1.0 | 3.8 | 4.6 | 2.8 |
| Northern | 101559 | 2244 | 2.2 | 3.1 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 2.7 | 0.9 | 3.7 | 4.4 | 3.0 |
| Southern | 60362 | 1354 | 2.2 | 3.1 | 1.4 | 1.9 | 2.8 | 1.0 | 3.8 | 4.4 | 3.3 |
| Western | 68056 | 2627 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 3.6 | 2.4 | 2.9 | 1.8 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 3.7 |
| 45-49 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 242188 | 5403 | 2.2 | 2.8 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 2.3 | 0.8 | 3.1 | 3.6 | 2.6 |
| Eastern | 58077 | 1237 | 2.1 | 2.6 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 2.1 | 1.0 | 3.2 | 3.6 | 2.4 |
| Northern | 82790 | 1510 | 1.8 | 2.5 | 1.0 | 1.5 | 2.2 | 0.7 | 2.8 | 3.5 | 2.1 |
| Southern | 49390 | 1002 | 2.0 | 2.7 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 2.4 | 0.9 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 2.9 |


| EC | Table A9.1: School participation ratios for population 3 years and older by age, region, place of residence and sex, 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Age/ Region | Population | CurrentAttendance | Place of residence/ Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | All Residence |  |  | Rural |  |  | Urban |  |  |
|  |  |  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| 50-54 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 186793 | 3570 | 1.9 | 2.4 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 1.9 | 0.7 | 2.7 | 3.1 | 2.3 |
| Eastern | 41653 | 725 | 1.7 | 2.2 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.8 | 0.7 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 2.2 |
| Northern | 65018 | 1104 | 1.7 | 2.4 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 2.0 | 0.7 | 2.8 | 3.5 | 2.1 |
| Southern | 38748 | 626 | 1.6 | 2.1 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 1.9 | 0.7 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.8 |
| Western | 41374 | 1115 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 2.4 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 2.4 |
| 55-59 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 110449 | 1883 | 1.7 | 2.3 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.9 | 0.5 | 2.3 | 2.8 | 1.8 |
| Eastern | 23877 | 393 | 1.6 | 2.2 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 0.5 | 2.6 | 3.1 | 1.7 |
| Northerm | 38363 | 582 | 1.5 | 2.2 | 0.8 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 0.6 | 2.2 | 2.9 | 1.5 |
| Southern | 22887 | 345 | 1.5 | 2.1 | 0.8 | 1.2 | 1.8 | 0.5 | 2.7 | 3.1 | 2.2 |
| Western | 25322 | 563 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 1.9 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 2.3 | 2.6 | 1.9 |
| 60+ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 359211 | 4888 | 1.4 | 1.8 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 1.5 |
| Eastern | 82132 | 1015 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 1.9 | 2.4 | 1.4 |
| Northerm | 133417 | 1699 | 1.3 | 1.9 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 1.8 | 2.4 | 1.2 |
| Southern | 82721 | 960 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 2.2 | 2.6 | 1.8 |
| Westerm | 60941 | 1214 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.8 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 2.6 | 1.5 |

Table A9.2 Net enrollment ratios by region, level of education, place of residence and sex, 2015


Table A9.3 Gross enrollment ratios by region, level of education, place of residence and sex, 2015

| Region/ Level of education | Palce of residence/ Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total |  |  | Rural |  |  | Urban |  |  |
|  | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary | 97 | 95 | 100 | 88 | 85 | 90 | 115 | 114 | 117 |
| JSS | 91 | 94 | 89 | 77 | 80 | 75 | 110 | 115 | 105 |
| SSS | 56 | 62 | 50 | 29 | 33 | 24 | 92 | 102 | 83 |
| Eastern |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary | 101 | 97 | 104 | 93 | 90 | 96 | 117 | 115 | 119 |
| JSS | 105 | 108 | 103 | 95 | 98 | 93 | 122 | 125 | 120 |
| SSS | 49 | 55 | 43 | 32 | 37 | 27 | 79 | 87 | 70 |
| Northern |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary | 89 | 88 | 89 | 83 | 83 | 82 | 110 | 108 | 111 |
| JSS | 80 | 85 | 75 | 68 | 73 | 62 | 114 | 119 | 110 |
| SSS | 42 | 48 | 36 | 27 | 32 | 21 | 82 | 92 | 73 |
| Southern |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary | 97 | 90 | 103 | 90 | 84 | 97 | 124 | 121 | 127 |
| JSS | 85 | 85 | 86 | 76 | 74 | 78 | 114 | 122 | 107 |
| SSS | 42 | 46 | 37 | 28 | 31 | 24 | 86 | 96 | 76 |
| Western |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary | 115 | 114 | 115 | 107 | 108 | 106 | 115 | 114 | 116 |
| JSS | 100 | 107 | 95 | 79 | 84 | 74 | 101 | 107 | 95 |

## CHAPTER 10 : ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

### 10.1 Introduction

The 2015 Census collected information on economic activity from all persons aged 10 years and above. This information is related to employment status, employer, occupation and industry. The economic characteristics will be analysed by sex and age, as well as the level of education and various geographical levels, which will include, total country, urban and rural areas, regions and where possible districts.

It should be noted that there cannot be a comparative analysis of the 2015 Census with the 1985 and the 2004 Censuses because those censuses considered different working age bands. In the 1985 Census, the population considered was 10 years and above, while in the 2004 Census the population under consideration was 15-64 years of age. In the current census, the population under consideration is 15 years and above, although information was also collected on children aged 10 to 15 years. However, the time horizon of economic activity and concepts of labour force are the same.

### 10.2 Economic activity status

The distribution of economic activity status for the population aged 15 years and above by sex for the whole country is presented in Table 10.1. The employed population makes up 62 per cent of the total population compared to the unemployed which is close to 3 per cent. An unemployed person is one who is not working but is actively looking for work. The population not in the labour force is 35 per cent. These are those who are not working and not actively looking for work.

Separating the population by gender does not significantly change the picture. The proportion of employed males is 65 per cent while that of employed females is 60 per cent. The proportion of unemployed males is just under 4 per cent while that for unemployed females is under 2 per cent. The proportion of males not in the labour force is 32 per cent while that for females is 38 per cent.

### 10.3 Economically active population

The economically active population is made up of the employed and unemployed population. As noted earlier, an unemployed person is one who is not working but is actively looking for work. The distribution of the economically active population aged 15 years and above by region and sex is presented in Table 10.2. The Northern Region has the largest proportion, 36 per cent, of the economically active population. It should be noted that 34 per cent of the economically active males belong to this region as well. The equivalent proportion for females is 38 per cent, which is the highest proportion among the four regions. On the other hand, the Southern Region has the smallest proportion, 20 per cent, of the economically active population. There are no differences between males and females.

At district level, the distribution of the economically active population aged 15 years and above is presented in Table 10.3. The Western Area Urban district is the only one with double digit percentages for both males and females where the proportions are 16 and 13 per cent respectively. The rest of the districts are all in one-figure digit percentages, with Bonthe having the lowest proportion of 3 per cent for the total and the same proportion for both males and females respectively.

| Economic activity |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Per cent |
| Both Sexes |  |  |
| Total | $4,183,879$ | 100.0 |
| Employed | $2,594,487$ | 62.0 |
| Unemployed | 112,268 | 2.7 |
| Not in labour <br> force | $1,477,124$ | 35.3 |
| Male | $2,024,944$ | 100.0 |
| Total | $1,305,635$ | 64.5 |
| Employed | 70,873 | 3.5 |
| Unemployed | 648,346 | 32.0 |
| Not in labour <br> force | $2,158,935$ | 100.0 |
| Female | $1,288,852$ | 59.7 |
| Total | 41,395 | 1.9 |
| Employed | 228,688 | 38.4 |
| Unemployed |  |  |
| Not in labour <br> force |  |  |



Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

## EA Table 10.2 Distribution of economically active population aged $15+$ years by region and by sex

| Region | Total |  | Male |  |  | Female |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Per cent | Number | Per cent | Number | Per cent |
| Total Country | $2,706,755$ | 100.0 | $1,376,508$ | 100.0 | $1,330,247$ | 100.0 |
| Eastern | 631,778 | 23.3 | 325,311 | 23.6 | 306,467 | 23.0 |
| Northern | 967,703 | 35.8 | 461,609 | 33.5 | 506,094 | 38.0 |
| Southern | 541,789 | 20.0 | 274,233 | 19.9 | 267,556 | 20.1 |
| Western | 565,485 | 20.9 | 315,355 | 22.9 | 250,130 | 18.8 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Table 10.3 Distribution of economically active population aged $15+$ years by district and sex

| District | Total |  | Male |  | Female |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Per cent | Number | Per cent | Number | Per cent |
| Kailahun | 199,428 | 7.4 | 98,139 | 7.1 | 101,289 | 7.6 |
| Kenema | 236,150 | 8.7 | 122,709 | 8.9 | 113,441 | 8.5 |
| Kono | 196,200 | 7.2 | 104,463 | 7.6 | 91,737 | 6.9 |
| Bombali | 226,566 | 8.4 | 108,950 | 7.9 | 117,616 | 8.8 |
| Kambia | 134,317 | 5.0 | 60,941 | 4.4 | 73,376 | 5.5 |
| Koinadugu | 165,005 | 6.1 | 79,904 | 5.8 | 85,101 | 6.4 |
| Port Loko | 234,617 | 8.7 | 110,678 | 8.0 | 123,939 | 9.3 |
| Tonkolili | 207,198 | 7.7 | 101,136 | 7.3 | 106,062 | 8.0 |
| Bo | 209,025 | 7.7 | 108,152 | 7.9 | 100,873 | 7.6 |
| Bonthe | 75,823 | 2.8 | 39,751 | 2.9 | 36,072 | 2.7 |
| Moyamba | 133,213 | 4.9 | 63,584 | 4.6 | 69,629 | 5.2 |
| Pujehun | 123,728 | 4.6 | 62,746 | 4.6 | 60,982 | 4.6 |
| Western Area Rural | 167,343 | 6.2 | 92,152 | 6.7 | 75,191 | 5.7 |
| Western Area Urban | 398,142 | 14.7 | 223,203 | 16.2 | 174,939 | 13.2 |
| Total (\%) |  | 100.0 |  | 100.0 |  | 100.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 10.3.1 Economically active population by age

The percentage distribution of the economically active population aged 15 years and above, by age group and sex, is presented in Table 10.4. The proportions for males in the younger age groups, from 15-19 to 30-34, are higher for the females than for the males. The opposite is the case from age groups $35-39$ to 65 plus, where the proportions for males are higher than those for the females. This can clearly be seen in Table 10.5 where cumulative percentages are presented.

Table 10.4 Distribution of economically active population aged 15 years and above by age group and sex

| Age Group | Total |  |  |  |  | Female |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Per cent | Number | Per cent | Number | Per cent |  |
| Total | $2,706,755$ |  | $1,376,508$ |  | $1,330,247$ |  |  |
| $15-19$ | 253,355 | 9.4 | 122,393 | 8.9 | 130,962 | 9.8 |  |
| $20-24$ | 334,692 | 12.4 | 148,008 | 10.8 | 186,684 | 14.0 |  |
| $25-29$ | 435,304 | 16.1 | 201,706 | 14.7 | 233,598 | 17.6 |  |
| $30-34$ | 359,147 | 13.3 | 173,978 | 12.6 | 185,169 | 13.9 |  |
| $35-39$ | 363,682 | 13.4 | 185,145 | 13.5 | 178,537 | 13.4 |  |
| $40-44$ | 262,502 | 9.7 | 143,263 | 10.4 | 119,239 | 9.0 |  |
| $45-49$ | 213,279 | 7.9 | 125,136 | 9.1 | 88,143 | 6.6 |  |
| $50-54$ | 159,763 | 5.9 | 91,381 | 6.6 | 68,382 | 5.1 |  |
| $55-59$ | 91,181 | 3.4 | 53,859 | 3.9 | 37,322 | 2.8 |  |
| $60-64$ | 84,813 | 3.1 | 46,002 | 3.3 | 38,811 | 2.9 |  |
| $65+$ | 149,037 | 5.5 | 85,637 | 6.2 | 63,400 | 4.8 |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census


Table 10.5 Cumulative percentage distribution of economically active population aged 15 years and above by age and sex

|  | Cumulative $\%$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Age Group | Male | Female |
| Total | 8.9 | 9.8 |
| $15-19$ | 19.7 | 23.8 |
| $20-24$ | 34.3 | 41.4 |
| $25-29$ | 46.9 | 55.3 |
| $30-34$ | 60.4 | 68.7 |
| $35-39$ | 79.8 | 77.7 |
| $40-44$ | 86.5 | 84.3 |
| $45-49$ | 90.4 | 99.5 |
| $50-54$ | 93.8 | 95.2 |
| $55-59$ | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| $60-64$ | 149,037 | 5.5 |
| $65+$ |  |  |



Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 10.4 Employed population

### 10.4.1 Employment status

It has already been shown that the employed population, aged 15 years and above, makes up 62 per cent of the economically active population. The employment status categories are listed below:
i. Paid employee
ii. Self-employed without paid employees
iii. Self-employed with employees (employer)
iv. Paid apprentice
v. Unpaid apprentice

The percentage distribution of the employed population aged 15 years and above by employment status is presented in Tables 10.6a and b . More than three-quarters of the whole employed population are self-employed without paid employees. The proportion of males in this category is 73 per cent while that for females is 83 per cent. This implies that more than three-quarters of the employed females are in self-employment without employees.

The proportion of paid employees is 15 per cent of all male employees as against 6 per cent for the females. The proportion of unpaid family workers is only 5 per cent of the total number of the employed population, with relatively small differences between males and females.

It can further be observed in Table 10.6b that in the case of urban and rural areas, almost two-thirds of the employed population are in rural areas. However, three-quarters of the paid employees are in urban areas. The same applies to paid apprentices where 7 out of 10 are found in urban areas. It can also be noted that more than 80 per cent of the unpaid family workers are found in rural areas.

Table 10.6a Distribution of the employed population aged 15 years and above by employment status and sex

|  | Sex |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Employment status | Number | Per cent | Male | Per cent | Female | Per cent |
| Total | $2,594,487$ | 100.0 | $1,305,635$ | 100.0 | $1,288,852$ | 100.0 |
| Paid employee | 271,779 | 10.5 | 198,783 | 15.2 | 72,996 | 5.7 |
| Self-employed without <br> employees | $2,028,958$ | 78.2 | 953,888 | 73.1 | $1,075,070$ | 83.4 |
| Self-employed with <br> employees (employer) | 115,781 | 4.5 | 63,801 | 4.9 | 51,980 | 4.0 |
| Unpaid family worker | 127,357 | 4.9 | 52,700 | 4.0 | 74,657 | 5.8 |
| Paid apprentice | 15,999 | 0.6 | 12,552 | 1.0 | 3,447 | 0.3 |
| Unpaid apprentice | 34,613 | 1.3 | 23,911 | 1.8 | 10,702 | 0.8 |

Table 10.6b Distribution of the employed population aged 15 years and above by employment status and sex

|  |  | Sex |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Employment status | Male | Female | Per cent |
| Total Employed | 50.3 | 49.7 | 100.0 |
| Paid employees | 73.1 | 26.9 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed without <br> employees | 47.0 | 53.0 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed with <br> employees (employer) | 55.1 | 44.9 | 100.0 |
| Unpaid family worker | 78.5 | 21.5 | 100.0 |
| Paid apprentice | 69.1 | 30.9 | 100.0 |
| Unpaid apprentice |  | 58.6 | 100.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Table 10.6c Distribution of the employed population aged 15 years and above by employment status, sex and residence

|  |  | Sex |  |  | Place of residence |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Employment status | Rural | Urban | Total | Rural | Urban | Total |
| Total | 50.3 | 49.7 | 100.0 | 64.6 | 35.4 | 100.0 |
| Paid employee | 73.1 | 26.9 | 100.0 | 22.6 | 77.4 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed without <br> employees | 47.0 | 53.0 | 100.0 | 69.5 | 30.5 | 100.0 |
| Self-employed with <br> employees (employer) | 55.1 | 44.9 | 100.0 | 58.5 | 41.5 | 100.0 |
| Unpaid family worker | 41.4 | 58.6 | 100.0 | 84.8 | 15.2 | 100.0 |
| Paid apprentice | 78.5 | 21.5 | 100.0 | 30.4 | 69.6 | 100.0 |
| Unpaid apprentice | 69.1 | 30.9 | 100.0 | 69.1 | 30.9 | 100.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 10.4.2 Employed population by level of education

The census collected information from all persons aged 15 years and above on the highest level of education completed. Proof of certification was not requested. The results relating to the employed population are summarized in Tables 10.8 to 10.10. The levels of education considered are:
i. No education
ii. Basic school (primary and junior secondary school)
iii. Senior secondary school (SSS)
iv. Vocational/ technical / nursing / teacher training
v. Higher education (first degree), and
vi. Tertiary (postgraduate and PhD)

The proportion of the employed population aged 15 years and above with no education is 64 per cent, with significant differences between males and females (56 and 72 per cent respectively). More than three-quarters of the employed population in rural areas have had no education. The proportion of the employed population, 15 years and above, with completed basic school is 21 per cent, with no significant differences between the sexes. After basic school, the proportions of the employed population at higher levels are 20 and 9 per cent respectively for males and females.

There are significant differences between urban and rural areas. The proportion with no education in rural areas is 77 per cent while that for urban areas is 23 per cent. Likewise, the proportions with basic school education are respectively 27 and 17 per cent. The proportion of the employed population with at least senior secondary school education heavily dominates in the urban areas.


| Selected characteristics | Highest educational level |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex | Total | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { education } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Basic } \\ \text { school } \\ \text { (primary \& } \\ \text { JSS) } \end{gathered}$ | SSS | Voc/ technical/ nursing/ teacher | Higher (first degree) | Tertiary (Postgraduate) and PhD |
| Total | 2,594,487 | 63.6 | 20.5 | 9.1 | 3.0 | 1.6 | 0.6 |
| Male | 1,305,635 | 55.6 | 21.8 | 12.8 | 3.8 | 2.4 | 0.9 |
| Female | 1,288,852 | 71.8 | 19.2 | 5.3 | 2.2 | 0.8 | 0.3 |


| Selected <br> characteristics |  |  |  | Highest educational level |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 10.4.3 Employed population by occupation

Information on the employed population by different occupations is summarized in Tables 10.9a and 10.9 b . The list of all the occupations, which are mutually exclusive, is given below:
i. Legislators and senior officials and managers
ii. Professionals
iii. Technicians and associate professionals
iv. Clerks
v. Service workers and shop and market workers
vi. Agricultural and fishery workers (including farmers, fishermen, animal rearers, hunters, palm wine tappers, poultry workers)
vii. Craft and related trades workers
viii. Plant and machine operators and assemblers
ix. Elementary occupations, and
$x$. Other
Although there are only small differences in the proportions of males and females in the employed population aged 15 years and above for the total country, there are some significant differences with regard to some occupations. These can be seen in Tables 10.9 a and b. Males dominate in all the occupations, except the agricultural-related occupations and the service workers and elementary occupations. With regard to urban-rural differences, almost two- thirds of all those employed reside in the rural areas. Perhaps unsurprisingly, nine out of ten employees in agriculture reside in the rural areas. For all other occupations, more employees are found in the urban areas.

### 10.4.4 Employed population by industry

Information on the employed population aged 15 years and above by industry is presented in Tables 10.10a and 10.10b. It can be noted that crop farming is the dominant industry with 61 per cent of all employed females and 52 per cent of all employed males belong to this industry. With regard to urbanrural comparisons, 80 per cent of employees in rural areas are engaged in this industry, compared to 14 per cent in urban areas.

The repair of motor vehicles is the most dominant industry in urban areas with 36 per cent of the employed population aged 15 years and above. The equivalent proportion in rural areas is 6 per cent. It should be noted that most industries are dominated by male employees, except in crop farming, wholesale and retail trade, accommodation and food service activities, real estate and activities of the household as employees.

Table 10.9a Percentage distribution of the employed population aged 15 years and above by occupation, sex and place of residence
$\left.\begin{array}{lcccccc} & & \text { Sex } & & & \text { Place of residence }\end{array}\right]$ Total

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 10.4.5 Employed population by main employer

Information on the employed population aged 15 years and above by main employer is presented in Table 10.9b More than eight out of ten people are self-employed. The proportions for males and females are both above 80 per cent. In the case of urban and rural areas, the same phenomenon prevails with 74 and 91 per cent of all employed people in urban and rural areas working for themselves.
The government sector is the second biggest employer, with a five per cent share of employees both in urban and rural areas. With regard to proportions of employees by sex, males dominate in all sectors except self-employed and family member.

Table 10.9b Percentage distribution of the employed population aged 15 years and above by occupation, sex and place of residence
$\left.\begin{array}{lcccccc}\hline & & \text { Sex } & & & \text { Place of residence }\end{array}\right]$ Total

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

## EO <br> Table 10.10a Distribution of the employed population aged 15+ years by industry, sex and place of residence

| Industry | Total | Percent | Sex |  | Place of residence |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Male | Female | Rural | Urban |
| Total | 2594487 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Crop Farming | 1461549 | 56.3 | 52.0 | 60.7 | 80.1 | 13.5 |
| Animal production | 31972 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.1 |
| Forestry Logging and Hunting | 17070 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 1.0 |
| Fishing \& Aquaculture | 59023 | 2.3 | 2.9 | 1.7 | 2.3 | 2.1 |


| Industry | Total | Percent | Sex |  | Place of residence |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Male | Female | Rural | Urban |
| Mining and Quarrying | 78609 | 3.0 | 4.7 | 1.4 | 2.8 | 3.5 |
| Manufacturing | 84140 | 3.2 | 3.6 | 2.9 | 2.0 | 5.5 |
| Electricity gas steam \& air conditioning supply | 18109 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 1.5 |
| Water supply; sewerage waste management \& remediation activities | 8249 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.8 |
| Construction | 51671 | 2.0 | 3.7 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 4.5 |
| Wholesale \& Retail Trade Repair of Motor Vehicles and Motorcycles | 423296 | 16.3 | 10.8 | 21.9 | 5.6 | 35.6 |
| Transport and Storage | 62378 | 2.4 | 4.5 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 5.4 |
| Accommodation and food service activities | 24143 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 2.3 |
| Information and Communication | 6720 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
| Financial and Insurance activities | 7788 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
| Real Estate activities | 5837 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.5 |
| Professional scientific \& technical activities | 56537 | 2.2 | 3.2 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 4.9 |
| Administration \& support service activities | 20292 | 0.8 | 1.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 1.8 |
| Public Administration and Defence Compulsory Social Security | 34768 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 3.2 |
| Education | 40094 | 1.5 | 2.1 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 2.9 |
| Human health and social work activities | 26191 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 2.1 |
| Arts entertainment and recreation | 10560 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 1.0 |
| Other service activities | 34490 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 0.3 | 3.2 |
| Activities of household as employers | 26944 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 0.6 | 1.8 |
| Activities of extraterritorial organizations and bodies | 4057 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.4 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Table 10.10b Distribution of the employed population aged $15+$ years by industry, sex and place of residence

| Industry | Sex |  |  | Place of residence |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Rural | Urban | Total |
| Total | 50.3 | 49.7 | 100 | 64.3 | 35.7 | 100 |
| Crop Farming | 46.5 | 53.5 | 100 | 91.4 | 8.6 | 100 |
| Animal production | 51.3 | 48.7 | 100 | 68.6 | 31.4 | 100 |
| Forestry Logging and Hunting | 69.5 | 30.5 | 100 | 47.5 | 52.5 | 100 |
| Fishing \& Aquaculture | 63.5 | 36.5 | 100 | 66.3 | 33.7 | 100 |
| Mining and Quarrying | 77.6 | 22.4 | 100 | 58.5 | 41.5 | 100 |
| Manufacturing | 56.1 | 43.9 | 100 | 39.8 | 60.2 | 100 |
| Electricity gas steam \& air conditioning supply | 78.9 | 21.1 | 100 | 21.5 | 78.5 | 100 |
| Water supply; sewerage waste management \& remediation activities | 77.7 | 22.3 | 100 | 15.4 | 84.6 | 100 |
| Construction | 92.5 | 7.5 | 100 | 19.6 | 80.4 | 100 |
| Wholesale \& Retail Trade Repair of Motor Vehicles and Motorcycles | 33.3 | 66.7 | 100 | 22.2 | 77.8 | 100 |
| Transport and Storage | 94.5 | 5.5 | 100 | 19.4 | 80.6 | 100 |
| Accommodation and food service activities | 31.2 | 68.8 | 100 | 11.8 | 88.2 | 100 |
| Information and Communication | 78.2 | 21.8 | 100 | 7.2 | 92.8 | 100 |
| Financial and Insurance activities | 63.3 | 36.7 | 100 | 7.0 | 93.0 | 100 |
| Real Estate activities | 46.0 | 54.0 | 100 | 17.3 | 82.7 | 100 |
| Professional scientific \& technical activities | 74.7 | 25.3 | 100 | 20.4 | 79.6 | 100 |
| Administration \& support service activities | 81.8 | 18.2 | 100 | 15.9 | 84.1 | 100 |
| Public Administration and Defence Compulsory Social Security | 77.0 | 23.0 | 100 | 15.0 | 85.0 | 100 |
| Education | 68.9 | 31.1 | 100 | 33.8 | 66.2 | 100 |
| Human health and social work activities | 43.9 | 56.1 | 100 | 24.1 | 75.9 | 100 |
| Arts entertainment and recreation | 76.7 | 23.3 | 100 | 16.7 | 83.3 | 100 |
| Other service activities | 53.1 | 46.9 | 100 | 14.7 | 85.3 | 100 |
| Activities of household as employers | 35.6 | 64.4 | 100 | 37.1 | 62.9 | 100 |
| Activities of extraterritorial organizations and bodies | 72.7 | 27.3 | 100 | 10.7 | 89.3 | 100 |

Table 10.11a Percentage distribution of the employed population aged 15+ years by main employer, sex and place of residence

|  | Sex |  |  | Place of residence |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Main Employer | Male | Female | Total | Rural | Urban | Total |
| Total | 100 | 50.3 | 49.7 | 100 | 64.3 | 35.7 |
| Government | 100 | 71.1 | 28.9 | 100 | 23.8 | 76.2 |
| Parastatal / Quasi Government | 100 | 63.7 | 36.3 | 100 | 43.7 | 56.3 |
| Self employed | 100 | 47.5 | 52.5 | 100 | 69.1 | 30.9 |
| International NonGovernmental Org. | 100 | 73.5 | 26.5 | 100 | 28.8 | 71.2 |
| Local Non-Governmental Organization | 100 | 73.7 | 26.3 | 100 | 23.6 | 76.4 |
| Family member | 100 | 42.8 | 57.2 | 100 | 80.5 | 19.5 |
| Private enterprises | 100 | 79.7 | 20.3 | 100 | 19.0 | 81.0 |
| Private household (paid domestic work) | 100 | 58.1 | 41.9 | 100 | 27.5 | 72.5 |
| Embassy or International Organization | 100 | 61.1 | 38.9 | 100 | 29.0 | 71.0 |
| Others | 100 | 76.4 | 23.6 | 100 | 35.4 | 64.6 |
| Don't know | 100 | 57.9 | 42.1 | 100 | 42.3 | 57.7 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census
Table 10.11b Percentage distribution of the employed population aged 15+ years by main employer, sex and place of residence

\left.| Main Employer | Sex |  |  |  |  |  | Place of residence |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |$\right]$ Total

Table 10.11b Percentage distribution of the employed population aged $15+$ years by main employer, sex and place of residence (continued)

| Main Employer | Sex |  |  | Place of residence |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Rural | Urban | Total |
| Embassy or International <br> Organization | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Others | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.6 |
| Don't know | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 10.5 Unemployed Population

Unemployed persons, together with the employed ones, make up the labour force. These are persons who are not working but actively looking for work. It was shown earlier that, according to the population census, unemployed persons aged 15 years and above constitute three per cent of the labour force. Tables 10.14 a and b present the distribution of the unemployed population aged 15 years and above by district, residence and sex. The Western Area Urban district has the highest proportion of the unemployed with 35 per cent. Kambia and Koinadugu districts have the lowest proportions of unemployed persons in the country, with less than 2 per cent in each of the two districts. There are no significant differences in the proportions between males and females. It is worth noting in Table 10.14 b that the proportions of unemployed males are higher than those of unemployed females in all the districts for both urban and rural areas.

## Table 10.14a Percentage distribution of the unemployed population aged 15+ years by district, sex and residence

| District | Place of Residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Country |  |  | Rural |  |  | Urabn |  |  |
|  | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female |
| Total | 112268 | 70873 | 41395 | 27753 | 17047 | 10706 | 84515 | 53826 | 30689 |
| Kailahun | 2.0 | 2.1 | 1.9 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 3.2 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.4 |
| Kenema | 4.8 | 4.8 | 4.7 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.3 | 5.5 | 5.4 | 5.6 |
| Kono | 6.1 | 5.7 | 6.7 | 10.2 | 9.8 | 10.9 | 4.7 | 4.4 | 5.2 |
| Bombali | 7.2 | 7.4 | 6.8 | 12.6 | 13.1 | 11.8 | 5.4 | 5.6 | 5.0 |
| Kambia | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 0.8 |


| District | Place of Residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Country |  |  | Rural |  |  | Urabn |  |  |
|  | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female |
| Port Loko | 7.9 | 8.9 | 6.2 | 10.8 | 12.2 | 8.6 | 7.0 | 7.8 | 5.4 |
| Tonkolili | 5.1 | 5.2 | 4.9 | 11.9 | 12.0 | 11.8 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 2.5 |
| Bo | 5.9 | 5.7 | 6.2 | 8.0 | 8.4 | 7.4 | 5.2 | 4.8 | 5.7 |
| Bonthe | 2.0 | 2.2 | 1.6 | 2.3 | 2.6 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 1.5 |
| Moyamba | 2.0 | 2.1 | 1.8 | 6.6 | 7.1 | 5.8 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.4 |
| Pujehun | 5.5 | 4.9 | 6.6 | 19.2 | 16.5 | 23.4 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 0.7 |
| Western Area Rural | 13.2 | 13.6 | 12.6 | 5.7 | 5.0 | 6.7 | 15.7 | 16.3 | 14.7 |
| Western Area Urban | 35.4 | 34.2 | 37.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 47.0 | 45.1 | 50.3 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census
Table 10.14b Percentage distribution of the unemployed population aged 15+ years by district, sex and residence

| District | Place of Residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All Residences |  |  | Rural |  |  | Urabn |  |  |
|  | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female |
| Total | 112268 | 63.1 | 36.9 | 27753 | 61.4 | 38.6 | 84515 | 63.7 | 36.3 |
| Kailahun | 2289 | 66.5 | 33.5 | 1029 | 67.1 | 32.9 | 1260 | 66.0 | 34.0 |
| Kenema | 5367 | 63.4 | 36.6 | 737 | 66.1 | 33.9 | 4630 | 63.0 | 37.0 |
| Kono | 6800 | 59.2 | 40.8 | 2835 | 58.8 | 41.2 | 3965 | 59.5 | 40.5 |
| Bombali | 8043 | 65.2 | 34.8 | 3497 | 63.9 | 36.1 | 4546 | 66.2 | 33.8 |
| Kambia | 1733 | 69.6 | 30.4 | 766 | 62.9 | 37.1 | 967 | 74.9 | 25.1 | aged 15+ years by district, sex and residence (continued)


| District | Place of Residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All Residences |  |  | Rural |  |  | Urban |  |  |
|  | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female |
| Port Loko | 8877 | 70.9 | 29.1 | 2994 | 69.3 | 30.7 | 5883 | 71.7 | 28.3 |
| Tonkolili | 5722 | 64.8 | 35.2 | 3312 | 61.8 | 38.2 | 2410 | 68.8 | 31.2 |
| Bo | 6587 | 61.2 | 38.8 | 2221 | 64.3 | 35.7 | 4366 | 59.6 | 40.4 |
| Bonthe | 2227 | 70.0 | 30.0 | 652 | 67.9 | 32.1 | 1575 | 70.9 | 29.1 |
| Moyamba | 2236 | 67.1 | 32.9 | 1840 | 66.2 | 33.8 | 396 | 71.5 | 28.5 |
| Pujehun | 6199 | 56.2 | 43.8 | 5319 | 52.8 | 47.2 | 880 | 76.9 | 23.1 |
| Western <br> Area Rural | 14838 | 64.7 | 35.3 | 1579 | 54.3 | 45.7 | 13259 | 66.0 | 34.0 |
| Western <br> Area <br> Urban | 39718 | 61.1 | 38.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 39718 | 61.1 | 38.9 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 10.5.1 Employment status of the unemployed population

Information on the unemployed population aged 15 years and above by employment status is presented in Table 10.15. There are only two categories of employment status for the unemployed. These are:
i. Those who worked before and are currently looking for work, and
ii. Those who are looking for work for the first time.

The proportions of those who are looking for work for the first time heavily outnumber those who have worked before and are currently unemployed. This phenomenon is observed across all the districts and is also the same for both males and females. The Western Area Urban district again leads with the highest proportions for the whole country.

| Districts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Employment status | Total | Kailahun | Kenema | Kono | Bombali | Kambia | Koinadugu | Port Loko |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 112268 | 2289 | 5367 | 6800 | 8043 | 1733 | 1632 | 8877 |
| Worked before but currently looking for work | 19.2 | 21.5 | 17.9 | 15.4 | 16.3 | 13.0 | 16.3 | 15.7 |
| Looking for work for the first time | 80.8 | 78.5 | 82.1 | 84.6 | 83.7 | 87.0 | 83.7 | 84.3 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Worked before but currently looking for work | 21.8 | 22.7 | 21.1 | 19.2 | 19.4 | 14.0 | 18.3 | 17.9 |
| Looking for work for the first time | 78.2 | 77.3 | 78.9 | 80.8 | 80.6 | 86.0 | 81.7 | 82.1 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Worked before but currently looking for work | 14.8 | 18.9 | 12.3 | 10.0 | 10.4 | 10.8 | 13.0 | 10.5 |
| Looking for work for the first time | 85.2 | 81.1 | 87.7 | 90.0 | 89.6 | 89.2 | 87.0 | 89.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |


| Employment status | Districts |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Tonkolili | Bo | Bonthe | Moyamba | Pujehun | Western Area Rural | Western Area Urban |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 5722 | 6587 | 2227 | 2236 | 6199 | 14838 | 39718 |
| Worked before but currently looking for work | 19.1 | 23.7 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 13.8 | 17.6 | 22.9 |
| Looking for work for the first time | 80.9 | 76.3 | 85.0 | 85.0 | 86.2 | 82.4 | 77.1 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Worked before but currently looking for work | 22.0 | 25.7 | 13.7 | 16.7 | 16.3 | 20.1 | 26.1 |
| Looking for work for the first time | 78.0 | 74.3 | 86.3 | 83.3 | 83.7 | 79.9 | 73.9 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Worked before but currently looking for work | 13.8 | 20.5 | 18.0 | 11.6 | 10.7 | 13.1 | 17.9 |
| Looking for work for the first time | 86.2 | 79.5 | 82.0 | 88.4 | 89.3 | 86.9 | 82.1 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 10.6 Economic characteristics of the population aged 10-14 years

The percentage distribution of the population aged 10-14 years by economic activity status is presented in Tables 10.17 a and b. For the country as a whole, those not in the labour force dominate. The same phenomenon applies to all the regions. More than three-quarters of those aged 10-14 years are not in the labour force. The proportion employed is 17 per cent for the total country and ranges from 4 per cent in the Western Region to 22 per cent in the Northern Region. The same pattern can be observed in both urban and rural areas. The Northern Region has the highest proportion of the employed with 47 per cent, while the Western Region has the lowest proportion of 5 per cent. It should be noted that the Western Region Urban has relatively high proportions of employment status categories as compared to the urban areas of the other regions.

| Region/ District/ Place of residence | Sex/ Economic activity status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Both Sexes |  |  |  | Male |  |  |  |
|  | Total | Employed | Unemployed | Not in labour force | Total | Employed | Unemployed | Not in labour force |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 846137 | 16.8 | 0.7 | 82.4 | 430883 | 18.4 | 0.8 | 80.9 |
| Eastern | 204173 | 18.3 | 0.5 | 81.2 | 104075 | 20.2 | 0.5 | 79.3 |
| Northern | 305679 | 22.0 | 0.7 | 77.4 | 161087 | 22.5 | 0.7 | 76.8 |
| Southern | 169936 | 18.5 | 0.7 | 80.7 | 87877 | 21.3 | 0.8 | 78.0 |
| Western | 166349 | 3.9 | 1.2 | 95.0 | 77844 | 4.1 | 1.3 | 94.6 |
| District |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 846137 | 16.8 | 0.7 | 82.4 | 430883 | 18.4 | 0.8 | 80.9 |
| Kailahun | 67127 | 17.7 | 0.4 | 81.9 | 34964 | 19.2 | 0.4 | 80.4 |
| Kenema | 71638 | 17.8 | 0.3 | 81.8 | 36144 | 20.9 | 0.3 | 78.8 |
| Kono | 65408 | 19.4 | 0.8 | 79.8 | 32967 | 20.4 | 0.8 | 78.8 |
| Bombali | 73865 | 15.2 | 0.6 | 84.2 | 38412 | 15.8 | 0.7 | 83.5 |
| Kambia | 39523 | 21.0 | 0.6 | 78.4 | 21006 | 20.7 | 0.6 | 78.6 |
| Koinadugu | 57254 | 36.1 | 0.4 | 63.5 | 30339 | 37.0 | 0.5 | 62.6 |
| Port Loko | 72666 | 15.6 | 0.7 | 83.8 | 38130 | 15.7 | 0.7 | 83.6 |
| Tonkolili | 62371 | 25.1 | 0.9 | 74.0 | 33200 | 25.9 | 0.9 | 73.2 |
| Bo | 67390 | 14.6 | 0.3 | 85.1 | 33692 | 17.1 | 0.3 | 82.6 |
| Bonthe | 23291 | 23.1 | 0.4 | 76.6 | 12212 | 26.5 | 0.5 | 73.0 |
| Moyamba | 35102 | 23.6 | 0.4 | 76.0 | 18864 | 26.5 | 0.4 | 73.1 |
| Pujehun | 44153 | 18.1 | 1.8 | 80.1 | 23109 | 20.3 | 1.9 | 77.8 |
| Western Area Rural | 50934 | 5.1 | 1.4 | 93.5 | 24516 | 5.6 | 1.6 | 92.9 |
| Western <br> Area <br> Urban | 115415 | 3.3 | 1.1 | 95.6 | 53328 | 3.4 | 1.2 | 95.4 |
| Place of Residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 846137 | 3.3 | 1.1 | 95.6 | 430883 | 18.4 | 0.8 | 80.9 |
| Rural | 498240 | 25.1 | 0.6 | 74.3 | 265084 | 26.4 | 0.6 | 73.0 |
| Urban | 347897 | 5.0 | 0.9 | 94.1 | 165799 | 5.5 | 1.0 | 93.5 |


| Region/ <br> District/ Place <br> of residence |  | Sex/ Economic activity status |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Table 10.17b Percentage distribution of the population aged $10-14$ years by economic activity status, region, district and residence

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 10.17b Percentage distribution of the population aged $10-14$ years by economic activity status, region, district and residence (continued)

| Region/ District/ Place of residence | Sex/ Economic activity status |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Female |  |  |
|  | Total | Employed | Unemployed | Not in labour force |
| Region |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 415254 | 63400 | 2858 | 348996 |
| Eastern | 24.1 | 25.8 | 17.6 | 23.8 |
| Northern | 34.8 | 48.9 | 30.9 | 32.3 |
| Southern | 19.8 | 20.2 | 19.1 | 19.7 |
| Western | 21.3 | 5.1 | 32.4 | 24.2 |
| District |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 415254 | 63400 | 2858 | 348996 |
| Kailahun | 7.7 | 8.2 | 3.8 | 7.7 |
| Kenema | 8.5 | 8.2 | 4.2 | 8.6 |
| Kono | 7.8 | 9.4 | 9.5 | 7.5 |
| Bombali | 8.5 | 8.2 | 6.3 | 8.6 |
| Kambia | 4.5 | 6.2 | 3.7 | 4.1 |
| Koinadugu | 6.5 | 14.9 | 3.7 | 5.0 |
| Port Loko | 8.3 | 8.4 | 7.5 | 8.3 |
| Tonkolili | 7.0 | 11.2 | 9.5 | 6.2 |
| Bo | 8.1 | 6.4 | 3.6 | 8.5 |
| Bonthe | 2.7 | 3.4 | 1.2 | 2.6 |
| Moyamba | 3.9 | 5.2 | 1.9 | 3.7 |
| Pujehun | 5.1 | 5.2 | 12.4 | 5.0 |
| Western Area Rural | 6.4 | 1.9 | 10.8 | 7.1 |
| Western Area Urban | 15.0 | 3.1 | 21.6 | 17.0 |
| Place of Residence |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 415254 | 63400 | 2858 | 348996 |
| Rural | 56.1 | 86.9 | 48.6 | 50.6 |
| Urban | 43.9 | 13.1 | 51.4 | 49.4 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015
Population and Housing Census

### 10.7 Conclusion

This analytical report on economic characteristics is based on the data collected during the Sierra Leon 2015 Population and Housing Census. It has not been possible to make any comparisons with the last censuses due to age differences of the target population group under consideration. This report has attempted to highlight the economic characteristics of the population aged 10 years and above, but with emphasis on those aged at least 15 years. It provides a picture of the situation at the time of the census. It does not provide any explanations or answers on why or how, since such detailed information was not collected. However, the inter-censal demographic and health surveys usually collect such detailed information and may provide some answers.

## Summary

Information on economic activity targeted all persons aged 10 years and above. The reference period relating to economic activity was 12 months prior to the census.

The economic characteristics of the population include, among other things, labour force, employment and unemployment.

The labour force is made up of the employed and the unemployed.

Economically active persons are those aged 15 years and above engaged in any economic activity, either as paid employees, self-employed, unpaid family workers and those looking for work.

Economically inactive persons are those aged 15 years and above who are neither working nor looking for work, full-time student, retired/ pensioner, totally impaired, or caring for family members.

An employed person is one aged 15 years and above who did any work regularly during the month prior to the census.

An unemployed person is one aged 15 years and above who is not working, available for work, and
or actively looking for work.
Employment status is classified as paid employee, self-employed and unpaid family worker.

Paid employee is one working for others and is paid in cash or in kind.

Self-employed is one working for himself/herself. The economic activity status of the population aged 15 years and above is made up of the employed, unemployed and those not in the labour force. According to the census, 62 per cent were employed, 3 per cent unemployed and 35 per cent not in the labour force. There were slight differences between males and females. In the case of the employed, the proportion of employed males was 65 per cent compared to 60 per cent for females. For the unemployed, the proportion for males was 4 per cent while that for females was 2 per cent. With regard to those not in the labour force, the proportions for males and females were 32 and 38 per cent respectively.

In the economically active population, the proportions by region range from 20 to 36 per cent respectively for the Southern and Northern regions with slight differences between males and females. At district level, the percentages of economically active population are all in one-digit figures except for the Western Area Urban where it is 15 .

The distribution of the economically active population by age group and sex indicate that the proportions for males in the younger age groups, 15-34, are higher for males than for females, while the opposite is the case for the older age groups. The Refined Activity Rate, an indicator of the level and extent of employment, which relates the labour force to the population in the working age, is higher for males than for females in all the districts except Konaidugu.

## On the employed population:

More than three-quarters of this population are self-employed without employees. Twothirds of them are in rural areas.

Three-quarters of the paid employed population are in urban areas. Nearly twothirds of the paid employees have no education - there is significant difference between males and females.

More than three-quarters of employed population in rural areas have no education.

Nearly six out of ten of all employed persons are agricultural and fishery workers.

Crop farming is the dominant industry with 56 per cent of all employees, 61 and 52 per cent of males and females respectively.

Between eight and nine out of ten employees are self-employed.

The Western Area Urban district has the highest proportion of the unemployed with 35 per cent. Kambia and Konaidugu districts have the lowest proportions of below 2 per cent each.

The proportion of those looking for work for the first time heavily outnumbers those who have worked before. Most children aged 1014 , are not in the labour force.

## CHAPTER 11:HOUSING CONDITIONS

### 11.1 Introduction

Since independence in 1961, the Government of Sierra Leone has taken responsibility for providing its people with adequate housing. It continued pre-independence programmes but also introduced new initiatives of its own. This is evidenced by the numerous plans, policies and programmes for housing development in the country. Notable ones include: The Kissy Low-Cost Housing Estate (1957 to 1963); the 1963 Borys Plan; the 1974 National Plan and the Five Year National Development Plan; the establishment of the Sierra Leone Housing Corporation (SALHOC), with responsibility for a low-cost housing scheme; the 2003 Vision 2025 (Sierra Leone Government, 2006, p.6); the 2006 Revised National Housing Policy; and the Sierra Leone National Housing Programme (20062016).

The genesis of these policies and programmes, the philosophy behind them, the roles played by government, local and international institutions have been documented, and their impact assessed and well-articulated by Rogers (2012). However he does note the lack of detailed data for a thorough evaluation.

Data collection on housing started as far back as 1985, when questions on housing conditions were first included in the population census. Due to the civil war, there was no census in 1990, but in the 2004 Census these questions were expanded. The current (2015) census has again seen further enhancement in the data items collected. These data are essential for evaluation of government plans on housing.

### 11.2 Data sources and limitations of study

The 2015 Census data on housing conditions were provided by Statistics Sierra Leone (SSL), while data for 1985 and 2004 were obtained from census reports for the respective years. The detailed items of information collected in each census are shown in Table 11.1. In 1985, only six data items, mainly on characteristics of dwelling unit (see table) were collected.

Subsequent censuses collected new data items (including type of dwelling unit, repair needs of dwelling unit and number of rooms) and more detailed data on some existing items such as water. In 2015, information was sought on sources of water supply for drinking and also for domestic use. In the previous censuses, data had only been collected on source of water supply and source of drinking water in 1985 and 2004 respectively. These additional data items provide the opportunity for a more detailed assessment of the housing conditions and quality of life of the population. This information has obvious implications for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes aimed at improving living standards. The report analyses and discusses housing characteristics of households by region and place of residence. Trend analysis over the 30 year period $(1985,2004$ and 2015) for the entire country is attempted wherever the data permit (data are available and definitions have remained consistent).

| Data item | Census Year |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1985 | 2004 | 2015 |
| Type of dwelling unit |  | + | $=$ |
| Tenure status | \# | + | $=$ |
| Repair needs of dwelling unit |  | + | $=$ |
| Number of rooms occupied by household |  | + | $=$ |
| Beds with mosquito nets |  | + | $=$ |
| Major materials for construction of dwelling unit, roof, wall, floor | \# | + | $=$ |
| Method of refuse disposal |  | + | $=$ |
| Principal supply of fuel for cooking | \# | + | = |
| Principal supply of fuel for lighting | \# | + | = |
| Principal source of water supply | \# |  |  |
| Principal source of water supply for drinking |  | + | = |
| Principal source of water supply for household use |  |  | = |
| Type of toilet facility | \# | + | $=$ |
| Type of bathing facility |  | $+$ | $=$ |
| Household main source of information |  | + | $=$ |
| Distance of household from nearest |  |  |  |
| Health facility |  | + | = |
| Primary school |  | + | $=$ |
| Source of water |  | + | $=$ |

\#: Data item collected in 1985
+: Data item collected in 2004
=: Data item collected in 2015

Source: Compiled from 1985, 2004 and 2015 Census Questionnaires. The Analytical Report, 1985 PHC, Sierra Leone, Central Statistics Office. Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015.

### 11.3 Definition of concepts

Dwelling unit refers to the space occupied by a household - its living quarters. A living quarter is a structurally separate and independent place of abode. It could be a building or some form of space or shelter arranged for human habitation which was occupied at the time of the census (for example, a hut or group of huts). Different types of dwelling units were identified and defined as follows:

- Separate house: a building consisting of a single detached housing unit (two or single storey) or a single detached living quarter.
- Semi-detached house: a single housing unit attached to another single housing unit. The adjoining housing units would usually have a common dividing wall which extends from ground to roof. Row houses are included in this category. This could be single or storey building.
- Flat/apartment: a dwelling/living quarters located in a building, which contains several sets of housing units. The flat/apartment building usually consists of several floors. The housing units are accessed by a common stairway.
- Compound house (rooms): living quarters (room or set of rooms) which are located within a compound, typically referred to as compound house. (A compound need not be surrounded by a wall, fence or hedge).
- Huts/buildings: living quarters made up of a group of huts or buildings which are being used as the place of abode by one or more households. They may be located on the same compound or on different compounds.
- Tent: a moveable shelter made of cloth supported by a framework of poles and ropes, used especially by campers, Red Cross men/ women or refugees.
- Improvised home (for example, kiosk/ container): an improvised housing unit is an independent makeshift shelter or structure built of materials such as wood, metal, cardboard or plastic sheets and without a predetermined plan, for the purpose of habitation, which is used as living quarters. Included in this category are squatters' huts, kiosks, containers as well as any similar premises arranged and used as living quarters, which does not comply with generally accepted standards of habitation. This type of housing unit is usually found in urban and suburban areas, particularly at the peripheries of principal cities.
- Uncompleted building: a building or structure that has not been completed but which provides shelter for some households.
- Living quarters attached to/inside work units such as shops or offices: housing units that are located in buildings that have not been built or constructed for human habitation but which are actually in use as living quarters at the time of the census. They include housing units in corn milling structures, warehouses, offices and shops. Premises that have been converted for human habitation, although not initially designed/constructed for this purpose, must not be included in this category, for example, an old school block or cocoa shed that has been converted into living quarters.
- Other (specify): if a type of dwelling/living quarters does not fall into any of the above categories it must be noted in this space. Dilapidated buildings marked for demolition but which are still inhabited, caves and other natural shelters fall within this category.
- Rooms occupied include sleeping rooms and the sitting rooms (parlour). They do not include kitchens or stores.
- A household is defined as a person or group of persons who normally eat and live together and recognize a particular person as the head. A household may occupy a whole building, part of a building or many buildings. A man with several wives might maintain separate living quarters for his wives and their children. In such cases each wife and her children should be enumerated as a separate household.


### 11.4 Housing stock

The number of houses available for the population and its growth over time provides information for assessing the effectiveness of housing policies. Table 11.2 presents data on the housing stock, households and household characteristics. There was a total of 801,417 houses in the country in 2015. One third of these houses were in the Northern Region, despite it having the lowest population density of 70 persons per square kilometre. The percentages of housing stock were evenly distributed, about 23, 22 and 21 for Southern, Eastern and Western regions respectively. The Western Region had the lowest proportion of houses, even though it was the most densely populated with 2,693 persons per square kilometre. This is indicative of acute housing needs in this region.

The distribution by place of residence shows that 61 per cent of houses were in rural areas with 39 per cent in urban areas. A similar but more pronounced variation is observed in the ruralurban distribution of houses in the regions. The percentages were 67.9, 76.2 and 82.6 for rural areas in Eastern, Northern and Southern regions respectively, with the Western Region being the exception. Only four per cent of houses in the Western Region were in rural locations.

Over the 30 year period, the number of households has more than doubled (261 per cent). It increased from 485,711 in 1985 to 819,848 in 2004 and to $1,265,468$ in 2015. The average household size for the country however declined consistently from 6.6 in 1985, to 6.0 in 2004 and 5.6 in 2015. The average household size for the regions did not differ much from the national average apart from the Western Region which recorded the smallest average household size of 4.7.

## 토옹 <br> Table 11.2 Number of houses, households and household characteristics by region

| Household characteristics | Total country |  |  | Household characteristics | Place of Residence 2015 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1985 | 2004 | 2015 |  | Rural | Urban |
| Total population | 3,515,812 | 4,976,871 | 7,092,113 | Total population | 4,187,016 | 2,905,097 |
| Total household population | 3,211,239 | 4,930,532 | 7,076,119 | Total household population | 4,182,612 | 2,893,507 |
| Number of houses |  |  | 801,417 | Number of houses | 485,616 | 315,801 |
| Number of households | 485,711 | 819,848 | 1,265,468 | Number of households | 697,734 | 567,734 |
| Rural houses |  |  | 485,616 | Rural houses | 485,616 | N/A |
| Percentage of land area | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | Percentage of land area | N/A | N/A |
| Population density (persons per km sq.) | 49.0 | 69.0 | 99.0 | Population density (persons per km sq.) | N/A | N/A |
| Percentage distribution of houses | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | Percentage distribution of houses | 60.6 | 39.4 |
| Rural share of housing stock | * | * | 60.6 | Rural share of housing stock | 100 | 0 |
| Households per house | * | * | 1.6 | Households per house | 1.4 | 1.8 |
| Average household size | 6.60 | 6.00 | 5.6 | Average household size | 6 | 5.1 |
| Average (mean) persons per house | * | * | 8.8 | Average (mean) persons per house | 8.6 | 9.2 |

N/A Not applicable. * Data not available.
Sources: [1] Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census.
[2] Statistics Sierra Leone (2006), Final Results. 2002 Population and Housing Census
[3] Statistics Sierra Leone, Republic of Sierra Leone, 2004 Population and Housing
Census. Analytical Report on Housing Situation and Characteristics
[4] Central Statistics Office, The Analytical Report. 1985 Population and Housing Census, Sierra Leone

Table 11.2 Number of houses, households and household characteristics by region (continued)

| Household <br> characteristics |  | Region 2015 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastern | Northern | Southern | Western |
| Total population | $1,642,370$ | $2,508,201$ | $1,441,308$ | $1,500,234$ |
| Total household <br> population | $1,640,592$ | $2,502,583$ | $1,439,165$ | $1,493,779$ |
| Number of <br> houses | 174,687 | 275,225 | 182,075 | 169,430 |
| Number of <br> households | 281,201 | 414,377 | 248,655 | 321,235 |
| Rural houses | 118,689 | 209,749 | 150,320 | 6,858 |
| Percentage of <br> land area | 21.7 | 50.0 | 27.5 |  |
| Population <br> density (persons <br> per km sq.) | 106.00 | 70.0 | 73.0 | 0.8 |
| Percentage <br> distribution of <br> houses | 21.8 | 34.3 | 22.7 | 269.3 |
| Rural share of <br> housing stock | 67.9 | 76.2 | 82.6 | 21.1 |
| Households per <br> house | 1.6 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 4 |
| Average <br> household size | 5.8 | 6.0 | 5.8 | 1.9 |
| Average (mean) <br> persons per <br> house | 9.4 | 9.1 | 7.9 | 4.7 |

N/A Not applicable. * Data not available. Sources:
[1] Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census.
[2] Statistics Sierra Leone (2006), Final Results. 2002 Population and Housing Census
[3] Statistics Sierra Leone, Republic of Sierra Leone, 2004 Population and Housing Census. Analytical Report on Housing Situation and Characteristics [4] Central Statistics Office, The Analytical Report. 1985 Population and Housing Census, Sierra Leone

### 11.5 Type of dwelling unit, tenure and current repair needs

### 11.5.1 Type of dwelling unit

More than half ( 54.2 per cent) of the dwelling units were separate houses, one fifth ( 20.6 per cent) were flats/apartments, one in 10 ( 10.4 per cent) were compound houses and seven per cent were semi-detached houses (Table 11.3). Households living in improvised homes constituted 2.2 per cent and those in uncompleted buildings were 0.7 per cent of all households.

A comparison of the 2015 and 2004 data is not possible because of differences in definition of "type" of dwelling unit in the two censuses. In 2004, type of dwelling was defined by number of units and number of storeys in the dwelling unit namely (single unit, one storey; multiple unit, one storey; single unit, two-storey; multiple unit, two-storey; single unit, three or more storey; multiple unit, three of more storey) which is different from the categories for type of dwelling units in the 2015 Census.

Table 11.3 Type of dwelling unit by region and place of residence

| Type of dwelling |  |  | Region |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Eastern | Northern | Southern | Western | Rural | Urban |
| Number | $1,265,468$ | 281,201 | 414,377 | 248,655 | 321,235 | 697,734 | 567,734 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Separate house | 54.2 | 65.8 | 61.3 | 65.0 | 26.3 | 67.6 | 37.7 |
| Semi-detached <br> house | 7.0 | 6.6 | 4.9 | 5.6 | 11.3 | 4.5 | 10.2 |
| Flat/apartment | 20.6 | 14.4 | 18.6 | 17.0 | 31.7 | 15.1 | 27.4 |
| Compound <br> house (rooms) | 10.4 | 8.2 | 7.1 | 7.4 | 18.8 | 5.5 | 16.3 |
| Huts/buildings <br> (same com- <br> pound) | 2.4 | 1.8 | 3.2 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.8 | 2.0 |
| Huts/buildings <br> (different com- <br> pound) | 1.4 | 1.6 | 2.3 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 2.4 | 0.2 |
| Tent | 0.8 | 0.6 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 0.5 |
| Improvised <br> home (kiosk <br> container board <br> pan-body) | 2.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 7.5 | 0.3 | 4.5 |
| Uncompleted <br> building | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 1.0 |
| Other | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |

Sources:
[1] Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census.
[2] Statistics Sierra Leone. (2006) Final Results, 2004 Population and Housing Census.
[3] Statistics Sierra Leone, Republic of Sierra Leone, 2004 Population and Housing Census. Analytical Report on Housing Situation and Characteristics
[4] Central Statistics Office, The Analytical Report. 1985 Population and Housing Census of Sierra Leone.

### 11.5.2 Tenure

Tenure provides security of abode and peace of mind. Data on tenure are available for 1985, 2004 and 2015 population and housing censuses. Tenure status and current repair needs by region, place of residence and census year are shown in Table 11.4. The table shows that in 2015, the two leading types were owner occupier (71.1 per cent) and renting (23.8 per cent). Employer-provided housing contributed less than two per cent of accommodation needs of the population in 2015. The pattern of tenure status has been erratic over the 30 year period.

Table 11.4 shows that in 2015, 48.7 per cent of households owned and constructed the houses they lived in while 20.3 per cent of households owned but inherited their homes. Purchased homes accounted for a small proportion of 2.1 per cent. Owner-constructed houses was the only category that showed a consistent increase over the 30-year period, with 44.6 per cent, 45.5 per cent and 48.7 per cent in 1985, 2004 and 2015 respectively. The percentage of households renting private accommodation decreased from 25.8 in 1985 to 17.2 in 2004 and increased to 20.9 in 2015. Most of the renting was done on a private basis, with government and the housing corporation contributing a small fraction (less than one per cent) except for 2015 when the share of the housing corporation increased to 2.2 per cent.

The regional pattern is not different from the national, except for the Western Region, where more than half ( 54.1 per cent) of the households were renting and were doing so privately (48.8 per cent). The Western Region also had the highest proportion ( 3.6 per cent) of its dwelling units being rental units belonging to the housing corporation. The percentage of owner-occupied houses in the Western Region (38.9 per cent) was about half of the percentage for the other three regions, but had the highest percentage of owner-purchased (3.7 per cent) and employer provided ( 2.7 per cent) homes.

There are wide variations in tenure status by place of residence. In the rural areas, the percentage of owner-occupied was over 90 per cent compared to less than 50 per cent in the urban areas; whilst nearly half ( 46.1 per cent) of urban households were renting, less than 6 per cent did the same in the rural areas.

The repair needs of dwelling units provide an indication of their condition. The data in Table 11.4 suggest that the condition of homes in 2015 was better than in 2004. The proportion of households in dwelling units that required any repairs nearly doubled (increased from 10 percent in 2004 to 19 percent in 2015). The percentage of households that required minor repairs declined from 59 to 49.3, while units needing major repairs or rehabilitation increased by nearly 6 per cent ( 24 per cent in 2004 to 29.8
per cent in 2015); and dwelling units that needed reconstruction declined from 8 per cent in 2004 to 1.3 per cent in 2015.

Table 11.4 also shows the repair needs of dwelling units in the regions. The percentages of household dwelling units with several types of repair needs were almost the same in the three regions with the Western Region being the exception. The percentage of households living in dwelling units requiring no repairs in the Western Region was 33 per cent which was more than double that for Eastern, Northern and Southern regions ( 13 per cent, 15 per cent and 14 per cent respectively). For units requiring minor and major repairs, the Western Region had lower percentages than the other three regions although the differences were less pronounced.

Table 11.4 shows that dwelling units of urban households were in a better condition than those of rural households. The percentage of dwelling units for rural households (11.2 per cent) that did not require any repairs was less than half the percentage for urban household dwelling units ( 28.5 per cent) in the same category. The percentage of dwelling units requiring major repairs or rehabilitation was higher for rural households than for urban households by 14.5 percentage points. The percentage of dwelling units requiring reconstruction was also higher for rural households by 0.2 percentage points.

Table 11.4 Tenure status and current repair needs by region and place of residence

| Ownership <br> status/repair <br> needs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Table 11.4 Tenure status and current repair needs by region and place of residence (continued)

| Ownership status/repair needs | Region 2015 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastern | Northern | Southern | Western |
| Number | 281,201 | 414,377 | 248,655 | 321,235 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Owner | 78.4 | 84.5 | 82.3 | 38.9 |
| Ownerpurchased | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 3.7 |
| Ownerconstructed | 53.3 | 62.5 | 53.6 | 23.2 |
| Owner-inherited | 23.6 | 20.5 | 27.1 | 12.0 |
| Employer provided | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 2.7 |
| Employergovernment | 0.8 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.5 |
| Employer-private | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 1.1 |
| Employer-para-statal/quasigovernment | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Renting | 17.7 | 10.8 | 13.4 | 54.1 |
| Renting government | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 1.5 |
| Renting housing corporation | 1.9 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 3.6 |
| Renting private | 15.2 | 8.7 | 11.5 | 48.8 |
| Renting-para-statal/quasigovernment | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Other | 2.6 | 3.1 | 2.6 | 4.3 |
| Squatter | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.9 |
| Other | 2.1 | 2.4 | 2.1 | 3.4 |
| Repair needs |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| No repairs | 13.2 | 14.9 | 14.2 | 33.0 |
| Minor repairs | 52.2 | 50.3 | 50.9 | 44.5 |
| Major repairs/ rehabilitation | 33.3 | 32.6 | 33.3 | 20.3 |
| Reconstruction | 1.0 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 1.6 |
| Not stated | 0.4 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.6 |

Category not used
Data not collected in 1985
Sources:
[1] Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census.
[2] Statistics Sierra Leone. (2006) Final Results. 2002 Population and Housing Census
[3] Statistics Sierra Leone, Republic of Sierra Leone, 2004 Population and Housing Census. Analytical Report on Housing Situation and Characteristics
[4] Central Statistics Office, The Analytical Report. 1985 Population and Housing Census, Sierra Leone

### 11.6 Room occupancy and beds with mosquito nets

### 11.6.1 Room occupancy

A critical index of overcrowding is the number of sleeping rooms households occupy. The World Health Organization (WHO) defines overcrowding as "the situation in which more people are living within a single dwelling than there is space for, so that movement is restricted, privacy secluded, hygiene impossible, rest and sleep difficult".

The effects of overcrowding are also well documented: increased physical contact, lack of sleep, lack of privacy, poor hygiene practices and an inability to care adequately for sick household members. Risks due to overcrowding may be classified as physical (spread of infectious diseases), psychological (frustration, anxiety), social (violence) and high morbidity and mortality (USDHUD, 2007).

One of the common indicators of overcrowding is persons per room (PPR). The most often reported standard for PPR is more than 1.5. Table 11.5 gives a PPR of 2.1 for the whole country, with the Northern Region having the lowest (1.8) while the Eastern Region had the highest (2.3). These results are indicative of overcrowding in the entire country with its attendant risks.

Another measure of overcrowding is what the United Nations Stats Millennium Indicator calls 'sufficient living area': "a house is considered to provide a sufficient living area for the household members if not more than three people share the same habitable (minimum of four square meters) room". Using this indicator, 76.2 per cent of households had sufficient living area. It is important to note that this indicator was calculated on the basis of number of rooms available to each household. The size of the room could not be considered because the information was not collected in the 2015 Census. The definition of "habitable" was also not considered in the collection of the data. These limitations of the data may account for the rather high proportion of 76.2 per cent of households observed for this indicator.

Nearly 30 per cent of households occupied one room, one in four occupied two rooms and 18 per cent occupied three rooms. Given an average household size of 5.6 persons, this suggests living conditions are not ideal. The Western Region had the highest proportions of households in fewer rooms, while the Northern Region had less overcrowding. Urban households also appeared to be more constrained than rural households. About 38 per cent of urban households occupied single rooms, compared to 23 per cent for rural households.

Table 11.5 Persons per room and distribution of households by number of rooms, region and place of residence

| Persons per room/ number of rooms |  | Region |  |  |  | Place of residence |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Eastern | Northern | Southern | Western | Rural | Urban |
| Persons per room | 2.1 | 2.3 | 1.8 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.0 | 2.1 |
| No. of households | 1,265,468 | 281,201 | 414,377 | 248,655 | 321,235 | 697,734 | 567,734 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| No. of rooms |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 29.3 | 29.7 | 19.2 | 28.4 | 42.5 | 22.5 | 37.5 |
| 2 | 25.7 | 27.5 | 23.0 | 25.1 | 28.0 | 25.0 | 26.5 |
| 3 | 18.2 | 19.1 | 18.0 | 21.9 | 14.8 | 20.4 | 15.5 |
| 4 | 12.8 | 13.3 | 15.1 | 14.0 | 8.4 | 15.0 | 10.0 |
| 5 | 7.0 | 6.0 | 10.9 | 6.4 | 3.3 | 8.7 | 4.9 |
| 6 | 3.9 | 2.5 | 7.5 | 2.5 | 1.4 | 4.9 | 2.6 |
| 7 | 1.6 | 0.9 | 3.3 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 1.9 | 1.3 |
| 8 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 1.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.7 |
| 9 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 |
| 10 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| 10+ | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 |

### 11.6.2 Ownership of mosquito nets

Malaria is endemic in West Africa and is one of the leading causes of morbidity and mortality (especially among children under 5 years) and of complications in pregnancy in the region. Bennett et. al. (2012) have shown that Sierra Leone is no different in this regard. About half of all health institutional outpatient visits and 38 per cent of hospital admissions are due to malaria. The disease also accounts for 38 per cent of under-five mortality, and one in four of all-age mortality.

The use of mosquito nets, especially insecticide treated nets (ITN) or impregnated mosquito nets (IMN) has been shown to reduce malaria cases in many countries in sub-Saharan Africa (Bennett et. al., 2012). Consequently, malaria intervention programmes such as the Roll Back Malaria Partnership has encouraged widespread use of these nets by the entire population, through free mass distribution. Data on beds with impregnated nets are essential for an evaluation of the impact of this and other programmes.

Data on beds and use of mosquito nets are presented in Tables 11.6. It shows that 40 per cent of beds were in the Northern region with the rest nearly evenly distributed among the other three regions. Rural households accounted for almost 62 per cent of beds. More than half ( 56 per cent) of all beds in the country had an IMN, while one in four ( 26.4 per cent) had no nets all. About 18 per cent had regular nets.

Table 11.6 shows that the Southern Region had the highest use ( 71 percent) of IMN and the lowest proportion ( 14 percent) of beds with no nets. The Western Region recorded the lowest (37 per cent) percentage of beds with IMN and the highest proportion ( 46 per cent) of beds with no mosquito nets. There are also differences by place of residence in the use of mosquito nets. The proportion of urban households without an IMN ( 35 per cent) was one and a half times that of rural households (21 per cent). Sixty two per cent of rural households used an IMN compared to 47 per cent of urban households. The higher levels of ownership among rural households could be down to a campaign in November 2010 which targeted groups with a higher burden of the disease, including rural areas (Bennett et. al., 2012).

## 启

Table 11.6 Distribution of beds and use of mosquito nets by region and place of residence

| Persons per room/ number of rooms |  | Region |  |  |  | Place of residence |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Eastern | Northern | Southern | Western | Rural | Urban |
| Total beds | 3,477,635 | 745,825 | 1,397,262 | 687,906 | 646,642 | 2,143,902 | 1,333,733 |
| Percentage | 100.0 | 21.5 | 40.2 | 19.8 | 18.6 | 61.7 | 38.4 |
| Mosquito net status of beds as percentage of total beds |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Impregnated | 56.0 | 60.6 | 54.9 | 71.1 | 37.1 | 61.7 | 47.0 |
| Regular | 17.6 | 18.7 | 18.5 | 14.9 | 17.0 | 17.5 | 17.7 |
| Beds with no nets | 26.4 | 20.7 | 26.6 | 14.0 | 45.9 | 20.9 | 35.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015
Population and Housing Census

Table 11.7 shows the percentages of households that own each type and the number of such nets. About 32 per cent do not own an IMN, while one in four households own one IMN. The general pattern is that the biggest proportion of households own no net, followed by ownership of one net, then two and so on - with the smallest proportion of households owning five or more than five nets. The Southern Region and rural areas show a slight deviation from this general pattern. In these areas, the proportion of households owning one impregnated mosquito net is higher than the proportion of households that do not own any of such nets at all. Apart from this, both areas also follow the general pattern noted above.

| Number of <br> mosquito nets |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

### 11.7 Major materials for construction of roof, wall and floor

Materials used for the construction of the roof, walls and floor provide an indication of the quality of housing and the extent to which they provide adequate shelter from harsh environmental conditions and the vagaries of the weather.

### 11.7.1 Materials for roof

A roof provides protection to the structure and to those living inside it. The ability of a roof to perform these functions effectively depends on the type of materials used. Table 11.8 shows that zinc and thatch are the main materials used for roofing in the country and account for more than 90 per cent of household dwelling units in both 2004 and 2015. The quality of materials used for roofing improved between 2004 and 2015. There was an increase in the proportion of households using zinc from 64.9 per cent in 2004 to 81.8 per cent in 2015 and a decline in proportion of households using thatch from 25.9 per cent to 12.8 per cent in 2004 and 2015 respectively.

In the Eastern, Northern and Southern regions zinc and thatch were the dominant types of materials used, accounting for over 95 per cent in each region. The Southern Region had the lowest proportion of households using zinc and the highest proportion using thatch. The Western Region, on the other hand, had nine out of 10 households using zinc, about 5 per cent using concrete, nearly 3 per cent using asbestos and a very small proportion ( 0.4 per cent) using thatch.

The differences between urban and rural choices of roof were marked. Although zinc was still the leading type of material used by both rural ( 73.3 per cent) and urban ( 92.2 per cent) households, thatch roofs were rare ( 0.7 per cent) in urban households, compared to one in four ( 22.6 per cent) in rural households. Concrete and asbestos were also used in urban areas.

### 11.7.2 Materials for wall

The functions of a wall are three fold; to control, support and distribute utilities. The walls control rain water penetration, light, heat flow, solar radiation, ground water, fire, noise, entrance of animals, bugs and odours. Materials used in their construction determine how well they do this.

Table 11.8 shows that the main materials used for walls in 2015 were mud bricks ( 42.9 per cent), cement blocks ( 24.8 per cent) and mud and wattle ( 14.9 per cent), while clay bricks ( 7.2 per cent) and zinc ( 6.3 per cent) together were used by more than one in 10 households. Apart from mud and wattle, whose use had declined from 35.1 per cent in 2004 to 14.9 per cent in 2015, there has been in general, an increase in the proportion of households using all the other main types of wall material.

The regions show several differences with respect to construction material for wall. The Southern Region again had the highest percentages of households using the poorer quality materials ( 39.6 per cent using mud and wattle), and the lowest percentage of households using the better quality materials (13.6 per cent using cement blocks). In the Eastern and Northern regions 51.8 per cent and 63.8 per cent respectively of households had walls made from mud bricks, whilst the majority of households ( 55.3 per cent) in the Western Region had walls made of cement blocks, followed by zinc (17.5 per cent) and mud bricks (16.3 per cent).

There are large differences between rural and urban areas. The main materials used by rural households were mud bricks ( 54.9 per cent), mud and wattle ( 24.9 per cent), clay bricks ( 6.6 per cent) and cement blocks (6.4 per cent), while the main materials used by urban households were cement blocks ( 47.3 per cent), mud bricks ( 28.2 per cent), zinc (10.7 per cent) and clay bricks ( 8.0 per cent).

Kelly et. al., (2013) have observed that houses built with mud brick or mud and wattle walls are almost 10 times more likely to have multi mammate rat (the common name for rats carrying the Lassa virus) infestation than houses with cement walls. There are high incidence of Lassa fever in rural parts of the Eastern Region.

### 11.7.3 Materials for floor

Poor quality flooring material exposes household members to the risk of diseases spread by rodents and other pests. The main materials used for the construction of floors in 2015 were mud ( 46.4 per cent), cement ( 44 per cent) and tiles ( 6.4 per cent) while mud ( 62.6 per cent) and cement ( 33.4 per cent) were used in 2004. Improvements in the quality of flooring material are seen by the use of mud dropping by 16.2 per cent and cement increasing by 11 per cent between 2004 and 2015. Mud was the main material used by most households in the Eastern ( 60.7 per cent), Northern ( 60.3 per cent) and Southern ( 60.8 per cent) regions. Cement was the second most common material used by a third of households in these three regions.

Kelly et. al., (2013) reported visible rodent burrows in the mud foundation in the exterior and interior of some houses in the Eastern Region. According to them, the presence of Lassa fever (an acute and sometimes severe viral haemorrhagic illness caused by Lassa virus) in the region can be attributed to the presence of disease-carrying rodents in houses. In the Western Region, the main materials used were cement ( 73 per cent) and tiles ( 18.9 per cent). The rural households used two main materials, mud ( 74 per cent) and cement ( 21 per cent) while urban households used cement ( 72 per cent), tiles ( 13 per cent) and mud ( 12 per cent).

## EC <br> Table 11.8 Construction materials for roof, wall and floor by region and place of residence

| Roof/wall/floor |  |  | Region |  |  |  | Place of residence |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2004 | 2015 | Eastern | Northern | Southern | Western | Rural | Urban |
| Roof |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number | 819,848 | 1,265,468 | 281,201 | 414,377 | 248,655 | 321,235 | 697,734 | 567,734 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Concrete | 1.2 | 1.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 4.9 | 0.3 | 3.1 |
| Asbestos | 0.8 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 2.7 | 1.6 | 2.5 |
| Zinc | 64.9 | 81.8 | 85.9 | 79.9 | 68.7 | 90.6 | 73.3 | 92.2 |
| Thatch | 25.9 | 12.8 | 10.2 | 15.3 | 27.6 | 0.4 | 22.6 | 0.7 |
| Tarpaulin | 0.0 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 2.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.8 | 1.2 |
| Tiles | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 7.3 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.2 |

* Category not used in 2004

Sources:
[1] Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census.
[2] Statistics Sierra Leone. (2006) Final Results. 2002 Population and Housing Census.
[3] Statistics Sierra Leone () Republic of Sierra Leone, 2004 Population and Housing Census. Analytical Report on Housing Situation and Characteristics

Table 11.8 Construction materials for roof, wall and floor by region and place of residence (continued)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roof/wall/floor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* Category not used in 2004

Sources: [1] Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census.
[2] Statistics Sierra Leone. (2006) Final Results. 2002 Population and Housing Census.
[3] Statistics Sierra Leone () Republic of Sierra Leone, 2004 Population and Housing
Census. Analytical Report on Housing Situation and Characteristics

### 11.8 Access to utilities and household facilities

### 11.8.1 Source of fuel for cooking

The source of cooking fuel (Table 11.9) show that wood ( 64.7 per cent) and charcoal (32.2 per cent) were the dominant fuels for cooking in 2015, providing the fuel needs of 96.9 per cent of households. Each of the other sources provided less than 1 per cent of household fuel needs in 2015.

Even though wood was the main source of fuel used by most households in 1985 and 2004, its use had been on the decline from 93.2 per cent in 1985, to 87 per cent in 2004 and 64.7 per cent in 2015. Similarly, the use of kerosene had declined from over four per cent in 1985 and 2004 to less than one per cent in 2015. The use of charcoal however, increased from less than 1 per cent in 1985 to 7.5 per cent in 2004 and over 30 per cent by 2015 .

Looking at the country by region, the dominant fuels used for cooking were wood and charcoal. However, in the Eastern, Northern and Southern regions, wood was used by more than 80 per cent of households and charcoal by 17.1 per cent, 15.2 per cent and 11.4 per cent of households respectively. On the other hand, over 80 per cent of households used charcoal in the Western Region and 8.9 per cent of households used wood. The use of gas, electricity and kerosene as supplementary fuels were more popular in the Western Region.

There are wide differences by place of residence. The use of wood was nearly universal ( 95.7 per cent) by rural households, and only 3 per cent used charcoal. However, two out of three urban households used charcoal and one out of five households used wood, and the remainder used electricity, gas and kerosene.

### 11.8.2 Source of fuel for lighting

Kerosene was the main source of lighting for eight out of 10 households ( 84.7 per cent, 85.6 per cent) in 1985 and 2004 respectively. Its use was negligible ( 1.2 per cent) by 2015. In that year battery/rechargeable light ( 76.4 per cent) and electricity ( 17.8 per cent) were the main
sources of lighting for households.
Fuel sources for lighting are very similar for Eastern, Northern and Southern regions: over 80 per cent for battery/rechargeable light and about 6 per cent for electricity in each of these regions. The same sources were used in the Western Region but the variation is small (and reversed) with electricity ( 51.7 per cent) and battery/rechargeable light (43.2 per cent).

Rural-urban differentials persisted for lighting fuel as well. Most rural dwellers ( 93 per cent) used battery/rechargeable light compared to over half ( 56.1 per cent) in urban areas. Electricity constituted the second (38.9 per cent) main source of fuel for lighting among urban households compared to 0.7 per cent in rural areas.

Table 11.9 Principal sources of fuel supply for cooking and lighting by region and place of residence

| Fuel for cooking/ lighting | Total country |  |  | Fuel for cooking/ lighting | Place of residence 2015 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1985 | 2004 | 2015 |  | Rural | Urban |
| Cooking |  |  |  | Cooking |  |  |
| Number | 485,711 | 819,848 | 1,265,468 | Number | 697,734 | 567,734 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Electricity | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.5 | Electricity | 0.0 | 1.1 |
| Gas | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.8 | Gas | 0.1 | 1.7 |
| Kerosene | 4.4 | 4.2 | 0.7 | Kerosene | 0.4 | 1.1 |
| Charcoal | 0.8 | 7.5 | 32.2 | Charcoal | 3.0 | 67.9 |
| Wood | 93.2 | 87.0 | 64.7 | Wood | 95.7 | 26.4 |
| Crop residue | * | * | 0.1 | Crop residue | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Saw dust | * | * | 0.1 | Saw dust | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Solar | * | * | 0.1 | Solar | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Animal waste | * | * | 0.0 | Animal waste | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Other | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.7 | Other | 0.1 | 1.5 |
| Not stated | 0.4 | * |  | Not stated |  |  |


| Fuel for cooking/ lighting | Region 2015 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastern | Northern | Southern | Western |  |
| Cooking |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number | 281,201 | 414,377 | 248,655 | 321,235 | * Category not used in 1985, 2004 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |
| Electricity | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 1.5 |  |
| Gas | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 2.6 | Sources: [1] Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census. [2] Statistics Sierra Leone. (2006) Final Results. 2004 Population and Housing Census. Analytical Report on Housing Situation and Characteristics |
| Kerosene | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 1.3 |  |
| Charcoal | 17.1 | 15.2 | 11.3 | 83.3 |  |
| Wood | 81.6 | 83.0 | 87.0 | 8.9 |  |
| Crop residue | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | [3] Central Statistics Office, The Analytical Report. 1985 Population and Housing Census, Sierra Leone. |
| Saw dust | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |  |
| Solar | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |  |
| Animal waste | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  |
| Other | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 1.9 |  |

Table 11.9 Principal sources of fuel supply for cooking and lighting by region and place of residence (continued)

| Lighting | Total country |  |  | Lighting | Place of residence 2015 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1985 | 2004 | 2015 |  | Rural | Urban |
| Lighting |  |  |  | Lighting |  |  |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Electricity | 9.1 | 4.1 | 17.8 | Electricity | 0.7 | 38.9 |
| Gas | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.2 | Gas | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| Kerosene | 84.7 | 85.6 | 1.2 | Kerosene | 1.4 | 0.9 |
| Generator | * | 1.1 | 0.9 | Generator | 0.4 | 1.6 |
| Battery/rechargeable light | * | 0.8 | 76.4 | Battery/rechargeable light | 93.0 | 56.1 |
| Candle | * | 0.8 | 0.2 | Candle | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| Wood | 5.0 | 5.1 | 1.6 | Wood | 2.6 | 0.3 |
| Solar | * | * | 0.8 | Solar | 0.7 | 1.0 |
| Other | 0.1 | 2.2 | 0.8 | Other | 0.9 | 0.7 |
| Not stated | 0.4 | * |  | Not stated |  |  |


| Lighting | Region 2015 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastern | Northern | Southern | Western |
| Lighting |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Electricity | 5.9 | 6.6 | 6.3 | 51.7 |
| Gas | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| Kerosene | 0.4 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 1.1 |
| Generator | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 1.7 |
| Battery/ rechargeable light | 89.6 | 85.7 | 89.0 | 43.2 |
| Candle | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| Wood | 1.1 | 3.1 | 1.4 | 0.2 |
| Solar | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.7 |
| Other | 1.1 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.8 |
| Not stated |  |  |  |  |

* Category not used in 1985, 2004

Sources: [1] Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census. [2] Statistics
Sierra Leone. (2006) Final Results. 2004 Population and Housing Census.
Analytical Report on Housing Situation and Characteristics
[3] Central Statistics Office, The Analytical Report. 1985 Population and Housing Census, Sierra Leone.

### 11.8.3 Source of water

In the 2008 National Water and Sanitation Policy (Government of the Republic of Sierra Leone, 2010), the Government stated that access to safe and adequate water to meet basic human needs is a fundamental human right. It also acknowledged its obvious health and wellbeing implications. The policy was further recognized in the objectives of Sierra Leone's Development Vision 2025, Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper and the Millennium Development Goals.

Data on principal source of water supply for drinking and household use are presented in Table 11.10. In 1985, information was collected on source of water supply with no distinction made between drinking water and water for household use. For the 2004 Census, the question was on source of drinking water only. However, in 2015, there were two questions on sources of water for drinking and for household use. Consequently, the necessary caution should be exercised in the interpretation of the data. For the trend analysis we make the plausible assumption that the source of water stated in 1985 served the population's need for both drinking and household use. Aggregating all sources of water, there is an increase in the proportion of households obtaining drinking water from taps from 18 per cent in 1985 to 26.3 per cent and 36.2 per cent in 2004 and 2015 respectively. Similarly, combining all sources of water from wells showed a moderate increase from 35.5 per cent in 1985 to 39.2 per cent and 41.2 per cent in 2004 and 2015 respectively.

This represents an increase of nearly 6 per cent over the 30 year period. By 2015, the percentage of households whose main source of drinking water was from river, riverbed or stream declined by more than half its level in 1985 ( 43.2 per cent) to 19.2 per cent. The major sources of drinking water changed from river, riverbed or stream ( 43.2 per cent), well ( 35.5 per cent) and tap ( 18 per cent) in 1985 to well ( 39.2 per cent), river, riverbed or stream ( 34 per cent) and tap ( 26.2 per cent) in 2004 and then to well ( 41.2 per cent), tap ( 36.2 per cent), and river, riverbed or stream (19.2 per cent) in 2015.

Public tap provided the leading source of drinking water in all regions, with the exception of the Northern Region. Other important sources were protected ordinary well and river, riverbed or stream. In the Northern Region, river, riverbed or stream was the main source of drinking water, followed by protected ordinary well.

The rural-urban comparisons show that urban areas had higher percentages of households using water from safer sources than rural households. For example, for public tap (rural 25.3 per cent, urban 33.5 per cent) and protected ordinary well (rural 14 per cent, urban 30 per cent).

Table 11.10 Principal source of water supply for drinking and household use by region and place of residence

| Source of water | Total country |  |  | Source of water | Place of residence 2015 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1985 | 2004 | 2015 |  | Rural | Urban |
| Drinking |  |  |  | Drinking |  |  |
| Number of households | 485,711 | 819,848 | 1,265,468 | Number of households | 697,734 | 567,734 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Piped indoors | 18.0* | 1.6 | 0.9 | Piped indoors | 0.1 | 1.9 |
| Piped in compound | *** | 4.9 | 4.3 | Piped in compound | 0.8 | 8.6 |
| Public tap | *** | 15.5 | 28.9 | Public tap | 25.3 | 33.5 |
| Protected ordinary well | 35.5** | 15.4 | 21.2 | Protected ordinary well | 14.0 | 30.0 |
| Protected spring | *** | * | 3.6 | Protected spring | 3.4 | 3.9 |
| Unprotected ordinary well | *** | 12.9 | 5.1 | Unprotected ordinary well | 7.1 | 2.6 |
| Unprotected spring | *** | * | 3.5 | Unprotected spring | 5.7 | 0.9 |
| Mechanical well | *** | 10.9 | 7.8 | Mechanical well | 10.2 | 5.0 |
| River/riverbed/ stream | 43.2 | 34.0 | 19.2 | River/riverbed/ stream | 32.7 | 2.7 |
| Neighbour's tap | *** | 4.3 | 2.1 | Neighbour's tap | 0.4 | 4.2 |
| Sachet/bottled water | *** | *** | 2.7 | Sachet/bottled water | 0.1 | 5.8 |
| Water vendor/ bowser | *** | 0.4 | 0.4 | Water vendor/ bowser | 0.2 | 0.8 |
| Other | 2.8 | 0.2 | 0.2 | Other | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Not stated | 0.4 | *** | *** | Not stated | *** | *** |

18.0* Represents water from all taps.
35.5** Represents water from all types of wells
*** Category not used in 1985, 2004 and 2015
Sources: [1] Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census. [2] Statistics
Sierra Leone. (2006) Final Results. 2004 Population and Housing Census.
[3] Statistics Sierra Leone, 2004 Population and Housing Census.
Analytical Report on Housing Situation and Characteristics
[4] Central Statistics Office, The Analytical Report. 1985 Population and Housing Census, Sierra Leone.

| Source of water | Region |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastern | Northern | Southern | Western |
| Drinking |  |  |  |  |
| Number of households | 281,201 | 414,377 | 248,655 | 321,235 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Piped indoors | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 3.0 |
| Piped in compound | 3.1 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 12.7 |
| Public tap | 35.4 | 18.8 | 26.4 | 38.4 |
| Protected ordinary well | 19.6 | 24.0 | 20.3 | 19.6 |
| Protected spring | 2.7 | 3.3 | 2.6 | 5.7 |
| Unprotected ordinary well | 4.7 | 7.1 | 6.2 | 1.9 |
| Unprotected spring | 4.1 | 4.7 | 4.4 | 1.0 |
| Mechanical well | 9.8 | 9.5 | 10.7 | 1.7 |
| River/riverbed/ stream | 16.8 | 29.8 | 26.3 | 2.2 |
| Neighbour's tap | 2.7 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 4.3 |
| Sachet/bottled water | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 8.6 |
| Water vendor/ bowser | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.9 |
| Other | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Not stated | *** | *** | *** | *** |

18.0* Represents water from all taps.
35.5** Represents water from all types of wells
*** Category not used in 1985, 2004 and 2015
Sources: [1] Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census. [2] Statistics
Sierra Leone. (2006) Final Results. 2004 Population and Housing Census.
[3] Statistics Sierra Leone, 2004 Population and Housing Census.
Analytical Report on Housing Situation and Characteristics
[4] Central Statistics Office, The Analytical Report. 1985 Population and Housing Census, Sierra Leone.

Table 11.10 Principal source of water supply for drinking and household use by region and place of residence (continued)


| Source of water | Place of residence 2015 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Rural | Urban |
| Household use |  |  |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Piped indoors | 0.1 | 1.9 |
| Piped in compound | 0.7 | 8.9 |
| Public tap | 20.4 | 27.8 |
| Protected ordinary well | 12.6 | 37.5 |
| Protected spring | 3.1 | 3.5 |
| Unprotected ordinary well | 7.6 | 5.1 |
| Unprotected spring | 6.3 | 1.3 |
| Mechanical well | 7.8 | 5.2 |
| River/riverbed/ stream | 40.8 | 4.7 |
| Neighbour's tap | 0.4 | 3.5 |
| Sacket/bottled water | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Water vendor/ bowser | 0.1 | 0.4 |
| Other | 0.1 | 0.1 |

18.0* Represents water from all taps.
35.5** Represents water from all types of wells
*** Category not used in 1985, 2004 and 2015
Sources: [1] Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census. [2] Statistics Sierra Leone. (2006) Final Results. 2004 Population and Housing Census.
[3] Statistics Sierra Leone, 2004 Population and Housing Census.
Analytical Report on Housing Situation and Characteristics
[4] Central Statistics Office, The Analytical Report. 1985 Population and Housing Census, Sierra Leone.

| Source of water |  | Region |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastern | Northern | Southern | Western |
| Household use |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Piped indoors | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 3.0 |
| Piped in compound | 2.7 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 13.5 |
| Public tap | 27.3 | 15.3 | 20.0 | 34.4 |
| Protected ordinary well | 22.0 | 23.4 | 21.7 | 27.4 |
| Protected spring | 2.6 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 5.0 |
| Unprotected ordinary well | 5.8 | 8.2 | 7.5 | 4.1 |
| Unprotected spring | 4.7 | 5.0 | 4.9 | 1.5 |
| Mechanical well | 7.3 | 8.2 | 8.4 | 2.7 |
| River/riverbed/ stream | 25.0 | 35.3 | 33.4 | 3.6 |
| Neighbour's tap | 2.0 | 0.5 | 0.9 | 4.0 |
| Sacket/bottled water | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Water vendor/ bowser | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.5 |
| Other | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 |

18.0* Represents water from all taps.
35.5** Represents water from all types of wells
*** Category not used in 1985, 2004 and 2015
Sources: [1] Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census. [2] Statistics
Sierra Leone. (2006) Final Results. 2004 Population and Housing Census.
[3] Statistics Sierra Leone, 2004 Population and Housing Census.
Analytical Report on Housing Situation and Characteristics
[4] Central Statistics Office, The Analytical Report. 1985 Population and Housing Census, Sierra Leone.

### 11.8.4 Sanitation

Sanitation covers refuse disposal, bathing and toilet facilities. Data were not collected on refuse disposal and bathing facilities in 1985.

### 11.8.4.1 Refuse disposal

Table 11.11 shows sanitation facilities by region and place of residence for 1985, 2004 and 2015. The two main methods of refuse disposal used in 2004 were deposited in bin and dumped anywhere. More than half of the households (54.1 per cent) used the former method, whilst about a third ( 30.8 percent) used the latter. Only a small fraction of households ( 3.5 percent) had their refuse collected.

The 2015 Census showed an improvement in the methods of refuse disposal in the country over the decade. The proportion using the leading method had not changed much ( 55.4 per cent) but the proportion of households that dumped their refuse anywhere had reduced by half (14.7 per cent). Households burning their refuse had increased two and half fold (14.7 per cent) and the proportion of households that had their refuse collected had more than doubled ( 8.8 per cent).

### 11.8.4.2 Bathing facilities

In 2004, most households (80 per cent) had their bathrooms outside the house. Households with a bathroom built outside the house constituted 42 per cent, while the percentage for those with a makeshift bathroom outside the house was 38 per cent. One in 10 had no bathrooms and 4 per cent of households had a bathroom inside their homes.

By 2015, the quality of bathroom facilities had shown moderate improvements. The proportion of households with a bathroom inside the house had nearly doubled ( 7.7 per cent), built bathrooms outside the house had also increased (56.1 per cent), while makeshift bathrooms outside the house had declined (31.8 per cent), and the percentage of households with no bathrooms at all had decreased to 2.3 per cent.
in Table 11.11. The pattern in the Eastern and Northern regions was similar; each with more than half of households having built bathrooms outside, and about a third with makeshift bathrooms outside. The Southern Region had nearly equal proportions of households with built bathrooms outside ( 47.6 per cent) and makeshift ( 42.0 per cent) bathrooms outside. It also had the highest proportion (4.2 per cent) of households with no bathrooms. More households in the Western Region had better quality facilities. One in five households in the Western Region had a bathroom inside, and over 60 per cent had built bathrooms outside, less than 20 per cent ( 18.3 per cent) had makeshift bathrooms outside and less than 1 per cent ( 0.7 per cent) had no bathrooms at all.

Rural-urban differentials exit. Over 90 per cent of households in rural areas had bathrooms outside, with built bathroom outside (51.1 per cent) and makeshift bathrooms outside (40.1 per cent). Urban areas had about 10 per cent more (62.1 per cent) households with bathrooms built outside than rural households, and had a smaller proportion (21.7 per cent) with makeshift bathrooms outside. The proportion of households in the urban areas with bathrooms inside the house was eight times (14.9 per cent) that in the rural areas.

### 11.8.4.3 Toilet facilities

Seven classifications were used to distinguish types of toilet facilities in 2015, namely; ventilated improved pit (VIP), flushed toilet inside, flushed toilet outside, pit, bucket, bush or river bed and other. The same detailed classifications were used for toilet facilities in 2004, however, due to the unavailability of the raw data, it is not featured in Table 11.11.

In addition to the classifications above, toilet facilities were also categorized as private or communal based on whether the facility was for the exclusive use of one household or whether it was shared with other households. In 1985 there was no distinction between flushed facilities inside and outside, and also, no disaggregation by communal and privacy status.

The bathroom facilities differ by region as shown

The proportion of households using communal facilities declined by 10 per cent from 84 per cent in 2004 to 74 per cent in 2015, whilst the proportion of households using private facilities increased by the same margin from 16 per cent in 2004 to 26 per cent in 2015. Table 11.11 shows that for both communal and private toilet facilities, pit latrine was the most common facility used by households (over 70 per cent) in 2015. The second most common communal toilet facility used by households was bush or river bed (17.5 per cent), whilst flushed toilet inside was the second most common private toilet facility (11.2 per cent).

The proportions of households using communal facilities showed variation by region and place of residence. Even though a pit latrine was used by the majority of households in all regions, the Northern Region had the highest (82.3 per cent) and the Southern Region the lowest (52.1 per cent) proportion. A higher proportion of urban households (77.6 per cent) used communal pit latrine compared to 68.7 per cent for rural households. Bush or river bed was the second most common facility used by households in three regions; Southern ( 42.2 per cent), Eastern ( 17.7 per cent) and Northern ( 11.8 per cent). In the Western region, bush/river bed was used by 5.6 per cent of households and it was the fourth common toilet facility after flushed toilet inside (11.1 per cent) and flushed toilet outside ( 7.8 per cent). The proportion of urban households using bush/river bed ( 4.5 per cent) was six times the proportion for rural households. Among urban households flushed toilet inside (8.1 per cent) and outside ( 6.2 per cent) were respectively the second and third most common communal toilet facilities used.

The use of private toilet facilities also shows variation by region and place of residence. Over 80 per cent of households used pit in the three regions, with the Western Region ( 51.8 per cent) being the only exception. A third of households in the Western Region used flushed toilet inside, whilst 6.7 per cent used flushed toilet outside. Eighty eight per cent of rural households used pit, compared to 67 per cent of urban households. Flushed toilet inside was used by 20.5 per cent of urban households compared to 1.5 per cent of rural households.


Table 11.11 Sanitation facilities by region and place of residence

| Refuse/bathing/toilet | Total country |  |  | Region |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1985 | 2004 | 2015 | Eastern | Northern | Southern | Western |
| Refuse |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No. of households | 485,711 | 819,848 | 1,265,468 | 281,201 | 414,377 | 248,655 | 321,235 |
| Total |  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Collected |  | 3.5 | 8.8 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 5.6 | 21.0 |
| Dumped anywhere |  | 30.8 | 14.7 | 10.8 | 20.6 | 16.3 | 9.1 |
| Burnt |  | 5.9 | 14.7 | 7.3 | 15.1 | 8.5 | 25.3 |
| Buried |  | 3.3 | 4.6 | 2.9 | 6.6 | 3.9 | 4.1 |
| Deposited in bin |  | 54.1 | 55.4 | 74.4 | 51.3 | 64.4 | 37.1 |
| Other |  | 2.4 | 1.9 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 3.3 |
| Bathing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Inside |  | 4.1 | 7.7 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 19.9 |
| Outside; built |  | 41.7 | 56.1 | 55.3 | 58.1 | 47.6 | 60.5 |
| Outside; makeshift |  | 38.5 | 31.8 | 35.6 | 33.6 | 42.0 | 18.3 |
| Other |  | 5.2 | 2.1 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 0.6 |
| None |  | 10.6 | 2.3 | 2.8 | 2.1 | 4.2 | 0.7 |
| Toilet |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Communal |  |  | 932,457 | 212,433 | 301,079 | 181,527 | 237,418 |
| Total | 100.0 |  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Communal-VIP | * |  | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.5 | 2.4 | 2.2 |
| Communal-flushed inside | 7.4** |  | 3.7 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 11.1 |
| Communal-flushed outside |  |  | 3.0 | 1.2 | 1.9 | 0.7 | 7.8 |
| Communal-pit | 62.7*** |  | 72.5 | 76.7 | 82.3 | 52.1 | 71.7 |
| Communal-bucket | $6.5 * * * *$ |  | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.8 |
| Communal-bush/river bed | 22.7 |  | 17.5 | 17.7 | 11.8 | 42.2 | 5.6 |
| Communal-other | 0.2+ |  | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 0.8 |
| Not stated | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Private |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Private-VIP |  |  | 4.2 | 4.6 | 2.4 | 3.5 | 6.9 |
| Private-flushed inside |  |  | 11.2 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 5.7 | 32.3 |
| Private-flushed outside |  |  | 2.8 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 6.7 |
| Private-pit |  |  | 77.6 | 86.3 | 88.8 | 82.0 | 51.8 |
| Private-bucket |  |  | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| Private-other |  |  | 3.8 | 3.9 | 3.2 | 7.1 | 1.7 |


| Refuse/bathing/toilet | Place of residence 2015 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Rural | Urban |
| Refuse |  |  |
| No. of households | 697,734 | 567,734 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Collected | 2.7 | 16.2 |
| Dumped anywhere | 19.9 | 8.3 |
| Burnt | 8.3 | 22.4 |
| Buried | 4.4 | 4.9 |
| Deposited in bin | 63.3 | 45.7 |
| Other | 1.5 | 2.4 |
| Bathing |  |  |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Inside | 1.8 | 14.9 |
| Outside; built | 51.1 | 62.1 |
| Outside; makeshift | 40.1 | 21.7 |
| Other | 3.4 | 0.6 |
| None | 3.6 | 0.7 |
| Toilet |  |  |
| Communal | 534,245 | 398,212 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Communal-VIP | 1.7 | 2.4 |
| Communal-flushed inside | 0.4 | 8.1 |
| Communal-flushed outside | 0.7 | 6.2 |
| Communal-pit | 68.7 | 77.6 |
| Communal-bucket | 0.2 | 0.6 |
| Communal-bush/river bed | 27.2 | 4.5 |
| Communal-other | 1.2 | 0.8 |
| Not stated | 0.4 |  |
| Private |  |  |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Private-VIP | 2.8 | 5.6 |
| Private-flushed inside | 1.5 | 20.5 |
| Private-flushed outside | 1.0 | 4.6 |
| Private-pit | 88.4 | 67.2 |
| Private-bucket | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Private-other | 5.9 | 1.7 |



### 11.9 Main source of information

The purpose of communication is to inform, educate, entertain and influence opinion. Perko (2012) has noted that efficient communication requires detailed understanding of the issues that influence people's attentiveness, recall of information and the process of opinion formation related to possible recommendations. Knowledge of the most effective medium (media) of communication in any country is necessary to facilitate government interaction with the population, as well as between businesses, civil society organizations and other interested groups.

Table 11.12 shows that there has been a drastic change in the main sources of information for the general public between 2004 and 2015. The main sources in 2015 were radio ( 71.1 per cent) and word of mouth ( 18.8 per cent), whilst in 2004 it was by word of mouth ( 49 per cent) and radio ( 47.7 per cent). Television increased its share by more than five times ( 0.9 in 2004 and 4.8 per cent in 2015) over the decade. Apart from the Western Region and urban areas, where television was second to radio, the pattern in the other three regions and rural areas was the same with variations only in the percentages, and less than 2 per cent of households obtained information from television.

The leading role of radio portrayed by the 2015 Census data is confirmed by the research of Musa (2017) and Mazzei and Scuppa (2006). Both studies identified radio as the most effective mass media channel to reach the general public.

## 홀 Table 11.12 Main source of information for household by region and place of residence

| Main source of information | Total country |  | Region 2015 |  |  |  | Place of residence |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2004 | 2015 | Eastern | Northern | Southern | Western | Rural | Urban |
| Number of households | 819,848 | 1,265,468 | 281,201 | 414,377 | 248,655 | 321,235 | 697,734 | 567,734 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Radio | 47.7 | 71.1 | 75.8 | 66.0 | 72.0 | 73.0 | 65.5 | 78.1 |
| Television | 0.9 | 4.8 | 1.2 | 1.9 | 1.3 | 14.5 | 1.0 | 9.5 |
| Print media | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.4 |
| Post mail | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Hand mail | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Social media | * | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 1.5 | 0.2 | 1.1 |
| Word of mouth | 49.0 | 18.8 | 18.0 | 26.2 | 21.1 | 8.1 | 27.3 | 8.4 |
| Church/mosque | 0.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 3.1 | 1.8 | 0.6 | 2.8 | 0.9 |
| Other | 0.5 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 2.6 | 1.4 | 2.6 | 1.4 |

[^10]Sources: [1] Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census. [2] Statistics
Sierra Leone. (2006) Final Results. 2004 Population and Housing Census.
[3] Statistics Sierra Leone, 2004 Population and Housing Census. Analytical Report on Housing Situation and Characteristics.

### 11.10 Distance to nearest facilities

Physical access to health, education and water facilities is measured by distance (or travel time). Data on distance to the nearest health facility, primary school and source of water by region and place of residence are shown in Table 11.13.

### 11.10.1 Distance to nearest health facility

Health service utilization is determined by physical and financial access. Where service is free, utilization is influenced by physical access and quality of service. Many writers have observed that physical distance to health facilities in Sierra Leone is a major hindrance to accessing health care (Mason 2017; SLRC 2014; AHO 2014).

In the inter-censal period, there was a 10 per cent increase in the proportions of households living within less than half a mile ( 34.1 per cent in 2004, 43.7 per cent in 2015) and a 3 per cent increase for households between half a mile and a mile ( 13 per cent in 2004 and 16.1 per cent in 2015) of a health facility. Declines of 4 per cent and about 10 per cent occurred for households between one and five miles, and those more than five miles from a facility respectively. Only the Western Region (57.9 per cent) and urban areas ( 59.4 per cent) had more than half of their households living within less than half a mile of a health facility. The rural areas recorded the lowest proportion (30.9 per cent) of households living within less than half a mile.

To overcome the challenges of geographical access, the Government has instituted a training programme for community health workers to assist in monitoring illness at the community level and refer those requiring treatment to the primary health units (SLRC 2017).

### 11.10.2 Distance to nearest primary school

Studies by UNESCO (2013) and SSL (2014) showed that the further the distance to
the nearest primary school, the higher the proportion of children not attending school. The distance to school also influences retention and completion rates in primary school, especially among rural children.

From 2004 to 2015, the proportion of households with a primary school within their compound declined from 8.1 per cent to 4.7 per cent. The Northern Region had the highest percentage of households ( 5.5 per cent) with a school within their compound, whilst the Southern Region had the lowest percentage ( 4.1 per cent). A higher percentage of rural households (4.9 per cent) had primary schools within their compound, compared to urban households (4.4 per cent).
There was an increase in the proportion of households with a primary school less than half a mile away from 55.9 per cent in 2004 to 64.1 per cent in 2015. The Northern Region had the lowest proportion ( 59.7 per cent) and the Western Region had the highest proportion ( 71.6 per cent) of households with a primary school less than half a mile away. Households with a primary school less than half a mile away showed differentials by place of residence, with more urban households ( 73.1 per cent) than rural households (56.7 percent).

Between 14 and 15 per cent of households had a primary school located between a half and one mile away. In the Western Region, 4.5 per cent of households had a school within one to five miles compared to 11 per cent for the Eastern and Northern regions and 13 per cent for the Southern Region. Whilst only 1.4 per cent of households in the Western Region had primary schools five or more miles away, the percentages for the other three regions were more than four times that of the Western Region.

Urban areas were better served than rural areas; 73 per cent of urban households had a primary school less than half a mile away, compared to 57 per cent for rural households, 4 per cent of urban households had primary schools between one and less than five miles away compared to 14.5 per cent for rural households. Similarly, 0.9 per cent of urban households had a primary school five or more miles away compared to 8.6 per cent for rural households.

### 11.10.3 Distance to nearest source of water

The distance to the nearest source of water has implications for personal and food hygiene, laundry and bathing and the level of health concern. A study by Howard and Bartrum (2003) found that the closer the water service is to the household, the better its basic needs will be met and health concern will be low. This has been confirmed from studies by the Environmental Health Group of the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, using data from 39 countries. It contends that to promote health "... make more water use more convenient and easy to access". Data on distance to the nearest water source provides the information needed for an assessment of water supply and access.

Water was, generally, closer to households than primary schools or health facilities. More than 10 per cent of households had water within their compound and over 60 per cent had water less than half a mile away. In both 2004 and 2015, 16 per cent of households had water within their compound.

The Western Region had the highest proportion (19.7 per cent) of households with water in their compound, while the percentage for the other three regions was 15 per cent. The percentage of households in urban areas with water in their compound ( 22.5 per cent) was double that for rural households (11 per cent). There had been a slight increase in the proportion of households with water within less than half a mile from 66.9 per cent in 2004 to 67.5 per cent in 2015. Eastern and Southern regions had the highest percentage (71.1) for this category, while the Western Region had the lowest percentage of 62.6.

The rural areas had 71.3 per cent of households with water less than half a mile away, compared to 62.7 per cent for urban households. Over the decade there has been a decline in the percentage of households with water between half a mile and less than a mile away ( 1.6 per cent) as well as between one and less than 5 miles away ( 0.7 per cent). The Northern Region had the highest percentage (11.8 per cent) of households with water between half a mile and a mile way, while the Southern Region had the
lowest (8.5 per cent).
The rural areas also had a higher proportion of households (10.9 per cent) in this category than urban areas ( 9.2 per cent). The Northern Region also had the highest percentage of households ( 4 per cent) with water between one and five miles, while the Eastern Region had the lowest percentage of households ( 2.8 per cent). The rural areas also had a higher percentage (3.9 per cent) of households with water between one and five miles away, compared to 2.5 per cent in urban areas. For water sources at five or more miles away, there has been a slight increase from 1.1 per cent in 2004 to 1.2 per cent in 2015. The highest proportion for water source five or more miles away was recorded by the Northern Region (1.4 per cent), while the lowest proportion was observed in the Southern Region (1 per cent). The proportion of households in urban areas with water more than 5 miles away ( 0.8 per cent) was half of that for rural areas (1.6 per cent).

Table 11.13 Distance from household to nearest health facility, primary school and source of water by region and place of residence

| Health facility/ primary school/water source | Total country |  | Region |  |  |  | Place of residence 2015 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2004 | 2015 | Eastern | Northern | Southern | Western | Rural | Urban |
| Health facility |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of households | 819,848 | 1,265,468 | 281,201 | 414,377 | 248,655 | 321,235 | 697,734 | 567,734 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Within compound | 3.1 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 2.7 |
| Less than $1 / 2$ mile | 34.1 | 43.7 | 42.8 | 35.8 | 39.3 | 57.9 | 30.9 | 59.4 |
| $1 / 2$ mile < 1 mile | 13.0 | 16.1 | 14.8 | 16.2 | 12.9 | 19.7 | 12.7 | 20.4 |
| 1 mile < 5 miles | 24.3 | 20.0 | 21.2 | 22.1 | 25.3 | 12.1 | 26.5 | 12.0 |
| 5 miles and above | 25.6 | 15.3 | 17.1 | 20.9 | 18.8 | 3.7 | 25.7 | 2.5 |
| Don't know | * | 2.6 | 1.8 | 2.8 | 1.5 | 4.1 | 2.3 | 3.1 |
| Primary school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Within compound | 8.1 | 4.7 | 4.4 | 5.5 | 4.1 | 4.3 | 4.9 | 4.4 |
| Less than $1 / 2$ mile | 55.9 | 64.1 | 63.5 | 59.7 | 62.3 | 71.6 | 56.7 | 73.1 |
| $1 / 2$ mile < 1 mile | 13.6 | 14.0 | 13.6 | 14.9 | 12.5 | 14.3 | 13.6 | 14.5 |
| 1 mile < 5 miles | 14.3 | 9.9 | 11.1 | 11.3 | 13.1 | 4.5 | 14.5 | 4.1 |
| 5 miles and above | 8.0 | 5.1 | 5.9 | 6.5 | 6.7 | 1.4 | 8.6 | 0.9 |
| Don't know | * | 2.3 | 1.5 | 2.1 | 1.3 | 3.9 | 1.7 | 3.0 |
| Source of water |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Within compound | 16.1 | 16.2 | 14.6 | 14.9 | 15.5 | 19.7 | 11.0 | 22.5 |
| Less than $1 / 2$ mile | 66.9 | 67.5 | 71.1 | 66.6 | 71.1 | 62.6 | 71.3 | 62.7 |
| $1 / 2$ mile < 1 mile | 11.8 | 10.2 | 9.2 | 11.8 | 8.5 | 10.2 | 10.9 | 9.2 |
| 1 mile < 5 miles | 4.0 | 3.3 | 2.8 | 4.0 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 3.9 | 2.5 |
| 5 miles and above | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 1.6 | 0.8 |

## * Category not used in 2004

Sources: [1] Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census. [2] Statistics Sierra Leone. (2006) Final Results. 2004 Population and Housing Census.

### 11.11 Summary, conclusions and recommendations

### 11.11.1 Summary

Mindful of its responsibilities of providing adequate housing for its people, the Government of Sierra Leone has drawn up numerous plans, policies and programmes on the issue since independence.

There has been a decline in average household size from 6.6 in 1985 to 5.6 in 2015 but the number of households has increased two and a half times from 485,711 in 1985 to 1,265,468. Seven out of 10 of households were owner occupiers while two in 10 were renting. The situation was different in the Western Region where more than half ( 54.1 per cent) and in urban areas where just below half ( 47 per cent) were renting. Even though the condition of dwelling units showed improvements from 2004 to 2015, nearly 30 per cent of dwelling units needed rehabilitation. The number of persons per room suggests overcrowding in the country, the situation being more acute in Eastern, Southern and Western regions where the persons per room is 2.3, 2.2 and 2.2 respectively. About 68 per cent of households own at least one impregnated mosquito net. There were wide variations by region and place of residence with rural households being better off at 80 per cent ownership.

The main types of roofing materials used by households were zinc ( 82 per cent) and thatch ( 13 per cent). There have been improvements from 2004 to 2015, as the proportion of households using zinc had increased by 16.9 per cent while the proportion using thatch had declined by 13.1 per cent. There are marked differences by region and place of residence. Mud bricks ( 43 per cent), cement blocks ( 25 per cent), mud and wattle ( 15 per cent) were used for walls. This however conceals the fact that, except for the Western Region, over 60 per cent of households used mud bricks or mud and wattle for walls and 60 per cent had mud floors. Mud floors are an issue because they permit the entry of rodents which pass diseases to household members.

Even though there appears to be a shift from wood to charcoal as the main fuel for cooking, wood was still the dominant fuel for cooking for over 80 per cent of households in the Eastern, Northern and Southern regions. In the Western Region, however, the percentage was just 8.9. Battery/rechargeable light was the main source of fuel for lighting in the Eastern, Northern and Southern regions, serving the needs of 76 to 89 per cent of households while the proportion for rural areas was 93 per cent. The situation was different for the Western Region where more than half of households used electricity and 43 per cent used battery or rechargeable light. Among urban dwellers electricity accounted for 39 per cent and battery/ rechargeable light was 56 per cent.

There has been a 10 per cent increase in the proportion of households with private toilet facilities and the proportion of households using flushed toilet doubled between 2004 and 2015 ( 3.5 per cent and 8.5 per cent respectively). The main source of information for all households was radio for all the regions and both rural and urban households. Primary schools were closer to households than health facilites with the majority ( 68.8 per cent) within less than half mile. Eight out of 10 households had water within less than half a mile away.

### 11.11.2 Conclusion

In spite of the Government's policies and programmes, it has not yet succeeded in providing adequate housing and related facilities for its people. These housing needs have been aggravated by the civil war which lasted from 1991 to 2002 (Sesay, 2001).

Even though there have been some improvements in housing conditions and facilities, the quality and provision is far from optimal. In some parts of the country, the quality of housing may still be described as poor as evidenced by the presence of rodents and other pests putting household members at risk of diseases such as Lassa fever.

From the many plans, programmes and Minister Sesay's statement to the United Nations General Assembly, the Government knows exactly what needs to be done, but the limitation is funding. In that statement he observed: "As and when the economy improves, new programmes will be developed and implemented". However, the people of this country cannot wait for the economy to improve. New ways of funding must be sought. A massive reconstruction effort is required to ensure rapid improvements in housing conditions for the entire population.

### 11.11.3 Recommendations

The reconstruction programme will need massive funding. Government might consider trading some of the country's untapped mineral wealth to support the reconstruction and rehabilitation programme. Government would want to ensure value for money in the implementation and execution of this national agenda.

Interested groups such as government, donor agencies and non-governmental organizations should stop paying lip service to the use of local building materials and ensure their use. In identifying solutions for the prevention of Lassa fever, Kelly et al (2013) made proposals for a pilot housing programme. The Government might consider implementing that programme as a first step in its housing development agenda. Because of its comprehensive nature, the relevant part of their recommendation is quoted here:
"...the Government of Sierra Leone might first work in partnership with international and non-governmental organizations with expertise in housing design, such as UN-HABITAT, Habitat for Humanity, and Architects Without Borders, to develop an architectural plan for low-cost houses... using locally available materials. The design might involve .. modifications to existing structures .- such as reinforcing floors and walls... The Government would then provide raw materials and logistic support to community members _. Ideally the materials would be free, but other options would be to make them available at a subsidized cost or under favourable loan conditions ... Utilization of
local resources and labour for production of building materials would .- ensure sustainability .."

Government institutions should be strengthened to keep records of building projects, to facilitate data collection on housing and related services.
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## CHAPTER 12: POPULATION IN AGRICULTURE

### 12.1 Introduction

Sierra Leone, like most developing countries, is an agrarian economy. The agriculture sector accounts for almost half of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and it employs the majority of the economically active labour force.

Agricultural production, manufacturing, mining and activities in the service sector are the major economic activities pursued by the people of Sierra Leone. Of these, the majority of the labour force are in agriculture. The agricultural sector is, however, further divided into the crop, livestock, fishery and forestry sub-sectors.

The country is endowed with good natural resources, climatic and agro-ecological conditions that support all year round agricultural production. This is in addition to a favourable macro-economic environment, high potential commitment to agricultural development, comparative advantage and increased empowerment of farmers and stakeholders (Lahai et al, 2006).

This chapter looks at the characteristics of the agricultural household heads by age, sex, educational status and literacy rate. It also discusses the region of residence of the agricultural population and their place of residence. Household headship by sex and age, household size and composition, among other characteristics, are also discussed. The area cultivated for the production of different types of crops, sale of agricultural produce and access of the agricultural population to agricultural equipment and infrastructure are also included in the chapter.

### 12.2 Definition of concepts

The census collected information on the population of Sierra Leone and its characteristics, including the population engaged in agricultural production. Questions on the agricultural population were included in Module 5 of the questionnaire. Information was collected on the three types of agricultural activities in which the agricultural population are engaged: crop production, fishery and animal husbandry.

Agricultural households are those with members who engage in agricultural activities, whether small scale or large scale. Fishery activities include those in a pond, artisanal fishing and coastal fishing.

### 12.3 Agricultural households

### 12.3.1 Households by region and place of residence

The results of the 2015 Census show there were 732,461 agricultural households in Sierra Leone, with 82 per cent and 18 per cent respectively in rural and urban areas (Table 12.1). The distribution of the agricultural households further shows that the Northern Region had the highest percentage (42.3) of the agricultural households in the country, followed by the Eastern (27.8) and the Southern (24.9) regions. These three regions had 95 per cent of all the agricultural households in the country. The Western Region was the most urbanized and, therefore, had a predominantly non-agricultural economy. It recorded only 5 per cent of the agricultural households that were enumerated at the census.

As can be seen from Table 12.1, the distribution of agricultural households by place of residence shows that the highest percentages of agricultural households in rural areas were again recorded in the Northern, Southern and Eastern regions with the Western Region having a negligible percentage. The percentage distribution of the agricultural households in urban areas ranges from approximately 12 per cent in the Southern Region to 34.2 per cent in the Northern Region. The Western Region, despite the small percentage of agricultural households recorded in it at the census, had almost a quarter (approximately 24 per cent) of all the urban agricultural households recorded in the entire country.

Table 12.1 Distribution of agricultural households by region and place of residence

| Region | Total | Percentage | Rural | Percentage | Urban | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 732,461 | 100.0 | 600,136 | 100.0 | 132,325 | 100.0 |
| Eastern | 203,286 | 27.8 | 162,991 | 27.2 | 40,295 | 30.5 |
| Northern | 310,073 | 42.3 | 264,771 | 44.1 | 45,302 | 34.2 |
| Southern | 182,402 | 24.9 | 167,214 | 27.9 | 15,188 | 11.5 |
| Western | 36,700 | 5.0 | 5,160 | 0.9 | 31,540 | 23.8 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015
Population and Housing Census

### 12.3.1 Households by size and place of residence

The 2015 Census recorded the size of agricultural households in Sierra Leone to be generally large in both rural and urban areas (Table 12.2). More than four-fifths ( 83 per cent and 82 per cent respectively in rural and urban places of residence) of the agricultural households have four or more members. Small household sizes with less than three members constituted 7 and 9 per cent respectively in rural and urban areas.

Depending on the age composition of the agricultural households, the large number of members can contribute to the labour required for agricultural activities. Family labour contribution to agricultural activities is usually required for labour intensive agricultural production and when the scale of production large. However, beyond the subsistence level, particularly when households engage in commercial agricultural activities, household labour may not be sufficient.

Table 12.2 Agricultural households by size and place of residence

| Household size | Total | Percentage | Rural | Percentage | Urban | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 17,470 | 2.4 | 13,260 | 2.2 | 4,210 | 3.2 |
| 2 | 37,481 | 5.1 | 30,316 | 5.1 | 7,165 | 5.4 |
| 3 | 71,472 | 9.8 | 58,852 | 9.8 | 12,620 | 9.5 |
| 4 | 95,968 | 13.1 | 79,354 | 13.2 | 16,614 | 12.6 |
| 5 | 108,934 | 14.9 | 90,307 | 15.0 | 18,627 | 14.1 |
| 6 | 98,615 | 13.5 | 81,674 | 13.6 | 16,941 | 12.8 |
| 7 | 82,443 | 11.3 | 68,035 | 11.3 | 14,408 | 10.9 |
| 8 | 68,350 | 9.3 | 56,505 | 9.4 | 11,845 | 9.0 |
| 9 | 47,824 | 6.5 | 39,387 | 6.6 | 8,437 | 6.4 |
| $10+$ | 103,904 | 14.2 | 82,446 | 13.7 | 21,458 | 16.2 |
| Total | 732,461 | 100.0 | 600,136 | 100.0 | 132,325 | 100.0 |

### 12.3.2 Age and sex composition of the household heads

The age distribution of the population into agricultural and non-agricultural households shows them to be predominately young (Table 12.3). Approximately 44 per cent and 36 per cent respectively are less than 15 years. The proportion of the population that are teenagers and young adults (15-29 years) was also high, 27.7 per cent in agricultural households and 34.8 in non-agricultural households. A little more than 7 out of every 10 household members in both types of households are children, teenagers and young adults. The aged, 60 years and over, constituted a slightly higher percentage of agricultural households ( 5.5 per cent) than the non-agricultural households (4.4 per cent).

Agricultural production is barely mechanized in Sierra Leone, so this youthful age structure probably supports a model of necessary family labour in agricultural households. However, it risks children and young people being prevented from participating in formal education.


Table 12.3 Age distribution of household population
by agricultural activity status

| Age-group | households | Percentage | Agriculture <br> household | Percentage <br> distribution | Non- <br> agricultural <br> household | Percentage <br> distribution |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $0-4$ | 937,973 | 13.3 | 642,095 | 14.1 | 295,878 | 11.7 |
| $5-9$ | $1,108,130$ | 15.7 | 780,119 | 17.2 | 328,011 | 12.9 |
| $10-14$ | 846,137 | 12.0 | 553,954 | 12.2 | 292,183 | 11.5 |
| $15-19$ | 871,348 | 12.3 | 545,010 | 12.0 | 326,338 | 12.9 |
| $20-24$ | 660,438 | 9.3 | 365,652 | 8.1 | 294,786 | 11.6 |
| $25-29$ | 605,621 | 8.6 | 344,832 | 7.6 | 260,789 | 10.3 |
| $30-34$ | 432,373 | 6.1 | 258,443 | 5.7 | 173,930 | 6.9 |
| $35-39$ | 419,485 | 5.9 | 260,709 | 5.7 | 158,776 | 6.3 |
| $40-44$ | 297,997 | 4.2 | 190,749 | 4.2 | 107,248 | 4.2 |
| $45-49$ | 241,362 | 3.41 | 157,526 | 3.5 | 83,836 | 3.3 |
| $50-54$ | 186,285 | 2.6 | 122,113 | 2.7 | 64,172 | 2.5 |
| $55-59$ | 110,200 | 1.6 | 71,290 | 1.6 | 38,910 | 1.5 |
| $60-64$ | 112,486 | 1.6 | 77,878 | 1.7 | 34,608 | 1.4 |
| $65+$ | 246,284 | 3.5 | 171,243 | 3.8 | 75,041 | 3.0 |
| Total | $7,076,119$ | 100.0 | $4,541,613$ | 100.0 | $2,534,506$ | 100.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015
Population and Housing Census
The distribution of agricultural households heads by sex of head and region (Table 12.4) shows that the highest proportion of the country's female agricultural household heads were in the Northern and Southern regions.

| Region | Total | Percentage | Male | Percentage | Female | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eastern | 203,286 | 27.8 | 154,172 | 28.9 | 49,114 | 24.7 |
| Northern | 310,073 | 42.3 | 220,133 | 41.2 | 89,940 | 45.2 |
| Southern | 182,402 | 24.9 | 132,332 | 24.8 | 50,070 | 25.2 |
| Western | 36,700 | 5.0 | 27,051 | 5.1 | 9,649 | 4.9 |
| Total | 732,461 | 100.0 | 533,688 | 100.0 | 198,773 | 100.0 |

### 12.3.3 Age-sex distribution of heads of agricultural households

The heads of agricultural households are mostly male (Table 12.5). With the exception of three age groups (15-19 years, 20- 24 years and 60+ years), males form more than 70 per cent of the heads of the various age groups. This high proportion reflects the leadership position of males in agricultural households more generally.

Table 12.5 Age and sex of heads of agricultural households

| Age-group | Total | Male | Female |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $15-19$ | 100.0 | 56.2 | 43.8 |
| $20-24$ | 100.0 | 67.9 | 32.1 |
| $25-29$ | 100.0 | 75.6 | 24.4 |
| $30-34$ | 100.0 | 74.8 | 25.2 |
| $35-39$ | 100.0 | 75.9 | 24.1 |
| $40-44$ | 100.0 | 74.6 | 25.4 |
| $45-49$ | 100.0 | 76.4 | 23.6 |
| $50-54$ | 100.0 | 71.9 | 28.1 |
| $55-59$ | 100.0 | 71.4 | 28.6 |
| $60+$ | 100.0 | 67.5 | 32.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 72.9 | 27.1 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015
Population and Housing Census


The heads of the agricultural households in Sierra Leone reside mostly in rural areas, as expected. Overall, 82 per cent of agricultural households are recorded in rural areas in the country (Table 12.6). The percentages do not vary much among the age groups.

Nevertheless, open spaces, backyards or unbuilt areas in urban areas do offer opportunities for urban residents to engage in agricultural activities (Yankson, 2004). Market gardening, in particular, is common in African cities. With declining employment opportunities in African urban areas, farming and other informal sector economic activities are now becoming attractive to urban residents.

Residents in Greater Freetown now engage in backyard and/or street gardening and reported as agricultural households in the 2004 Census(Lahal et al., 2006). The 2004 results also indicated that production of vegetables, particularly exotic ones, is an emerging economic activity in urban areas; and that farming households, especially in urban areas, depend on it for their livelihood.

## Table 12.6 Heads of agricultural households by age and place of residence

| Age group | Number | Percent | Rural <br> Percent | Urban Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| $15-19$ | 5,617 | 100.0 | 79.2 | 20.8 |
| $20-24$ | 24,613 | 100.0 | 81.1 | 18.9 |
| $25-29$ | 62,964 | 100.0 | 82.2 | 17.8 |
| $30-34$ | 76,091 | 100.0 | 82.6 | 17.4 |
| $35-39$ | 109,388 | 100.0 | 82.1 | 17.9 |
| $40-44$ | 94,635 | 100.0 | 81.7 | 18.3 |
| $45-49$ | 93,415 | 100.0 | 81.7 | 18.3 |
| $50-54$ | 74,042 | 100.0 | 81.1 | 18.9 |
| $55-59$ | 45,770 | 100.0 | 80.0 | 20.0 |
| $60-64$ | 46,580 | 100.0 | 81.8 | 18.2 |
| $65+$ | 99,346 | 100.0 | 83.5 | 16.5 |
| Total | 732,461 | 100.0 | 81.9 | 18.1 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015
Population and Housing Census

Households with four to six members were the most common size of household per household head (Figure 12.1) with an average of 41 per cent. The seven to nine member household size is the second commonest type of household size, with an average of 27 per cent.

Vast differences exist among the age categories with respect to the other household sizes. Households with one to three members ranged from 14 per cent among those aged 30-59 years to 34 per cent among those under 30 years.

As might be expected, household heads aged 60 years and over had the highest proportion of households of ten or more members ( 20 per cent) while heads aged below 30 years reported the lowest of 5 per cent.

The distribution of households by size and sex among the household heads shows that overall, the households headed by males had higher percentages with large household sizes compared with those of the females. The male-headed households had more members who could contribute to agricultural activities compared with those with female heads.

Figure 12.1 Heads of agricultural households by age and size of household


Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

The vast majority (not less than 80 per cent) of the agricultural household heads in all the regions are married (currently, engaged, married in monogamous or polygamous union or have been cohabiting less than 5 years or 5 years and over) (Table 12.7). The highest proportion never married ranges from 2.5 per cent in the Northern Region to 16.9 per cent in the Western Region. The Western Region recorded the lowest proportion for household heads who are currently not married ( 2.6 per cent) while the rest of the regions have more than a tenth in this category.

These high proportions of married household heads again points to the low mechanization of agricultural production. Married heads are more likely to have families who can work on the land.

| Region | Total | Never <br> married | *Currently <br> married | **Currently <br> not married | Don't <br> know |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North | 100.0 | 2.5 | 86.9 | 13.2 | 0.0 |
| South | 100.0 | 3.2 | 84.9 | 11.9 | 0.0 |
| East | 100.0 | 2.6 | 84.2 | 13.2 | 0.0 |
| West | 100.0 | 16.9 | 80.3 | 2.6 | 0.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 6.3 | 84.1 | 10.2 | 0.0 |

*Currently married - engaged, married monogamous, married polygamous, cohabitation (<
5 years), cohabitation (= > 5 years)
**Currently not married - separated, divorced, widowed
Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 12.3.4 Education and literacy among agricultural households

The majority of agricultural household members had no education. On the average more than half ( 52.8 per cent) had no education (Table 12.8), with 24.8 per cent having a primary education. Nearly 80 per cent of spouses and nearly 71 per cent of heads of households had no education.

Vast differences are observed among the various categories of the household members. More than a third of the children ( 35.1 per cent) and other members ( 33.9 per cent) compared with less than a tenth of heads ( 8.2 per cent) and spouses ( 8.7 per cent) have primary education. Children have the highest percentage of secondary education (11.7 per cent).

The educational status of agricultural household members has improved, considering the higher proportion of children with primary and secondary school levels of education compared with those of the heads and spouses or the older generation.


Table 12.8 Educational level of agricultural household members 3 years and older

| Level of education | All household <br> members | Head | Spouse(s) | Children | Others |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kindergarten | 3.9 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 5.9 | 6.1 |
| Primary | 24.8 | 8.2 | 8.7 | 35.1 | 33.9 |
| JSS | 10.1 | 7.4 | 6.5 | 11.7 | 8.8 |
| SSS | 5.8 | 6.4 | 2.5 | 6.0 | 4.5 |
| Vocational/Tech/Nursing/ | 1.0 | 2.4 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| Teacher | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Higher (First degree) | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Tertiary (Post-graduate) | 1.0 | 2.5 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.7 |
| Koranic | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Don't know | 52.8 | 70.6 | 79.9 | 39.7 | 44.8 |
| Never attended school | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Literacy rates are also low among agricultural household members. On average, almost six out of every ten agricultural household members were not literate (Table 12.9). The percentage ranges from 43 per cent among the children to 83 per cent among the spouses. A little more than half of the children were literate in English language only. The heads and spouses recorded rates that were less than average while other household members had more than the average rate. Generally the same pattern observed for educational attainment among the household members holds true for literacy.

| Language | All household members | Head | Spouse(s) | Children | Others |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local language only | 2.4 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 2.2 | 2.6 |
| English only | 33.8 | 19.4 | 12.4 | 51.1 | 43.3 |
| Local language and English | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| French | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Local language and French only | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| English and French only | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Local language, English and French | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Arabic only | 3.1 | 7.0 | 1.1 | 1.9 | 2.4 |
| Local language and Arabic only | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| English and Arabic only | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Local language, English and Arabic only | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| French and Arabic only | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Local language, French and Arabic only | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Local language, English, French and Arabic only | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| None (not literate) | 58.8 | 69.3 | 82.5 | 42.6 | 49.5 |
| Don't know | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census
The results of the 2015 Census show that on average almost seven out of every 10 of agricultural household heads were not literate in any language - English, Arabic or local languages (Table 12.10). A far higher proportion of the females ( 85.2 per cent) compared with the males ( 63.4 per cent) were illiterate. On average, only about a fifth of them were literate in English. Another seven per cent on average and approximately a tenth ( 9.3 per cent) of the males and one out of every 100 ( 0.8 per cent) of the females were literate in Arabic only.

In total, the heads of agricultural households had very low literacy rates. The males had higher literacy rates in both English only and Arabic only than the female agricultural household heads. Gender issues in education, enrolment, completion, among others may explain the gender gaps in the literacy rates between the sexes.In Africa, the agricultural sector labour force generally has the lowest levels of educational status, lowest literacy rates and lowest levels of income subgroups, even though farmers engaged in cash cropping and other commercial agricultural activities are usually not poor.

| Literacy levels | Total | Percentage | Number of males | Percentage | Number of females | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local language only | 19,202 | 2.6 | 13,966 | 2.6 | 5,236 | 2.6 |
| English only | 142,215 | 19.4 | 121,937 | 22.8 | 20,278 | 10.2 |
| Local language and English only | 3,773 | 0.5 | 3,284 | 0.6 | 489 | 0.2 |
| French only | 1,372 | 0.2 | 1,124 | 0.2 | 248 | 0.1 |
| Local language and French only | 171 | 0.0 | 159 | 0.0 | 12 | 0.0 |
| English and French only | 819 | 0.1 | 697 | 0.1 | 122 | 0.1 |
| Local language English and French only | 152 | 0.0 | 141 | 0.0 | 11 | 0.0 |
| Arabic only | 51,134 | 7.0 | 49,523 | 9.3 | 1,611 | 0.8 |
| Local language and Arabic only | 276 | 0.0 | 254 | 0.0 | 22 | 0.0 |
| English and Arabic only | 993 | 0.1 | 921 | 0.2 | 72 | 0.0 |
| Local language English and Arabic only | 98 | 0.0 | 91 | 0.0 | 7 | 0.0 |
| Other languages | 1,916 | 0.3 | 1,487 | 0.3 | 429 | 0.2 |
| Not literate | 507,509 | 69.3 | 338,173 | 63.4 | 169,336 | 85.2 |
| Do not know | 2,831 | 0.4 | 1,931 | 0.4 | 900 | 0.5 |
| Total | 732,461 | 100.0 | 533,688 | 100.0 | 198,773 | 100.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 12.3.5 Employment status of head of agricultural households

The heads of the agricultural households were predominantly self-employed without employees (Table 12.11). The proportion ranges from a little more than half (54 per cent) in the Western Region to 81 per cent in the Eastern region. Some of these heads probably had household members working for them but were not enumerated as having employees because they were unpaid family workers. Consequently, the self-employed with employees (employer) and paid employees constituted small proportion of the heads in the various regions. The heads in the Western Region had the highest percentage who are paid employees (18.8 per cent) while the Northern Region recorded the lowest (4.4 per cent).

Table 12.11 Agriculture households by employment status of head and region

| Employment status | Region |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Northern | Southern | Eastern | Western |
| Paid employee | 4.4 | 6.0 | 4.4 | 18.8 |
| Self-employed without <br> employees | 78.5 | 74.3 | 80.9 | 53.6 |
| Self-employed with <br> employees (employer) | 4.1 | 3.9 | 3.0 | 5.0 |
| Unpaid family worker | 3.4 | 4.4 | 3.8 | 0.8 |
| Paid apprentice | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.7 |
| Unpaid apprentice | 0.4 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.4 |
| Worked before but <br> currently looking for <br> work | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 1.9 |
| Looking for work for the <br> first time | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 3.3 |
| Household work | 2.9 | 3.6 | 2.2 | 3.9 |
| Not working and not <br> looking for work | 2.9 | 2.8 | 1.8 | 4.6 |
| Full time student | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.9 |
| Retired/pensioner | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 2.6 |
| Other, specify | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 2.0 |
| Don't know | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 12.3.6 Disability among agricultural population

Several disability types were reported by the agricultural households at the census, ranging from physical to mental and psychiatric disorders (Table 12.12). The rates of disability were high. Sons and daughters made up the highest proportion of the household to have no disability.

Among the household heads, the most common types of disability reported was sight impairment (47 per cent) and spinal injury (48.9 per cent). Poor sight is associated with old age, while spinal injury may be caused by the manual agricultural activities performed. A high percentage reported physical injury from polio and amputation. Many lost limbs during during the Civil War and amputees are not uncommon among those who survived the conflict. Their disability often makes agricultural work difficult and policy interventions are needed to address their needs.

Even though the sons and daughters of the heads of households recorded the highest percentage with no disabilities, their proportions with speech impairment ( 41.7 per cent), mental psychiatric disability ( 37.4 per cent) and physical disability ( 28.9 per cent) were relatively very high.

Table 12.12 Disability in agricultural households
$\left.\begin{array}{lc|c|c|c|c|c|cc}\hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Household } \\ \text { Composition }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Type of } \\ \text { Disability }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Physical } \\ \text { (poli \& } \\ \text { amputee }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Blind \& } \\ \text { partially } \\ \text { sighted }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Deaf \& } \\ \text { partially } \\ \text { deaf }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Speech } \\ \text { difficulties \& } \\ \text { mute/dumb }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Mental \& } \\ \text { psychiatric }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Spinal } \\ \text { injury }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { Head disabilities }\end{array}\right]$

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 12.3.7 Nationality and migration status of agricultural households

Like many other West African countries, Sierra Leone is a destination of immigrants, mostly from the West African sub-region. More recent movements within the sub-region has been facilitated by the free movement of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and the common approach to migration by ECOWAS and the African Union (AU). These and many other protocols account for the higher volume of movement within the sub-region (Adepoju, 2010).

The agricultural sector is however not attractive to immigrants to Sierra Leone. As can be seen from Table 12.13, almost all ( 99.8 per cent) members of agricultural households are Sierra Leoneans, while just 0.2 per cent are nationals of other ECOWAS (West African) countries. The rest are foreigners from other African countries, the USA, other European countries and elsewhere.

Table 12.13 Nationality of members of agricultural households

| Nationality | Number | Per cent | Head | All other <br> members |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sierra Leonean | $4,531,051$ | 100.0 | 16.1 | 83.9 |
| ECOWAS (West African) | 10,401 | 100.0 | 23.1 | 76.9 |
| All other African <br> countries | 29 | 100.0 | 13.8 | 86.2 |
| United Kingdom | 6 | 100.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| Other European <br> Countries | 17 | 100.0 | 35.3 | 64.7 |
| United States of America | 29 | 100.0 | 13.8 | 86.2 |
| All other countries | 80 | 100.0 | 31.3 | 68.8 |
| Total | $4,541,613$ | 100.0 | 16.1 | 83.9 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 12.4 Agricultural activities

The 2015 Census enumerated agricultural households engaged in crop and animal production. The census enumerated 1,265,468 households out of which 732,461 (57.9 per cent) were agricultural households (Table 12.14). These are distributed unevenly across the four regions unevenly, with the majority (nearly 43 per cent) being in the Northern Region.


| Region | Total | Percentage | Agriculture | Percentage | Non- <br> agriculture | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eastern | 281,201 | 22.2 | 203,286 | 27.8 | 77,915 | 14.6 |
| Northern | 414,377 | 32.7 | 310,073 | 42.3 | 104,304 | 19.6 |
| Southern | 248,655 | 19.6 | 182,402 | 24.9 | 66,253 | 12.4 |
| Western | 321,235 | 25.4 | 36,700 | 5.0 | 284,535 | 53.4 |
| Total | $1,265,468$ | 100 | 732,461 | 100.0 | 533,007 | 100.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 12.4.1 Types of agricultural activities

The major agricultural activities carried out by the agricultural households were crop farming, fish farming and animal husbandry. The households engaged in crop farming were concentrated in the Northern, Southern and Eastern regions where almost all (98.1 per cent) were engaged in crop farming. The percentages ranged from 25 per cent in the Eastern Region to as high as 43 per cent in the Northern Region (Figure 12.2).

Households engaged in animal husbandry are also concentrated in the same regions but with Southern region accounting for the largest percentage. Fish farming households are quite evenly distributed across the Northern, Southern and Eastern regions, with each of them having around a third of them. The Western Region has a negligible percentage of all types of agricultural households.

Figure 12.2 Major agricultural activities undertaken by households by region


Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

The type of agricultural activity, whether crop farming or fishing or animal husbandry by size of household is shown in Table 12.15. Generally, close to 80 per cent of each type of the agricultural activities was carried out in households that have four or more members. Household sizes of 10 and over members accounted for a third of fishing ( 34.3 per cent) and animal husbandry ( 33.6 per cent) activities while close to a third of the same household size engaged in crop farming (31.3 per cent). Furthermore, households with seven and over members account for more than half of all households engaged in the three different types of agricultural activities. Agricultural activities were carried out mostly in large households.


Table 12.15 Agricultural activity by size of household

| Size of household | Type of agricultural activity |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Crop farming |  | Fishing |  | Animal husbandry |  |
|  | Number | \% | Number | \% | Number | \% |
| <4 | 43,319 | 15.2 | 14,520 | 12.9 | 34,090 | 13.8 |
| 4-6 | 81,019 | 28.4 | 30,429 | 27.0 | 67,336 | 27.2 |
| 7-9 | 71,806 | 25.2 | 29,083 | 25.8 | 62,910 | 25.4 |
| 10+ | 89,299 | 31.3 | 38,570 | 34.3 | 83,085 | 33.6 |
| Total | 285,443 | 100.0 | 112,602 | 100.0 | 247,421 | 100.0 |

### 12.4.2 Crops and acreage cultivated

Even though the agricultural households in Sierra Leone cultivated 10 different crops, according to both 2004 and 2015 censuses, five types were dominant: rice (on upland and lowland), cassava, coffee, cacao and oil palm.

The percentage of the total area cultivated for the production of these five crops declined between the two censuses, with the exception of rice (Table 12.16). Moreover, the area cultivated for rice (classified as upland and lowland rice at the 2015 Census) accounts for more than half ( 52.2 per cent) of the total acreage cultivated, rising from 30.5 per cent at the 2004 Census to 52.3 per cent at the 2015 Census.

The area for the cultivation of the other crops declined from the 2004 levels. The decline in the proportion of the land under coffee recorded the greatest decline; it decreased from 17.3 per cent to 5.9 per cent of the total land area for crop production. This is a 65.9 per cent decline from the 2004 level. Similarly, the area for the cultivation of sweet potato, maize, citrus and vegetables declined considerably. The area for the cultivation of cacao remained the same at the two censuses. Overall, rice has become the one single predominant crop being cultivated in Sierra Leone, grown in upland and lowland areas.


Table 12.16 Area cultivated by crop, 2004 and 2015

| Crop | All regions |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2004 | 2015 |
| Upland rice |  | 35.0 |
| Lowland rice | $30.5^{*}$ | 17.3 |
| Cassava | 12.7 | 10.6 |
| Sweet potato | 4.5 | 1.5 |
| Groundnut | 6.6 | 9.2 |
| Maize | 3.0 | 0.9 |
| Coffee | 17.3 | 5.9 |
| Cacao | 7.4 | 7.3 |
| Oil palm | 11.6 | 9.5 |
| Citrus | 2.6 | 0.3 |
| Vegetables | 3.7 | 2.5 |
| Cashew | - | 0.1 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number | $3,991,661$ | $3,244,214$ |

* Both types of rice were classified together in 2004

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 12.4.3 Area of land cultivated

The distribution of area cultivated by crop is about the same for both rural and urban areas (Table 12.17). The same five types of crops dominate, with rice being the predominant crop in both places of residence. Cashew and vegetables covered slightly higher percentage of the land under cultivation in urban areas compared to rural areas. The rural areas, on the other hand, have a slightly higher percentage of land under cassava, groundnut, coffee and oil palm. The rural areas had more than half ( 52.5 per cent) of the land under rice, compared to 49.9 per cent in urban areas. Generally, cash crops covered a higher percentage of the land in rural areas than urban areas.


Table 12.17 Area cultivated (acres) by crop and place of residence

| Crop | Total | Percentage | Rural | Percentage | Urban | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Upland rice | $1,133,925$ | 35.0 | $1,032,654$ | 35.5 | 101,271 | 30.4 |
| Lowland rice | 560,384 | 17.3 | 495,486 | 17.0 | 64,899 | 19.5 |
| Cassava | 342,507 | 10.6 | 313,072 | 10.8 | 29,435 | 8.8 |
| Sweet potato | 50,105 | 1.5 | 39,483 | 1.4 | 10,622 | 3.2 |
| Groundnut | 299,580 | 9.2 | 271,269 | 9.3 | 28,311 | 8.5 |
| Maize | 28,984 | 0.9 | 24,907 | 0.9 | 4,077 | 1.2 |
| Coffee | 191,791 | 5.9 | 173,533 | 6.0 | 18,258 | 5.5 |
| Cacao | 235,749 | 7.3 | 202,369 | 7.0 | 33,380 | 10.0 |
| Oil palm | 307,593 | 9.5 | 278,138 | 9.6 | 29,454 | 8.8 |
| Citrus | 9,487 | 0.3 | 8,361 | 0.3 | 1,126 | 0.3 |
| Vegetables | 79,742 | 2.5 | 69,049 | 2.4 | 10,694 | 3.2 |
| Cashew | 4,368 | 0.1 | 2,506 | 0.1 | 1,861 | 0.6 |
| Total | $3,244,214$ | 100 | $2,910,826$ | 100 | 333,388 | 100 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census
The proportion of area under different crops by region varied. The highest percentages of land under a single crop were 91.4 per cent and 84.8 per cent respectively for cacao and coffee, both in the Eastern Region (Table 12.18). The Northern Region also accounted for far more than half of the area under lowland rice ( 59.9 per cent) and groundnut ( 59.7 per cent). The Southern Region accounted for slightly more than half ( 50.3 per cent) of the area under cassava. The Western Region had a generally negligible percentage of the various areas under the cultivation of all the different crops, ranging from as low as 0.1 per cent (cacao) to 6.7 per cent (sweet potato).

| Crop | All Regions <br> Distribution |  | Region |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Northern | Southern | Eastern | Western |
|  | Area | Percentage | Percentage |  |  |  |
| Upland rice | 1,133,925 | 100.0 | 37.4 | 26.6 | 35.4 | 0.5 |
| Lowland rice | 560,384 | 100.0 | 59.9 | 15.2 | 24.3 | 0.6 |
| Cassava | 342,507 | 100.0 | 32.5 | 50.3 | 15.8 | 1.4 |
| Sweet potato | 50,105 | 100.0 | 45.5 | 26.1 | 21.7 | 6.7 |
| Groundnut | 299,580 | 100.0 | 59.7 | 21.3 | 17.9 | 1.1 |
| Maize | 28,984 | 100.0 | 39.5 | 29.9 | 27.0 | 3.7 |
| Coffee | 191,791 | 100.0 | 4.7 | 10.3 | 84.8 | 0.2 |
| Cacao | 235,749 | 100.0 | 1.6 | 7.0 | 91.4 | 0.1 |
| Oil palm | 307,593 | 100.0 | 27.6 | 35.9 | 36.2 | 0.3 |
| Citrus | 9,487 | 100.0 | 38.0 | 24.5 | 35.6 | 1.9 |
| Vegetables | 79,742 | 100.0 | 40.4 | 39.2 | 15.9 | 4.5 |
| Cashew | 4,368 | 100.0 | 56.9 | 13.9 | 23.6 | 5.6 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census
Overall, the percentage of all and some of the crops sold varies among the regions as shown in Table 12.19. The percentage of all crops sold varies from 0.6 per cent in the Western Region to 69 per cent in the Eastern region. A negligible percentage of the households in all the regions sold all their rice. The percentage that did not sell any of the rice grown are the highest, ranging from 45 per cent of households in the Northern Region which grew lowland rice to 69 per cent of those in the Eastern Region which cultivated upland rice. Even though a high proportion of all the cash crops were sold in the Eastern, Northern and Southern regions, the Western Region sold a considerably low percentages of theirs, probably because they processed some of the cash crops for domestic consumption.

In general, the Northern Region recorded the highest percentage of the crops not sold at all compared to the other regions but in all the regions higher percentages of cassava, sweet potato, vegetables and oil palm were not sold compared with the other crops (Table 12.19).

Table 12.19 Households engaged in crop production by sale of produce and region

| Crop |  | Region |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All Regions | Northern | Southern | Eastern | Western |
| All crops |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Number | 1,266,174 | 41.7 | 22.4 | 34.7 | 1.2 |
| Sold all | 162,092 | 13.5 | 16.9 | 69.0 | 0.6 |
| Sold part | 297,384 | 51.3 | 22.3 | 25.2 | 1.3 |
| Sold None | 524,172 | 39.8 | 24.3 | 34.6 | 1.3 |
| Upland rice |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Number | 456,470 | 41.2 | 23.6 | 34.7 | 0.5 |
| Sold all | 2,925 | 41.4 | 21.2 | 35.1 | 2.4 |
| Sold part | 170,516 | 50.7 | 20.2 | 28.4 | 0.6 |
| Sold None | 283,029 | 35.4 | 25.7 | 38.4 | 0.4 |
| Lowland rice |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Number | 231,335 | 55.8 | 14.6 | 28.9 | 0.7 |
| Sold all | 2,433 | 44.5 | 20.9 | 33.4 | 1.2 |
| Sold part | 105,142 | 66.2 | 11.4 | 21.8 | 0.6 |
| Sold None | 123,760 | 47.1 | 17.2 | 34.9 | 0.7 |
| Cassava |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Number | 147,936 | 36.3 | 42.6 | 18.8 | 2.3 |
| Sold all | 19,513 | 20.0 | 60.4 | 18.6 | 1.0 |
| Sold part | 92,952 | 39.9 | 38.3 | 20.0 | 1.8 |
| Sold None | 35,471 | 35.8 | 44.1 | 15.7 | 4.4 |
| Sweet potato |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Number | 30,866 | 46.9 | 22.0 | 24.0 | 7.2 |
| Sold all | 3,170 | 42.7 | 22.5 | 30.5 | 4.4 |
| Sold part | 19,098 | 48.2 | 20.9 | 25.1 | 5.7 |
| Sold None | 8,598 | 45.5 | 24.2 | 18.9 | 11.4 |
| Groundnut |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Number | 139,909 | 61.9 | 19.8 | 17.2 | 1.2 |
| Sold all | 7,806 | 43.5 | 20.9 | 34.4 | 1.2 |
| Sold part | 99,109 | 62.0 | 19.6 | 17.4 | 1.0 |
| Sold None | 32,994 | 65.9 | 19.8 | 12.4 | 1.8 |
| Maize |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Number | 15,330 | 42.2 | 24.8 | 28.6 | 4.5 |
| Sold all | 1,812 | 26.3 | 26.0 | 45.2 | 2.4 |
| Sold part | 9,056 | 44.4 | 23.0 | 29.0 | 3.7 |
| Sold None | 4,462 | 44.2 | 27.9 | 21.1 | 6.9 |

Table 12.19 Households engaged in crop production by sale of produce and region (continued)

| Crop |  | Region |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All Regions | Northern | Southern | Eastern | Western |
| Coffee |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Number | 55,447 | 5.6 | 6.7 | 87.7 | 0.1 |
| Sold all | 46,512 | 3.2 | 5.9 | 90.9 | 0.0 |
| Sold part | 3,271 | 32.3 | 14.0 | 53.5 | 0.2 |
| Sold None | 5,664 | 9.5 | 9.2 | 81.0 | 0.4 |
| Cacao |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Number | 66,362 | 2.1 | 6.8 | 91.1 | 0.1 |
| Sold all | 56,072 | 1.2 | 5.3 | 93.5 | 0.0 |
| Sold part | 2,999 | 14.8 | 19.6 | 65.3 | 0.3 |
| Sold None | 7,291 | 3.8 | 13.1 | 82.8 | 0.3 |
| Oil palm |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Number | 77,278 | 31.1 | 28.7 | 40.0 | 0.1 |
| Sold all | 10,507 | 20.1 | 31.0 | 48.8 | 0.2 |
| Sold part | 52,689 | 32.3 | 27.9 | 39.8 | 0.1 |
| Sold None | 14,082 | 34.9 | 30.2 | 34.5 | 0.4 |
| Citrus |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Number | 3,647 | 38.5 | 20.7 | 38.2 | 2.6 |
| Sold all | 853 | 28.5 | 14.1 | 55.5 | 2.0 |
| Sold part | 2,004 | 42.6 | 19.5 | 35.7 | 2.2 |
| Sold None | 790 | 38.9 | 31.1 | 25.9 | 4.1 |
| Vegetables |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Number | 40,739 | 46.8 | 24.2 | 22.5 | 6.4 |
| Sold all | 10,270 | 55.6 | 24.6 | 15.0 | 3.9 |
| Sold part | 22,805 | 43.7 | 23.6 | 26.8 | 6.0 |
| Sold None | 7,664 | 43.1 | 25.8 | 19.9 | 11.2 |
| Cashew |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Number | 855 | 63.3 | 13.5 | 19.1 | 4.2 |
| Sold all | 219 | 62.1 | 16.0 | 19.2 | 2.7 |
| Sold part | 269 | 63.9 | 12.6 | 20.1 | 3.3 |
| Sold None | 367 | 63.5 | 12.5 | 18.3 | 5.7 |

[^11]
### 12.4.4 Livestock, numbers and keepers

The Northern Region's agricultural households owned the largest proportion of Sierra Leone's livestock, accounting for almost nine out of every 10 cattle, more than seven out of every 10 sheep and more than six out of every 10 goats numbered at the 2015 Census (Table 12.20). It also had close to half of the chickens and ducks. The percentage of animals owned in the other regions varied less, with the Western Region owning very few animals (with the exception of pigs).


Table 12.20 Number of livestock owned by type, number of households and by region

| Region | Number of households | Type of Livestock |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Cattle | Sheep | Goat | Pig | Chicken | Duck |
| Northern |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number | 239,973 | 403,215 | 409,245 | 516,170 | 17,018 | 2,099,462 | 187,365 |
| Percentage | 44.5 | 86.6 | 71.2 | 63.4 | 29.4 | 48.6 | 47.3 |
| Southern |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number | 130,419 | 9,699 | 48,682 | 108,896 | 14,010 | 1,065,918 | 77,227 |
| Percentage | 24.2 | 2.1 | 8.5 | 13.4 | 24.2 | 24.7 | 19.5 |
| Eastern |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number | 147,936 | 45,648 | 101,609 | 171,444 | 15,903 | 882,219 | 108,372 |
| Percentage | 25.4 | 9.8 | 17.7 | 21.1 | 27.5 | 20.4 | 27.4 |
| Western |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number | 31,835 | 7,255 | 15,170 | 17,759 | 10,946 | 268,750 | 23,139 |
| Percentage | 5.9 | 1.6 | 2.6 | 2.2 | 18.9 | 6.2 | 5.8 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Generally, keepers across the country kept more cows than other animals, with a mean number of 19.4. Rural keepers had, unsurprisingly, on average more than urban keepers (19.9 to 16.0) (Table 12.21). The mean number of other animals kept was considerably lower, ranging from a little more than four to nine animals per keeper. In the urban areas the lowest mean number of animals kept was 4.4 for sheep while in rural areas, the lowest mean number was for goats (4.3).


| Livestock | Total |  |  | Urban |  |  | Rural |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. of animals | No. of keepers | Mean animals per keeper | No. of animals | No. of keepers | Mean animals per keeper | No. of animals | No. of keepers | Mean animals per keeper |
| Cattle | 465,817 | 24,015 | 19.4 | 51,827 | 3,244 | 16.0 | 413,990 | 20,771 | 19.9 |
| Sheep | 574,706 | 126,833 | 4.5 | 97,859 | 22,494 | 4.4 | 476,847 | 104,339 | 4.6 |
| Goat | 814,269 | 188,330 | 4.3 | 116,494 | 25,998 | 4.5 | 697,775 | 162,332 | 4.3 |
| Pig | 57,877 | 9,528 | 6.1 | 19,856 | 2,748 | 7.2 | 38,021 | 6,780 | 5.6 |
| Chicken | 4,316,349 | 505,036 | 8.5 | 909,422 | 102,063 | 8.9 | 3,406,927 | 402,973 | 8.5 |
| Duck | 396,103 | 83,507 | 4.7 | 111,465 | 19,953 | 5.6 | 284,638 | 63,554 | 4.5 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census
Unsurprisingly, at least two-thirds of the country's livestock and, therefore, their keepers, were in rural areas, with cattle making up 88.9 per cent. Pigs, chickens and ducks were a more popular choice of livestock in urban areas, probably because they are more easily reared in backyards with feed purchased from shops, instead of grazing.


| Livestock | Animal Population |  |  | Keepers |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Rural | Urban | Total | Rural | Urban | Total |
| Cattle | 88.9 | 11.1 | 100 | 86.5 | 13.5 | 100 |
| Sheep | 83.0 | 17.0 | 100 | 82.3 | 17.7 | 100 |
| Goat | 85.7 | 14.3 | 100 | 86.2 | 13.8 | 100 |
| Pig | 65.7 | 34.3 | 100 | 71.2 | 28.8 | 100 |
| Chicken | 78.9 | 21.1 | 100 | 79.8 | 20.2 | 100 |
| Duck | 71.9 | 28.1 | 100 | 76.1 | 23.9 | 100 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 12.4.5 Fishery

The vast majority (around 80 per cent and above) of households engaged in the fishery industry in three out of the four regions (Northern, Southern and Eastern) were in artisanal fishing. This was also true to a lesser extent in the Western Region, where 56.7 per cent of the households were also in artisanal fishing. Fish ponds accounted for small percentages, ranging from 4.2 per cent in the Southern Region to 14.3 per cent in the Northern Region. Similar percentages of households engaged in coastal fishing in all the regions, with the exception of the Western Region where coastal fishing formed a little more than a third (34 per cent) of fishing activities.

| Region |  |  | Type of fishery |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All households |  | Fish pond | Artisanal <br> fishing | Coastal <br> fishing |
| Number | Total |  | Percentage |  |  |
| All regions | 245,957 | 100.0 | 7.7 | 86.6 | 5.8 |
| Northern | 81,943 | 100.0 | 14.3 | 78.0 | 7.8 |
| Southern | 84,428 | 100.0 | 4.2 | 90.5 | 5.2 |
| Eastern | 75,175 | 100.0 | 4.3 | 93.3 | 2.4 |
| Western | 4,411 | 100.0 | 8.9 | 56.7 | 34.4 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 12.4.6 Access to agricultural facilities

Access to agricultural facilities among the regions varies by type of facility and region. The percentage with access to equipment such as tractors and power tillers is the lowest (less than a tenth) and less than five per cent had access to threshers.

On average, more than half of agricultural households had access to rice mills but the percentage varied from as low as 12 per cent in the Western Region to 53.8 per cent in the Northern Region. At least 40 per cent had access to stores and floors. But the vast majority (more than nine out of every 10 households) did not have access to cassava graters and oil palm pressers.

Agricultural Business Centres (ABCs) were accessible to between 22 and 36 per cent of the households. Households in the Western Region (36 per cent) had the highest proportion of access to the ABCs while the Northern Region ( 22 per cent) recorded the lowest percentage.


Table 12.23 Agriculture households with access to agricultural facilities by region

| Agricultural Facility |  | Region |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All Regions | Northern | Southern | Eastern | Western |  |
| Tractors |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Have access | 6.3 | 9.5 | 6.2 | 3.1 | 6.3 |  |
| No access | 93.7 | 90.5 | 93.8 | 96.9 | 93.7 |  |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |
| Number | 265,857 | 99,966 | 24.3 | 34.6 | 1.3 |  |
| Power tillers |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Have access | 6.3 | 6.2 | 5.3 | 4.5 | 5.9 |  |
| No access | 93.7 | 93.8 | 94.7 | 95.5 | 94.1 |  |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |
| Number | 99,966 | 35.4 | 25.7 | 38.4 | 0.4 |  |

Table 12.23 Agriculture households with access to agricultural facilities by region (continued)

| Agricultural Facility |  | Region |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All Regions | Northern | Southern | Eastern | Western |
| Threshers |  |  |  |  |  |
| Have access | 3.0 | 4.3 | 3.2 | 4.3 | 3.4 |
| No access | 97.0 | 95.7 | 96.8 | 95.7 | 96.6 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number | 99,966 | 68,645 | 94,942 | 2,304 | 265,857 |
| Rice mills |  |  |  |  |  |
| Have access | 53.8 | 24.6 | 65.6 | 12.0 | 50.1 |
| No access | 46.2 | 75.4 | 34.4 | 88.0 | 49.9 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number | 99,966 | 68,645 | 94,942 | 2,304 | 265,857 |
| Stores |  |  |  |  |  |
| Have access | 52.5 | 46.6 | 56.6 | 55.4 | 52.5 |
| No access | 47.5 | 53.4 | 43.4 | 44.6 | 47.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number | 99,966 | 68,645 | 94,942 | 2,304 | 265,857 |
| Drying floors |  |  |  |  |  |
| Have access | 61.8 | 52.6 | 65.7 | 40.7 | 60.6 |
| No access | 38.2 | 47.4 | 34.3 | 59.3 | 39.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number | 99,966 | 68,645 | 94,942 | 2,304 | 265,857 |
| Cassava Grater |  |  |  |  |  |
| Have access | 8.9 | 55.7 | 6.6 | 15.7 | 20.2 |
| No access | 91.1 | 44.3 | 93.4 | 84.3 | 79.8 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number | 99,966 | 68,645 | 94,942 | 2,304 | 265,857 |
| Oil palm pressers |  |  |  |  |  |
| Have access | 1.6 | 5.2 | 1.8 | 3.2 | 2.6 |
| No access | 98.4 | 94.8 | 98.2 | 96.8 | 97.4 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number | 99,966 | 68,645 | 94,942 | 2,304 | 265,857 |
| Agricultural Business Centres (ABC) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Have access | 21.9 | 29.6 | 29.9 | 35.8 | 26.9 |
| No access | 78.1 | 70.4 | 70.1 | 64.2 | 73.1 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number | 99,966 | 68,645 | 94,942 | 2,304 | 265,857 |

### 12.5 Summary, conclusions and recommendations

### 12.5.1 Summary

The 2015 Census enumerated a total of 732,461 agricultural households that engaged in crop, fishery and animal husbandry activities. Rice was the predominant crop produced. The distribution of the agricultural households indicated that 82 per cent resided in rural areas while 12 per cent were urban dwellers. The distribution of the agricultural households by region shows that more than nine out of every 10 of them were in three of the regions - Northern (42.3 per cent), Eastern (27.8 per cent) and Southern (24.9 per cent). The Western Region had only 5 per cent of the households.

The sizes of the agricultural households were generally large in both rural and urban areas. More than 80 per cent of rural and urban places of residence had four or more members. Only seven and nine per cent respectively of the rural and urban agricultural households had three or less members.

The age distribution of the agricultural households showed that the members were predominantly children and youth, just like the national population. Approximately 44 per cent were less than 15 years old. More than seven out of 10 of household members were children, teenagers and young adults combined.

Level of educational attainment was low among agricultural household members. For example, on average almost seven out of every 10 agricultural household heads were not literate in any language. A far higher proportion of the female household heads (85.2 per cent) than males (63.4 per cent) were illiterate.

The heads of the agricultural households were predominantly self-employed without employees, with the proportion ranging from a little more than half in the Western Region to 81 per cent in the Eastern Region. Some of these probably had household members working for them but they were enumerated as unpaid family workers.

Almost all (99.8 per cent) of the agricultural household members were Sierra Leoneans.

The vast percentage of livestock in Sierra Leone, were owned by households in the Northern Region, accounting for almost nine out of every 10 cattle, more than seven out of every 10 sheep and more than six out of every 10 goats. It also had close to half of the chicken and duck population.

The proportion of area under cultivation of different crops in the various regions varied greatly. The highest percentages of land under cultivation of a single crop were 91.4 per cent and 84.8 per cent respectively for cacao and coffee, both in the Eastern Region. The Northern Region also had more than half of the area under lowland rice cultivation and groundnut cultivation. The Southern Region accounted for slightly more than half (50.3 per cent) the area under cultivation of cassava, while the Western Region had a generally negligible percentage of land under cultivation.

Rice was the dominant crop in both rural and urban areas. Cashew and vegetables covered slightly higher percentages of land under cultivation in urban areas compared to rural areas. The rural areas on the other hand had a slightly higher percentage of land under cultivation of cassava, groundnut, coffee and oil palm.

Generally, the mean number of animals owned by keepers varied throughout the country. Cows are the most common animal to be kept (19.4 per keeper) but less were kept in urban and rural areas. The mean number of animals owned by keeper ranged from four goats per keeper to 19 cows per keeper in the entire country.

Access to agricultural facilities was generally limited in all the regions, and the percentages varied from facility to facility. The poorest access recorded was for equipment.

### 12.5.2 Conclusion

A very large percentage of the households in Sierra Leone enumerated at the 2015 Census were agricultural households.

They were mostly in rural areas and were predominantly made up of children and youth. The household sizes were large, usually four or more members. Levels of educational attainment were low. Foreigners form a negligible percentage of the population, suggesting that the country's agricultural sector is not attractive to immigrants.

The heads of agricultural households were predominantly self-employed without employees, even though they might have household members working for them who were enumerated as unpaid family workers. Rice was the dominant crop cultivated in both rural and urban areas.

The animal population and keepers were concentrated in rural areas. Fish ponds accounted for small percentages of fishing activities. Large percentages of most crops produced were not sold. Generally, the majority of the households did not have access to agricultural facilities

### 12.5.3 Recommendations

Agricultural production is a major economic activity in Sierra Leone. Since the vast majority of households is engaged in various agricultural activities, investment in the agricultural sector should be a priority. Access to agricultural equipment should be improved, to enable less laborious methods of cultivation.

The proportion of agricultural produce sold is quite small. Cultivation on a commercial scale should be promoted so that sales of produce can be increased in all the regions. Marketing of produce also needs to be supported by a better transportation network and storage facilities. However, commercial agricultural activities need to be promoted before these are provided. Some of the agricultural produce should be processed in order to increase its value, enabling households to buy access to agricultural facilities. This could also prevent post-harvest loss, a problem which faces households. Once commercial production has been sufficiently increased, the export market should also be explored and promoted.
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## CHAPTER 13: POVERTY AND DURABLE ASSETS

### 13.1 Introduction

Sierra Leone ranks 181 out of 188 countries on the UNDP Human Development Index (HDI) scoring 0.413, classed as 'low human development' (UNDP, 2015). There is no reason why a country with such a small population and such rich mineral wealth and agricultural potential should be poor.

The current challenges facing the country are partly due to the legacy of the 11-year Civil War and the natural disasters (Ebola, mud slides and flooding) which have affected the country in recent years. At the end of the war, the Government drew up a number of policies to help in reconstruction, nation building and to improve the living conditions of its people.

The policies are the Sierra Leone Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (SL-I-PRSP); the Sierra Leone National Recovery Strategy (SRNRS); Sierra Leone Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (SL-PRSP) 2005-2007: A national programme for food security, job creation and good governance, (SL-PRSP I); Sierra Leone Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper 2008 - 2012: An agenda for change (SL-PRSP II); and the Sierra Leone Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper 2013 -2018: The Agenda for Prosperity, Road to Middle Income Status (SL-PRSP III).

The objectives of theSL-I-PRSP wereimplemented in two stages. The first stage was the transitional phase (2001-2002). Its aims were threefold: restoring national security and good governance; re-launching the economy; and providing basic social services to the most vulnerable groups. The second stage was the medium-term (20032004) and focussed on good governance, revival of the economy and social sector development (IMF 2005).

The SRNRS focused on five main areas: the consolidation of state authority and peacebuilding; promotion of reconciliation and enforcement of human rights; facilitating resettlement and reintegration and rebuilding
communities; facilitating access to previously inaccessible areas and expediting service delivery; and stimulating economic recovery (IMF 2005).

The SL-PRSP I was constructed around three pillars: good governance, peace and security; food security, job creation and growth; and human development (IMF 2005). The SL-PRSP II focused on four key areas: energy - providing reliable power supply to the country; agriculture - raising quantity and value-added in agricultural and fishing activities; transportation - develop national transportation network to enable movement of goods and people and thereby facilitate increased investment and economic activity; and human development - ensure sustainable human development through the provision of improved social services (RoSL, no date stated in publication).

The current SL-PRSP III, an agenda for prosperity, is built around eight pillars: diversified economic growth; managing natural resources; accelerating human development; international competitiveness; labour and employment; social protection; governance and public sector reform; and gender and women's empowerment (GoSL, no date stated in publication).

During the implementation of each policy paper, progress is monitored, implementation problems assessed and steps taken to eliminate or minimize the effects of constraints. Lessons learnt from each stage are carried forward to ensure previous mistakes are not repeated. This has ensured 'a generally satisfactory experience' with each policy.

The country is currently embarking on 'the agenda for prosperity' whose main thrust is the country's Vision 2035 - to propel Sierra Leone into being a middle-income country with 80 per cent of its people living above the poverty line. The Government has consistently acknowledged the role of the international community and its development partners in this effort (IMF 2011, 2008).

According to the World Bank and Statistics Sierra Leone (2014), the incidence of poverty declined from 66.4 per cent in 2003 to 52.9 per cent in 2011. Rural poverty fell from 78.7 per cent in 2003 to 66.1 per cent in 2011, while urban poverty declined from 46.9 per cent in 2003 to 31.2 per cent in 2011. Poverty also declined in the Northern, Eastern, and Southern regions, but increased in the Western Region. Poverty declined from 86.0 to 61.3 percent in the Eastern Region, from 80.6 to 61.0 per cent in the Northern Region, and from 64.1 to 55.4 per cent in the Southern Region, but increased in the Western Region from 20.7 to 28.0 per cent. Similar declines are also reported by the SL-PRSP III (GoSL). These declines in poverty may be attributed to the programmes which have been implemented in the country since 2001.

The purpose of this chapter is to analyse the 2015 Census data to assess trends and extent of changes in poverty.

### 13.2 Definition and measurement of poverty. Non-monetary poverty.

### 13.2.1 Definition of poverty

Poverty is the 'condition where people's basic needs for food, clothing and shelter are not being met' (Business dictionary). It is usually defined in absolute or relative terms.

Absolute poverty measures poverty in terms of the amount of money needed to meet basic needs (World Bank) or in terms of calories or nutrition required 'to support a minimum level of physical health' (World Health Organization). Relative poverty, on the other hand, 'defines poverty in relation to the economic status of other members of the society: people are poor if they fall below prevailing standards of living in a given societal context' (UNESCO). That is, relative poverty occurs when people do not enjoy a certain minimum level of living standards as determined by a government (and enjoyed by the bulk of the population) (Business dictionary, 2017). This definition is stated very succinctly
by Townsend as 'the absence or inadequacy of those diets, amenities, standards, services, and activities which are common or customary in society' (Townsend, 1979).

The United Nations definition of absolute poverty, provided in the Copenhagen Declaration at the World Summit for Social Development in 1995, defines poverty in non-monetary terms and is comprehensive in that it encompasses the multi-facetted nature of poverty.

It states:
Absolute poverty is a condition characterized by severe deprivation of basic human needs, including food, safe drinking water, sanitation facilities, health, shelter, education, and information. It depends not only on income but also on access to social services.

This definition of poverty will be adopted for this study as it is operationalized in the UNDP Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI). It reveals both the direct effects - illiteracy, hunger and malnutrition; shortened life spans; illness or death from preventable diseases; and poor health of pregnant women and mothers - and indirect effects - lack of access to essentials such as energy, sanitation, clean drinking water, healthcare, transportation and communication services - of poverty on people (Gale, 2007).

### 13.2.2 Measurement of poverty

For this report, poverty will be measured using the ten indicators of the MPI with appropriate modifications. The index measures poverty across three dimensions namely, education, health and standard of living. Education and health are measured using two indicators each, while living standards has six indicators. The unit of analysis for this index is the household. Each household is described as 'deprived' or 'not deprived' in each indicator, based on certain thresholds of the indicator. The indicator thresholds for households to be considered deprived is described by the UNDP MPI (Alkire \& Santos, 2011) and summarized below.

### 13.2.2.1 Education

Years of schooling: No household member has completed at least six years of schooling.

School attendance: At least one school-age child is not attending school.

### 13.2.2.2 Health

Child mortality: Death of at least one child under five.

Maternal mortality: At least one death due to pregnancy or child birth.

### 13.2.2.2 Standard of living

Electricity: No access to electricity.
Drinking water: No access to clean drinking water, which is defined as water from pipe indoors, pipe in compound, public tap, protected ordinary well and protected ordinary spring. In addition, the source of water must be within the compound or less than half mile away.

Sanitation: No access to improved sanitation or, if improved, it is shared. Improved sanitation is defined as ventilated improved pit (VIP), flushed inside, flushed outside toilets and pit latrine. All these must be private (that is not shared).

Floor: No access to improved floor. Improved floor means floor material must not be sand, dirt or dung.

Cooking fuel: No access to improved cooking fuel. This means cooking fuel used must be electricity or gas or kerosene or solar.

## Assets:

a) Access to information: Not owning at least one asset related to access to information such as radio, television or mobile phone.
b) Mobility: Not owning at least one asset related to mobility (bicycle, motorbike, car, truck, boat).
c) Livelihood: Not owning at least one asset
related to livelihood (refrigerator or freezer, livestock). Livestock means either a head of cattle, two goats, two sheep or ten chickens.

In the MPI, the health dimension is measured by child mortality and nutrition. However, no data on nutrition were collected in the census so the nutrition indicator has been replaced by maternal mortality. This satisfies the requirement that the data for the measurement of the MPI should all come from one single survey or census. This substitution works because maternal mortality is a direct effect of poverty. For this report, the three components of the asset indicator have been shown separately, to identify the specific areas of deprivation for the attention of policy makers.

### 13.3 Data sources and limitations of study

Data for this study are from the 2015 Population and Housing Census, provided by Statistics Sierra Leone (SSL). Secondary data for 2004 were obtained from the Analytical Report on Housing Situation and Characteristics for the 2004 Population and Housing Census, and for 1985 from the Analytical Report, 1985 Population and Housing Census of Sierra Leone.

This report is limited to a descriptive analysis of each indicator. The computation of the MPI and its disaggregation by indicators, regions and place of residence is beyond its scope.

The analysis by indicators is restricted to the 2015 Census data. A comparative analysis with data from previous censuses is limited to the living standards indicators because:

- There is a lack of published data in a form consistent with the current method of analysis; for example, ownership of durable assets in 2004. (However, comparisons with data from other surveys and investigations are carried out where data is available).
- Some data items were not collected in previous censuses, for example, ownership of durable assets was not collected in 1985.


### 13.4 Descriptive analysis of nonmonetary poverty

For simplicity, ease of understanding and to highlight the relevant aspect of each indicator under consideration, this report has adopted the nomenclature used by GSS (2013) with reference to the 10 indicators of the MPI.

### 13.4.1 Education

It has been noted that education is measured by years of schooling (attainment) and school attendance. A household is considered deprived if no member has completed at least six years of schooling (primary education). Consequently, the educational attainment indicator is described as 'primary school completion' since that is precisely what it seeks to measure.

For the school attendance indicator, a household is deprived if at least one child of school going age is not in school. Thus, this indicator is aptly referred to as 'child school attendance'.

Educational attainment is the highest level of schooling each student attended and successfully completed (UN year). In the education sector, primary school completion is measured by the gross completion rate (GCR) for that level. It is the total number of pupils completing the final year of primary education, regardless of age, expressed as a percentage of the official primary school graduation age.

Alghali et al (2005) observed that 'provision of quality, relevant and equitable learning opportunities for all is the policy thrust and overarching objective of education in Sierra Leone'. Indeed, this is a succinct summary of the various national legislations (Education Act 2004, the Child Rights Act 2007), policies (The Sierra Leone Education Sector Plan 2014-2018, The Sierra Leone Sector Capacity Development Strategy 2012-2016 and the Sierra Leone Education Sector Plan 2007-2015) and international goals to which Sierra Leone is a signatory (Education For All, and Millennium Development Goal (MDG) of primary school completion rate of 100 per cent by 2015).

The Government of Sierra Leone introduced a fee-free primary education policy in the 2002/03 academic year (UNESCO 2013). The country also had a national and MDG target of a primary school completion rate of 100 percent by 2015 (SSL 2004).

### 13.4.1.1 Primary school completion

The primary school completion deprivation status of households by region and place of residence is shown in Table 13.1. At the national level, two out of five households are deprived, and there are differences by region. Apart from the Western Region, where the percentage of deprived households is half of the national (one out of five), the other three regions have rates higher than the national value. The Northern Region has the highest figure with half of all its households being deprived, whilst the rates are nearly 43 per cent and 48 per cent for Eastern and Southern regions respectively.

Regional variations in deprivation of households in primary school completion rates have persisted since 2004. SSL (2006) reported significant differences in GCRs among the regions in that year. The Western Region had the highest GCR (88 per cent) and the Northern Region had the lowest (39 per cent).

There are differences by place of residence. Rural households are three times ( 30.8 per cent) more likely to be deprived than urban households (9.7 per cent). Similar differences ( 33.6 per cent, 9.1 per cent) are recorded in the Eastern Region. However, in the Northern and Southern regions, rural households are several times worse off than their urban households ( 7 times and 12 times respectively). It is only in the Western Region that rural households are 18 times better off than their urban counterparts.

In 2007, Nishimuko reported that the completion rate of primary education in Sierra Leone is still below 60 per cent nationally, but this increased to 74 per cent by 2011 (UNESCO 2012).

A number of studies (SLDHS 2013, UNESCO 2013, SSL 2014) have shown that the inability of pupils to complete school is due partly to financial reasons (inability of parents to pay school fees, provide school uniforms, other costs). The issue of school fees in household expenditure costs for children in public schools is disturbing, especially as the Government officially introduced fee-free education in public primary and junior secondary school levels in 2002/03 (Nishimuko 2007, UNESCO 2013). Indeed, the 2011/2012 Sierra Leone Integrated Household Survey (SLIHS) revealed that out of five reasons for low school attendance, no money for fees or books accounted for 77 per cent (SSL 2014).


|  |  | Primary school completion deprivation status |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region |  | Not deprived |  |  | Deprived |  |  | Total No. of households |
|  |  | Total | Rural | Urban | Total | Rural | Urban |  |
| Eastern | No. of HH | 160,978 | 72,891 | 88087 | 120,223 | 25,673 | 94,550 | 281,201 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 57.25 | 25.92 | 31.33 | 42.75 | 9.13 | 33.62 | 100.0 |
| Northern | No. of HH | 206,501 | 80,311 | 126,190 | 207,876 | 27,092 | 180,784 | 414,377 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 49.83 | 19.38 | 30.45 | 50.17 | 6.54 | 43.63 | 100.0 |
| Southern | No. of HH | 128,844 | 40,124 | 88,720 | 119,811 | 9,306 | 110,505 | 248,655 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 51.8 | 16.1 | 35.7 | 48.2 | 3.7 | 44.4 | 100.0 |
| Western | No. of HH | 257,319 | 251,829 | 5,490 | 63,916 | 60,508 | 3,408 | 321,235 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 80.1 | 78.4 | 1.7 | 19.9 | 18.8 | 1.1 | 100.0 |
| All Regions | No. of HH | 753,642 | 445,155 | 308,487 | 511,826 | 122,579 | 389,247 | 1,265,468 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 59.6 | 35.2 | 24.4 | 40.5 | 9.7 | 30.8 | 100.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 13.4.1.2 Child school attendance

The second indicator for assessing poverty in education is child school attendance. Participation in education is usually measured by the gross enrolment ratio (GER) and the net enrolment ratio (NER). The GER is the total enrolment at a particular level of education, regardless of age, expressed as a percentage of the official school-age population for that particular level in a given school year. The NER is total enrolment of the official school age pupils at a particular level, expressed as a percentage of the official school-age population for that particular level in a given school year.

The NER can be used to estimate the number of children not enrolled in school. Deprivation status in child school attendance is presented in Table 13.2. A household is deprived in child school attendance if any child aged between six and 14 years in that household is not attending school. For the country as a whole, 22.3 per cent of households were deprived in 2015. This result is consistent with findings reported by SSL, that in 2004, 29 per cent of 6 to 11 year olds had never attended school (SSL 2004) and a decade later, that nearly half (48 per cent) of all Sierra Leoneans had never had any formal education. One third of these were children of school-going age (less than 18 years old) (SSL 2014).

The data in Table 13.2 shows variation in child school attendance by region. Eastern, Northern and Southern regions have more than 20 per cent of their households deprived in child school attendance while the Western Region has 9 per cent. The Northern Region is the most deprived ( 30.3 per cent), and the Western Region is the most privileged.

These regional differentials have remained unchanged during the past decade, as confirmed by SSL (2006). It noted that the Western Region had the highest NER and GER for both primary and junior secondary schools, while the Northern Region had the lowest NER and GER at both levels. However, in the UNESCO (2013) report, the Southern Region had the lowest NER for the three age groups (6-11, 12-14 and 15-17) in 2010, even though the Northern Region had the lowest rates in 2003/4.Rural-urban differentials persist with child school attendance too. At the national level, the proportion of deprived households in rural areas (31.8 per cent) is about three times that of urban households ( 9.7 per cent). This disparity is also confirmed by UNESCO (2013) who noted that differences by place of residence are apparent for all age groups.

The Southern and Northern regions recorded the largest differences in the proportion of households deprived in child school attendance among rural and urban households. In the Southern Region, 2.3 per cent of urban households are deprived compared to 23.1 per cent for rural households. For the Northern Region, the proportion of deprived rural households ( 26.3 per cent) is nearly seven times that of urban households ( 4 per cent). Unlike the other three regions, the Western Region has a higher proportion of deprived households in urban areas ( 8.6 per cent) than in rural areas ( 0.4 per cent).

The Government's free education at the basic (primary and junior secondary) level and introduction of a fine or a term of imprisonment (or both) for parents or guardians who do not send their children or wards to school have brought some positive outcomes in terms of increased access to primary education (Nishimuko 2007). But the main objectives are yet to be achieved. The fact that over 20 per cent of households are deprived shows that a lot more needs to be done to ensure universal education for all children in Sierra Leone.

## Table 13.2 Household deprivation status in child school attendance by region and place of residence

|  |  | Child school attendance deprivation status |  |  |  |  |  | Total No. of households |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region |  | Not deprived |  |  | Deprived |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total | Urban | Rural | Total | Urban | Rural |  |
| Eastern | No. of HH | 216,544 | 86,458 | 130,086 | 64,657 | 12,106 | 52,551 | 281,201 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 77.0 | 30.7 | 46.3 | 23.0 | 4.3 | 18.7 | 100.0 |
| Northern | No. of HH | 288,979 | 90,874 | 198,105 | 125,398 | 16,529 | 108,869 | 414,377 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 69.7 | 21.9 | 47.8 | 30.3 | 4.0 | 26.3 | 100.0 |
| Southern | No. of HH | 185,495 | 43,822 | 141,673 | 63,160 | 5,608 | 57,552 | 248,655 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 74.6 | 17.6 | 57.0 | 25.4 | 2.3 | 23.1 | 100.0 |
| Western | No. of HH | 292,346 | 284,742 | 7,604 | 28,889 | 27,595 | 1,94 | 321,235 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 91.0 | 88.6 | 2.4 | 9.0 | 8.6 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| All Regions | No. of HH | 983,364 | 505,896 | 477,68 | 282,104 | 61,838 | 220,266 | 1,265,468 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 77.7 | 40.0 | 37.7 | 22.3 | 4.9 | 17.4 | 100.0 |

To help evaluate previous educational policies and programmes and to chart the path for the future, the Global Partnership for Education Secretariat approved USD 361,000 for Sierra Leone in April 2017 to develop an education sector assessment and update the current education sector plan (GPE 2017).

### 13.4.2 Health

The health dimension of household poverty is measured by child and maternal mortality. Tables 13.3 and 13.4 present the data on households that experienced at least one child death and one maternal death respectively, by region and place of residence.

### 13.4.2.1 Child mortality

Sierra Leone has the highest rate of under-5 child mortality in the world ( 182 deaths before the age of five for every 1,000 children born) (UN Tribune 2014).

Child mortality, also referred to as under-five mortality, is the death of a person before they reach age five. It is the probability that a new born baby will die before celebrating their fifth birthday, if subject to age-specific mortality rates of the specified year.

According to the UN: "The under-5 mortality rate is considered a principal indicator of a country's development as it is the result of a number of factors including the health of mothers, the level of immunization, availability of maternal and child health services, income and food availability, availability of clean water and safe sanitation and the overall safety of the child's environment" (UN 2014).

Table 13.3 shows that less than two per cent of all households in the country are deprived in child mortality, that is, they lost at least one child under age five in the census year 2015. The Sierra Leone Demographic and Health Survey (SLDHS) 2013 (SSL \& ICF 2014) reports a decline in under-five mortality rates from 227 deaths per 1,000 live births during 1998-2004 to 156 deaths per 1,000 live births in 2008-2013.

The Sierra Leone multiple indicator cluster surveys(SLMICS) estimate under-five mortality rates of 267 and 217 deaths per 1,000 live births for 2005 and 2010 respectively (SSL \& UNICEF-SL, 2007 and 2011). Even though the levels of the estimates of under-five mortality are not the same (probably due to differences in methods of estimation), the decline in the under-five mortality is also confirmed by the estimates from SLMICS.

There are regional differences in the percentage of households deprived in child mortality. Table 13.2 shows that the Southern Region has the highest proportion of deprived households ( 2.4 per cent), while the Western Region has the lowest ( 0.9 per cent). Eastern and Northern regions have the same proportion of households deprived in child deaths (1.8 per cent).

Similar regional differences were also noted by SSL and UNICEF-SL (2011) and SSL and ICF (2014). SSL and UNICEF-SL reported that under-five mortality rates differ little between the Eastern, Southern and Northern regions (224, 224 and 219 deaths per 1,000 live births respectively) in 2010; but are 30 per cent lower in the Western Region. The under-five mortality rates from the 2013 demographic and health survey range from a low of 157 deaths per 1,000 live births in the Western Region to a high of 200 deaths per 1,000 live births in the Eastern Region (SSL \& ICF 2014).

The data also show child deaths are twice as high in rural than in urban areas. Underfive mortality rates estimated by SSL and ICF ( 181 and 158 death per 1,000 live births for rural and urban areas respectively) and SSL and UNICEF-SL (220 and 202 deaths per 1,000 live births for rural and urban areas respectively) also reveal these differentials by place of residence. The differences by place of residence also manifest across regions. While proportions of urban households deprived in child deaths are less than two per cent in each region, proportions deprived in rural areas are two per cent or more in every region.

| Region | Total |  |  | Urban |  |  | Rural |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total households | Number of affected households | As \% of Total households | Total households | Number of affected households | As \% of Total households | Total households | Number of affected households | As \% of Total households |
| Eastern | 281,201 | 5,129 | 1.8 | 98,564 | 1,562 | 1.6 | 182,637 | 3,567 | 2.0 |
| Northern | 414,377 | 7,602 | 1.8 | 107,403 | 1,453 | 1.4 | 306,974 | 6,149 | 2.0 |
| Southern | 248,655 | 6,066 | 2.4 | 49,430 | 595 | 1.2 | 199,225 | 5,471 | 2.7 |
| Western | 321,235 | 2,995 | 0.9 | 312,337 | 2,811 | 0.9 | 8,898 | 184 | 2.1 |
| All Regions | 1,265,468 | 21,792 | 1.7 | 567,734 | 6,421 | 1.1 | 697,734 | 15,371 | 2.2 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 13.4.2.2 Maternal mortality

A maternal death is the death of a female: 'from any cause related to or aggravated by pregnancy or its management (excluding accidental or incidental causes). Maternal mortality includes deaths during pregnancy, childbirth, or within 42 days of termination of pregnancy, irrespective of the duration and site of the pregnancy ..." (IndexMundi 2017). Maternal deaths are usually measured by the maternal mortality ratio (MMR) which is the number of maternal deaths per 100,000 live births for a specified year.

Information on maternal deaths as presented in Table 13.4 shows that 0.3 per cent of households experienced a maternal death in the entire country. The SLDHS of 2013 recorded a MMR of 1,165 (SSL and ICF (2014). Also, estimates from 2015 indicate that 1 in 17 mothers in Sierra Leone have a lifetime risk of death associated with childbirth (UNICEF 2016). Regional differences are slight, with differences of only 0.1 per cent more or less than the national average (Eastern and Western regions respectively), or values equal to the national average (Northern and Southern regions).

The deprivation status of households in respect to maternal deaths by place of residence also shows slight differences. There is a higher proportion in rural ( 0.3 per cent) compared to urban areas ( 0.2 per cent). There are no differences by place of residence in the Eastern and Northern regions. The Southern and Western regions recorded the same figures and differences as observed in the entire country.

The causes of the high maternal deaths are well documented: post-partum haemorrhage (bleeding after childbirth), obstructed labour, anaemia and toxaemia (pregnancy-induced hypertension). The high maternal mortality is also due to the fact that about 73 per cent of births in Sierra Leone occur in rural areas, where access to health care during pregnancy is limited (Rau 2015, UNICEF 2016). As noted above, these rural households also contribute the majority of child deaths.

To help reduce the high rates of child and maternal mortality, the 2010 Health Care Act introduced a programme of free healthcare for pregnant and lactating women and for children under the age of five. This led to an increase in the number of antenatal care visits. However, the policy did not yield the desired impact, as increased numbers in antenatal care visits was not sustained.

It has also been suggested that the Government increase health infrastructure by having more well equipped national referral centres and peripheral health units to provide comprehensive maternal care. An increase in skilled workers to manage emergency cases, and the deployment of more doctors countrywide to respond to emergency care is also required. Public sensitization on the need to attend antenatal clinic is also essential (Turay 2016).

Currently, a major objective is to provide at least, five fully functional Basic Emergency Obstetrical and Neonatal Care (BEmONC) centres and one Comprehensive Emergency Obstetric and Neonatal Care (CEmONC) centre in each of the 14 districts in the country. This is being funded by the European Union through UNICEF (UNICEF 2016).


Table 13.4 Households that experienced maternal death by region and place of residence

| Region | Total |  |  | Urban |  |  | Rural |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total households | Number of affected households | As \% of Total households | Total households | Number of affected households | As \% of Total households | Total households | Number of affected households | As \% of Total households |
| Eastern | 281,201 | 1,028 | 0.4 | 98,564 | 370 | 0.4 | 182,637 | 658 | 0.4 |
| Northern | 414,377 | 1,199 | 0.3 | 107,403 | 279 | 0.3 | 306,974 | 920 | 0.3 |
| Southern | 248,655 | 659 | 0.3 | 49,430 | 82 | 0.2 | 199,225 | 577 | 0.3 |
| Western | 321,235 | 499 | 0.2 | 312,337 | 469 | 0.2 | 8898 | 30 | 0.3 |
| All Regions | 1,265,468 | 3,385 | 0.3 | 567,734 | 1,200 | 0.2 | 697,734 | 2,185 | 0.3 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 13.4.3 Standard of living

This dimension is measured by six indicators: drinking water, sanitation facilities, type of cooking fuel, material used for floor, electricity and household assets. Previous poverty studies and reports, such as the 2004 Census poverty report, did not consider these indicators separately (SSL, 2006). However, they were included (among other variables) in a multidimensional composite index of poverty. Consequently, comparison with earlier reports on poverty is not possible for these indicators.

### 13.4.3.1 Access to clean drinking water

Clean drinking water is defined as water from a tap inside the house or in the compound, public tap, protected ordinary well and protected ordinary spring. In addition to the listed sources, the distance to the water source must be less than half a mile away.

Any household whose water source is not one of those listed, or is more than half a mile away, is deprived in access to clean water. In 2015, 48.4 per cent of households were deprived in access to clean water (Table 13.5).

Western and Eastern regions had less than half of their households being deprived in access to clean water, while Northern and Southern regions had a little more than half of their households being deprived.

Table 13.5 shows that apart from the Western Region, all the other three regions have higher percentages of households deprived in rural than in urban areas. The Southern Region has the lowest percentage (6.3) of deprived urban households, whilst the Western Region has the highest (32.7) of such households. In rural settlements, the Western Region has the lowest percentage (1.5) of deprived households, with the Northern Region having the highest (49.3 per cent).

An attempt to obtain similar data from previous censuses for trend analysis yielded limited results. The secondary data for these censuses did not provide detailed information on the sources of drinking water as recorded in the 2015 Census. Hence, the trend analysis should be viewed with caution. The data suggests that the level of deprivation in access to clean drinking water has been on the decline from 1985 to 2015 ( $82,73.8$ and 48.4 per cent for 1985, 2004 and 2015 respectively).

Table 13.5 Households' deprivation status in access to clean drinking water by region

|  |  | Household access to clean drinking water deprivation status |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region |  | Not deprived |  |  | Deprived |  |  | Total No. of households |
|  |  | Total | Urban | Rural | Total | Urban | Rural |  |
| Eastern | No. of HH | 154,952 | 68,567 | 86,385 | 126,249 | 29,997 | 96,252 | 281,201 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 55.1 | 24.4 | 30.7 | 44.9 | 10.7 | 34.2 | 100.0 |
| Northern | No. of HH | 172,996 | 70,447 | 102,549 | 241,381 | 36,956 | 204,425 | 414,377 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 41.7 | 17.0 | 24.7 | 58.3 | 8.9 | 49.3 | 100.0 |
| Southern | No. of HH | 114,080 | 33,680 | 80,400 | 134,575 | 15,750 | 118,825 | 248,655 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 45.9 | 13.5 | 32.3 | 54.1 | 6.3 | 47.8 | 100.0 |
| Western | No. of HH | 211,03 | 207,303 | 4,000 | 109,932 | 105,034 | 4,898 | 321,235 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 65.8 | 64.5 | 1.2 | 34.2 | 32.7 | 1.5 | 100.0 |
| All Regions2015 | No. of HH | 653,331 | 379,997 | 273,334 | 612,137 | 187,737 | 424,400 | 1,265,468 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 51.6 | 30.0 | 21.6 | 48.4 | 14.8 | 33.5 | 100.0 |
| All Regions 2004 | No. of HH | * | * | * | * | * | * | 819,484 |
|  | \% of Total HH | $26.2^{\wedge}$ | * | * | $73.8{ }^{\wedge}$ | * | * | 100.0 |

Clean drinking water $=$ Piped indoors, piped in compound, public tap, protected ordinary well, and protected ordinary spring. In addition source of water must be within compound or less than half a mile away.
*Data not available. ^Data classified as tap, wells (all types), rivers and others. Tap was chosen as improved source. Was not possible to incorporate distance to water source due to secondary source of data.
Sources: Compiled from [1] Statistics Sierra Leone, 2004 Population and Housing Census. Analytical Report on Poverty. [2]Central Statistics Office (). The Analytical Report, 1985 Population and Housing Census of Sierra Leone. [3] Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census.

### 13.4.3.2 Improved sanitation

According to the MDGs, improved sanitation facilities are more likely to prevent human contact with human excreta than unimproved facilities. A household is considered to have access to improved sanitation if the household has some type of flush toilet or latrine, or VIP or composting toilet (Santos and Alkire, 2011). Unimproved sanitation facilities include pit latrine without slab or open pit, bucket, no facilities or bush, field or river bed.

Improved sanitation facilities must be for the exclusive use of each household. If the improved facility is shared with one or more households, the households are considered deprived.
In 2015, three out of four households were deprived in the entire country as well as in each region (Table 13.6). A total of 31.7 per cent of urban households were deprived compared to 43 per cent for rural households.

The higher levels of deprivation in rural areas compared to urban areas are replicated in all regions except the Western. The Southern Region has the lowest proportion (10.6 per cent) of deprived urban households whilst the Western Region has the highest (72.4 per cent). For rural areas, the Western Region has the lowest percentage (2.1) of deprived households, while each of the other three regions has more than half of their households deprived in improved sanitation. Comparable data for 2004 shows that 84.6 per cent of all households were deprived in improved sanitation, thus, showing a decline of about 10 per cent from 2004 to 2015.

Table 13.6 Households' deprivation status in access to improved sanitation by region and place of residence

| Region |  | Not deprived |  |  | Deprived |  |  | Total No. of households |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total | Urban | Rural | Total | Urban | Rural |  |
| Eastern | No. of HH | 65,796 | 30.181 | 35,615 | 215,405 | 68,383 | 147,022 | 281,201 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 23.4 | 10.7 | 12,7 | 76.6 | 24.3 | 52.3 | 100.0 |
| Northern | No. of HH | 109,344 | 33,102 | 76,242 | 305,033 | 74,301 | 230,732 | 414,377 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 26.4 | 8.0 | 18,4 | 73.6 | 17.9 | 55.7 | 100.0 |
| Southern | No. of HH | 62,025 | 22,988 | 39,037 | 186,630 | 26,442 | 160,188 | 248,655 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 24.9 | 9.2 | 15,7 | 75.1 | 10.6 | 64.4 | 100.0 |
| Western | No. of HH | 81,970 | 79,701 | 2,269 | 239,265 | 232,636 | 6,629 | 321,235 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 25.5 | 24.8 | 0.7 | 74.5 | 72.4 | 2.1 | 100.0 |
| All Regions 2015 | No. of HH | 319,135 | 165,972 | 153,163 | 946,333 | 401,762 | 544,571 | 1,265,468 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 25.2 | 13.1 | 12.1 | 74.8 | 31.7 | 43.0 | 100.0 |
| All Regions$2004$ | No. of HH | * | * | * | * | * | * | 819,484 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 15.4 | * | * | 84.6 | * | * | 100.0 |

Improved sanitation = VIP, flushed inside, flushed outside or pit. All these must be private.
*Data not available.
Sources: Compiled from [1] Statistics Sierra Leone, 2004 Population and Housing Census, Analytical Report on Poverty. [2] Central Statistics Office (). The Analytical Report, 1985 Population and Housing Census of Sierra Leone.
[3] Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 13.4.3.3 'Improved' cooking fuel

A household is considered deprived in cooking fuel if the household cooks with dung, charcoal or wood. Nearly all households ( 97.8 per cent) were deprived in improved cooking fuel in 2015 (Table 13.7).

The Western Region has the lowest deprivation of 94.4 per cent of household, whilst the Eastern Region has the highest proportion of 99.2 per cent. As usual, there are higher levels of deprivation among rural households and 43.1 per cent of urban households are deprived compared to 54.8 per cent of rural households. The Western Region is again the exception. It has the highest proportion ( 91.7 per cent) of urban households deprived in improved cooking fuel while the Southern Region has the lowest (19.5 per cent). In rural areas, the Western Region has the lowest percentage (2.7) of deprived households; whilst the Southern Region has the highest ( 79.6 per cent). Indeed, the percentages for the other three regions exceed 60 per cent.

The percentage of deprived households has been on the increase over the three decades, having increased from 94.5, 95.3 and 97.8 per cent in 1985, 2004 and 2015 respectively.


| Region |  | Not deprived |  |  | Deprived |  |  | Total No. of households |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total | Urban | Rural | Total | Urban | Rural |  |
| Eastern | No. of HH | 2,151 | 1,348 | 803 | 279,050 | 97,216 | 181,834 | 281,201 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 99.2 | 34.6 | 64.7 | 100.0 |
| Northern | No. of HH | 4,658 | 2,192 | 2,466 | 409,719 | 105,211 | 304,508 | 414,377 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 1.1 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 98.9 | 25.4 | 73.5 | 100.0 |
| Southern | No. of HH | 2,398 | 1,024 | 1,374 | 246,257 | 48,406 | 197,851 | 248,655 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 1.0 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 99.0 | 19.5 | 79.6 | 100.0 |
| Western | No. of HH | 18,113 | 17,903 | 210 | 303,122 | 294,434 | 8,688 | 321,235 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 5.6 | 5.6 | 0.1 | 94.4 | 91.7 | 2.7 | 100.0 |
| All Regions 2015 | No. of HH | 27,320 | 22,467 | 4,853 | 1,238,148 | 545,267 | 692,881 | 1,265,468 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 2.2 | 1.8 | 0.4 | 97.8 | 43.1 | 54.8 | 100.0 |
| All Regions 2004 | No. of HH | * | * | * | * | * | * | 819,484 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 4.7 | * | * | 95.3 | * | * | 100.0 |
| All Regions$1985$ | No. of HH | * | * | * | * | * | * | 475,060 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 5.5 | * | * | 94.5 | * | * | 100.0 |

Improved cooking fuel= electricity, gas, kerosene and solar.
*Data not available.
Sources: Compiled from [1] Statistics Sierra Leone, 2004 Population and Housing Census. Analytical Report on
Poverty. [2] Central Statistics Office, The Analytical Report, 1985 Population and Housing Census of Sierra Leone.
[3] Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 13.4.3.4 Access to improved floor

Flooring material and access to electricity are proxies for the quality of housing in the poverty index (Santos \& Alkire, 2011). Flooring material made of dirt, sand or dung is considered as deprivation in flooring. In the current context, households are not deprived if the floor is made of stone, or tiles or wood.

The data show a sharp decline of 16 per cent of deprived households in this indicator from 62.9 per cent in 2004 to 46.9 per cent in 2015 (Table 13.8). In 2015, the Western Region had less than six per cent of its households deprived in flooring compared to about 60 per cent for each of the other three regions. Rural households are worse off in improved flooring compared to urban households; in 2015, 5.7 per cent of urban households were deprived in improved flooring compared to 41.3 per cent for rural households.

Similar deprivation percentages of 2.7, 4.8, 5.4 and 9.7 are observed for urban areas in Southern, Western, Northern and Eastern regions respectively. The deprivation rates in rural areas are over 50 per cent for Eastern, Northern and Southern regions, whilst it is 0.9 per cent in the Western Region.


|  |  | Household access to improved floor Deprivation status |  |  |  |  |  | Total No. of households |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region |  | Not deprived |  |  | Deprived |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total | Urban | Rural | Total | Urban | Rural |  |
| Eastern | No. of HH | 109,542 | 71,269 | 38,273 | 171,659 | 27,295 | 144,364 | 281,201 |
|  | $\% \text { of Total }$ $\mathrm{HH}$ | 39.0 | 25.3 | 13.6 | 61.0 | 9.7 | 51.3 | 100.0 |
| Northern | No. of HH | 162,685 | 85,133 | 77,552 | 251,692 | 22,270 | 229,422 | 414,377 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% of Total } \\ & \text { HH } \end{aligned}$ | 39.3 | 20.5 | 18.7 | 60.7 | 5.4 | 55.4 | 100.0 |
| Southern | No. of HH | 96,581 | 42,757 | 53,824 | 152,074 | 6,673 | 145,401 | 248,655 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 38.8 | 17.2 | 21.6 | 61.2 | 2.7 | 58.5 | 100.0 |
| Western | No. of HH | 302,725 | 296,793 | 5,932 | 18,510 | 15,544 | 2,966 | 321,235 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 94.2 | 92.4 | 1.8 | 5.8 | 4.8 | 0.9 | 100.0 |
| All Regions 2015 | No. of HH | 671,533 | 495,952 | 175,581 | 593,35 | 71,782 | 522,153 | 1,265,468 |
|  | \% of Total <br> HH | 53.1 | 39.2 | 13.9 | 46.9 | 5.7 | 41.3 | 100.0 |

Improved floor = stone, tiles, cement and wood.
*Data not available.
Sources: Compiled from [1] Statistics Sierra Leone, 2004 Population and Housing Census. Analytical Report on Poverty. [2] Central Statistics Office, The Analytical Report, 1985 Population and Housing Census of Sierra Leone.
[3] Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 13.4.3.5 Access to electricity

In 2015, 82 per cent of households in the country were deprived in access to electricity (Table 13.9). This is an improvement over the 94.8 per cent in 2004 and 90.9 per cent in 1985.

Eastern, Northern and Southern regions all had more than 90 per cent of their households deprived in electricity access, while the Western Region had 48.3 per cent of households deprived.

Rural urban differentials once more exist in access to electricity. The proportion of households deprived in access to electricity in urban areas ( 27.4 per cent) is half of the proportion deprived in rural areas (54.7 per cent).

These differentials are more pervasive in the regions. The Southern Region has the largest difference (14 per cent urban and 79.7 per cent rural), followed by the Northern Region (20.1 per cent urban and 73.3 per cent rural) and the Eastern Region ( 29.3 per cent urban and 64.8 per cent rural). It is only in the Western Region that the percentage of deprived households is higher in urban areas ( 45.6 per cent) than in rural areas ( 2.8 per cent).

##  <br> Table 13.9 Households' electricity access deprivation status by region and place of residence

| Region |  | Not deprived |  |  | Deprived |  |  | Total No. of households |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total | Urban | Rural | Total | Urban | Rural |  |
| Eastern | No. of HH | 16,546 | 16,088 | 458 | 264,655 | 82,476 | 182,179 | 281,201 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 5.9 | 5.7 | 0.2 | 94.1 | 29.3 | 64.8 | 100.0 |
| Northern | No. of HH | 27,448 | 24,057 | 3,391 | 386,929 | 83,346 | 303,583 | 414,377 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 6.6 | 5.8 | 0.8 | 93.4 | 20.1 | 73.3 | 100.0 |
| Southern | No. of HH | 15,615 | 14,591 | 1,024 | 233,040 | 34,839 | 198,201 | 248,655 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 6.3 | 5.9 | 0.4 | 93.7 | 14.0 | 79.7 | 100.0 |
| Western | No. of HH | 165,942 | 165,911 | 31 | 155,293 | 146,426 | 8,867 | 321,235 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 51.7 | 51.6 | 0.0 | 48.3 | 45.6 | 2.8 | 100.0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { All Regions } \\ & 2015 \end{aligned}$ | No. of HH | 225,551 | 220,647 | 4,904 | 1,039,917 | 347,087 | 692,830 | 1,265,468 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 17.8 | 17.4 | 0.4 | 82.2 | 27.4 | 54.7 | 100.0 |
| All Regions$2004$ | No. of HH | * | * | * | * | * | * | 819,484 |
|  | \% of Total HH | $5 .{ }^{\wedge}$ | * | * | * | 94.8 | * | 100.0 |
| All Regions1985 | No. of HH | * | * | * | * | * | * | 475,060 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 9.1 | * | * | * | 90.9 | * | 100.0 |

[^12]The five housing indicators of standard of living showed that the Western Region has the lowest percentage of deprived households in four of these indicators, namely, clean drinking water, improved cooking fuel, improved floor, and electricity.

The Northern Region has the smallest percentage of deprived households in sanitation and the highest in cleaning drinking water. The Southern Region is the worst for improved floor, while the Eastern Region is the most deprived in three indicators - sanitation, improved cooking fuel and electricity.

The Western Region is thus the least deprived with respect to housing poverty and the Eastern Region is the most deprived. These findings for the Western Region are consistent with reports by SSL (2006) that the Western Region is rich in terms of housing.

However, this same report found the Northern not the Eastern Region to be the most deprived in terms of housing poverty.

### 13.4.4 Assets

Ownership of household goods is a very good proxy for a household's socioeconomic status. Data on ownership of durable goods were collected for the first time in the 2004 Census. There were 11 items, namely, electric iron, refrigerator, television, computer, radio, telephone, cell phone, modern stove, bicycle, motor cycle and car/truck. For the 2015 Census, the list of durable goods was increased to 16 , adding charcoal iron, generator, bed, sofa and boat. Car/truck was also separated out and considered as two items. Refrigerator was combined with freezer and telephone (landline) was dropped, leaving only mobile phone.

The discussion on the deprivation of status of households with respect to durable assets is preceded by a description of household assets by characteristics of dwelling unit (region and place of residence, type of dwelling unit) as well as characteristics of the head of household (sex, age, education, marital status, economic
activity status and main employment status).
It has not been possible to obtain data on the ownership of individual household items for the 2004 Census data. Such data are however available for the 2008 and 2013 SLDHS (SSL \& ICF, 2009 \& 2014). That list has 10 items (car and truck considered a single item) but excludes charcoal iron, electric iron, generator, computer, bed, sofa and modern stove. Even though the data from the SLDHS was collected on a sample basis, it was a nationally representative sample and hence could facilitate comparison with the current data where necessary.

Some data on asset-based poverty are also published in the SL-PRSP I (ownership of consumer durables by quintiles) and SLPRSR II (percentage of households owning certain durable assets in 2007). The tables on ownership of household durable goods show the percentages of households that own each of the 16 items. These are mutually exclusive and hence do not add up to 100 per cent.

According to the SL-PRSP II (RoSL), the incidence of national asset-based poverty declined from 67.5 per cent in 2003 to 61.6 per cent in 2007. In rural areas the decline was marginal, from 78.6 per cent to 77.1 per cent; while in urban areas the decline was from 47.3 in 2003 to 35.4 per cent in 2007.

### 13.4.4.1 Ownership of household assets by region and place of residence

The most common goods owned by households in Sierra Leone are a bed (81.2 per cent), radio ( 65.9 per cent) and mobile phone ( 62.9 per cent) (Table 13.10). Fewer households own a charcoal iron (29.7 per cent) and television (19.8 per cent). A sofa (14.6 per cent) and fridge/freezer (10.3 per cent) have lower ownership rates.

For mobility goods, motorcycles come out top with 7.6 per cent ownership followed by bicycle ( 6.4 per cent), car ( 3.7 per cent), boat ( 2.4 per cent) and truck ( 0.6 per cent).

Ownership of non-information electrical goods such as fridge/freezer (10.3 per cent), generator ( 8.2 per cent) and electric iron (5.5 per cent) show no discernible patterns.

The national pattern of the top four leading goods - bed, radio, mobile phone and charcoal iron - is replicated across all regions. However, in the Western Region ownership of mobile phone (89.9 per cent) tops the list and also a higher proportion of households own a bed, radio and charcoal iron compared to the other three regions.

Indeed in this region, apart from less than 10 per cent ownership of mobility goods, ownership of all other goods exceeds 15 per cent. The Western Region also has the highest ownership rates for all goods except bicycle, motorcycle, truck and boat.

Motorcycle and bicycle ownership are the leaders in the Eastern ( 8.0 and 5.1 per cent respectively) and Northern ( 8.7 and 7.4 per cent respectively) regions, motorcycle and boat ( 6.9 and 6.3 per cent respectively) are most common in the Southern Region and car and bicycle (9.7 and 7.1 per cent respectively) are most popular in the Western Region. Ownership of a boat is highest in the Southern Region ( 6.3 per cent) and lowest in the Eastern Region ( 0.6 per cent).

Ownership of durable goods shows differentials by place of residence and the type of the asset. With the exception of a boat, which has a higher ownership rate among rural households ( 3.4 per cent compared to 1.2 per cent for urban), all other assets have higher ownership rates for urban households.

The disparities by place of residence are more pronounced for most of the electronic goods. For example, 11. 7 per cent of urban households own an electric iron, compared with 0.4 per cent of rural households. Similarly, 22 per cent of urban households own a fridge/ freezer compared to 0.8 per cent of rural households.

These large rural-urban differentials in ownership of electrical goods were also noted in the SLDHS (SSL \& ICF 2014, 2009) and also in the SL-PRSP II. Although ruralurban differences also persist in ownership of radio ( 54.4 and 80.2 per cent respectively) and mobile phones (43.3 and 86.9 per cent respectively), the variations are less pronounced.

Variations by place of residence for mobility goods are not as marked as some of those noted above. As noted earlier, urban households have higher ownership rates for all mobility goods except a boat. The proportions of households owning a bicycle and motorcycle in urban areas is twice that in rural areas, while the likelihood of urban households owning a car or truck is 10 times that of rural households.

This large variation in ownership proportions for car or truck between rural and urban areas is actually a decline from the 2007 level when urban households were 14 times more likely to own a car or truck (SL-PRSP II).

Table 13.10 Percentage of households owning durable goods by region and residence

| Durable goods |  | Region |  |  |  | Residence |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total country | Northern | Southern | Eastern | Western | Rural | Urban |
| No. of households | 1,265,468 | 281,201 | 414,377 | 248,655 | 321,235 | 697,734 | 567,734 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Electric iron | 5.5 | 1.0 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 17.0 | 0.4 | 11,7 |
| Charcoal iron | 29.7 | 22.4 | 20.3 | 19.8 | 55.8 | 11.1 | 52.5 |
| Generator | 8.2 | 4.5 | 4.2 | 5.8 | 18.5 | 2.4 | 15.3 |
| Fridge/ freezer | 10.3 | 2.8 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 30.4 | 0.8 | 22.0 |
| TV | 19.8 | 7.5 | 8.1 | 8.9 | 53.9 | 2.6 | 40.9 |
| Computer | 5.8 | 2.4 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 15.1 | 1.0 | 11.7 |
| Radio | 66.0 | 65.8 | 58.5 | 60.6 | 79.9 | 54.4 | 80.2 |
| Mobile phone | 62.9 | 56.3 | 52.4 | 53.3 | 89.9 | 43.4 | 86.9 |
| Modern stove | 6.3 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 15.4 | 2.0 | 11.6 |
| Bed | 81.2 | 82.1 | 74.3 | 84.6 | 86.6 | 76.2 | 87.3 |
| Sofa | 14.6 | 14.1 | 6.5 | 10.8 | 28.3 | 8.9 | 21.6 |
| Bicycle | 6.4 | 5.1 | 7.4 | 5.5 | 7.1 | 4.6 | 8.7 |
| Motorcycle | 7.6 | 8.0 | 8.7 | 6.9 | 6.5 | 5.4 | 10.3 |
| Car | 3.7 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 9.7 | 0.7 | 7.3 |
| Truck | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 02 | 1.1 |
| Boat | 2.4 | 0.6 | 2.2 | 6.3 | 1.3 | 3.4 | 1.2 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 13.4.4.2 Ownership of household goods by characteristics of dwelling units

The ownership pattern of the top four goods (bed, radio, mobile phone and charcoal iron) varies according to the type of dwelling units (Table 3.11). For households in improvised homes, the top four goods are mobile phone ( 85.2 per cent), bed ( 80.5 per cent), radio ( 74.3 per cent), charcoal iron ( 42.7 per cent). Ownership of mobile phone has the highest proportion.

Ownership of mobility goods among households in different types of dwelling units also follows the same pattern observed in the entire country, namely, motorcycle, bicycle, car, boat and truck. The pattern for households in huts/buildings in different compounds does not conform to the national pattern. For this group, a boat is the most popular, followed by motorcycle, bicycle, car and truck.

Households living in compound houses have the highest ownership rates for 11 out of 16 goods, the exceptions being mobile phone, radio, television (households in improvised homes have the highest rates for these three goods), truck (highest rate of 1.1 per cent by other category) and boat.

Households living in huts/buildings in different compounds have the lowest ownership rate in all but two goods - sofa and boat. These households have the highest ownership rate ( 4.6 per cent) for boat. Even though their ownership rates for bed ( 68.2 per cent), radio ( 44.9 per cent) and mobile phone ( 33.4 per cent) are the lowest, the rates show that a reasonable percentage of households own these items.


| Durable goods |  | Type of dwelling unit |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total country | Separate house | Semidetached house | Flat/ Apartment | Compound house (rooms) | Huts/ Buildings (same compound) |
| No. of HH | 1,265,468 | 685,348 | 89,124 | 261,181 | 131,072 | 30,758 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Electric Iron | 5.5 | 3.2 | 8.1 | 8.8 | 9.6 | 5.1 |
| Charcoal Iron | 29.7 | 23 | 39.9 | 38.2 | 43.2 | 24.4 |
| Generator | 8.2 | 6.2 | 10.5 | 11.5 | 12 | 6.2 |
| Fridge/ Freezer | 10.3 | 5.9 | 16.1 | 16.1 | 18.4 | 9.5 |
| TV | 19.8 | 11.5 | 32.1 | 29.6 | 35 | 18 |
| Computer | 5.8 | 3.8 | 7.9 | 8.6 | 9.7 | 5.2 |
| Radio | 66 | 62.3 | 72.1 | 71.6 | 73.3 | 58.7 |
| Mobile Phone | 62.9 | 55.8 | 74.1 | 71.5 | 77.4 | 54.6 |
| Modern Stove | 6.3 | 4.5 | 8.3 | 8.8 | 10 | 5.3 |
| Bed | 81.2 | 80 | 83.3 | 83.6 | 85.5 | 75.5 |
| Sofa | 14.6 | 12.1 | 17.3 | 18.6 | 19.4 | 12.9 |
| Bicycle | 6.4 | 6 | 7.1 | 7.4 | 7.7 | 5.4 |
| Motorcycle | 7.6 | 7.2 | 8.2 | 8.4 | 9 | 6.9 |
| Car | 3.7 | 2.5 | 4.5 | 5.4 | 6.2 | 3.1 |
| Truck | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 1 | 0.6 |


| Durable goods | Type of dwelling unit |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Huts/ Buildings (different compound) | Tent | Improvised home (kiosk container board pan-body) | Uncompleted building | Other |
| No. of HH | 18,031 | 10,025 | 27,578 | 9,467 | 2,884 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Electric Iron | 0.7 | 2.3 | 7.1 | 5.5 | 5.9 |
| Charcoal Iron | 6.7 | 20.4 | 42.7 | 31.4 | 26.5 |
| Generator | 1.6 | 5 | 10.6 | 9.6 | 9 |
| Fridge/ Freezer | 1.3 | 4.5 | 16.8 | 9.7 | 9.6 |
| TV | 2.7 | 9.5 | 38.2 | 18.6 | 16.5 |
| Computer | 1 | 3.4 | 6.9 | 6.2 | 6.2 |
| Radio | 44.9 | 55.4 | 74.3 | 66.5 | 64.7 |
| Mobile Phone | 33.4 | 49.8 | 85.2 | 69.3 | 62.4 |
| Modern Stove | 1.7 | 4.3 | 8.7 | 7 | 6.6 |
| Bed | 68.2 | 72.7 | 80.5 | 75.9 | 77.8 |
| Sofa | 7.9 | 7 | 16.2 | 12.4 | 13.2 |
| Bicycle | 3.4 | 5.8 | 4.3 | 5.4 | 6.7 |
| Motorcycle | 4.1 | 8 | 5.8 | 6.6 | 6.4 |
| Car | 0.6 | 2 | 3.1 | 4 | 4.1 |
| Truck | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 1.1 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 13.4.4.3 Ownership of household goods by sex of head and place of residence

The ownership of household durable goods by sex of household head and place of residence are presented in Table 13.12. Male-headed households have higher ownership rates of all durable goods except refrigerator/freezer where the rate is slightly higher for females (by 0.2 per cent).

A similar situation prevailed in 2007. Out of seven household assets (home, land, car/truck, fan, refrigerator, cell phone and radio), male-headed households had higher percentages owning all goods, except for refrigerator where the percentage for females, was higher than 0.3 percent higher (SL - PRSP II). This higher ownership rate for females may be because women are more aware of the benefits a refrigerator brings to food storage.

Ownership of goods by sex of head shows patterns similar to the national. The five most common goods are the same for each sex. Five goods (electric iron, charcoal iron, fridge/ freezer, modern stove and sofa) show slight differences.

For all the remaining 11 goods, differences between male and female-headed households are more pronounced; for example, radio (males 69.3 per cent; females 56.1 per cent) and mobile phone (males 65.8 per cent; females 55.7 per cent), for motorcycle (male 9 per cent, female 4.1 per cent) and boat (male 2.8 per cent, female 1.4 per cent).

Comparisons by sex of head of household and place of residence still favour males in both places. The differences in this case are more accentuated in rural areas. This suggests that male-headed rural households are better off than female-headed rural households.

## 통 <br> Table 13.12 Percentage of households owning durables <br> by place of residence and sex of head of household

|  | Both Sexes |  |  | Male Head |  |  | Female Head |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Durable good/ ownership status | Total | Rural | Urban | Total | Rural | Urban | Total | Rural | Urban |
| No. of households | 1,265,468 | 697,734 | 567,734 | 909,535 | 504,818 | 404,717 | 355,933 | 192,916 | 163,017 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Electric iron | 5.5 | 0.4 | 11.7 | 5.6 | 0.4 | 12.0 | 5.2 | 0.3 | 11.1 |
| Charcoal iron | 29.7 | 11.1 | 52.5 | 29.8 | 11.8 | 52.3 | 29.4 | 9.4 | 53.1 |
| Generator | 8.2 | 2.4 | 15.3 | 9.0 | 2.7 | 16.8 | 6.3 | 1.6 | 11.8 |
| Refrigerator/ freezer | 10.3 | 0.8 | 22.0 | 10.2 | 0.8 | 22.0 | 10.6 | 0.8 | 22.1 |
| Television | 19.8 | 2.6 | 40.9 | 20.5 | 2.8 | 42.7 | 17.8 | 1.9 | 36.6 |
| Computer | 5.8 | 1.0 | 11.7 | 6.3 | 1.1 | 12.7 | 4.6 | 0.7 | 9.1 |
| Radio | 66.0 | 54.4 | 80.2 | 69.8 | 59.4 | 82.8 | 56.1 | 41.4 | 73.5 |
| Mobile phone | 62.9 | 43.4 | 86.9 | 65.8 | 47.4 | 88.8 | 55.7 | 33.0 | 82.4 |
| Modern stove | 6.3 | 2.0 | 11.6 | 6.4 | 2.1 | 11.8 | 6.0 | 1.9 | 10.9 |
| Bed | 81.2 | 76.2 | 87.3 | 81.9 | 77.4 | 87.6 | 79.3 | 73.1 | 86.6 |
| Sofa | 14.6 | 8.9 | 21.6 | 14.8 | 9.1 | 21.9 | 14.0 | 8.4 | 20.7 |
| Bicycle | 6.4 | 4.6 | 8.7 | 7.0 | 5.2 | 9.2 | 5.0 | 2.7 | 7.6 |
| Motorcycle | 7.6 | 5.4 | 10.3 | 9.0 | 6.4 | 12.2 | 4.1 | 2.7 | 5.6 |
| Car | 3.7 | 0.7 | 7.3 | 4.1 | 0.8 | 8.2 | 2.5 | 0.4 | 5.1 |
| Truck | 0.6 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.7 |
| Boat | 2.4 | 3.4 | 1.2 | 2.8 | 3.9 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 2.0 | 0.8 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 13.4.4.4 Ownership of household assets by age of head

Household heads aged 55 to 59 have the highest ownership rates for 10 out the 16 goods (Table 13.13). The exceptions are television, computer, mobile phone, modern stove, motorcycle and boat; where they are placed between second and sixth. The ownership rates for these items were all above the national average except for mobile phone which was lower than the national average.

Households with heads aged 75 years and over have the lowest ownership in 12 out of the 16 goods, the only exceptions being bed, sofa, car and boat. For bed, they are only better off than the youngest age group, for sofa and car they are better off than the three youngest age groups.

Household with heads aged 70 to 74 are just a little better off than their older counterparts. In their case they are second to last in ten items, with the same exceptions as before, in addition to freezer and truck. The proportions of households with heads age 70 to 74 owning these items are higher for this age group than for the four youngest age groups.

There appears to be a trend where ownership rates for certain types of goods are higher among younger, middle or older age groups. For example, households with young heads have higher ownership rates in electronic goods. Those with heads aged 25-29 and 30-34 have the highest ownership rates for computer ( 6.8 and 7 per cent respectively) and heads aged 20-24 and 25-29 have the highest ownership rates for mobile phone ( 70.9 and 70.2 percent respectively).

Ownership rates for motorcycle are higher among heads aged 25-29 to 45-49, stove and bed (30-34 to 55-59), sofa (30-34 to 65-69), bicycle (35-39 to 55-59), car (35-39 to 65-69), truck (40-44 to 65-60) and boat (40-44 to 75+).


Table 13.13 Percentage of households owning durable goods by age of head

| Household durable goods | Total country | Age group of head of household |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 15-19 | 20-24 | 25-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | 40-44 | 45-49 |
| No. of HH | 1,265,68 | 15,291 | 62,681 | 138,726 | 148,416 | 191,384 | 156,927 | 146,621 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Electric iron | 5.5 | 3.4 | 4.1 | 4.9 | 6.3 | 5.9 | 6.2 | 5.5 |
| Charcoal iron | 29.7 | 30.0 | 28.3 | 27.7 | 28.4 | 28.6 | 30.8 | 31.2 |
| Generator | 8.2 | 8.3 | 7.1 | 7.3 | 8.4 | 8.5 | 9.1 | 8.8 |
| Fridge/ freezer | 10.3 | 6.7 | 6.9 | 8.6 | 11.6 | 11.1 | 11.7 | 10.7 |
| Television | 19.8 | 15.6 | 20.0 | 22.7 | 24.2 | 21.3 | 20.9 | 18.8 |
| Computer | 5.8 | 4.7 | 6.2 | 6.8 | 7.0 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 5.6 |
| Radio | 66.0 | 60.2 | 64.7 | 66.8 | 67.2 | 67.5 | 67.5 | 68.2 |
| Mobile phone | 62.9 | 63.8 | 70.9 | 70.2 | 67.3 | 65.7 | 63.8 | 63.1 |
| Modern stove | 6.3 | 5.1 | 5.5 | 6.1 | 7.0 | 6.6 | 6.8 | 6.3 |
| Bed | 81.2 | 75.1 | 78.1 | 80.2 | 81.6 | 81.7 | 81.9 | 82.3 |
| Sofa | 14.6 | 10.3 | 11.0 | 12.2 | 14.7 | 14.9 | 15.4 | 15.1 |
| Bicycle | 6.4 | 6.8 | 5.7 | 5.5 | 6.0 | 6.6 | 7.2 | 7.1 |
| Motorcycle | 7.6 | 5.9 | 7.3 | 8.6 | 8.5 | 8.4 | 8.2 | 8.0 |
| Car | 3.7 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.4 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 4.3 | 4.1 |
| Truck | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Boat | 2.4 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 2.0 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 2.6 | 2.7 |


|  |  | Age group of head of household |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Household durable goods | Total country | 50-54 | 55-59 | 60-64 | 65-69 | 70-74 | $75+$ |
| No. of HH | 1,265,68 | 115,692 | 72,545 | 69,521 | 47,699 | 39,269 | 60696 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Electric iron | 5.5 | 6.0 | 6.6 | 5.2 | 5.4 | 4.1 | 3.0 |
| Charcoal iron | 29.7 | 32.6 | 35.4 | 30.2 | 32.0 | 25.9 | 23.0 |
| Generator | 8.2 | 8.9 | 9.8 | 7.9 | 8.2 | 6.2 | 5.0 |
| Fridge/ freezer | 10.3 | 11.2 | 12.4 | 10.1 | 10.6 | 8.1 | 6.4 |
| Television | 19.8 | 19.0 | 20.1 | 15.9 | 16.5 | 12.6 | 10.2 |
| Computer | 5.8 | 5.9 | 6.3 | 4.9 | 5.0 | 3.7 | 2.8 |
| Radio | 66.0 | 66.7 | 68.0 | 62.7 | 63.9 | 58.4 | 55.8 |
| Mobile phone | 62.9 | 60.8 | 62.5 | 55.0 | 56.0 | 49.0 | 44.2 |
| Modern stove | 6.3 | 6.6 | 6.9 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 4.8 | 4.2 |
| Bed | 81.2 | 82.1 | 82.9 | 80.7 | 81.6 | 79.4 | 78.0 |
| Sofa | 14.6 | 15.8 | 16.7 | 15.5 | 16.1 | 13.7 | 13.1 |
| Bicycle | 6.4 | 7.1 | 7.3 | 6.3 | 6.4 | 5.4 | 4.7 |
| Motorcycle | 7.6 | 7.3 | 7.7 | 6.2 | 6.1 | 4.8 | 4.1 |
| Car | 3.7 | 4.3 | 4.9 | 4.1 | 4.4 | 3.1 | 2.4 |
| Truck | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.4 |
| Boat | 2.4 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 2.6 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 13.4.4.5 Ownership of household goods by marital status of head

Ownership of household durable goods by marital status of head is presented in Table 13.14. The data show that household with heads who have never married have the highest ownership rates in all but five goods (bed, bicycle, motorcycle, truck and boat). Households with heads who are engaged are placed second in all but three goods, namely bed (first), car and truck (third).

Households where the head is widowed have the lowest ownership percentages for all goods.
Household with heads who are married and in monogamous unions also have higher ownership rates than those in polygamous unions in all but five goods (mobile phone, bed, bicycle, motor and boat).

Heads of households who are cohabiting have higher ownership rates for most items than those who are married. The latter have a higher advantage with mobility goods. Households whose heads are divorced also have higher ownership rates in 11 items than those who are separated.

Table 13.14 Percentage of households owning durable goods by marital status of head

| Household durable goods | Total country | Marital status of head of household |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Never married | Engaged | Married monogamous | Married polygamous | Co-habitation (< 5 years) |
| No. of HH | 1,265 468 | 112,187 | 70,862 | 174,382 | 744,678 | 3,192 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Electric iron | 5.5 | 12.2 | 7.1 | 6.3 | 4.3 | 7.6 |
| Charcoal iron | 29.7 | 41.4 | 37.7 | 30.6 | 27.2 | 35.7 |
| Generator | 8.2 | 11.5 | 10.7 | 8.8 | 7.9 | 8.9 |
| Fridge/ freezer | 10.3 | 18.1 | 14.7 | 11.3 | 8.7 | 11.9 |
| Television | 19.8 | 37.9 | 31.8 | 19.2 | 16.7 | 26.5 |
| Computer | 5.8 | 13.0 | 7.7 | 6.4 | 4.7 | 7.8 |
| Radio | 66.0 | 73.1 | 72.7 | 63.2 | 67.2 | 65.2 |
| Mobile phone | 62.9 | 81.8 | 76.2 | 60.3 | 61.5 | 73.2 |
| Modern stove | 6.3 | 11.4 | 8.5 | 7.0 | 5.3 | 7.9 |
| Bed | 81.2 | 82.0 | 82.1 | 80.3 | 81.7 | 81.5 |
| Sofa | 14.6 | 18.7 | 17.6 | 14.6 | 13.6 | 14.8 |
| Bicycle | 6.4 | 6.1 | 6.3 | 6.1 | 7.0 | 6.0 |
| Motorcycle | 7.6 | 7.5 | 8.1 | 6.5 | 8.7 | 7.0 |
| Car | 3.7 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.4 | 3.5 | 3.8 |
| Truck | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 |
| Boat | 2.4 | 0.9 | 1.9 | 1.7 | 3.1 | 1.1 |

Table 13.14 Percentage of households owning durable goods by marital status of head (continued)

| Household durable goods | Total country | Marital status of head of household |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Co-habitation (= >5 years) | Separated | Divorced | Widowed | Don't know |
| No. of HH | 1,265 468 | 2,044 | 30,954 | 19,623 | 106,728 | 818 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Electric iron | 5.5 | 7.6 | 5.9 | 7.2 | 3.8 | 7.8 |
| Charcoal iron | 29.7 | 36.9 | 32.1 | 33.5 | 25.9 | 33.9 |
| Generator | 8.2 | 7.8 | 6.8 | 7.9 | 5.1 | 7.1 |
| Fridge/ freezer | 10.3 | 13.8 | 11.2 | 12.5 | 8.5 | 10.8 |
| Television | 19.8 | 28.7 | 21.5 | 21.9 | 13.9 | 22.7 |
| Computer | 5.8 | 7.4 | 5.3 | 6.2 | 3.4 | 5.9 |
| Radio | 66.0 | 64.9 | 63.3 | 63.2 | 50.7 | 64.5 |
| Mobile phone | 62.9 | 71.7 | 63.1 | 61.8 | 48.1 | 65.6 |
| Modern stove | 6.3 | 8.1 | 7.1 | 7.9 | 4.7 | 8.2 |
| Bed | 81.2 | 78.3 | 80.8 | 79.5 | 78.0 | 74.9 |
| Sofa | 14.6 | 19.2 | 15.9 | 16.6 | 14.1 | 13.7 |
| Bicycle | 6.4 | 5.8 | 4.7 | 5.3 | 4.2 | 4.6 |
| Motorcycle | 7.6 | 5.9 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 3.2 | 3.5 |
| Car | 3.7 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 3.7 | 2.0 | 3.5 |
| Truck | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 1.3 |
| Boat | 2.4 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.1 | 1.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 13.4.4.6 Ownership of household goods by level of education of head

Ownership of household goods classified by education (highest level attained) of household head is presented in Table 13.15. As expected, households with heads who have tertiary and higher education top the list for ownership of all durable goods except boat; achieving over 90 per cent ownership for radio, mobile phone and bed. Apart from boat, where their ownership rate is below the national average, they are well above average for all goods.

Households whose heads have no education and those with Koranic education own the least durable goods. However, household heads with Koranic education have the highest ownership rate ( 5.2 per cent) for boats. Households whose heads have only kindergarten education have higher ownership rates than households whose heads have primary and JSS. This may be due to the fact that those with kindergarten education may have been working for longer periods of time.

Household heads with vocational, technical, nursing and teacher training educational backgrounds do better than those with SSS and they in turn do better than all the educational levels below them.

World Bank (2014) and World Bank and SSL (WB \& SSL 2014) also noted that higher levels of education of head of household were strongly associated with higher consumption and lower poverty.


Table 13.15 Percentage of households owning durable goods by highest education level of head

| Household durable goods | Total country | Highest education level of head of household |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | No Education | Kindergarten | Primary | Junior secondary | Senior secondary |
| No. of HH | 1,265 468 | 717,782 | 17,638 | 106,856 | 121,735 | 167,969 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Electric iron | 5.5 | 1.2 | 9.6 | 3.6 | 4.8 | 11.1 |
| Charcoal iron | 29.7 | 17.4 | 41.0 | 30.0 | 36.6 | 51.9 |
| Generator | 8.2 | 3.0 | 13.1 | 7.8 | 9.7 | 15.4 |
| Fridge/ freezer | 10.3 | 3.2 | 17.3 | 8.9 | 11.7 | 21.2 |
| Television | 19.8 | 7.8 | 29.4 | 19.6 | 25.8 | 41.3 |
| Computer | 5.8 | 1.4 | 9.0 | 3.5 | 4.2 | 10.4 |
| Radio | 66.0 | 56.6 | 73.9 | 68.9 | 73.9 | 82.3 |
| Mobile phone | 62.9 | 48.7 | 73.9 | 68.6 | 77.2 | 88.8 |
| Modern stove | 6.3 | 3.0 | 10.0 | 5.3 | 6.4 | 10.7 |
| Bed | 81.2 | 76.9 | 83.5 | 82.7 | 84.0 | 88.1 |
| Sofa | 14.6 | 9.8 | 20.4 | 13.7 | 15.2 | 21.4 |
| Bicycle | 6.4 | 4.3 | 8.6 | 6.7 | 7.2 | 9.2 |
| Motorcycle | 7.6 | 4.7 | 10.0 | 7.6 | 9.3 | 12.1 |
| Car | 3.7 | 1.1 | 6.2 | 2.8 | 3.4 | 6.0 |
| Truck | 0.6 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.9 |
| Boat | 2.4 | 2.9 | 2.3 | 2.4 | 1.7 | 1.2 |

Table 13.15 Percentage of households owning durable goods by highest education level of head (continued)

|  | Highest education level of head of household |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Household durable goods | Voc /Tech/ Nursing/ Teacher training | Higher (First Degree) | Tertiary (Postgraduate \& Ph.D | Koranic | Other | Don't Know |
| No. of HH | 58,085 | 33,487 | 13,063 | 24,473 | 3,397 | 983 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Electric iron | 16.9 | 40.9 | 48.0 | 1.6 | 18.5 | 11.7 |
| Charcoal iron | 65.1 | 72.1 | 73.1 | 24.2 | 55.3 | 53.0 |
| Generator | 21.8 | 37.9 | 47.5 | 5.1 | 21.4 | 16.5 |
| Fridge/ freezer | 28.4 | 54.1 | 61.7 | 4.4 | 31.3 | 27.0 |
| Television | 48.3 | 73.3 | 75.4 | 10.7 | 47.8 | 45.9 |
| Computer | 19.6 | 46.4 | 53.3 | 2.2 | 16.5 | 10.7 |
| Radio | 88.5 | 89.8 | 90.6 | 67.7 | 81.4 | 77.1 |
| Mobile phone | 92.5 | 96.2 | 95.9 | 63.5 | 84.0 | 82.5 |
| Modern stove | 15.0 | 30.3 | 39.0 | 3.7 | 16.2 | 10.7 |
| Bed | 91.4 | 93.9 | 94.6 | 84.4 | 88.1 | 88.9 |
| Sofa | 26.5 | 45.3 | 52.1 | 10.7 | 28.0 | 23.2 |
| Bicycle | 12.8 | 15.5 | 18.7 | 7.1 | 9.9 | 8.2 |
| Motorcycle | 17.2 | 17.6 | 17.5 | 9.3 | 10.7 | 7.8 |
| Car | 8.6 | 26.9 | 39.2 | 2.1 | 13.0 | 9.5 |
| Truck | 1.1 | 2.8 | 4.2 | 0.5 | 2.0 | 1.8 |
| Boat | 1.1 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 5.3 | 1.6 | 1.1 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 13.4.4.7 Ownership of household durable goods by economic activity status of head

Generally, households with heads who are employed have the lowest ownership rates of goods while households with heads who are unemployed have the highest ownership rates (apart from motorcycle, car, truck and boat) (Table 13.16). Households with heads who are employed have the highest ownership rates for motorcycle and boat while households with heads who are not in the labour force dominate ownership of car and truck.

| Household durable goods | Total country | Economic activity status of head of household |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Employed | Unemployed | Not in labour force |
| No. of HH | 1,265,468 | 1,051,315 | 38,766 | 175,387 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Electric iron | 5.5 | 5.1 | 7.3 | 7.2 |
| Charcoal iron | 29.7 | 27.7 | 44.0 | 38.6 |
| Generator | 8.2 | 7.9 | 11.0 | 9.6 |
| Fridge/ freezer | 10.3 | 9.6 | 14.9 | 13.6 |
| Television | 19.8 | 18.5 | 32.4 | 24.8 |
| Computer | 5.8 | 5.4 | 8.2 | 7.4 |
| Radio | 66.0 | 65.5 | 75.2 | 66.9 |
| Mobile phone | 62.9 | 61.3 | 82.3 | 68.6 |
| Modern stove | 6.3 | 6.0 | 8.9 | 7.4 |
| Bed | 81.2 | 81.0 | 82.0 | 81.7 |
| Sofa | 14.6 | 14.3 | 16.3 | 16.0 |
| Bicycle | 6.4 | 6.3 | 7.0 | 6.9 |
| Motorcycle | 7.6 | 7.8 | 7.6 | 6.3 |
| Car | 3.7 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 4.0 |
| Truck | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| Boat | 2.4 | 2.6 | 1.0 | 1.4 |



Ownership of durable goods classified by main employment status of head of household is also examined. There are 12 categories for employment status (see Table 13.17). Households with heads who are pensioners are leaders in ownership of durable goods (except access to information goods, bed and motorcycle, where paid employees fare better). They are followed by households who heads are paid employees and those whose heads are persons who have worked before but currently looking for work. Households with heads who are unpaid apprentice, self-employed without employees and unpaid family worker are the least endowed. It is surprising to note that households with heads who are unpaid apprentices have higher ownership rates in nine items than the households with heads who are selfemployed without employees.

|  |  | Main employment status of household head |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Household durable goods | Total country | Paid employee | Self-employed without employees | Selfemployed with employees (employer) | Unpaid family worker | Paid apprentice |
| No. of HH | 1,265,468 | 1,051,315 | 38,766 | 175,387 | 31.683 | 5,837 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Electric iron | 5.5 | 5.1 | 7.3 | 7.2 | 1.1 | 5.6 |
| Charcoal iron | 29.7 | 27.7 | 44.0 | 38.6 | 14.0 | 35.6 |
| Generator | 8.2 | 7.9 | 11.0 | 9.6 | 2.9 | 10.5 |
| Fridge/ freezer | 10.3 | 9.6 | 14.9 | 13.6 | 2.4 | 11.3 |
| Television | 19.8 | 18.5 | 32.4 | 24.8 | 5.4 | 28.1 |
| Computer | 5.8 | 5.4 | 8.2 | 7.4 | 1.5 | 6.0 |
| Radio | 66.0 | 65.5 | 75.2 | 66.9 | 54.9 | 73.5 |
| Mobile phone | 62.9 | 61.3 | 82.3 | 68.6 | 45.2 | 81.0 |
| Modern stove | 6.3 | 6.0 | 8.9 | 7.4 | 2.4 | 7.8 |
| Bed | 81.2 | 81.0 | 82.0 | 81.7 | 77.0 | 81.2 |
| Sofa | 14.6 | 14.3 | 16.3 | 16.0 | 10.9 | 14.0 |
| Bicycle | 6.4 | 6.3 | 7.0 | 6.9 | 4.4 | 6.5 |
| Motorcycle | 7.6 | 7.8 | 7.6 | 6.3 | 4.6 | 8.2 |
| Car | 3.7 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 4.4 |
| Truck | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 1.2 |
| Boat | 2.4 | 2.6 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 2.1 | 1.5 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Table 13.17 Percentage of households owning durables goods
by main employment status of headstatus of head (continued)

| Household <br> durable <br> goods | Unpaid <br> apprentice | Worked before <br> but currently <br> looking for work | Looking for <br> work for the <br> first time | Household <br> work |  <br> not looking for <br> work | Full time <br> student |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of HH | 8,012 | 11,660 | 27,106 | 49,917 | 51,514 | 38,112 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Electric iron | 2.3 | 10.2 | 6.1 | 3.9 | 4.9 | 9.6 |
| Charcoal iron | 23.6 | 51.9 | 40.6 | 31.3 | 33.5 | 47.2 |
| Generator | 6.3 | 14.3 | 9.6 | 6.8 | 7.4 | 11.5 |
| Fridge/ <br> freezer | 4.9 | 20.1 | 12.7 | 9.5 | 10.8 | 14.7 |
| Television | 13.7 | 40.2 | 29.1 | 17.9 | 20.3 | 31.2 |
| Computer | 2.7 | 9.8 | 7.5 | 3.8 | 4.6 | 13.8 |
| Radio | 63.5 | 79.4 | 73.3 | 61.0 | 62.7 | 75.2 |
| Mobile phone | 64.6 | 86.0 | 80.6 | 60.8 | 61.6 | 84.1 |
| Modern stove | 4.8 | 11.3 | 7.8 | 5.4 | 5.8 | 8.8 |
| Bed | 74.2 | 85.6 | 80.4 | 79.6 | 80.6 | 83.2 |
| Sofa | 11.9 | 21.0 | 14.3 | 13.3 | 13.9 | 16.4 |
| Bicycle | 5.0 | 8.2 | 6.5 | 5.9 | 5.6 | 9.3 |
| Motorcycle | 5.5 | 8.2 | 7.4 | 5.0 | 5.2 | 8.8 |
| Car | 1.4 | 5.5 | 3.2 | 2.6 | 3.0 | 3.9 |
| Truck | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.6 |
| Boat | 2.5 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 0.9 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

|  | Main employment status of household head |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Household <br> durable <br> goods | Retired/ <br> pensioner | Other (specify) | Don't know |
| No. of HH | 15,899 | 16,230 | 3,715 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Electric iron | 20.0 | 6.2 | 5.9 |
| Charcoal iron | 61.4 | 35.1 | 37.1 |
| Generator | 22.7 | 8.8 | 8.0 |
| Fridge/ <br> freezer | 33.8 | 12.9 | 11.7 |
| Television | 45.4 | 25.4 | 24.1 |
| Computer | 14.7 | 5.6 | 5.8 |
| Radio | 80.1 | 65.9 | 65.7 |
| Mobile phone | 78.6 | 69.6 | 64.3 |
| Modern stove | 16.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |
| Bed | 89.2 | 81.6 | 78.1 |
| Sofa | 32.1 | 14.9 | 15.5 |
| Bicycle | 9.8 | 5.7 | 6.3 |
| Motorcycle | 7.8 | 6.3 | 5.4 |
| Car | 12.8 | 3.6 | 3.3 |
| Truck | 1.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 |
| Boat | 1.4 | 1.0 | 1.2 |
|  |  |  |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 13.4.5 Asset Poverty

The deprivation status of households with respect to assets, has been classified into three groups namely, information goods, mobility goods and livelihood goods. The goods included in the classification are limited to those used in the UNDP MPI and not the entire list discussed in the household durable goods section above. Information goods are: radio, television and mobile phone; mobility goods are: bicycle, motorbike, car, truck and boat; while livelihood goods are refrigerator/freezer, and livestock.

### 13.4.5.1 Information goods

One in four households are deprived with regard to access to information goods in the country, with variations by region (Table 13.18). The Western Region has the lowest rate of deprivation ( 5.4 per cent), followed by Eastern ( 25.7 per cent), Southern ( 30.3 per cent) and Northern (32.4 per cent) regions.

There are also obvious disparities by place of residence, with rural households worse off. While 20.5 per cent of households are deprived in rural areas, only 3.2 per cent are deprived among urban households. The Southern Region recorded the lowest (1.2 per cent) and Western Region ( 4.8 per cent) the highest percentage in urban areas.

The percentage of households deprived of access to information goods in rural areas ranges from a low of 0.6 per cent in the Western Region, to a high of 29.6 per cent in the Northern Region.

There is also intra-region variation by place of residence. Percentages of deprived households in rural areas are six times that in urban areas in the Eastern Region, 11 times the rate in urban areas in the Northern Region and 24 times the urban rate in Southern Region. The Western Region has lower proportions deprived in rural compared to urban areas. The gap in rural urban differentials has been observed by the World Bank (2014).

Table 13.18 Households' deprivation status in access to information goods by region and place of residence

| Region |  | Not deprived |  |  | Deprived |  |  | Total No. of households |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total | Urban | Rural | Total | Urban | Rural |  |
| Eastern | No. of HH | 209,031 | 88,513 | 120,518 | 72,170 | 10,051 | 62,119 | 281,201 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 74.3 | 31.5 | 42.9 | 25.7 | 3.6 | 22.1 | 100.0 |
| Northern | No. of HH | 280,252 | 95,737 | 184,515 | 134,125 | 11,666 | 122,459 | 414,377 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 67.6 | 23.1 | 44.5 | 32.4 | 2.8 | 29.6 | 100.0 |
| Southern | No. of HH | 173,340 | 46,390 | 126,950 | 75,315 | 3,040 | 72,275 | 248,655 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 69.7 | 18.7 | 51.1 | 30.3 | 1.2 | 29.1 | 100.0 |
| Western | No. of HH | 303,844 | 296,976 | 6,868 | 17,91 | 15,361 | 2,030 | 321,235 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 94.6 | 92.4 | 2.1 | 5.4 | 4.8 | 0.6 | 100.0 |

Access to information* goods are radio, TV and telephone
Source: Statistics Sierra Leone. 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 13.4.5.2 Mobility goods

Households' deprivation status in access to mobility goods (bicycle, motorbike, car, truck and boat) by region and place of residence is presented in Table 13.19. For the entire country 83.6 per cent of households are deprived in access to mobility goods. The Western Region has the lowest ( 80.7 per cent) and the Eastern Region the highest ( 87.6 per cent) proportion of deprived households.

At the national level, rural urban differences vary by 13 percentage points in favour of urban areas. The regions recorded larger rural urban differentials in the percentage of households deprived of access to mobility goods.

In the Eastern Region the proportion of deprived households in urban areas ( 27.5 per cent) is about half the proportion in rural areas ( 60.1 per cent); whilst in the Northern Region the percentages deprived in rural areas (64.7) is more than three times that of urban areas (19.1), and in the Southern Region rural deprivation (68 per cent) is more than four and a half times (14.7 per cent) that of urban dwellers.

The Western Region has the lowest percentage of households deprived of access to mobility goods in rural areas ( 2.4 per cent) compared to 78.3 per cent for urban areas. The Western Region is also the only region where rural households are better off with respect to mobility goods than urban households.

## 롱 <br> Table 13.19 Household deprivation status in access to mobility goods by region and place of residence

| Region |  | Not deprived |  |  | Deprived |  |  | Total No. of households |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total | Urban | Rural | Total | Urban | Rural |  |
| Eastern | No. of HH | 34,923 | 21,287 | 13,636 | 246,278 | 77,277 | 169,001 | 281,201 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 12.4 | 7.6 | 4.8 | 87.6 | 27.5 | 60.1 | 100.0 |
| Northern | No. of HH | 67,238 | 28,379 | 38,859 | 347,139 | 79,024 | 268,115 | 414,377 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 16.2 | 6.8 | 9.4 | 83.8 | 19.1 | 64.7 | 100.0 |
| Southern | No. of HH | 42,905 | 12,874 | 30031 | 205,750 | 36,556 | 169,194 | 248,655 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 17.3 | 5.2 | 12.1 | 82.7 | 14.7 | 68.0 | 100.0 |
| Western | No. of HH | 61,975 | 60,858 | 1,117 | 259,260 | 251,479 | 7,781 | 321,235 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 19.3 | 18.9 | 0.3 | 80.7 | 78.3 | 2.4 | 100.0 |

Mobility* goods are bicycle, motorbike, car, truck and boat
Source: Statistics Sierra Leone. 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 13.4.5.3 Livelihood goods

The data shows that 68 per cent of households are deprived in access to livelihood goods across the entire country (Table 3.20). The Northern Region has the lowest proportion of deprived households ( 61.5 per cent) and the Eastern Region has the highest ( 75.9 per cent).

At the national level, percentages of households deprived by place of residence are similar, for urban and rural areas. Though rural urban differences persist, in the regions they are not as marked as those for mobility goods. Eastern, Northern and Southern regions have higher percentage of deprived households in rural areas compared to urban areas. In these regions rural percentages are nearly twice, two and a half times, and nearly four times the urban percentages in Eastern, Northern and Southern regions respectively. Once again the Western region is different, as the proportion of households deprived in urban areas (64.1 per cent) is several times the proportion in rural areas ( 1.9 per cent).

| Region |  | Not deprived |  |  | Deprived |  |  | Total No. of households |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total | Urban | Rural | Total | Urban | Rural |  |
| Eastern | No. of HH | 67,733 | 20,239 | 47,494 | 213,468 | 78,325 | 135,143 | 281,201 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 24.1 | 7.2 | 16.9 | 75.9 | 27.9 | 48.1 | 100.0 |
| Northern | No. of HH | 159,634 | 33,219 | 126,415 | 254,743 | 74,184 | 180,559 | 414,377 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 38.5 | 8.0 | 30.5 | 61.5 | 17.9 | 43.6 | 100.0 |
| Southern | No. of HH | 68,542 | 13,084 | 55,458 | 180,113 | 36,346 | 143,767 | 248,655 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 27.6 | 5.3 | 22.3 | 72.4 | 14.6 | 57.8 | 100.0 |
| Western | No. of HH | 108,942 | 106,296 | 2,646 | 212,293 | 206,041 | 6,252 | 321,235 |
|  | \% of Total HH | 33.9 | 33.1 | 0.8 | 66.1 | 64.1 | 1.9 | 100.0 |

Livelihood goods are refrigerator/freezer, livestock
Source: Statistics Sierra Leone. 2015 Population and Housing Census
The analysis of ownership of household durable goods shows that the Western Region has the highest rates while the Eastern and Northern regions have the lowest. The Western Region is also the least deprived for information and mobility goods and the Northern Region is the least deprived for access to livelihood goods. The Northern Region is also the most deprived for access to information goods, while the Eastern Region is the most deprived for access to mobility and livelihood goods.

These finding are confirmed by SSL (2006) which concluded that assets poverty is lowest in the Western Region and highest in the Northern Region and parts of the Eastern Region. These results suggest that poverty patterns by region have remained unchanged.

### 13.5 Summary, conclusions and recommendations

### 13.5.1 Summary

Three dimensions namely, education, health and standard of living and their ten indicators are used in the determination of the deprivation status of households. Forty per cent of households are deprived in primary school completion, compared to 19 per cent in child school attendance.Even though the proportions of households deprived in health indicators are very low in comparison with those of education and standard of living (1.7 per cent for child death and 0.3 per cent for maternal death), they represent one of the highest in the world.

Less than half of households are deprived in access to clean drinking water and improved floors. However, the majority of households are deprived in improved sanitation ( 75 per cent), access to electricity ( 82 per cent) and near universal deprivation in access to improved cooking fuel (98 per cent). Households seem to be well-endowed in information goods with only 24 per cent being deprived. A large percentage of households are deprived in livelihood goods ( 68 per cent) and mobility goods ( 84 per cent).

The goods most commonly owned by Sierra Leoneans are a bed (81 per cent), radio (66 per cent) and mobile phone ( 63 per cent). Fewer households own a charcoal iron (30 per cent) television (20 per cent), sofa (15 per cent) and fridge/freezer (10 per cent). Between five and eight per cent own a generator, motorcycle, modern stove, bicycle and computer. Ownership of goods by region follows the national pattern, except for some variations in the Western Region. Urban households have a higher ownership of goods than rural households.

Five items (electric iron, charcoal iron, fridge/ freezer, modern stove and sofa) are owned in the same proportion by male and female household heads. However male-headed households own higher proportions of the remaining 11 goods than female-headed households.

Households with heads aged 55 to 59 have the highest ownership rates for 10 out the 16 goods. The exceptions are television, computer, mobile phone, modern stove, motorcycle and boat. Households with heads aged 75 years and over have the lowest proportions of ownership in 12 out of the 16 goods, the only exceptions being bed, sofa, car and boat. Households with young heads have higher ownership rates in electronic goods.

The data show that household with heads who have never married have the highest ownership rates in all but five goods (bed, bicycle, motorcycle, truck and boat). Households with heads who are engaged placed second in all but three goods, namely bed (first), car and truck (third) and households where the head is widowed have the lowest ownership rates for all goods.
Households with heads who have tertiary and higher education top the list for ownership of all durable goods except boat; achieving over 90 per cent ownership for radio, mobile phone and bed. Households whose heads have no education and those with Koranic education are the least endowed in ownership of durable goods. However, household heads with Koranic education have
the highest ownership rate (5.2 per cent) of boats. Households whose heads have only kindergarten education have higher ownership rates than households whose heads have primary and JSS. Household heads with vocational, technical, nursing and teacher training educational backgrounds do better than those with SSS and they in turn do better than all the educational levels below them.

In terms of economic activity status, generally households with heads who are employed have the lowest ownership rates of goods, while households with heads who are unemployed have the highest ownership rates of all durable goods.

Employment status of head of household revealed that households with heads who are pensioners are leaders in ownership of durable goods (except access to information goods, bed and motorcycle, where paid employees fare better). Households with heads who are unpaid apprentices, self-employed without employees and unpaid family worker are the least endowed.

### 13.5.2 Conclusion

Recognizing the impact of education on human development, one of the Government's objectives (through its education sector plan 2014-2018) is to ensure that all children enter school and complete primary education. This is to be achieved by:

- Providing more classrooms in the communities.
- Reducing the cost of schooling to parents and households to encourage parents to send children to school.
- Providing targeted support programme for needy students.
- Providing support for extra-curricular activities and accelerated primary education for older children and young persons aged 10-15.

Sierra Leone has the highest child and maternal mortality rates in the world. The causes of these high rates of death are known and the measures to reduce them have been identified. UNICEF and the European Union are working with the Government to reduce these deaths through investment in training, equipment, medical supplies and maternal and child health infrastructure.

The Government of Sierra Leone is very much alive to its responsibilities towards its citizens and knows exactly what needs to be done to improve the situation, whether in education, health or housing. Some programmes have been implemented which seemed to address the issues, but did not yield the intended results because funds run out. The basic lack of adequate government funding is at the core of the education, health and housing problems.

### 13.5.3 Recommendations

The country needs long term sustainable sources of funding. One way of raising the funds may be for the Government to mortgage some of its untapped mineral wealth.

The Ebola outbreak in Sierra Leone and its neighbours in 2014-2015, and the way it spread to other countries and continents emphasized the fact that the world is indeed a global village. The international community is very much aware of this and have rallied to the support of Sierra Leone and still continue to do so. However, the problems still remain. This is an indication that things must be done differently to obtain the desired results. Support for the country needs be on a much larger scale, well-coordinated and comprehensive to achieve the impact required. Perhaps there should be a type of post-war massive reconstruction effort led by an international organization such as the United Nations.
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## CHAPTER 14: PERSONS WITH DISABILITY

### 14.1 Introduction

According to the World Health Organization (WHO), disability is a contested concept, with different meanings for different communities. It may be used to refer to physical or mental attributes that some institutions, particularly medical, view as needing to be fixed. It is an impairment that may be cognitive, developmental, intellectual, mental, physical, sensory, or some combination of these. It substantially affects a person's life activities and may be present from birth or occur during a person's lifetime.

Disability is an umbrella term, covering impairments, activity limitations, and participation restrictions. Impairment is a problem in body function or structure; an activity limitation is a difficulty encountered by an individual in executing a task or action; while a participation restriction is a problem experienced by an individual in involvement in life situations.

Disability is thus not just a health problem. It is a complex phenomenon, reflecting the interaction between features of a person's body and features of the society in which he or she lives. According to the WHO report 2016, it is estimated that 15 per cent of the world's population experience some form of disability or impairment.

A number of efforts have been put in place by the Government of Sierra Leone to improve the welfare of Persons With Disability (PWD). The 1991 Constitution in chapter II, section 8(3)(f) states that the state shall direct its policy towards ensuring that the care and welfare of the aged, young and disabled shall be actively promoted and safeguarded. Section 9 (1)(b) further states that Government shall direct its policy towards ensuring that there are equal rights and adequate educational opportunities for all citizens at all level by safeguarding the rights of vulnerable groups, such as children, women and PWDs in security, educational facilities, and providing the necessary facilities for education as and when practicable.

The Disability Act of 2011 established a National

Commission for PWD and a National Development Fund for PWD. In addition, the law states the rights and privileges of PWDs. It prohibits discrimination against persons with physical, sensory, intellectual and mental disabilities in employment and provision of state services including judicial services, and it calls for free health care and education for PWDs, equal access to government buildings, housing and public transportation, and provision of rehabilitation services.

### 14.2 Data sources

The 2015 Population and Housing Census included questions to enhance the understanding of the disability status of the population of Sierra Leone. The questionnaire elicited information from the respondents on the status, type and cause of disability. The PWD were also requested to state whether they were receiving any kind of assistance or treatment. For the purpose of the enumeration exercise, PWD included; the blind, the crippled, the deaf, the dumb, the mentally retarded, those who lost limbs, the speech impaired and albinos.

The results presented in this chapter are therefore based on the 2015 Census data. It should however be noted that during the data collection information was recorded as reported by the respondents. The enumerators did not test to confirm the disability status of the household members.

### 14.3 Disability status

### 14.3.1 Distribution of the population by disability status, place of residence and sex

A total of 93,129 people, or 1.3 per cent of the total population of Sierra Leone, had disabilities at the time of the 2015 Census enumeration (Table 14.1). The overall percentage of PWD revealed a reduction in the population with disabilities compared to the last Census of 2004 which found 2.4 per cent of the total population with disabilities.

Table 14.1 Distribution of the population by disability status, place of residence and sex

| Region | Total |  |  | Rural |  |  | Urban |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Number | 7,076,119 | 3,479,633 | 3,596,486 | 4,182,612 | 2,049,590 | 2,133,022 | 2,893,507 | 1,430,043 | 1,463,464 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 1.3 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.0 |
| No | 92.3 | 92.2 | 92.5 | 93.4 | 93.3 | 93.6 | 90.8 | 90.7 | 90.8 |
| Don't Know | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 5.1 | 5.0 | 5.1 | 8.2 | 8.2 | 8.2 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

The percentage distribution of PWD by sex and place of residence is presented in Figure 14.1. The findings revealed that most of PWD were males ( 54 per cent). The proportions of male PWDs by place of residence were 54.2 per cent and 53.8 per cent for rural and urban areas respectively. The corresponding figures for female PWDs were 45.8 and 46.2 per cent for rural and urban areas respectively.

Figure 14.1 Persons with disability by sex and place of residence (per cent)


Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 14.3.2 Distribution of the population by disability status, region and sex

A look at the regional distribution of PWDs showed that the Northern Region had the biggest proportion ( 35.3 per cent) while the Western Region had the least ( 12.8 per cent).

Figure 14.2 Persons with disability by region (percent)


Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

The percentage distribution of the population by disability status, region and gender is presented in Table 14.2 below. Generally, the results presented in the table exhibit a trend similar to the one depicted by figure 14.2. No major variations were noted when the PWDs and non-PWDs were distributed by gender and the region of residence. However, it is worth noting that the Northern Region again had the highest proportion, even among persons with no disabilities.

Table 14.2 Distribution of the population by region, disability status and sex

| Region | Total |  |  | Disability |  |  | No Disability | Don't Know |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| Number | $3,479,633$ | $3,596,486$ | 50,319 | 42,810 | $3,209,111$ | $3,325,531$ | 220,203 | 228,145 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Eastern | 23.4 | 23.0 | 28.1 | 26.7 | 23.3 | 22.9 | 23.3 | 23.2 |
| Northern | 35.1 | 35.6 | 34.5 | 36.2 | 36.0 | 36.5 | 22.6 | 23.2 |
| Southern | 20.1 | 20.5 | 24.3 | 24.7 | 20.0 | 20.4 | 21.2 | 21.7 |
| Western | 21.4 | 20.8 | 13.2 | 12.4 | 20.7 | 20.2 | 33.0 | 31.9 |

### 14.3.3 Distribution of the population by disability status, district and sex

Further analysis by district of residence revealed that the districts of Kailahun and Bo had considerably higher percentages of PWD, as shown in Figure 14.3. Bonthe district on the other hand had the lowest proportion (2.9 percent).

Figure 14.3 Distribution of the persons with disability by district


Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Table 14.3 presents a distribution of the population by disability status, district and sex. Kailahun district presented the highest percentages of the male (10.3) and female (10.4) PWD. The high proportion in Kailahun district could be attributed to the Civil War . Bonthe district had the lowest percentage share of PWDs for both males ( 2.9 per cent) and females ( 3.0 per cent). Koinadugu and Pujehun districts had similar percentage shares for males and females. The distribution of the household population by disability status and chiefdom is presented in Appendix Table A14.1.

Table 14.3 Distribution of the population by disability status, district and sex

| District | Total |  | Disability |  | No Disability |  | Don't Know |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| Number | $3,479,633$ | $3,596,486$ | 50,319 | 42,810 | $3,209,111$ | $3,325,531$ | 220,203 | 228,145 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Kailahun | 7.5 | 7.4 | 10.3 | 10.4 | 7.7 | 7.6 | 4.2 | 4.2 |
| Kenema | 8.6 | 8.6 | 10.3 | 9.3 | 8.6 | 8.5 | 9.0 | 9.1 |
| Kono | 7.3 | 7.0 | 7.5 | 6.9 | 7.0 | 6.8 | 10.1 | 9.9 |
| Bombali | 8.5 | 8.6 | 9.3 | 9.6 | 8.6 | 8.7 | 7.4 | 7.8 |


| District | Total |  | Disability |  | No Disability |  | Don't Know |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| Kambia | 4.7 | 5.0 | 4.6 | 5.1 | 5.0 | 5.2 | 1.1 | 1.2 |
| Koinadugu | 5.9 | 5.7 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 6.1 | 5.9 | 2.7 | 2.8 |
| Port Loko | 8.4 | 8.9 | 9.4 | 10.1 | 8.6 | 9.0 | 6.1 | 6.3 |
| Tonkolili | 7.6 | 7.5 | 6.7 | 7.0 | 7.7 | 7.6 | 5.2 | 5.2 |
| Bo | 8.0 | 8.2 | 10.0 | 10.1 | 7.7 | 7.8 | 13.2 | 13.7 |
| Bonthe | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 1.2 | 1.1 |
| Moyamba | 4.4 | 4.6 | 6.2 | 6.5 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 4.1 | 4.2 |
| Pujehun | 4.9 | 4.9 | 5.2 | 5.2 | 5.0 | 5.1 | 2.7 | 2.8 |
| Western <br> Rural | 6.3 | 6.2 | 4.7 | 4.1 | 6.3 | 6.1 | 7.3 | 7.1 |
| Western | 15.1 | 14.6 | 8.5 | 8.3 | 14.4 | 14.0 | 25.7 | 24.8 |
| Urban |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census
Generally, most of PWDs were living in separate houses (Table 14.4). About two thirds of the PWDs in the Northern, Eastern and Southern regions were enumerated in separate houses. In the Western Region however, irrespective of gender, one in every three PWD were living in flats or apartments. The Western Region also had the highest percentage of PWDs enumerated in improvised homes and uncompleted buildings. The results do not show variation in type of dwelling by sex of the PWD.

Table 14.4 Distribution of persons with disability aged 15 years and over by type of dwelling, region and sex

| District | Total |  | Eastern |  | Northern |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| Number | 41,271 | 35,750 | 11,521 | 9,365 | 14,044 | 12,944 |
| Per cent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Separate house | 60.0 | 60.1 | 66.9 | 66.8 | 62.7 | 62.7 |
| Semi-detached house | 5.9 | 5.7 | 5.8 | 5.4 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| Flat/ apartment | 18.2 | 18.4 | 14.3 | 14.2 | 17.5 | 17.9 |
| Compound house | 8.7 | 9.1 | 8.2 | 8.6 | 7.2 | 7.5 |
| Huts buildings (Same Compound) | 2.6 | 2.6 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 3.4 | 3.1 |
| Huts buildings (Different compound) | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 2.2 | 2.0 |
| Tent | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| Improvised home | 1.5 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 |
| Uncompleted building | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Other | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.2 |


| District | Southern |  | Western |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| Number | 10,141 | 8,972 | 5,565 | 4,469 |
| Per cent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Separate house | 66.3 | 65.3 | 27.7 | 27.7 |
| Semi-detached house | 5.1 | 5.3 | 10.9 | 10.1 |
| Flat/ apartment | 16.2 | 16.8 | 31.6 | 32.0 |
| Compound house | 7.1 | 7.3 | 16.5 | 18.0 |
| Huts buildings <br> (Same Compound) | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.4 |
| Huts buildings <br> (Different compound) | 1.4 | 1.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| Tent | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| Improvised home | 0.3 | 0.2 | 8.6 | 7.6 |
| Uncompleted building | 0.4 | 0.4 | 1.6 | 1.3 |
| Other | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

The distribution of PWDs aged 15 years and over by tenure status, region and sex is presented in Table 14.5. It is seen that irrespective of gender considerations, most PWDs were living in houses constructed by their households. The highest percentage of PWDs living in constructed houses is recorded in the Northern Region with 64.5 per cent for males and 61.8 per cent for females. In the Eastern and Southern regions, close to three in every five PWDs were staying in their own constructed houses.

However, the important tenure status in the Western Region is privately renting, constituting about 36 per cent, followed by constructed dwelling unit forming 30.5 per cent for males and 31.8 per cent for females. Furthermore, there were no significant variations when the analysis was carried out by the gender of the PWD.


Table 14.5 Distribution of persons with disability aged 15 years and over by tenure status, region and sex

| District | Total |  | Eastern |  | Northern |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| Number | 41,271 | 35,750 | 11,521 | 9,365 | 14,044 | 12,944 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Owner |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Purchased | 1.9 | 1.8 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.4 | 4.7 |
| Constructed | 57.1 | 55.6 | 59.5 | 57.9 | 64.5 | 17.9 |
| Inherited | 23.1 | 25.9 | 23.7 | 26.3 | 22.1 | 7.5 |
| Employer provided |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Government | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 2.0 |
| Private | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 1.4 |
| Parastatal/ Quasi Government | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Renting |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Government | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.4 |
| Housing Corporation | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 1.3 | 1.0 |
| Private | 11.1 | 10.4 | 9.4 | 9.0 | 5.8 | 5.5 |
| Parastatal/ Quasi Government | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Squatter | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 0.7 |
| Other | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.6 |



Table 14.5 Distribution of persons with disability aged 15 years and over by tenure status, region and sex (continued)

| District | Southern |  | Western |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| Number | 10,141 | 8,972 | 5,565 | 4,469 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Owner |  |  |  |  |
| Purchased | 1.8 | 1.7 | 4.5 | 4.1 |
| Constructed | 58.5 | 56.3 | 30.5 | 31.8 |
| Inherited | 27.7 | 30.6 | 15.9 | 17.1 |
| Employer provided | 0.9 | 0.7 | 1.4 | 0.9 |
| Government | 0.4 | 0.3 | 1.4 | 1.0 |
| Private | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.0 |
| Parastatal/ Quasi <br> Government | 0.3 | 0.2 | 2.1 | 1.7 |
| Renting | 0.8 | 0.8 | 2.4 | 2.1 |
| Government | 6.7 | 6.3 | 35.9 | 36.0 |
| Housing Corporation | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| Private | 0.6 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| Parastatal/ Quasi | 2.1 | 2.4 | 4.3 | 3.9 |
| Government | Other | Squatter | Other |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census


### 14.4 Demographic characteristics of people with disabilities

### 14.4.1 Persons with disability by place of residence

The disability rates by place of residence and sex are presented in Table 14.6. Overall, 1.3 per cent of the total population were PWDs at the time of the 2015 Census enumeration. The rural areas have a higher rate of PWDs than urban areas. Irrespective of the place of residence, the rate is higher for males than their female counterparts.

Table 14.6 Disability rates by place of residence and sex

| Region | Total | Male | Female |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.2 |
| Rural | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.3 |
| Urban | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census


### 14.4.2 Persons with disability by region

The disability rates varied from 0.8 per cent in the Western Region to 1.6 per cent in the Southern and Eastern regions (Table 14.7). Among the males, the Eastern and Southern regions showed higher disability rates. The same regions (Eastern and Southern) showed higher rates for females.


Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 14.4.3 Persons with disability by district

The districts with high disability rates are Kailahun, Moyamba and Bo (Table 14.8). A similar trend is depicted when the analysis is carried out by gender. On the other hand, Western Urban shows the lowest disability rates when compared with other districts.


Table 14.8 Disability rates by district and sex

| District |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 1.3 | 1.5 | Female |
| Kailahun | 1.8 | 2.0 | 1.2 |
| Kenema | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.7 |
| Kono | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.3 |
| Bombali | 1.5 | 1.6 | 1.2 |
| Kambia | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.3 |
| Koinadugu | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.2 |
| Port Loko | 1.5 | 1.6 | 0.9 |
| Tonkolili | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 |
| Bo | 1.6 | 1.8 | 1.1 |
| Bonthe | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Moyamba | 1.8 | 2.0 | 1.2 |
| Pujehun | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.7 |
| Western Area <br> Rural | 0.9 | 1.1 | 1.3 |
| Western Area <br> Urban | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.8 |



Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 14.4.4 Main disability type by place of residence and sex

Types of disabilities include various physical and mental impairments that can hamper or reduce a person's ability to carry out his day to day activities. Disability can be broken down into a number of broad sub-categories, which include the following: mobility and physical impairment, spinal cord disability, head injuries or brain disability, vision disability, hearing disability, cognitive or learning disabilities, psychological disorders, invisible disabilities. The 2015 Census collected information on such types of disabilities and the results are presented in the tables and figures below.The most contributing factors or the most common types of disability in Sierra Leone at the time of the census were; physical disability or polio (21.8 per cent), partially sighted (15.2 per cent), blind or visually impaired (12.5 per cent) and physical disability or amputee ( 8.9 per cent). Kyphoscoliosis (hunch back) and albinism were the least dominant types of disability representing 0.7 and 0.5 per cent respectively (Table 14.9).

The distribution of PWDs by place of residence showed that physical disabilities (polio) were the leading disability in both rural and urban areas. It is noted however that within the place of residence distribution, the proportion of persons with physical disabilities was higher in urban than in the rural areas. The males, irrespective of place of residence, were slightly more affected than their female counterparts. Furthermore, the findings also reveal that vision disabilities (visual impaired and partially sighted) are slightly more prevalent in the rural areas than in the urban areas. Unlike the physical disability, the vision disability seems to affect more females than males in both rural and urban settings.

Table 14.9 Distribution of the population by type of disability, place of residence and sex

| Main type of disability | Total |  |  | Rural |  |  | Urban |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Number | 93,129 | 50,319 | 42,810 | 62,380 | 33,779 | 28,601 | 30,749 | 16,540 | 14,209 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Physical disability (Polio) | 21.8 | 22.4 | 21.2 | 20.1 | 20.3 | 20.0 | 25.3 | 26.7 | 23.8 |
| Physical disability (Amputee) | 8.9 | 9.7 | 8.0 | 8.4 | 9.1 | 7.5 | 10.0 | 10.9 | 9.0 |
| Blind or visual impaired | 12.5 | 13.5 | 11.3 | 13.4 | 14.6 | 12.1 | 10.6 | 11.4 | 9.7 |
| Partially sighted | 15.2 | 14.9 | 15.6 | 15.7 | 15.9 | 15.6 | 14.2 | 13.1 | 15.5 |
| Deaf | 6.8 | 6.1 | 7.5 | 7.4 | 6.6 | 8.2 | 5.6 | 5.1 | 6.2 |
| Partially deaf | 5.1 | 4.5 | 5.7 | 5.4 | 4.9 | 5.9 | 4.5 | 3.9 | 5.3 |
| Speech difficulties | 3.9 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.4 | 4.5 | 4.6 | 4.4 |
| Mute/ dumb | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.7 | 3.4 | 4.1 |
| Mental difficulties | 4.7 | 4.8 | 4.6 | 4.7 | 4.6 | 4.9 | 4.7 | 5.1 | 4.1 |
| Spinal injury | 3.1 | 3.2 | 2.9 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 2.7 |
| Psychiatric disability | 1.4 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.4 |
| Epileptic | 2.4 | 2.3 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.2 | 2.0 | 2.4 |
| Rheumatism | 1.7 | 1.3 | 2.1 | 1.8 | 1.3 | 2.3 | 1.5 | 1.1 | 1.8 |
| Albinism | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.7 |
| Kyphoscoliosis Hunch back) | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.8 |
| Other | 7.7 | 7.4 | 8.2 | 7.8 | 7.4 | 8.2 | 7.7 | 7.3 | 8.1 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 14.4.5 Main disability type by region and sex

On average, the Northern Region has the largest proportion of PWDs with different types of disabilities (Table 14.10). It is worth noting that even kyphoscoliosis (hunch back), which is the least dominant disability in the country, is more prevalent in the Northern Region ( 41.6 per cent) than in the other regions. Furthermore, considering all types of disabilities, the Western Region presented the lowest percentage share.

| Main type of disability | Total | Eastern | Northern | Southern | Western |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | 100.0 | 24.5 | 40.8 | 18.3 | 16.4 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 33.8 | 27.2 | 23.0 | 16.0 |
| Physical disability (Polio) | 100.0 | 25.7 | 37.6 | 25.5 | 11.3 |
| Physical disability (Amputee) | 100.0 | 24.0 | 40.0 | 25.2 | 10.8 |
| Blind or visual impaired | 100.0 | 35.0 | 30.7 | 25.5 | 8.9 |
| Partially sighted | 100.0 | 30.0 | 36.5 | 25.3 | 8.2 |
| Deaf | 100.0 | 26.5 | 35.3 | 22.1 | 16.0 |
| Partially deaf | 100.0 | 28.8 | 36.9 | 21.1 | 13.1 |
| Speech difficulties | 100.0 | 33.0 | 30.6 | 26.2 | 10.1 |
| Mute/ dumb | 100.0 | 24.2 | 29.8 | 30.5 | 15.6 |
| Mental difficulties | 100.0 | 28.0 | 30.4 | 29.6 | 11.9 |
| Spinal injury | 100.0 | 22.7 | 38.6 | 29.4 | 9.3 |
| Psychiatric disability | 100.0 | 29.6 | 25.2 | 34.8 | 10.4 |
| Epileptic | 100.0 | 32.7 | 29.3 | 21.8 | 16.2 |
| Rheumatism | 100.0 | 20.8 | 41.6 | 25.7 | 12.0 |
| Albinism | 100.0 | 29.1 | 25.2 | 33.3 | 12.5 |
| Kyphoscoliosis Hunch back) | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Other | 7.7 | 7.4 | 8.2 | 7.8 | 7.4 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Table 14.11 presents the distribution of the PWDs by main type of disability, region and sex. Irrespective of gender, the most common types of disability are; physical disability (polio and amputee), visual impairment, partially sighted, deaf and partially deaf. Slightly, more females than males reported physical disabilities or polio, deaf, partially deaf and mental difficulties in the Eastern and Southern regions. The distribution of the PWDs by administrative area and type of disability is shown in Appendix Table A14.2.

| Main type of disability | Total |  | Eastern |  | Northern |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| Number | 50,319 | 42,810 | 14,150 | 11,427 | 17,337 | 15,512 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Physical disability (Polio) | 22.4 | 21.2 | 19.4 | 19.6 | 26.3 | 24.2 |
| Physical disability (Amputee) | 9.7 | 8.0 | 12.0 | 9.7 | 7.4 | 6.3 |
| Blind or visual impaired | 13.5 | 11.3 | 12.8 | 10.3 | 14.3 | 12.3 |
| Partially sighted | 14.9 | 15.6 | 13.7 | 12.8 | 16.2 | 18.5 |
| Deaf | 6.1 | 7.5 | 7.7 | 9.8 | 5.4 | 6.4 |
| Partially deaf | 4.5 | 5.7 | 5.0 | 6.2 | 4.7 | 5.9 |
| Speech difficulties | 4.0 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.7 |
| Mute/ dumb | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 3.7 |
| Mental difficulties | 4.8 | 4.6 | 5.5 | 5.8 | 4.3 | 3.8 |
| Spinal injury | 3.2 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 2.6 | 2.6 |
| Psychiatric disability | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 1.3 |
| Epileptic | 2.3 | 2.6 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 2.8 |
| Rheumatism | 1.3 | 2.1 | 1.4 | 2.3 | 0.9 | 1.5 |
| Albinism | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 |
| Kyphoscoliosis (Hunch back) | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.9 |
| Other | 7.4 | 8.2 | 7.6 | 8.9 | 5.5 | 5.6 | region and sex (continued)


| Main type of disability | Southern |  | Western |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| Number | 12,207 | 10,563 | 6,625 | 5,308 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Physical disability (Polio) | 16.3 | 16.5 | 29.8 | 25.5 |
| Physical disability <br> (Amputee) | 9.4 | 7.3 | 11.6 | 10.5 |
| Blind or visual impaired | 14.2 | 11.6 | 11.7 | 10.2 |
| Partially sighted | 16.5 | 14.8 | 11.5 | 14.5 |
| Deaf | 6.4 | 7.9 | 4.4 | 5.1 |
| Partially deaf | 4.7 | 5.9 | 2.7 | 3.9 |
| Speech difficulties | 3.7 | 3.3 | 4.8 | 4.9 |
| Mute/ dumb | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 4.1 |
| Mental difficulties | 4.8 | 5.3 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Spinal injury | 3.9 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.6 |
| Psychiatric disability | 1.4 | 2.0 | 1.3 | 1.2 |
| Epileptic | 2.9 | 2.9 | 1.6 | 1.9 |
| Rheumatism | 1.8 | 3.1 | 1.0 | 1.8 |
| Albinism | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.9 |
| Kyphoscoliosis (Hunch back) | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.8 |
| Other | 9.9 | 11.4 | 7.2 | 7.9 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 14.4.6 Main disability type by household size

The distribution of PWD by type of disability and average household size is presented in Table 14.12. Irrespective of the type of disability, the findings revealed a correlation between the disability status and the size of household. The prevalence of disability was directly proportional to the size of the household. Most of the PWDs, irrespective of the type, were living in or had families with more than six persons. This could be attributed to the assistance needed to be extended to PWDs, where more people are required.

Table 14.12 Persons with disability by type of disability and average household size (per cent)

| Main type of disability | Total | Average Household Size |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $1-3$ Persons | $4-6$ Persons | $6+$ Persons |
| Total | 100.0 | 15.3 | 34.9 | 49.8 |
| Physical disability (Polio) | 100.0 | 13.8 | 35.1 | 51.0 |
| Physical disability (Am- <br> putee) | 100.0 | 14.9 | 34.5 | 50.6 |
| Blind or visually impaired | 100.0 | 16.2 | 34.2 | 49.5 |
| Partially sighted | 100.0 | 17.7 | 34.9 | 47.4 |
| Deaf | 100.0 | 13.8 | 35.0 | 51.2 |
| Partially deaf | 100.0 | 15.3 | 35.9 | 48.7 |
| Speech difficulties | 100.0 | 13.7 | 34.1 | 52.1 |
| Mute | 100.0 | 11.8 | 34.0 | 54.2 |
| Mental difficulties | 100.0 | 16.4 | 33.0 | 50.6 |
| Spinal injury/disability | 100.0 | 17.6 | 33.6 | 48.8 |
| Psychiatric disability | 100.0 | 15.9 | 36.3 | 47.9 |
| Epileptic | 100.0 | 11.9 | 34.5 | 53.7 |
| Rheumatism | 100.0 | 18.1 | 34.8 | 47.1 |
| Albinism | 100.0 | 13.6 | 36.5 | 49.9 |
| Kyphoscoliosis (Hunch <br> Back) | 100.0 | 15.5 | 33.0 | 51.4 |
| Other | 100.0 | 16.6 | 37.1 | 46.3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Further analysis of the main type of disability, household size and sex was carried out and the results are presented in Table 14.13. No major differences are noted when the percentages are compared across the different household size categories by gender of the PWDs.

Table 14.13 Distribution of the population by main type of disability, household size and sex

| Main type of disability | $1-3$ Persons |  | $4-6$ Persons |  | Over 6 Persons |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| Number | 8,025 | 6,257 | 17,344 | 15,132 | 24,950 | 21,421 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Physical disability (Polio) | 22.4 | 21.2 | 21.1 | 17.9 | 22.9 | 21.8 |
| Physical disability <br> (Amputee) | 9.7 | 8.0 | 9.6 | 7.5 | 9.9 | 8.1 |
| Blind or visual impaired | 13.5 | 11.3 | 15.0 | 11.0 | 12.9 | 11.9 |
| Partially sighted | 14.9 | 15.6 | 16.8 | 18.7 | 14.3 | 14.7 |
| Deaf | 6.1 | 7.5 | 5.2 | 7.3 | 6.4 | 7.6 |
| Partially deaf | 4.5 | 5.7 | 4.1 | 6.4 | 4.5 | 5.5 |
| Speech difficulties | 4.0 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 4.1 | 3.9 |
| Mute/ dumb | 3.4 | 3.6 | 2.6 | 2.9 | 3.7 | 3.9 |
| Mental difficulties | 4.8 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 5.3 | 5.0 | 4.5 |
| Spinal injury | 3.2 | 2.9 | 3.6 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 2.9 |
| Psychiatric disability | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 1.4 |
| Epileptic | 2.3 | 2.6 | 1.7 | 2.1 | 2.5 | 2.8 |
| Rheumatism | 1.3 | 2.1 | 1.3 | 2.8 | 1.2 | 2.0 |
| Albinism | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.5 |
| Kyphoscoliosis <br> (Hunch back) | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.8 |
| Other | 7.4 | 8.2 | 8.2 | 8.6 | 6.9 | 7.6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 14.4.7 Type of disability by age

Overall, disabilities were more prevalent among persons aged over 15 years, with the majority falling in the age groups 15 to 35 years and 36 to 60 years (Table 14.14). However, vision disabilities, (blind or visually impaired and partially sighted) are more prevalent in persons over 60 years of age. In addition, males are more affected by the different types of disabilities than females. It is worth noting that vision disabilities are more prevalent in females 36 years and above than they are in males, whereas the opposite is true for younger age groups.

Table 14.14 Distribution of the PWDs by main type of disability, broad age-groups and sex

| Main type of <br> disability |  | All Ages |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Main type of disability | 36-60 Years |  |  | Over 60 Years |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Total | 29.4 | 30.7 | 27.9 | 22.4 | 21.0 | 24.0 |
| Physical disability (Polio) | 28.1 | 30.0 | 25.7 | 11.7 | 10.7 | 12.9 |
| Physical disability (Amputee) | 31.5 | 34.8 | 26.7 | 14.5 | 14.6 | 14.5 |
| Blind or visually impaired | 33.0 | 34.7 | 30.5 | 44.4 | 43.6 | 45.6 |
| Partially sighted | 34.2 | 35.5 | 32.9 | 38.7 | 36.9 | 40.8 |
| Deaf | 25.9 | 24.9 | 26.8 | 18.4 | 16.6 | 20.1 |
| Partially deaf | 25.4 | 25.8 | 24.9 | 22.1 | 18.8 | 25.2 |
| Speech difficulties | 18.3 | 19.3 | 17.1 | 11.0 | 10.1 | 12.2 |
| Mute | 16.3 | 16.6 | 15.9 | 4.4 | 4.2 | 4.6 |
| Mental difficulties | 24.4 | 22.5 | 26.7 | 7.7 | 5.2 | 10.8 |
| Spinal injury/ disability | 36.9 | 39.4 | 33.7 | 25.5 | 21.8 | 30.2 |
| Psychiatric disability | 34.1 | 37.0 | 31.1 | 20.9 | 17.5 | 24.3 |
| Epileptic | 14.6 | 12.8 | 16.5 | 7.2 | 7.1 | 7.3 |
| Rheumatism | 34.1 | 35.9 | 32.9 | 40.7 | 35.0 | 44.6 |
| Albinism | 25.9 | 25.1 | 26.9 | 14.0 | 16.1 | 11.5 |
| Kyphoscoliosis (Hunch back) | 23.9 | 23.9 | 23.9 | 13.2 | 13.0 | 13.4 |
| Other | 36.2 | 36.7 | 35.6 | 21.6 | 19.6 | 23.7 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census
The 2015 Census also collected information on persons with more than one disability. Out of the 93,129 persons with disability, 30,869 people reported a second disability. A total of 16,703 PWDs with a second disability were males, while 14,166 were females.

Figure 14.4 presents the distribution of the PWDs that reported a second disability. The findings revealed that persons aged between 15 and 35 years presented a high proportion of those with a second type of disability ( 29.9 per cent) followed by persons aged between 36 and 60 years ( 28.2 per cent).

Figure 14.4 Distribution of the population by second type of disability (per cent)


Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

An analysis of the distribution of the population by second type of disability in Table 14.15 shows that there were no major variations by gender of the PWDs.

| Main type of disability | All Ages |  |  | 0-14 Years |  |  | 15-35 Years |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Number | 93,129 | 50,319 | 42,810 | 16,108 | 9,048 | 7,060 | 28,792 | 15,257 | 13,535 |
| Per cent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| None | 66.9 | 66.8 | 66.9 | 64.6 | 64.7 | 64.5 | 68.0 | 67.9 | 68.1 |
| Physical (Polio) | 5.6 | 5.7 | 5.4 | 7.2 | 7.1 | 7.4 | 6.9 | 7.1 | 6.6 |
| Physical - <br> (Amputee) | 3.9 | 4.1 | 3.6 | 4.2 | 4.5 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Blind or visually impaired | 2.9 | 3.1 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 2.0 | 1.4 |
| Partially sighted | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 2.0 |
| Deaf | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.8 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 3.0 |
| Partially deaf | 2.0 | 1.8 | 2.2 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 2.1 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.7 |
| Speech difficulties | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 3.1 |
| Mute | 1.6 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 2.0 |
| Mental difficulties | 1.6 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 1.9 | 1.7 | 2.0 | 2.3 | 2.4 | 2.2 |
| Spinal injury/ disability | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 0.7 |
| Psychiatric disability | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.7 |
| Epileptic | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.0 |
| Rheumatism | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| Albinism | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Kyphoscoliosis (Hunch back) | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Others | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 2.4 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 2.8 |

[^13]Table 14.15 Distribution of population by second type of disability, broad age-groups and sex (continued)

| Main type of disability | 36-60 Years |  |  | Over 60 Years |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Number | 27,376 | 15,430 | 11,946 | 20,853 | 10,584 | 10,269 |
| Per cent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| None | 68.2 | 68.1 | 68.4 | 65.3 | 65.2 | 65.4 |
| Physical (Polio) | 5.2 | 5.3 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.1 |
| Physical - <br> (Amputee) | 4.1 | 4.5 | 3.6 | 3.1 | 3.4 | 2.9 |
| Blind or visually impaired | 3.2 | 3.4 | 2.9 | 5.1 | 5.9 | 4.3 |
| Partially sighted | 4.1 | 4.3 | 3.8 | 5.9 | 6.1 | 5.8 |
| Deaf | 2.2 | 2.1 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 2.7 |
| Partially deaf | 1.6 | 1.5 | 1.8 | 3.3 | 2.8 | 3.7 |
| Speech difficulties | 1.9 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 |
| Mute | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.5 |
| Mental difficulties | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.9 |
| Spinal injury/ disability | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| Psychiatric disability | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| Epileptic | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Rheumatism | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.3 |
| Albinism | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Kyphoscoliosis (Hunch back) | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Others | 4.0 | 3.8 | 4.2 | 4.6 | 4.4 | 4.8 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 14.4.8 Cause of disability by sex, broad age group, place of residence and region

The 2015 Census collected information on the main causes of disability which include; congenital from birth, diseases or illness, transport accident, occupational injury, other accident, war and natural ageing.

Table 14.16 presents the distribution of the population by cause of main type of disability and selected characteristics like sex, age group, place of residence and region. The findings show that irrespective of the selected characteristics chosen, disease and/or illness is the major cause of disability followed by congenital from birth.

It is however worth noting that for people aged over 60 years, natural ageing constitutes a considerable percentage (28.3) of disabilities. Physical impairments, sight problems and changing mental states are often experienced by people as they age.

More males than females reported the cause of their disability as a transport accident, occupational injury, other accident or war. On the other hand, disease and/or illness and war are reported more by rural than urban residents as the causes of disability.


Table 14.16 Distribution of population by cause of main type of disability and selected characteristics

| Selected <br> characteristics | Total | Congenital <br> from birth | Disease/ ilness | Transport <br> accident | Occupational <br> injury |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 100.0 | 16.2 | 40.5 | 4.6 | 4.5 |
| Male | 100.0 | 16.2 | 38.2 | 5.7 | 5.9 |
| Female | 100.0 | 16.1 | 43.1 | 3.3 | 2.8 |
| Broad Age | 100.0 | 16.2 | 40.5 | 4.6 | 4.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 32.1 | 36.9 | 2.5 | 1.3 |
| $0-14$ | 100.0 | 21.5 | 40.8 | 5.0 | 3.2 |
| $15-35$ | 100.0 | 10.2 | 42.3 | 6.2 | 6.5 |
| $36-60$ | 100.0 | 4.2 | 40.2 | 3.7 | 5.9 |
| $60+$ | 100.0 | 16.2 | 40.5 | 4.6 | 4.5 |
| Place of residence | 100.0 | 15.3 | 41.8 | 3.9 | 5.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 17.9 | 37.7 | 6.0 | 3.4 |
| Rural |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 100.0 | 16.2 | 40.5 | 4.6 | 4.5 |
| Region | 100.0 | 15.3 | 41.5 | 4.5 | 4.1 |
| Total | 100.0 | 17.6 | 39.4 | 4.6 | 4.0 |
| Eastern | 100.0 | 13.9 | 43.7 | 3.6 | 5.7 |
| Northern | 100.0 | 18.3 | 35.1 | 6.8 | 4.0 |
| Southern |  |  |  |  |  |
| Western |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 14.16 Distribution of population by cause of main type of disability and selected characteristics (Continued)

| Selected characteristics | Other accident | War | Natural ageing | Other | Not Stated |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 8.8 | 4.1 | 8.1 | 10.5 | 2.8 |
| Male | 10.1 | 5.0 | 6.1 | 10.0 | 2.7 |
| Female | 7.2 | 3.0 | 10.5 | 11.0 | 3.0 |
| Broad Age |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 8.8 | 4.1 | 8.1 | 10.5 | 2.8 |
| 0-14 | 8.5 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 12.8 | 5.1 |
| 15-35 | 9.1 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 13.4 | 3.1 |
| 36-60 | 9.7 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 10.2 | 2.1 |
| 60+ | 7.3 | 3.7 | 28.3 | 5.1 | 1.6 |
| Place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 8.8 | 4.1 | 8.1 | 10.5 | 2.8 |
| Rural | 8.6 | 4.3 | 8.5 | 10.2 | 2.4 |
| Urban | 9.1 | 3.7 | 7.5 | 11.0 | 3.6 |
| Region |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 8.8 | 4.1 | 8.1 | 10.5 | 2.8 |
| Eastern | 8.5 | 6.0 | 6.4 | 10.7 | 3.0 |
| Northern | 9.3 | 3.0 | 9.8 | 10.1 | 2.2 |
| Southern | 7.7 | 4.0 | 8.5 | 10.2 | 2.7 |
| Western | 9.8 | 3.3 | 6.8 | 11.4 | 4.6 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 14.4.9 Cause of disability by district

The distribution of PWDs by cause of main type of disability by district of residence, as presented in Table 14.17, revealed a similar trend to Table 14.16 above. All districts confirmed that disease/ illness was the major cause of main type of disability followed by congenital birth. Natural ageing as a cause of disability was mainly reported in Kambia ( 15.5 per cent) followed by Port Loko (11.5 per cent). Appendix Table A14.3 presents the distribution of the PWDs by region, district, chiefdom and main cause of disability.

Table 14.17 Distribution of persons with disabilities by cause of main type of disability and district

| District | Total |  | Congenital from birth | Disease/ illness | Transport accident | Occupational injury |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 93,129 | 100.0 | 16.2 | 40.5 | 4.6 | 4.5 |
| Kailahun | 9,666 | 100.0 | 15.9 | 41.2 | 4.1 | 4.1 |
| Kenema | 9,155 | 100.0 | 15.5 | 39.5 | 4.7 | 4.8 |
| Kono | 6,756 | 100.0 | 14.1 | 44.6 | 4.8 | 3.1 |
| Bombali | 8,797 | 100.0 | 18.8 | 40.1 | 3.8 | 3.5 |
| Kambia | 4,489 | 100.0 | 15.3 | 37.7 | 5.0 | 4.4 |
| Koinadugu | 4,125 | 100.0 | 16.3 | 43.2 | 4.3 | 4.0 |
| Port Loko | 9,050 | 100.0 | 19.4 | 36.4 | 4.9 | 3.9 |
| Tonkolili | 6,388 | 100.0 | 15.6 | 41.3 | 5.2 | 4.9 |
| Bo | 9,335 | 100.0 | 14.4 | 44.0 | 3.6 | 5.2 |
| Bonthe | 2,726 | 100.0 | 14.9 | 43.7 | 2.9 | 5.1 |
| Moyamba | 5,866 | 100.0 | 13.0 | 43.1 | 3.5 | 7.2 |
| Pujehun | 4,843 | 100.0 | 13.8 | 44.0 | 4.1 | 5.2 |
| Western- Rural | 4,126 | 100.0 | 16.9 | 37.3 | 6.9 | 4.4 |
| Western- Urban | 7,807 | 100.0 | 19.1 | 33.9 | 6.7 | 3.8 |


| District | Other accident | War | Natural ageing | Other | Not Stated |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 8.8 | 4.1 | 8.1 | 10.5 | 2.8 |
| Kailahun | 8.6 | 6.6 | 7.3 | 10.1 | 2.0 |
| Kenema | 7.4 | 6.1 | 7.1 | 11.3 | 3.6 |
| Kono | 9.7 | 5.2 | 4.1 | 10.8 | 3.5 |
| Bombali | 8.6 | 2.9 | 9.0 | 10.7 | 2.5 |
| Kambia | 9.2 | 1.5 | 15.5 | 10.3 | 1.2 |
| Koinadugu | 9.0 | 3.5 | 8.5 | 9.4 | 1.9 |
| Port Loko | 9.9 | 3.0 | 11.5 | 8.7 | 2.3 |
| Tonkolili | 9.9 | 3.9 | 5.3 | 11.7 | 2.3 |
| Bo | 8.4 | 3.7 | 7.8 | 10.1 | 2.8 |
| Bonthe | 7.4 | 4.0 | 9.1 | 10.2 | 2.9 |
| Moyamba | 7.2 | 2.9 | 9.5 | 10.8 | 2.9 |
| Pujehun | 7.3 | 5.7 | 8.0 | 9.7 | 2.1 |
| Western- Rural | 10.0 | 4.9 | 4.3 | 11.2 | 4.1 |
| Western- Urban | 9.7 | 2.5 | 8.1 | 11.5 | 4.8 |
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### 14.4.10 Type of disability by kind of treatment

Information was collected from the respondents on the kind of treatment and assistance PWD had received (Figure 14.5). The findings revealed that the majority had received medication forming 60.5 per cent. Other important forms of treatment and support reported were surgical operation, assistive device, counselling and financial support. It should be noted that 21.6 per cent of PWD had not been assisted in any way.

Figure 14.5 Treatment and support for the persons with disability (per cent)


Table 14.18 presents the distribution of PWD by main type of disability and the kind of treatment received. The majority of beneficiaries for surgical operation, medication, assistive devices, skills training, counselling and financial support were people with physical disabilities.

Table 14.18 Distribution of the population by main type of disability and type of treatment or rehabilitation for disability

| Main disability | Total | Surgical operation | Medication | Assistive devices | Special education (mentally retarded) | Braille training/ Sign language |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | 93,129 | 5,012 | 56,297 | 2,065 | 681 | 504 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Physical disability (Polio) | 21.8 | 22.9 | 21.7 | 33.6 | 10.9 | 7.7 |
| Physical disability <br> (Amputee) | 8.9 | 17.0 | 7.7 | 10.3 | 4.6 | 3.4 |
| Blind or visually impaired | 12.5 | 16.8 | 13.2 | 11.8 | 7.3 | 10.7 |
| Partially sighted | 15.2 | 17.5 | 16.8 | 15.4 | 3.5 | 2.8 |
| Deaf | 6.8 | 2.8 | 6.8 | 4.8 | 6.8 | 15.7 |
| Partially deaf | 5.1 | 1.9 | 5.1 | 3.1 | 2.8 | 4.0 |
| Speech difficulties | 3.9 | 2.3 | 2.6 | 3.4 | 7.0 | 15.1 |
| Mute | 3.5 | 1.6 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 6.8 | 33.1 |
| Mental difficulties | 4.7 | 1.7 | 3.9 | 3.3 | 42.6 | 1.8 |
| Spinal injury/disability | 3.1 | 3.9 | 3.7 | 2.4 | 1.2 | 0.2 |
| Psychiatric disability | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 2.3 | 0.6 |
| Epileptic | 2.4 | 0.6 | 3.0 | 1.7 | 1.5 | 0.4 |
| Rheumatism | 1.7 | 0.6 | 2.2 | 1.5 | 0.1 | 0.4 |
| Albinism | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.2 |
| Kyphoscoliosis (Hunch back) | 0.7 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 3.4 |
| Other | 7.7 | 7.6 | 8.8 | 4.0 | 1.9 | 0.6 | and type of treatment or rehabilitation for disability (continued)


| Main disability | Skills <br> training | Counselling | Financial | Other | None |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | 641 | 2,065 | 1,479 | 4,303 | 20,082 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Physical disability <br> (Polio) | 38.5 | 25.1 | 22.0 | 23.2 | 20.2 |
| Physical disability <br> (Amputee) | 12.0 | 9.3 | 9.1 | 6.6 | 10.7 |
| Blind or visually <br> impaired | 6.6 | 13.2 | 13.5 | 7.4 | 11.0 |
| Partially sighted | 2.8 | 7.6 | 13.6 | 9.1 | 13.6 |
| Deaf | 7.2 | 6.5 | 6.8 | 6.9 | 7.7 |
| Partially deaf | 2.2 | 4.1 | 3.6 | 4.8 | 6.5 |
| Speech difficulties | 4.4 | 6.9 | 3.7 | 4.9 | 6.8 |
| Mute | 8.0 | 4.9 | 3.2 | 4.4 | 6.4 |
| Mental difficulties | 2.3 | 9.8 | 5.5 | 8.7 | 5.2 |
| Spinal injury/disability | 3.4 | 1.9 | 5.7 | 2.3 | 1.5 |
| Psychiatric disability | 2.0 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 1.8 | 0.9 |
| Epileptic | 1.9 | 1.7 | 2.2 | 3.2 | 1.5 |
| Rheumatism | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 0.8 |
| Albinism | 0.5 | 1.4 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 1.1 |
| Kyphoscoliosis <br> (Hunch back) | 2.2 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.8 |
| Other | 4.8 | 3.2 | 5.8 | 13.7 | 5.1 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 14.5 Socio-economic characteristics of persons with disabilities

The analysis of socio-economic characteristics of PWDs was carried out to understand their welfare status. The key variables considered in the analysis were; educational levels, literacy levels, marital status, activity status, type of dwelling, tenure status, source of drinking water, and type of toilet facility used by the household members.

It is important to analyse the data since PWDs are likely to face more social and economic hardships than their non-PWDs counterparts. The social and physical barriers combined with the stigma of disability constrain PWDs' ability to earn, which in turn limits access to the basic necessities of life. According to the WHO report on disability (2011), half of PWDs cannot afford health care, compared to only one third of non-PWDs.

### 14.5.1 Literacy of persons with disabilities 10 years and older by region

The distribution of PWDs aged 10 years and above by cause of main type of disability and literacy status is presented in Table 14.19. Only 32.7 per cent of PWDs were literate at the time of the census enumeration. The literacy status varied by cause of disability, with those reporting transport accident as the main cause of disability registering the highest literacy levels (47.4 per cent), while those reporting natural ageing process revealed the lowest literacy levels (18 per cent). The findings suggest variations in the disability experiences. It is likely that the PWDs who suffered a transport accident became disabled when they were already literate.

The census questionnaire included a question which was administered to all persons aged 10 years and above, to access the literacy levels and the languages in which the respondent was fluent. Close to one quarter of the PWDs aged 10 years and over could write and speak English. The other languages with significant proportions were; Arabic ( 4.2 per cent) and local languages (2.4 per cent). The knowledge of English varied from 9.1 per cent for the PWDs who reported the cause as natural ageing process to 36.6 per cent for those whose cause of disability was transport accident.

Table 14.19 Distribution of the population aged 10 years and above by cause of main type of disability and literacy status

| Literacy status | Total | Congenital (from birth) | Disease/ illness | Transport accident | Occupational injury |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Literacy |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Literate | 32.7 | 35.4 | 30.4 | 47.4 | 32.6 |
| Not literate | 66.8 | 64.2 | 69.1 | 52.1 | 67.1 |
| Dont know | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.3 |
| Literacy levels |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Local language only | 2.4 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 3.4 | 2.4 |
| English only | 24.5 | 28.4 | 23.0 | 36.6 | 21.3 |
| Local language and English only | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.9 | 0.8 |
| French only | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 |
| Local language and French only | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| English and French only | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Local language English and French only | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Arabic only | 4.2 | 3.0 | 3.8 | 5.3 | 7.3 |
| Local language and Arabic only | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| English and Arabic only | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Local language English and Arabic only | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other languages | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Not literate | 66.8 | 64.2 | 69.1 | 52.1 | 67.1 |
| Dont know | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.3 |

Table 14.19 Distribution of the population aged 10 years and above by cause of main type of disability and literacy status (continued)

| Literacy status | Other accident | War | Natural ageing | Other | Not stated |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Literacy |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Literate | 38.5 | 35.8 | 18.0 | 35.0 | 43.3 |
| Not literate | 61.0 | 63.8 | 81.0 | 64.3 | 56.1 |
| Dont know | 0.5 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.5 |
| Literacy levels |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Local language only | 2.0 | 3.2 | 1.9 | 2.8 | 2.9 |
| English only | 30.1 | 25.3 | 9.1 | 27.4 | 34.4 |
| Local language and English only | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 1.0 |
| French only | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Local language and French only | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| English and French only | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Local language English and French only | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Arabic only | 4.6 | 5.8 | 5.9 | 3.4 | 3.5 |
| Local language and Arabic only | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| English and Arabic only | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Local language English and Arabic only | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Other languages | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.6 |
| Not literate | 61.0 | 63.8 | 81.0 | 64.3 | 56.1 |
| Dont know | 0.5 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.5 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

The Western Region presented the highest literacy levels (58.2 per cent) of PWDs aged 10 and older, while the Northern Region showed the lowest literacy levels (28 per cent) (Table 14.20). Across the regions, the male literacy levels were higher than their female counterparts. The proportion of the male literate PWDs varied from 37.6 per cent in the Northern Region to 66.8 per cent in the Western Region. A similar trend was noted for the females with 17.5 and 47.5 per cent for the Northern and Western region, respectively.

Table 14.20 Distribution of the persons with disabilities aged 10 years and older by literacy status, region and sex

| Region/Sex | Total <br> Number | Percent | Literate | Not Literate | Don't Know |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Country |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 83,292 | 100.0 | 32.7 | 66.8 | 0.5 |
| Male | 44,759 | 100.0 | 41.9 | 57.6 | 0.5 |
| Female | 38,533 | 100.0 | 21.9 | 77.5 | 0.6 |
| Eastern |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 22,797 | 100.0 | 29.9 | 69.6 | 0.5 |
| Male | 12,589 | 100.0 | 38.2 | 61.2 | 0.5 |
| Female | 10,208 | 100.0 | 19.6 | 79.9 | 0.5 |
| Northern | 29,239 | 100.0 | 28.0 | 71.3 | 0.7 |
| Total | 15,292 | 100.0 | 37.6 | 61.8 | 0.6 |
| Male | 13,947 | 100.0 | 17.5 | 81.7 | 0.8 |
| Female | 20,411 | 100.0 | 28.8 | 70.9 | 0.4 |
| Southern | 10,870 | 100.0 | 38.5 | 61.2 | 0.4 |
| Total | 9,541 | 100.0 | 17.7 | 81.9 | 0.4 |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 10,845 | 100.0 | 58.2 | 41.2 | 0.6 |
| Western | 6,008 | 100.0 | 66.8 | 32.7 | 0.5 |
| Total | 100.0 | 47.5 | 51.8 | 0.7 |  |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census
The literacy levels of the PWDs aged 10 to 24 years by region and sex is presented in Table 14.21. The majority of the literate PWDs were knowledgeable in the English language forming 43.5 per cent of the total PWDs. Overall, the knowledge of English varied from 36.3 per cent in the Southern Region to 62.7 per cent in the Western Region. A similar trend was noted when the analysis on knowledge of English was carried out by sex.
(1) Table 14.21 Literacy levels of persons with disabilities

| Region/Sex | Total Number | Percent | Local language only | English only | Local language and English only |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Country |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 19,298 | 100.0 | 2.1 | 43.5 | 0.8 |
| Male | 10,574 | 100.0 | 2.1 | 46.6 | 0.9 |
| Female | 8,724 | 100.0 | 2.2 | 39.8 | 0.8 |
| Eastern |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 5,536 | 100.0 | 2.2 | 41.2 | 0.4 |
| Male | 3,025 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 44.1 | 0.4 |
| Female | 2,511 | 100.0 | 2.2 | 37.8 | 0.3 |
| Northern |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 6,817 | 100.0 | 1.7 | 41.8 | 1.0 |
| Male | 3,726 | 100.0 | 1.7 | 45.7 | 1.0 |
| Female | 3,091 | 100.0 | 1.8 | 37.1 | 0.9 |
| Southern |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 4,114 | 100.0 | 2.4 | 36.3 | 1.0 |
| Male | 2,266 | 100.0 | 2.5 | 37.9 | 1.2 |
| Female | 1,848 | 100.0 | 2.2 | 34.3 | 0.8 |
| Western |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 2,831 | 100.0 | 2.4 | 62.7 | 1.1 |
| Male | 1,557 | 100.0 | 2.0 | 66.2 | 0.9 |
| Female | 1,274 | 100.0 | 2.9 | 58.5 | 1.3 |


| Region/Sex | French <br> only | Arabic only | Other | Not literate | Don't Know |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Country |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 0.4 | 1.5 | 0.7 | 50.5 | 0.4 |
| Male | 0.4 | 2.3 | 0.8 | 46.6 | 0.5 |
| Female | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 55.2 | 0.4 |
| Eastern | 0.3 | 1.4 | 0.7 | 53.5 | 0.4 |
| Total | 0.3 | 2.0 | 0.9 | 49.7 | 0.3 |
| Male | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 58.1 | 0.4 |
| Female | 0.3 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 52.9 | 0.5 |
| Northern | 0.3 | 1.5 | 0.7 | 48.6 | 0.6 |
| Total | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 58.1 | 0.5 |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 0.4 | 2.7 | 0.7 | 56.3 | 0.3 |
| Southern | 0.4 | 4.5 | 0.4 | 52.6 | 0.4 |
| Total | 0.3 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 60.8 | 0.2 |
| Male |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 0.6 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 27.1 | 0.6 |
| Western | 0.8 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 34.8 | 0.6 |
| Total | Male |  |  |  |  |
| Female |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 14.5.2 Level of education of persons with disabilities, three years and older by region

Table 14.22 presents the distribution of the PWDs aged three years and above by highest educational level attained, region and sex. The findings show that 62.8 per cent of the total PWDs had never been to school. Among the males, 55.4 per cent had no education. The corresponding figure for the females is 71.4 per cent. Overall, 15.9 per cent of the PWDs had completed primary level of education. The PWDs who had studied beyond the primary level constituted 17.4 per cent of the total population of the PWDs. At the regional level, the Western Region had the lowest proportion ( 38.3 per cent) of PWDS with no education, followed by the Eastern Region ( 63.4 per cent). The Northern Region presents the highest proportion ( 68.6 per cent) of PWDs who had never gone to school at the time of the census enumeration.

Further analysis by region and gender shows that, the proportion of the female PWDs with no education varied from 47.2 per cent in the Western Region to 77.1 per cent in the Northern Region. The corresponding percentages for the male PWDs were 32.1 and 61.1 for Western and Northern regions respectively. Generally, the male PWDs had higher percentages at every level of education than those of their female counterparts. and above by highest educational level attained, region and sex

| Region/Sex | Number | Percent | No <br> education | Kinder <br> garten | Primary | JSS | SSS |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Country |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 92,076 | 100.0 | 62.8 | 2.2 | 15.9 | 8.0 | 6.4 |  |  |  |
| Male | 49,713 | 100.0 | 55.4 | 2.3 | 17.0 | 9.5 | 8.6 |  |  |  |
| Female | 42,363 | 100.0 | 71.4 | 2.0 | 14.7 | 6.2 | 3.7 |  |  |  |
| Eastern |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 25,332 | 100.0 | 63.4 | 2.4 | 16.7 | 8.1 | 5.6 |  |  |  |
| Male | 14,008 | 100.0 | 56.3 | 2.4 | 17.8 | 9.9 | 7.8 |  |  |  |
| Female | 11,324 | 100.0 | 72.3 | 2.4 | 15.4 | 5.8 | 2.9 |  |  |  |
| Northern |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 32,477 | 100.0 | 68.6 | 1.9 | 14.8 | 6.5 | 4.3 |  |  |  |
| Male | 17,141 | 100.0 | 61.1 | 2.2 | 16.3 | 7.8 | 6.3 |  |  |  |
| Female | 15,336 | 100.0 | 77.1 | 1.5 | 13.1 | 5.0 | 2.1 |  |  |  |
| Southern |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 22,471 | 100.0 | 66.1 | 1.9 | 15.5 | 6.9 | 5.1 |  |  |  |
| Male | 12,024 | 100.0 | 59.0 | 2.0 | 16.5 | 8.3 | 7.1 |  |  |  |
| Female | 10,447 | 100.0 | 74.2 | 1.7 | 14.4 | 5.3 | 2.7 |  |  |  |
| Western |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18.9 | 13.9 | 16.1 |
| Total | 11,796 | 100.0 | 38.8 | 3.1 | 17.9 | 14.9 | 19.4 |  |  |  |
| Male | 6,540 | 100.0 | 32.1 | 3.1 | 12.9 | 11.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 5,256 | 100.0 | 47.2 | 3.1 | 18.7 |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Table 14.22 Distribution of persons with disabilities aged 3 years and above by highest educational level attained, region and sex (continued)

| Region/Sex | Vocational/ technical/ nursing/ Teacher | Higher (First degree) | Tertiary (Postgraduate) \& PHD | Koranic | Other | Don't know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Country |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 1.9 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 1.6 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Male | 2.6 | 1.1 | 0.5 | 2.7 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Female | 1.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Eastern |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 1.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 1.4 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Male | 2.3 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 2.3 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Female | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Northern |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 1.5 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 1.8 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Male | 2.2 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 3.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Female | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Southern |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 1.7 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 1.9 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Male | 2.3 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 3.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Female | 1.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Western |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 4.0 | 2.9 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.3 |
| Male | 4.6 | 3.9 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 0.8 | 0.3 |
| Female | 3.2 | 1.6 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.3 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 14.5.3 Level of education of persons with disabilities, three years and older by type of disability

The distribution of the PWDs aged three years and older by type of disability and highest level of educational attainment is presented in Table 14.23. Irrespective of the type of disability, the majority of PWDs had never been to school. The PWDs with mute condition ( 76.6 per cent) presented the biggest proportion of PWDs who had never been to school. On the other hand, the PWDs with hunch back ( 48.9 per cent) condition presented the lowest proportion. The proportion of PWDs who had attained primary school education as the highest level of education varied from 8.8 per cent for the blind or visually impaired to 23 per cent for the partially deaf. and older by type of disability and highest level of education

| Type of Disability | Number | Percent | No education | Kinder garten | Primary | JSS | SSS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 92,076 | 100.0 | 62.8 | 2.2 | 15.9 | 8.0 | 6.4 |
| Physical disability (Polio) | 19,985 | 100.0 | 53.2 | 2.7 | 19.0 | 10.6 | 8.9 |
| Physical disability (Amputee) | 8,114 | 100.0 | 53.8 | 2.9 | 18.0 | 10.5 | 8.9 |
| Blind or visually impaired | 11,599 | 100.0 | 74.3 | 1.6 | 8.8 | 5.1 | 5.1 |
| Partially sighted | 14,115 | 100.0 | 67.9 | 1.4 | 12.7 | 6.7 | 5.7 |
| Deaf | 6,240 | 100.0 | 66.9 | 2.4 | 17.9 | 6.9 | 3.3 |
| Partially deaf | 4,706 | 100.0 | 59.9 | 2.0 | 23.0 | 7.8 | 4.5 |
| Speech difficulties | 3,572 | 100.0 | 63.5 | 2.6 | 19.1 | 6.9 | 4.5 |
| Mute | 3,221 | 100.0 | 76.6 | 2.6 | 13.7 | 3.5 | 2.2 |
| Mental difficulties | 4,354 | 100.0 | 68.9 | 2.6 | 11.9 | 7.0 | 6.5 |
| Spinal injury/ disability | 2,845 | 100.0 | 61.0 | 2.2 | 14.9 | 10.1 | 6.1 |
| Psychiatric disability | 1,268 | 100.0 | 61.4 | 1.6 | 17.4 | 7.6 | 6.8 |
| Epileptic | 2,240 | 100.0 | 63.0 | 2.2 | 21.1 | 6.7 | 4.1 |
| Rheumatism | 1,552 | 100.0 | 72.9 | 1.4 | 10.5 | 6.4 | 3.9 |
| Albinism | 476 | 100.0 | 53.4 | 3.4 | 22.5 | 9.0 | 6.3 |
| Kyphoscoliosis (Hunch Back) | 660 | 100.0 | 48.9 | 4.2 | 20.9 | 11.5 | 10.8 |
| Other | 7,129 | 100.0 | 59.4 | 1.6 | 17.6 | 8.7 | 7.2 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

| Type of Disability | Vocational/ technical | Higher (First degree) | Tertiary | Koranic | Other | Don't <br> Know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 1.9 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 1.6 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Physical disability (Polio) | 2.8 | 1.1 | 0.5 | 1.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Physical disability (Amputee) | 2.4 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 1.6 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| Blind or visually impaired | 1.9 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 1.9 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| Partially sighted | 1.8 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 2.6 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Deaf | 1.1 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Partially deaf | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Speech difficulties | 1.3 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Mute | 0.9 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Mental difficulties | 1.1 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Spinal injury/ disability | 2.2 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 2.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Psychiatric disability | 1.5 | 1.1 | 0.2 | 1.8 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Epileptic | 1.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Rheumatism | 1.5 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 2.4 | 0.3 | 0.1 |
| Albinism | 2.9 | 1.1 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| Kyphoscoliosis (Hunch Back) | 1.1 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 1.9 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 2.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 14.5.4 Persons with disabilities and non persons with disabilities aged 6-24 by level of education

Table 14.24 presents the distribution of the PWDs and non-PWDs aged 6 to 24 years by level of education. The findings reveal that irrespective of the disability status, the majority of the population aged 6 to 24 years had completed primary school education. Generally, the proportion of people who had completed any level of education was lower for PWDs than for non-PWDs. There are no clear variations when the analysis was carried out by disability status and sex.

Table 14.24 Distribution of person with disabilities and non person with disabilities aged 6-24 by level of education

| Highest educational level | Total |  |  | Persons with disability |  |  | Persons with no disability |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Number | 3,243,231 | 1,598,069 | 1,645,162 | 24,703 | 13,635 | 11,068 | 3,218,528 | 1,584,434 | 1,634,094 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Kindergarten | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.3 |
| Primary | 40.9 | 40.1 | 41.7 | 36.2 | 36.2 | 36.1 | 40.9 | 40.1 | 41.7 |
| JSS | 17.1 | 17.1 | 17.0 | 12.8 | 13.6 | 11.7 | 17.1 | 17.2 | 17.1 |
| SSS | 11.2 | 12.5 | 10.0 | 7.3 | 8.6 | 5.8 | 11.3 | 12.6 | 10.0 |
| Vocational/ Technical/ Nursing/ Teacher | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Higher (First degree) | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.4 |
| Tertiary (Postgraduate) \& PHD | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Koranic | 0.6 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 0.2 |
| Other | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Don't know | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Not stated | 25.6 | 24.6 | 26.6 | 39.1 | 36.7 | 42.2 | 25.5 | 24.5 | 26.5 |

[^15]
### 14.5.5 Marital status of persons with disabilities and non-persons with disabilities 12 years and older

The distribution of the PWDs and non-PWDs aged 10 years and over by marital status is presented in table 14.25 below. Generally, the proportions of male persons aged 10 years and over who were not married at the time of the census enumeration were higher than their female counterparts. The most prominent types of marital status for the PWDs and non-PWDs were never married and married polygamous. The proportion of persons married polygamous was higher for the PWDs than for the non-PWDs.

The PWDs also registered a higher proportion ( 14.8 per cent) of the persons whose marital status was widowed than those with no disabilities ( 3.8 per cent). Further analysis by sex showed that the proportion of males ( 44.1 per cent) in polygamous marriage was higher than that of their female counterparts ( 26.4 per cent) for the PWDs. The corresponding percentages for the nonPWDs were 29.5 and 30.3 for the males and females, respectively.


Table 14.25 Distribution of the persons with disabilities and non-persons with disabilities aged 10 years and older by marital status

| Marital status | Total |  |  | Persons with disability |  |  | Persons with no disability |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Number | 5,030,016 | 2,455,827 | 2,574,189 | 83,292 | 44,759 | 38,533 | 4,946,724 | 2,411,068 | 2,535,656 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Never married | 45.9 | 53.1 | 39.1 | 27.9 | 32.9 | 22.2 | 46.2 | 53.5 | 39.3 |
| Engaged | 4.0 | 3.7 | 4.4 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 4.1 | 3.7 | 4.4 |
| Married monogamous | 13.0 | 9.8 | 15.9 | 12.5 | 10.3 | 15.2 | 13.0 | 9.8 | 15.9 |
| Married polygamous | 30.0 | 29.8 | 30.3 | 35.9 | 44.1 | 26.4 | 29.9 | 29.5 | 30.3 |
| Co-habitation (< 5 years) | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 |
| Co-habitation (= >5 years) | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Separated | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.5 |
| Divorced | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 2.1 | 2.2 | 2.0 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.9 |
| Widowed | 4.0 | 0.9 | 7.0 | 14.8 | 4.0 | 27.5 | 3.8 | 0.8 | 6.7 |
| Don't know | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 14.5.6 Employment status of persons with disabilities 10 years and older

There is a correlation between disabilities and poverty. It is worth noting that jobs offered to PWDs are scarce, yet most adult PWDs have families to take care of. Even the intellectual PWDs experience difficulties finding jobs. For those who do get jobs, keeping them can be difficult. Most potential employers are biased and only concerned about maximising production and effective social participation.

Just over half ( 55.1 per cent) of PWDs were employed at the time of the census, with 43 per cent not working (inactive) and 1.8 per cent were not employed. Further analysis revealed that 44.1 per cent were self-employed without employees while the self-employed with employees formed 2.6 per cent of the total. There were no major variations in reporting when the analysis was carried out with respect to type of disability.

## 를 <br> Table 14.26 Distribution of the population aged 10 years and above by cause of main type of disability and employment status

| Employment status/ Economic activity | Total | Congenital (from birth) | Disease/ illness | Transport accident | Occupational injury |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | 83,292 | 11,744 | 34,145 | 4,083 | 4,032 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Paid employee | 3.9 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 8.1 | 4.8 |
| Self-employed without employees | 44.1 | 41.6 | 44.1 | 47.5 | 55.2 |
| Self-employed with employees (employer) | 2.6 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 3.5 | 4.6 |
| Unpaid family worker | 3.5 | 3.8 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.7 |
| Paid apprentice | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.4 |
| Unpaid apprentice | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.7 |
| Worked before but currently looking for work | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 1.2 | 0.8 |
| Looking for work for the first time | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 1.8 | 0.8 |
| Household work | 8.4 | 9.9 | 8.9 | 6.0 | 5.1 |
| Not working \& not looking for work | 16.2 | 11.9 | 17.4 | 10.9 | 12.4 |
| Full time student | 11.0 | 19.4 | 10.1 | 11.1 | 5.0 |
| Retired/pensioner | 2.9 | 0.7 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 3.6 |
| Other (specify) | 3.6 | 2.8 | 3.6 | 2.0 | 2.3 |
| Don't know | 1.0 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| Economic Activity |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Employed Population | 55.1 | 52.7 | 54.6 | 64.2 | 69.4 |
| Unemployed Population | 1.8 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 2.9 | 1.6 |
| Inactive Population | 43.1 | 45.6 | 43.6 | 32.9 | 29.0 |

Table 14.26 Distribution of the population aged 10 years and above by cause of main type of disability and employment status (continued)

| Employment status/ <br> Economic activity | Other accident | War | Natural ageing | Other | Not stated |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | 7,432 | 3,772 | 7,589 | 8,480 | 2,015 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Paid employee | 4.1 | 4.7 | 2.2 | 4.0 | 5.3 |
| Self-employed without employees | 47.5 | 54.5 | 31.1 | 44.9 | 43.6 |
| Self-employed with employees (employer) | 2.4 | 3.8 | 2.2 | 2.6 | 2.9 |
| Unpaid family worker | 3.7 | 3.2 | 2.5 | 3.2 | 3.1 |
| Paid apprentice | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.7 |
| Unpaid apprentice | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.9 |
| Worked before but currently looking for work | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Looking for work for the first time | 1.6 | 1.6 | 0.5 | 1.6 | 1.5 |
| Household work | 6.9 | 6.8 | 9.8 | 8.5 | 7.1 |
| Not working \& not looking for work | 12.0 | 12.6 | 32.5 | 14.0 | 10.1 |
| Full time student | 14.3 | 5.5 | 0.2 | 12.8 | 18.3 |
| Retired/pensioner | 2.3 | 1.9 | 11.3 | 1.2 | 1.9 |
| Other (specify) | 2.8 | 3.3 | 5.4 | 4.7 | 3.4 |
| Don't know | 0.6 | 0.9 | 1.6 | 1.2 | 0.8 |
| Economic Activity |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Employed Population | 59.0 | 67.0 | 38.4 | 55.5 | 56.5 |
| Unemployed Population | 2.0 | 2.1 | 0.8 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Inactive Population | 39.0 | 30.9 | 60.8 | 42.5 | 41.5 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 14.5.7 Employment status of persons with disability by sex

Generally, the majority of persons aged 15 years and over reported that they were in selfemployment without employees (Table 14.27). There were no clearly marked differences when the proportion of PWDs in self-employment without employees is compared with the one for persons with no disability. The category of self-employed without employees was more dominant in the rural than urban areas. The three most important categories of the employment status for PWDs are; self-employed without employees, not working and not looking for work, and household work. For non-PWDs, the categories with significant proportions are; self-employed without employees, full time student and household work.

The analysis by sex of the person revealed some differences in the reporting of the employment status. For the category of self-employed without employees for the PWDs, the proportion of the males ( 49.3 per cent) is higher than that for the females ( 43.2 per cent), while the reverse is noted for the non-PWDs. Overall, the proportion of the males ( 6.2 per cent) in paid employment is higher than that of females ( 1.9 per cent). A similar trend is revealed when the analysis is carried out by place of residence. Irrespective of the disability status and place of residence, the proportions of females in household work are higher than those of their male counterparts.

Table 14.27 Distribution of the population aged 15 years and older by employment status, place of residence, sex and disability status

| Employment status/ Economic activity | Total |  |  | Persons with disability |  |  | Persons with no disability |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Paid employee | 6.5 | 9.8 | 3.4 | 4.2 | 6.2 | 1.9 | 6.5 | 9.9 | 3.4 |
| Self-employed without employees | 48.5 | 47.1 | 49.8 | 46.5 | 49.3 | 43.2 | 48.5 | 47.1 | 49.9 |
| Self-employed with employees (employer) | 2.8 | 3.2 | 2.4 | 2.8 | 3.2 | 2.2 | 2.8 | 3.1 | 2.4 |
| Unpaid family worker | 3.0 | 2.6 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.2 | 3.8 | 3.0 | 2.6 | 3.5 |
| Paid apprentice | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.2 |
| Unpaid apprentice | 0.8 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 1.2 | 0.5 |
| Worked before but currently looking for work | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.3 |
| Looking for work for the first time | 2.2 | 2.7 | 1.6 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 1.1 | 2.2 | 2.8 | 1.6 |
| Household work | 7.3 | 2.1 | 12.2 | 8.5 | 3.0 | 14.7 | 7.3 | 2.0 | 12.2 |
| Not working \& not looking for work | 4.5 | 3.7 | 5.3 | 16.8 | 15.0 | 18.8 | 4.3 | 3.5 | 5.0 |
| Full time student | 21.3 | 24.0 | 18.7 | 7.1 | 8.4 | 5.6 | 21.5 | 24.3 | 18.9 |
| Retired/ pensioner | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 3.2 | 3.5 | 2.8 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.5 |
| Other (specify) | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 3.6 | 3.3 | 4.0 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.2 |
| Don't know | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 |

[^16]Table 14.27 Distribution of the population aged 15 years and older by employment status, place of residence, sex and disability status (continued)

| Employment <br> status/ Economic <br> activity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Table 14.27 Distribution of the population aged 15 years and older by employment status, place of residence, sex and disability status (continued)

| Employment <br> Status / Place <br> of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

[^17]
### 14.5.8 Persons with disabilities 15 years and older by type of dwelling unit and region

The most common types of dwelling units for PWDs were: separate house, flat/apartment, compound house, and semi-detached house in that order (Table 14.28). The analysis by region of residence of PWDs revealed a similar trend to that of the overall for the Eastern, Northern and Southern regions. The most common type of dwelling for the PWDs in the Western Region were: flat/apartment, separate houses, compound houses, and semi-detached houses. The Western Region ( 9.3 per cent) revealed a higher proportion of PWDs in improvised home (kiosk container board pan-body) than any other region. It is worth noting that the Western Region also presented a higher proportion (1.6 per cent) of PWDs living in uncompleted houses than any other region.

Table 14.28 Distribution of persons with disabilities aged 15 years and older by type of dwelling unit, region and sex

| Type of dwelling | All regions |  |  | Eastern |  |  | Northern |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Separate house | 62.1 | 62.1 | 62.2 | 68.8 | 68.4 | 69.5 | 63.0 | 62.8 | 63.2 |
| Semi-detached house | 5.5 | 5.6 | 5.4 | 5.2 | 5.3 | 5.1 | 4.6 | 4.7 | 4.5 |
| Flat/apartment | 17.5 | 17.4 | 17.7 | 13.5 | 13.8 | 13.1 | 18.0 | 17.8 | 18.2 |
| Compound house (rooms) | 7.8 | 7.7 | 7.8 | 7.6 | 7.7 | 7.5 | 6.4 | 6.3 | 6.4 |
| Huts/buildings (same compound) | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 3.2 |
| Huts/buildings (different compound) | 1.6 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 2.3 | 2.4 | 2.2 |
| Tent | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 1.5 |
| Improvised home (kiosk container board pan-body) | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 |
| Uncompleted building | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Other | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |

[^18]Table 14.28 Distribution of persons with disabilities aged 15 years and older by type of dwelling unit, region and sex (continued)

| Type of <br> dwelling |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Southern |  |  | Western |  |  |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Separate house | 63.2 | 66.6 | 67.5 | 27.2 | 27.1 | 27.5 |
| Semi-detached <br> house | 4.5 | 4.8 | 4.6 | 11.1 | 11.5 | 10.5 |
| Flat/apartment | 18.2 | 16.6 | 16.0 | 30.7 | 30.9 | 30.5 |
| Compound <br> house (rooms) | 6.4 | 6.6 | 6.5 | 16.2 | 15.6 | 17.2 |
| Huts/buildings <br> (same <br> compound) | 3.2 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.7 |
| Huts/buildings <br> (different <br> compound) | 2.2 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.6 |
| Tent | 1.5 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.5 |
| Improvised <br> home (kiosk <br> container board <br> pan-body) | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 9.3 | 9.7 | 8.6 |
| Uncompleted <br> building | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.7 |
| Other | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |



Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 14.5.9 Persons with disabilities 15 years and older by type of tenure status and region

The majority of PWDs were living in owner constructed dwelling units ( 56.4 per cent), followed by owner inherited ( 24.4 per cent) and renting private ( 10.8 per cent) (see Table 14.29). There are no major differences in reporting when gender is taken into consideration. The trend in the reporting of the tenure status for Eastern, Northern and Southern regions was similar to that of the overall. The majority of PWDs in the Western Region were enumerated in private renting facilities forming 35.9 per cent of the total, followed by owner constructed ( 31.1 per cent) and owner inherited ( 16.4 per cent). There were no clear differences when comparisons are carried out by the sex of PWD and region of residence.

Table 14.29 Distribution of persons with disabilities aged 15 years and older by type of tenure status and region

|  | All regions |  |  | Eastern |  |  | Northern |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tenure Status | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Total | 77,021 | 41,271 | 35,750 | 20,886 | 11,521 | 9,365 | 26,988 | 14,044 | 12,944 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |


| OWNER |  | 1.9 | 1.8 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.5 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Purchased | 1.8 | 56.4 | 57.1 | 55.6 | 58.8 | 59.5 | 57.9 | 63.2 | 64.5 |
| Constructed | 24.4 | 23.1 | 25.9 | 24.9 | 23.7 | 26.3 | 23.7 | 22.1 | 25.4 |
| Inherited |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

EMPLOYER
PROVIDED

| Government | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Private | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Parastatal/ | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Quasi- <br> Government |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| RENTING | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.4 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Government | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.0 |
| Housing <br> Corporation | 10.8 | 11.1 | 10.4 | 9.2 | 9.4 | 9.0 | 5.7 | 5.8 | 5.5 |
| Private | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Parastatal/ <br> Quasi- <br> Government | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| OTHER | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.6 |
| Squatter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

| Tenure Status | Southern |  |  | Western |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Total | 19,113 | 10,141 | 8,972 | 10,034 | 5,565 | 4,469 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| OWNER |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Purchased | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 4.1 |
| Constructed | 57.5 | 58.5 | 56.3 | 31.1 | 30.5 | 31.8 |
| Inherited | 29.1 | 27.7 | 30.6 | 16.4 | 15.9 | 17.1 |
| EMPLOYER PROVIDED |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Government | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 0.9 |
| Private | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 1.0 |
| Parastatal/ QuasiGovernment | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.0 |
| RENTING |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Government | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 1.7 |
| Housing Corporation | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.1 |
| Private | 6.5 | 6.7 | 6.3 | 35.9 | 35.9 | 36.0 |
| Parastatal/ Quasi-Government | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| OTHER |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Squatter | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| Other | 2.2 | 2.1 | 2.4 | 4.1 | 4.3 | 3.9 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 14.5.10 Employed people with disabilities 15 years and older by employer and type of dwelling

The distribution of the employed PWDs aged 15 years and older by employer and type of dwelling is presented in Table 14.30. The findings reveal that irrespective of the main employer, the common type of dwelling unit is separate house. The proportion of PWDs in separate houses varied from 38.5 per cent for those employed by private enterprises to 63.9 per cent for those who reported family member as the main employer. The proportion of the PWDs staying in flat/ apartment was higher for those who reported their main employer as government (26.8 per cent) followed by those who were being employed by private enterprises ( 25.4 per cent) at the time of the census enumeration.


Table 14.30 Distribution of employed persons with disabilities aged 15 years and older by main employer and type of dwelling unit

| Type of dwelling unit |  | Main employer |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Government | Self <br> employed | Family <br> member | Private <br> enterprises | Others |  |  |
| Number | 44,675 | 1,890 | 39,019 | 1,948 | 972 | 846 |  |  |
| Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |  |
| Separate house | 62.1 | 47.5 | 63.6 | 63.9 | 38.5 | 48.6 |  |  |
| Semi-detached house | 5.5 | 8.4 | 5.2 | 6.0 | 8.5 | 5.7 |  |  |
| Flat/Apartment | 17.5 | 26.8 | 17.0 | 12.4 | 25.4 | 25.1 |  |  |
| Compound house <br> (rooms) | 7.8 | 11.0 | 7.3 | 9.8 | 13.8 | 12.8 |  |  |
| Huts/Buildings (same <br> compound) | 2.7 | 2.3 | 2.6 | 3.6 | 2.4 | 3.3 |  |  |
| Huts/Buildings <br> (different compound) | 1.6 | 0.7 | 1.7 | 2.3 | 0.7 | 0.4 |  |  |
| Tent | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 1.1 | 0.9 |  |  |
| Improvised home <br> (kiosk container <br> board pan-body) | 1.2 | 2.2 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 7.5 | 2.5 |  |  |
| Uncompleted building | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 1.6 | 0.6 |  |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 14.5.11 Main source of drinking water of persons with disabilities and nonpersons with disabilities by sex

The distribution of the population by disability status and main source of drinking water is presented in Table 14.31. The results show that irrespective of the disability status and the gender, the major sources of water were; public tap, protected ordinary well and river, riverbed or stream. Apart from the river, riverbed or stream, the other unsafe water sources were: unprotected ordinary well and unprotected spring. Overall, a higher proportion of PWDs accessing water from unsafe water sources was revealed when a comparison is made with the proportion for non-PWDs. The proportion of PWDs (10.1 per cent) accessing water from mechanical wells was slightly higher than that for the non-PWDs ( 8.2 per cent).

Table 14.31 Distribution of the population by disability status, sex and main source of drinking

| Main source of drinking water | Overall |  |  | Persons with disability |  |  | Persons with no disability |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Number | 7,076,119 | 3,479,633 | 3,596,486 | 93,129 | 50,319 | 42,810 | 6,982,990 | 3,429,314 | 3,553,676 |
| Per cent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Piped indoors | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.8 |
| Piped in compound | 3.8 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 3.8 |
| Public tap | 28.1 | 28.0 | 28.3 | 27.3 | 27.4 | 27.3 | 28.1 | 28.0 | 28.3 |
| Protected ordinary well | 21.1 | 21.1 | 21.1 | 19.5 | 19.1 | 20.0 | 21.1 | 21.1 | 21.2 |
| Protected spring | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.1 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.4 |
| Unprotected ordinary well | 5.4 | 5.4 | 5.4 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.1 | 5.4 | 5.4 | 5.4 |
| Unprotected spring | 3.8 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 4.5 | 4.7 | 4.3 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| Mechanical well | 8.2 | 8.1 | 8.3 | 10.1 | 10.0 | 10.3 | 8.2 | 8.1 | 8.2 |
| River/riverbed/stream | 21.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 | 22.7 | 22.8 | 22.6 | 21.0 | 21.0 | 21.0 |
| Neighbour's tap | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 |
| Sachet/ bottled water | 1.9 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.1 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 1.7 |
| Water vendor/ bowser | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Other | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 14.5.12 Toilet facility used by disability status and sex

Availability of a safe toilet facility is one measure of safe sanitation. The lack of safe sanitary facilities in households and communities is a serious health concern. Table 14.32 presents the distribution of the population by disability status, sex and type of toilet facility used by the household members. The three most common toilet facilities were: community pit, private pit and communal bush or riverbed. The population reporting use of communal pit, irrespective of gender and disability status constituted over 50 per cent. The three common types of toilet facilities formed 87.4 per cent overall. The unsafe sanitary toilet facilities include: use of communal bucket, communal bush or riverbed, communal other, private bucket and private other. Overall, 15.3 per cent of the population were using unsafe toilet facilities. The disaggregation by disability status revealed that the proportion of PWDs (19.2 per cent) using unsafe toilet facilities was higher than that for the non-PWDs (15.3 per cent).

Table 14.32 Distribution of the population by disability status, sex and type of toilet facility

| Type of toilet facility | Total |  |  | Persons with disability |  |  | Persons with no disability |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Total | 7,076,119 | 3,479,633 | 3,596,486 | 93,129 | 50,319 | 42,810 | 6,982,990 | 3,429,314 | 3,553,676 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| COMMUNAL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VIP | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| Flushed inside | 2.6 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 2.6 |
| Flushed outside | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 1.9 |
| Pit | 52.9 | 52.7 | 53.1 | 50.2 | 50.3 | 50.1 | 52.9 | 52.8 | 53.1 |
| Bucket | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Bush/River bed | 13.3 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 16.5 | 16.5 | 16.6 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 13.3 |
| Other | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| PRIVATE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VIP | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| Flushed inside | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.8 |
| Flushed outside | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Pit | 21.2 | 21.2 | 21.3 | 22.5 | 22.6 | 22.4 | 21.2 | 21.2 | 21.2 |
| Bucket | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Other | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |

[^19]
### 14.6 Summary, conclusions and recommendations

### 14.6.1 Summary

The results of the 2015 Census show that PWDs constitute 1.3 per cent of the total population of Sierra Leone. More than two thirds were living in rural areas. The Northern Region had the most PWDs and Western Region had the least. The districts of Bo, Kailahun and Kenema had the highest proportion with three in every ten PWDs enumerated there.

The most common types of disability were: physical disability or polio (21.8 per cent), partially sighted (15.2 per cent), blind or visually impaired (12.5 per cent) and physical disability or amputee ( 8.9 per cent). Irrespective of type of disability, the findings revealed a correlation between the disability status and the size of household. Most PWDs, irrespective of the type, were living with or had families with more than six persons. This could be attributed to the extra assistance needed by PWDs.

The findings revealed that disease or illness were the major causes of disability followed by congenital from birth. It is worth noting that for people aged over 60 years, natural ageing had a considerable percentage (28.3) as a cause of main type of disability. More males than females reported the cause of their disability as transport accident, occupational injury, other accidents and war. Rural residents were more likely to report disease or illness and war as a cause of disability.

Forty three per cent of PWDs were not working (inactive). The PWDs who were employed at the time of the census constituted 55.1 per cent and those who were not employed formed 1.8 per cent. The majority of PWDs were not literate ( 66.8 per cent), while 32.7 per cent of the disabled population was literate. The literacy status varied by cause of disability. Those reporting transport accident as the main cause of disability had the highest literacy levels (47.4 per cent), while those reporting natural ageing process revealed the lowest literacy levels (18 per cent).
The Western Region presented the highest literacy levels (58.2 per cent), while the Northern Region showed the lowest literacy levels (28 per
cent) for PWDs. Across the regions, the male literacy levels were higher than those of their female counterparts. The proportion of the male literate PWDs varied from 37.6 per cent in the Northern Region to 66.8 per cent in the Western Region.Overall, 15.3 per cent of the population was using unsafe toilet facilities. The disaggregation by disability status revealed that the proportion of PWDs (19.2 per cent) using unsafe toilet facilities is higher than that for the non-PWDs (15.3 per cent).

### 14.6.2 Conclusion

The 2015 Census has revealed a reduction in the disability rate when compared to 2004. Several disparities were noted when the socio-economic characteristics of the PWDs were compared to those of non-PWDs.

The non-PWDs were performing well on all socio-economic indicators but the inaccessible physical and communication infrastructure always puts PWDs at a disadvantage, while favouring non-PWDs. This is true when all aspects of socio-economic development are considered. The situation is aggravated by the fact that the majority of PWDs were enumerated in the rural areas. Improved accessibility to the physical and communication infrastructure is key to empowering the PWDs to improve their standards of living, be integrated well in their communities, be more productive, and to access basic information. There is a strong correlation between disability and poverty. The barriers to accessing opportunities make it difficult for PWDs to get income, which limits them from accessing education, health care, safe water and safe sanitation.

Among the PWDs, differences were noted from the gender perspective and type of disabilities and residence. Men with disabilities represented higher proportions for employment, education attainment and literacy status than their female counterparts. The lower participation rates in the labour market for female PWDs put them at a disadvantage. Indeed, the female PWDs showed a higher proportion for the employment status category of household work. Furthermore, the PWDs with physical impairment were faring better than those with other disability types on all the socio-economic characteristics.

### 14.6.3 Recommendations

The Government of Sierra Leone has put in place a number measures to improve the welfare of PWDs. The 1991 Constitution and the Disability Act of 2011 states the rights and privileges of PWDs. The impact of Government efforts is also reflected in the intercensal reduction of the disability rate. However, a lot more works remains to be done to improve the standards of living of PWDs ,as revealed by the analysis of the 2015 Census results.

Medical services should be extended by Government to cover the entire population, given that the main cause of disability was reported as diseases or illness and the common type of disability was physical impairment or polio. Polio immunization should be carried out regularly as advised by the WHO.

The Government should put in place programmes targeting PWDs to improve their living conditions, giventhatthere is a correlation between disabilities and poverty. The PWDs experience challenges to access the job market. Those who manage to get employed face many problems keeping their employment. Business opportunities for PWDs should be created to promote disability inclusion and increased employment opportunities.

TheGovernmentshould partner with development partners and the Civil Society Organizations to educate all PWDs in order to reduce illiteracy. Children with disabilities are less likely to attend school than other children. These young persons could benefit from formal education systems while adults who are illiterate could be enrolled under the functional adult literacy programmes. Vocational training for PWDs who drop out from school should be enhanced to ensure that they are productive. The disability theme should be mainstreamed in vocational and technical training.

There is a need to put in place a system where Government rewards those companies and organizations that employ or assist PWDs. This could be in terms of tax reduction, tax holidays and certificates of recognition. The rewarding system could identify and reward companies that apply disability inclusive practices. A quota system for PWDs should be implemented in the
public service and the private sector employment system. Research on disability should be regularly conducted to inform policy makers and implementers.
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| Region/ <br> District/ | Total |  |  | Disable |  |  | Not Disable |  |  | Don't Know |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| SierraLeone | 7,076,119 | 3,479,633 | 3,596,486 | 93,129 | 50,319 | 42,810 | 6,534,642 | 3,209,111 | 3,325,531 | 448,348 | 220,203 | 228,145 |
| EASTERN | 1,640,592 | 813,110 | 827,482 | 25,577 | 14,150 | 11,427 | 1,510,797 | 747,588 | 763,209 | 104,218 | 51,372 | 52,846 |
| KAILAHUN | 525,674 | 260,060 | 265,614 | 9,666 | 5,194 | 4,472 | 497,256 | 245,584 | 251,672 | 18,752 | 9,282 | 9,470 |
| Dea | 13,263 | 6,577 | 6,686 | 396 | 208 | 188 | 12,445 | 6,166 | 6,279 | 422 | 203 | 219 |
| Jawie | 50,910 | 24,903 | 26,007 | 1,041 | 557 | 484 | 48,624 | 23,709 | 24,915 | 1,245 | 637 | 608 |
| Kissi Kama | 20,421 | 10,201 | 10,220 | 470 | 242 | 228 | 19,523 | 9,741 | 9,782 | 428 | 218 | 210 |
| Kissi Teng | 45,026 | 22,881 | 22,145 | 701 | 361 | 340 | 43,852 | 22,289 | 21,563 | 473 | 231 | 242 |
| Kissi Tongi | 50,748 | 25,703 | 25,045 | 518 | 249 | 269 | 47,806 | 24,104 | 23,702 | 2,424 | 1,350 | 1,074 |
| Kpeje Bongre | 25,169 | 12,026 | 13,143 | 375 | 218 | 157 | 24,249 | 11,542 | 12,707 | 545 | 266 | 279 |
| Kpeje West | 27,544 | 14,135 | 13,409 | 363 | 194 | 169 | 26,587 | 13,655 | 12,932 | 594 | 286 | 308 |
| Luawa | 80,907 | 38,540 | 42,367 | 2,121 | 1,165 | 956 | 73,692 | 34,952 | 38,740 | 5,094 | 2,423 | 2,671 |
| Malema | 37,095 | 18,980 | 18,115 | 586 | 315 | 271 | 35,856 | 18,356 | 17,500 | 653 | 309 | 344 |
| Mandu | 30,984 | 14,791 | 16,193 | 628 | 363 | 265 | 28,245 | 13,401 | 14,844 | 2,111 | 1,027 | 1,084 |
| Njaluahun | 61,165 | 30,924 | 30,241 | 866 | 476 | 390 | 59,176 | 29,861 | 29,315 | 1,123 | 587 | 536 |
| Penguia Upper | 26,272 | 13,193 | 13,079 | 519 | 266 | 253 | 24,241 | 12,149 | 12,092 | 1,512 | 778 | 734 |


| Region/ District/ | Total |  |  | Disable |  |  | Not Disable |  |  | Don't Know |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Bambara | 26,848 | 12,793 | 14,055 | 530 | 302 | 228 | 25,097 | 11,935 | 13,162 | 1,221 | 556 | 665 |
| Yawei | 29,322 | 14,413 | 14,909 | 552 | 278 | 274 | 27,863 | 13,724 | 14,139 | 907 | 411 | 496 |
| KENEMA | 609,427 | 300,755 | 308,672 | 9,155 | 5,163 | 3,992 | 559,615 | 275,800 | 283,815 | 40,657 | 19,792 | 20,865 |
| Dama | 30,751 | 14,721 | 16,030 | 421 | 248 | 173 | 27,925 | 13,396 | 14,529 | 2,405 | 1,077 | 1,328 |
| Dodo | 22,858 | 11,738 | 11,120 | 303 | 182 | 121 | 22,237 | 11,396 | 10,841 | 318 | 160 | 158 |
| Gaura | 18,176 | 8,691 | 9,485 | 390 | 215 | 175 | 15,388 | 7,354 | 8,034 | 2,398 | 1,122 | 1,276 |
| Gorama Mende | 43,349 | 21,604 | 21,745 | 586 | 350 | 236 | 40,644 | 20,216 | 20,428 | 2,119 | 1,038 | 1,081 |
| Kandu Lekpeama | 18,216 | 9,267 | 8,949 | 352 | 208 | 144 | 17,393 | 8,825 | 8,568 | 471 | 234 | 237 |
| Koya | 13,482 | 6,732 | 6,750 | 262 | 149 | 113 | 11,975 | 5,967 | 6,008 | 1,245 | 616 | 629 |
| Langrama | 3,584 | 1,673 | 1,911 | 67 | 33 | 34 | 3,356 | 1,567 | 1,789 | 161 | 73 | 88 |
| Lower Bambara | 76,259 | 39,195 | 37,064 | 1,219 | 693 | 526 | 72,202 | 37,048 | 35,154 | 2,838 | 1,454 | 1,384 |
| Malegohun | 20,544 | 10,195 | 10,349 | 456 | 227 | 229 | 17,480 | 8,677 | 8,803 | 2,608 | 1,291 | 1,317 |
| Niawa | 7,815 | 3,661 | 4,154 | 182 | 93 | 89 | 7,474 | 3,495 | 3,979 | 159 | 73 | 86 |
| Nomo | 5,491 | 2,838 | 2,653 | 71 | 38 | 33 | 4,671 | 2,397 | 2,274 | 749 | 403 | 346 |
| Nongowa | 45,562 | 22,018 | 23,544 | 921 | 521 | 400 | 41,442 | 19,916 | 21,526 | 3,199 | 1,581 | 1,618 |
| Simbaru | 17,397 | 8,642 | 8,755 | 243 | 136 | 107 | 16,677 | 8,295 | 8,382 | 477 | 211 | 266 |
| Small Bo | 29,498 | 14,133 | 15,365 | 478 | 263 | 215 | 27,165 | 12,997 | 14,168 | 1,855 | 873 | 982 |
| Tunkia | 36,054 | 17,848 | 18,206 | 564 | 339 | 225 | 33,182 | 16,423 | 16,759 | 2,308 | 1,086 | 1,222 |
| Wandor | 20,326 | 10,275 | 10,051 | 388 | 237 | 151 | 19,434 | 9,797 | 9,637 | 504 | 241 | 263 |
| Kenema City | 200,065 | 97,524 | 102,541 | 2,252 | 1,231 | 1,021 | 180,970 | 88,034 | 92,936 | 16,843 | 8,259 | 8,584 |

Table A14.1 Distribution of the Population by Chiefdom and Disability Status
Region/
District/
Chiefdom

| Region/ District/ Chiefdom | Total |  |  | Disable |  |  | Not Disable |  |  | Don't Know |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| kono | 505,491 | 252,295 | 253,196 | 6,756 | 3,793 | 2,963 | 453,926 | 226,204 | 227,722 | 44,809 | 22,298 | 22,511 |
| Fiama | 15,411 | 7,525 | 7,886 | 168 | 106 | 62 | 14,537 | 7,088 | 7,449 | 706 | 331 | 375 |
| Gbane | 24,404 | 12,155 | 12,249 | 284 | 162 | 122 | 21,910 | 10,884 | 11,026 | 2,210 | 1,109 | 1,101 |
| Gbane Kandor | 11,903 | 5,662 | 6,241 | 185 | 97 | 88 | 11,452 | 5,452 | 6,000 | 266 | 113 | 153 |
| Gbense | 15,716 | 7,718 | 7,998 | 267 | 155 | 112 | 14,160 | 6,952 | 7,208 | 1,289 | 611 | 678 |
| Gorama Kono | 18,294 | 9,240 | 9,054 | 243 | 122 | 121 | 15,708 | 7,913 | 7,795 | 2,343 | 1,205 | 1,138 |
| Kamara | 19,412 | 10,218 | 9,194 | 316 | 188 | 128 | 16,892 | 8,911 | 7,981 | 2,004 | 1,119 | 1,085 |
| Lei | 26,966 | 13,012 | 13,954 | 433 | 248 | 185 | 23,607 | 11,351 | 12,256 | 2,926 | 1,413 | 1,513 |
| Mafindor | 13,703 | 6,687 | 7,016 | 155 | 96 | 59 | 13,310 | 6,469 | 6,841 | 238 | 122 | 116 |
| Nimikoro | 61,176 | 31,870 | 29,306 | 746 | 418 | 328 | 51,252 | 26,612 | 24,640 | 9,178 | 4,840 | 4,338 |
| Nimiyama | 28,168 | 14,505 | 13,663 | 515 | 275 | 240 | 25,587 | 13,172 | 12,415 | 2,066 | 1,058 | 1,008 |
| Sandor | 89,879 | 44,249 | 45,630 | 1,078 | 605 | 473 | 86,045 | 42,281 | 43,764 | 2,756 | 1,363 | 1,393 |
| Soa | 39,250 | 19,087 | 20,163 | 547 | 319 | 228 | 34,108 | 16,547 | 17,561 | 4,595 | 2,221 | 2,374 |
| Tankoro | 8,496 | 4,329 | 4,167 | 189 | 97 | 92 | 6,934 | 3,563 | 3,371 | 1,373 | 669 | 704 |
| Toii | 5,046 | 2,410 | 2,636 | 37 | 17 | 20 | 4,000 | 1,934 | 2,066 | 1,009 | 459 | 550 |
| Koidu/New | 127,667 | 63,628 | 64,039 | 1,593 | 888 | 705 | 114,424 | 57,075 | 57,349 | 11,650 | 5,665 | 5,985 |


| Region/ <br> District/ | Total |  |  | Disable |  |  | Not Disable |  |  | Don't Know |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| NORTHERN | 2,502,583 | 1,221,189 | 1,281,394 | 32,849 | 17,337 | 15,512 | 2,367,194 | 1,154,196 | 1,212,998 | 102,540 | 49,656 | 52,884 |
| BOMBALI | 605,741 | 296,123 | 309,618 | 8,797 | 4,669 | 4,128 | 562,820 | 275,099 | 287,721 | 34,124 | 16,355 | 17,769 |
| Biriwa | 47,300 | 22,719 | 24,581 | 752 | 418 | 334 | 44,265 | 21,240 | 23,025 | 2,283 | 1,061 | 1,222 |
| Bombali Sebora | 36,323 | 17,720 | 18,603 | 688 | 358 | 330 | 32,379 | 15,782 | 16,597 | 3,256 | 1,580 | 1,676 |
| Gbanti-Kamaranka | 28,491 | 14,011 | 14,480 | 276 | 146 | 130 | 26,687 | 13,145 | 13,542 | 1,528 | 720 | 808 |
| Gbendembu Ngowahun | 38,800 | 18,498 | 20,302 | 803 | 397 | 406 | 34,636 | 16,527 | 18,109 | 3,361 | 1,574 | 1,787 |
| Libeisaygahun | 16,199 | 7,798 | 8,401 | 198 | 126 | 72 | 15,043 | 7,221 | 7,822 | 958 | 451 | 507 |
| Magbaimba Ndorhahun | 12,686 | 6,346 | 6,340 | 140 | 86 | 54 | 12,276 | 6,144 | 6,132 | 270 | 116 | 154 |
| Makari Gbanti | 81,201 | 39,708 | 41,493 | 1,199 | 680 | 519 | 74,767 | 36,463 | 38,304 | 5,235 | 2,565 | 2,670 |
| Paki <br> Masabong | 19,880 | 9,487 | 10,393 | 430 | 215 | 215 | 18,813 | 8,956 | 9,857 | 637 | 316 | 321 |
| Safroko Limba | 31,256 | 14,683 | 16,573 | 704 | 384 | 320 | 25,916 | 12,202 | 13,714 | 4,636 | 2,097 | 2,539 |
| Sanda Loko | 45,019 | 22,252 | 22,767 | 421 | 192 | 229 | 42,795 | 21,216 | 21,579 | 1,803 | 844 | 959 |
| Sanda Tendaren | 26,228 | 13,178 | 13,050 | 464 | 232 | 232 | 24,482 | 12,291 | 12,191 | 1,282 | 655 | 627 |
| Sella Limba | 58,315 | 28,454 | 29,861 | 672 | 346 | 326 | 56,825 | 27,745 | 29,080 | 818 | 363 | 455 |
| Tambakka | 38,458 | 19,438 | 19,020 | 406 | 221 | 185 | 37,404 | 18,894 | 18,510 | 648 | 323 | 325 |
| Makeni City | 125,585 | 61,831 | 63,754 | 1,644 | 868 | 776 | 116,532 | 57,273 | 59,259 | 7,409 | 3,690 | 3,719 |



| $$ | $\frac{0}{10}$$\stackrel{1}{4}$$\stackrel{1}{4}$$\frac{0}{\sum^{\pi}}$ | $\stackrel{N}{N}$ $\underset{\sim}{*}$ <br> $\stackrel{\sim}{N}$ $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | 欠ั <br> $\underset{\infty}{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\stackrel{ }{\wedge}}$ <br> 용 | $\stackrel{\circ}{\square}$ <br> $\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{N}}$ | $\stackrel{N}{\mathrm{~N}}$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{N}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ <br> $\stackrel{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0}}{\text { nे }}$ | $\stackrel{-}{\underset{\sim}{m}}$ <br> $\stackrel{N}{N}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\infty}$ <br> $\stackrel{\circ}{N}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\infty}$ <br> $\stackrel{0}{7}$ | ก ก <br> 연 | $\stackrel{N}{-}$ <br> $\stackrel{J}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ <br> $\stackrel{+}{N}$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\underset{\sim}{7}}$$\stackrel{\underset{\sim}{0}}{\underset{\sim}{2}}$ | $\stackrel{n}{N}$ <br> $\stackrel{N}{N}$ | $\stackrel{N}{\sim}$$\underset{\sim}{\text { N N }}$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\wedge}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \underset{\sim}{7} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\underset{\infty}{\sim}$ | － | 汤 | $\stackrel{\sim}{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{N}{\sim}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\text { G}}{-}$ | $\stackrel{+}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\otimes}{\infty}$ | 亿 | ¢ | ¢ | セூ | $\stackrel{\sim}{6}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\mathrm{T}} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{0} \\ & \stackrel{N}{N} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\sim}{7}$ | $\stackrel{\stackrel{\infty}{\underset{\sim}{i}}}{-}$ | N | $\underset{\underset{\sim}{7}}{\underset{\sim}{7}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | $$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\infty} \\ & \sim \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\text { No }}{-}$ | ले | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{J} \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \underset{\sim}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\dot{\infty}}$ | $\begin{gathered} \infty \\ \underset{N}{N} \end{gathered}$ | N | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0}$ | ¢ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \hline 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | N | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O } \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N} \\ & \underset{7}{7} \end{aligned}$ | N |
| 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0}$ <br>  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{0}{\mathbb{0}} \\ & \stackrel{N}{\overleftarrow{N}} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ñ } \\ & \underset{\sigma}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{N} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{N}{N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { in } \\ & \text { on } \\ & \text { of } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \hat{0} \\ & \text { onj } \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{ \pm}{\underset{\sim}{N}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{1} \\ & \mathbf{N}^{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N్0 } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\underset{N}{N}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{L}{0} \\ & \underset{\sim}{+} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \dot{g} \\ & \underset{N}{N} \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{寸} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\infty}{\stackrel{0}{N}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{n} \\ & \stackrel{i}{-} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\stackrel{\infty}{n}} \stackrel{+}{\underset{\sim}{7}}$ | $\stackrel{\text { N }}{\underset{\sim}{5}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N} \\ & \text { N} \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N్N } \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{N} \\ & \text { N} \end{aligned}$ | ¢ ก̀ ñ |
|  | $\frac{0}{\sum_{\Sigma}^{\pi}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \text { N} \\ & \stackrel{N}{N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\wedge} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\underset{\sigma}{2}} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\stackrel{i}{4}}{\underset{\sim}{5}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{-n}{N} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\sim}{+}$ m － | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{N}{0} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\sim}{-} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0- \\ & \hline- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \stackrel{n}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{N}{2} \\ & \underset{\sim}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{-} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\sim}{N}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{0}{-} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $$ | $$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{N} \\ & \hat{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{*} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{0} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{N} \\ & \hat{N} \\ & \hat{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | N Ṅ in |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\mathrm{O}} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \sim \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \vdots \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\text { 근 }}{\text { in }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \infty \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{o}{0} \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N} \\ & \text { N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \underset{\infty}{\boldsymbol{I}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n} \\ & 0 \\ & \text { iñ } \end{aligned}$ | m 合 | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \infty \\ & \underset{N}{N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { M } \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 00 \\ & 0 \\ & i \\ & i \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overrightarrow{7} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \stackrel{+}{\sim} \\ & \underset{M}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\underset{\sim}{7}}{\underset{\sim}{7}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ờ } \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{-} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & N \\ & \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \text { Ni } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { in } \\ & \text { ì } \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { oo } \\ & \text { ò } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lf } \\ & \text { Ǹ } \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\lambda} \\ & \stackrel{-}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\infty$ 0 0 O－ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{0}{0} \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \frac{0}{0} \\ \stackrel{\sim}{0} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\text { ¢ }}$ | $\stackrel{\underset{\sim}{\prime}}{ }$ | $\underset{\sim}{\infty}$ | $\underset{0}{0}$ | 人̀ | N | $\stackrel{7}{\sim}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{m}$ | ＋ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{O} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{~N}} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\text { r }}{ }$ | $\stackrel{0}{7}$ | － | $\stackrel{\infty}{\square}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | N్フ入 | Nop | $\cdots$ | 8 | ञ | ¢ |
|  | $\frac{0}{\sum^{\pi}}$ | $\stackrel{\underset{\sim}{N}}{\underset{\sim}{2}}$ | $\stackrel{N}{n}$ | －9 | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{N}$ | ¢ | \％ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | ¢ | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\text { ¢ }}$ | 은 | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | ก | N | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\square}$ | $\frac{9}{i n}$ | $\stackrel{\text { N }}{\sim}$ | $\frac{8}{2}$ | $\stackrel{m}{N}$ | $\stackrel{\bigcirc}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{-}{0}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\mathbb{N}} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { oin } \\ & \text { o } \end{aligned}$ | 8 | ¢ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sim}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{\sim}}$ | $\stackrel{\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}}{\underset{\sim}{\sim}}$ | 낭 | $\stackrel{\text { Or }}{7}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \underset{\sim}{0} \\ & - \end{aligned}$ | $\widehat{N}$ | $\sim_{\sim}^{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{m}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \underset{\sim}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{m}{\infty}$ | ल్m | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\underset{\sim}{n}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\underset{\infty}{\square}$ | $\underset{\sim}{ \pm}$ | N | $\overrightarrow{7}$ | ${\underset{\sim}{N}}_{\sim}^{\sim}$ |
| $\stackrel{\overline{0}}{\stackrel{0}{0}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\otimes}{N} \\ & \stackrel{N}{\mathbb{N}} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \dot{+} \\ & \dot{\sigma} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{m} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{O} \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{0} \\ & \infty \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IV } \\ & =- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{n}{\underset{\sim}{j}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \text { O} \\ & \text { Si } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\underset{M}{\prime}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { in } \\ & \stackrel{i n}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{O} \\ & \text { n } \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{n}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\sim}{o}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { © } \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { N } \\ \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ \hline}}{ }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \hat{0} \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\stackrel{N}{N}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { on } \\ & \text { Nָ } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ழ. } \\ & \text { O} \\ & \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \infty \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { M } \\ & \underset{\sim}{\mathbf{O}} \\ & \hline 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{0}{2} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\infty}$ |
|  | $\frac{0}{\sum_{\Sigma}^{\pi}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \underset{N}{\sim} \\ & \underset{N}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { on } \\ & \text { In } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 . \\ & \hline 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{N}{N}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \sim \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \infty_{0}^{-} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \dot{6} \\ & \dot{6} \\ & \dot{q} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{N}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{-} \\ & \underset{\sim}{-} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{n}{n} \\ & \stackrel{\gamma}{\gamma} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \\ & \underset{\sim}{7} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overrightarrow{0} \\ & = \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{n}} \underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{2}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ò } \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \text { O} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\underset{\sim}{*}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{6} \\ & \dot{\infty} \\ & { }_{7}^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{2} \\ & \stackrel{1}{1} \end{aligned}$ | 읏 | $\begin{aligned} & -7 \\ & 0 \\ & N \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \text { mi } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { on } \\ & \stackrel{n}{n} \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \dot{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{-} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { oి } \\ & \text { n } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { oj} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline 1 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{T 0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\lambda} \\ & \underset{\sim}{N} \end{aligned}$ | 2 $\stackrel{2}{9}$ $\stackrel{y}{9}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\imath}{n} \\ & \stackrel{n}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \otimes \\ & 0 \\ & \text { 冃̀ } \\ & \underset{7}{7} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N} \\ & \text { O} \\ & \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\infty}{N} \\ & \stackrel{N}{N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{y}{5} \\ & \stackrel{y}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% } \\ & \text { O} \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { M } \\ & \infty \\ & \dot{\sigma} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{m}{N} \\ & \underset{N}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { m} \\ & \stackrel{1}{N} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { og } \\ & \underset{\sim}{7} \\ & \tilde{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\text { n }}{\stackrel{0}{\gtrless}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { す } \\ & \text { © } \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \infty \\ & \text { i } \\ & \text { i} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\llcorner }{\sim}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{n}{7} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\top} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{-} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim m}{N} \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  | O O $\stackrel{0}{0}$ $\vdots$ | $\sum_{\text {㐫 }}$ |  | $\frac{.0}{\bar{O}}$ |  | $\underset{\text { O}}{0}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\frac{1}{0}} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \Sigma \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \stackrel{0}{్} \\ & \text { No } \\ & \text { No } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\sum_{\bigvee}^{n}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ㄱ } \\ & \text { O } \\ & \text { O } \\ & \text { ○ } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\stackrel{\text { ® }}{+}}$ | 힝 |

뿡
$\overline{\text { ® }}$
$\stackrel{-}{0}$
Table A14.1 Distribution of the Population by Chiefdom and Disability Status


| Region/ District/ Chiefdom | Total |  |  | Disable |  |  | Not Disable |  |  | Don't Know |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| BONTHE | 200,771 | 99,007 | 101,764 | 2,726 | 1,461 | 1,265 | 192,919 | 95,004 | 97,915 | 5,126 | 2,542 | 2,584 |
| Bendu Cha | 7,168 | 3,500 | 3,668 | 114 | 54 | 60 | 7,037 | 3,438 | 3,599 | 17 | 8 | 9 |
| Bum | 24,339 | 11,841 | 12,498 | 478 | 252 | 226 | 23,496 | 11,386 | 12,110 | 365 | 203 | 162 |
| Dema | 7,411 | 3,749 | 3,662 | 96 | 51 | 45 | 7,118 | 3,590 | 3,528 | 197 | 108 | 89 |
| Imperi | 33,384 | 17,012 | 16,372 | 294 | 168 | 126 | 31,934 | 16,269 | 15,665 | 1,156 | 575 | 581 |
| Jong | 33,816 | 16,511 | 17,305 | 692 | 374 | 318 | 32,832 | 15,979 | 16,853 | 292 | 158 | 134 |
| Kpanga Kemo | 10,438 | 5,057 | 5,381 | 125 | 77 | 48 | 9,163 | 4,428 | 4,735 | 1,150 | 552 | 598 |
| Kwamebai Krim | 14,289 | 6,975 | 7,314 | 224 | 121 | 103 | 13,830 | 6,748 | 7,082 | 235 | 106 | 129 |
| Nongoba Bullom | 20,060 | 10,009 | 10,051 | 254 | 132 | 122 | 19,092 | 9,539 | 9,553 | 714 | 338 | 376 |
| Sittia | 21,347 | 10,522 | 10,825 | 129 | 61 | 68 | 20,803 | 10,264 | 10,539 | 415 | 197 | 218 |
| Sogbini | 10,863 | 5,236 | 5,627 | 162 | 80 | 82 | 10,593 | 5,104 | 5,489 | 108 | 52 | 56 |
| Yawbeko | 7,581 | 3,670 | 3,911 | 80 | 50 | 30 | 7,251 | 3,486 | 3,765 | 250 | 134 | 116 |
| Bonthe Municipal | 10,075 | 4,925 | 5,150 | 78 | 41 | 37 | 9,770 | 4,773 | 4,997 | 227 | 111 | 116 |
| MOYAMBA | 318,002 | 153,467 | 164,535 | 5,866 | 3,099 | 2,767 | 293,592 | 141,314 | 152,278 | 18,544 | 9,054 | 9,490 |
| Bagruwa | 27,623 | 13,705 | 13,918 | 664 | 358 | 306 | 22,093 | 10,915 | 11,178 | 4,866 | 2,432 | 2,434 |
| Bumpeh | 37,424 | 17,805 | 19,619 | 571 | 315 | 256 | 33,899 | 16,069 | 17,830 | 2,954 | 1,421 | 1,533 |
| Dasse | 13,217 | 6,369 | 6,848 | 257 | 132 | 125 | 12,741 | 6,134 | 6,607 | 219 | 103 | 116 |
| Fakunya | 27,646 | 13,133 | 14,513 | 623 | 320 | 303 | 25,818 | 12,230 | 13,588 | 1,205 | 583 | 622 |
| Kagboro | 34,862 | 16,811 | 18,051 | 611 | 296 | 315 | 32,934 | 15,887 | 17,047 | 1,317 | 628 | 689 |
| Kaiyamba | 25,331 | 12,099 | 13,232 | 459 | 266 | 193 | 23,661 | 11,232 | 12,429 | 1,211 | 601 | 610 |
| Kamajei | 10,165 | 4,934 | 5,231 | 175 | 98 | 77 | 9,743 | 4,724 | 5,019 | 247 | 112 | 135 |

Table A14.1 Distribution of the Population by Chiefdom and Disability Status
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| Region/ District/ | Total |  |  | Disable |  |  | Not Disable |  |  | Don't Know |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| WESTERN | 1,493,779 | 744,417 | 749,362 | 11,933 | 6,625 | 5,308 | 1,336,405 | 665,205 | 671,200 | 145,441 | 72,587 | 72,854 |
| WESTERN AREA RURAL | 443,068 | 220,536 | 222,532 | 4,126 | 2,361 | 1,765 | 406,629 | 202,123 | 204,506 | 32,313 | 16,052 | 16,261 |
| Koya | 70,328 | 34,329 | 35,999 | 842 | 485 | 357 | 65,695 | 32,028 | 33,667 | 3,791 | 1,816 | 1,975 |
| Mountain | 30,358 | 15,929 | 14,429 | 226 | 126 | 100 | 26,832 | 14,078 | 12,754 | 3,300 | 1,725 | 1,575 |
| Waterloo | 213,439 | 104,772 | 108,667 | 1,835 | 1,045 | 790 | 196,800 | 96,493 | 100,307 | 14,804 | 7,234 | 7,570 |
| York Rural | 128,943 | 65,506 | 63,437 | 1,223 | 705 | 518 | 117,302 | 59,524 | 57,778 | 10,418 | 5,277 | 5,141 |
| WESTERN AREA URBAN | 1,050,711 | 523,881 | 526,830 | 7,807 | 4,264 | 3,543 | 929,776 | 463,082 | 466,694 | 113,128 | 56,535 | 56,593 |
| Central 1 | 61,796 | 31,392 | 30,404 | 456 | 239 | 217 | 53,208 | 27,014 | 26,194 | 8,132 | 4,139 | 3,993 |
| Central 2 | 19,648 | 10,042 | 9,606 | 229 | 133 | 96 | 19,195 | 9,789 | 9,406 | 224 | 120 | 104 |
| East 1 | 61,015 | 30,179 | 30,836 | 427 | 232 | 195 | 52,285 | 25,865 | 26,420 | 8,303 | 4,082 | 4,221 |
| East 2 | 89,179 | 45,011 | 44,168 | 652 | 352 | 300 | 81,467 | 41,085 | 40,382 | 7,060 | 3,574 | 3,486 |
| East 3 | 447,840 | 221,999 | 225,841 | 3,318 | 1,815 | 1,503 | 402,686 | 199,343 | 203,343 | 41,836 | 20,841 | 20,995 |
| West 1 | 53,812 | 26,426 | 27,386 | 443 | 234 | 209 | 41,488 | 20,359 | 21,129 | 11,881 | 5,833 | 6,048 |
| West 2 | 129,600 | 64,206 | 65,394 | 962 | 510 | 452 | 113,967 | 56,344 | 57,623 | 14,671 | 7,352 | 7,319 |
| West 3 | 187,821 | 94,626 | 93,195 | 1,320 | 749 | 571 | 165,480 | 83,283 | 82,197 | 21,021 | 10,594 | 10,427 |

Table A14.2 Distribution of the Persons with disability by Chiefdom
and Type of Disability
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Table A14.2 Distribution of the Persons with disability by Chiefdom
and Type of Disability

|  | Main disability |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\cong}{\Sigma}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ¢ <br> $\pm$ |
| Libeisaygahun | 198 | 48 | 10 | 50 | 12 | 20 | 9 | 6 | 7 | 11 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 1 | - | 3 | 10 |
| Magbaimba Ndorhahun | 140 | 31 | 8 | 30 | 20 | 4 | 10 | 4 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | - | - | 4 |
| Makari Gbanti | 1,199 | 347 | 97 | 122 | 165 | 67 | 79 | 51 | 52 | 41 | 24 | 16 | 32 | 9 | - | 22 | 75 |
| Paki Masabong | 430 | 81 | 33 | 55 | 83 | 28 | 37 | 12 | 23 | 10 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 44 |
| Safroko Limba | 704 | 196 | 34 | 104 | 112 | 48 | 36 | 18 | 22 | 30 | 16 | 4 | 22 | 35 | 2 | 3 | 22 |
| Sanda Loko | 421 | 115 | 22 | 42 | 79 | 24 | 16 | 9 | 12 | 23 | 18 | 18 | 12 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 21 |
| Sanda <br> Tendaren | 464 | 106 | 29 | 41 | 115 | 28 | 21 | 15 | 15 | 22 | 7 | 8 | 20 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 23 |
| Sella Limba | 672 | 163 | 30 | 99 | 57 | 34 | 42 | 47 | 32 | 58 | 4 | 12 | 23 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 61 |
| Tambakka | 406 | 92 | 49 | 56 | 56 | 40 | 11 | 14 | 5 | 19 | 17 | 4 | 11 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 25 |
| Makeni City | 1,644 | 371 | 142 | 162 | 221 | 85 | 89 | 124 | 85 | 83 | 38 | 14 | 51 | 39 | 4 | 15 | 121 |
| KAMBIA | 4,489 | 1,118 | 230 | 661 | 965 | 235 | 200 | 166 | 172 | 190 | 120 | 33 | 93 | 52 | 8 | 33 | 213 |
| Bramaia | 541 | 149 | 30 | 70 | 76 | 27 | 18 | 11 | 37 | 34 | 22 | 5 | 12 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 44 |


Table A14.2 Distribution of the Persons with disability by Chiefdom
and Type of Disability


|  | д๖วО | $\checkmark$ | $\exists$ | \％ | $\pm$ | m | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | เ | §ூ | $\sigma$ | m | $\stackrel{\infty}{\text { m }}$ | $\wedge$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | （жэея чэипн） s！so！｜oวsoudky | 7 | ค | m | ＊ | $\stackrel{3}{1}$ | $\pm$ | $\rightarrow$ | m | $\sim$ | 윽 | $\cdots$ | $\bullet$ | $\neg$ | $\neg$ |
|  | ms！u！qu｜v | $\infty$ | $m$ | 1 | $\sim$ | n | $\sigma$ | $\sim$ | $\sim$ | ＇ | m | $\square$ | ＊ | $\sim$ | $\sim$ |
|  | us！̧eunəyч | $\because$ | $m$ | $m$ | ＇ | In | N | ＇ | $\neg$ | $\neg$ | n | $\neg$ | $\cdots$ | $\bullet$ | $\square$ |
|  | ग！̣də！！dヨ | セ | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | ค | $\stackrel{\square}{7}$ | $\cdots$ | $\infty$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\cdots$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\sim$ | N | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\sim$ |
|  | （1） | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\neg$ | $\sigma$ | $\sigma$ | $\infty$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\checkmark$ | $m$ | $\sim$ | $\sigma$ | $\neg$ | $\sigma$ | $\sim$ | $\sim$ |
|  | K！！uquesp ／Kınโ̣u！ןeu！̣ds | 今 | $F$ | $\sigma$ | N | $\stackrel{0}{7}$ | N | $m$ | 윽 | $\sim$ | 인 | 1 | 간 | 7 | $\sim$ |
|  |  | र | $\stackrel{\square}{7}$ | ～ | 7 | $\underset{N}{N}$ | $\%^{\circ}$ | 악 | $\infty$ | $\sim$ | 낸ํ | เ | N | 7 | $\bullet$ |
|  |  | $\stackrel{\infty}{\square}$ | $\cdots$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\pm$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{N}{N}}$ | m | $\cdots$ | 윽 | $\bullet$ | $\infty$ | $\cdots$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\cdots$ | เ |
|  |  | ＋ | 9 | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\overrightarrow{7}$ | $\stackrel{\text { n }}{\sim}$ | 7 | $\stackrel{\sim}{\square}$ | $\sigma$ | 윽 | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\cdots$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{+}$ | N | $m$ |
|  |  | T | \％ | N | $\cdots$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | 옹 | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | $\pm$ | 윽 | 논 | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{0}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\square}$ | $\wedge$ |
|  | јеəロ | ® | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | N | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | ¢ | ก | $\vec{m}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{ }{\top}$ | \％ | $\xrightarrow[\sim]{\sim}$ | ำ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | 아 |
|  |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\sim}$ | 끅 | $\stackrel{\circ}{1}$ | $\underset{\infty}{\underset{\infty}{J}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{7}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | 8 | 9 | $\underset{7}{7}$ | $\vec{\sigma}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\square}$ | ก | ำ |
|  | pə！！edu！人｜｜ens！ı＾10 pu！｜g | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | Nor | $\stackrel{\sim}{\square}$ | $\vec{m}$ | 요 | $\xrightarrow[\square]{+}$ | 낭 | กก | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\underset{\sim}{N}$ | ¢ | NT | ก | ¢ |
|  | （әəұndū）人！！！！qes！p ן ןכ！ | 6 | ำ | 9 | ¢ | $\stackrel{7}{i n}$ | T | N | F | ¢ | ¢ | $\stackrel{\sim}{1}$ | 8 | m | $\pm$ |
|  |  | $\stackrel{0}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\ominus}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\Perp}{\underset{\sim}{n}}$ | N | $\underset{-}{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | $\infty$ | 8 | $\stackrel{\infty}{m}$ | $\stackrel{-1}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\bigcirc$ |
|  | IP7O1 | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{0} \\ & \cdots \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\hat{N}$ | 凩 | $\stackrel{\infty}{\mathrm{m}}$ | $\begin{gathered} \infty \\ \hline \mathbf{N} \\ \underset{6}{\infty} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\mathbf{m}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{m}}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{N}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{n}$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sim}$ | $\underset{\infty}{\square}$ | $\underset{\sim}{*}$ | N |
|  | шорјə！чว <br>  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\pi}{0} \\ & \frac{E}{\omega} \\ & \frac{\pi}{\Sigma} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\sum_{\wedge}^{\infty}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{3}{3} \\ & \text { O} \\ & \stackrel{y}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\mathbb{N}}{\frac{0}{0}} \\ & \frac{\sqrt{N}}{2} \\ & \frac{\pi}{N} \end{aligned}$ |  |



|  | Main disability |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\circ}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{4}{0} \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\frac{y}{\Sigma}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U } \\ & \text { 言 } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{t} \\ & \stackrel{1}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ |
| Tane | 441 | 135 | 28 | 55 | 88 | 23 | 20 | 15 | 11 | 14 | 16 | 3 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 15 |
| Yoni | 1,237 | 359 | 100 | 170 | 145 | 84 | 50 | 42 | 57 | 33 | 35 | 18 | 45 | 13 | 9 | 10 | 67 |
| SOUTHERN | 22,770 | 3,732 | 1,910 | 2,965 | 3,571 | 1,611 | 1,199 | 798 | 690 | 1,148 | 875 | 381 | 664 | 542 | 109 | 172 | 2,403 |
| во | 9,335 | 1,546 | 816 | 1,233 | 1,408 | 647 | 504 | 321 | 308 | 476 | 296 | 142 | 282 | 201 | 52 | 81 | 1,022 |
| Badjia | 201 | 26 | 13 | 21 | 31 | 14 | 9 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 14 | 3 | - | 42 |
| Bagbo | 443 | 47 | 48 | 52 | 63 | 48 | 28 | 21 | 15 | 28 | 11 | 13 | 20 | 15 | - | 3 | 31 |
| Bagbwe | 404 | 72 | 33 | 53 | 34 | 35 | 23 | 11 | 8 | 40 | 31 | 14 | 9 | 3 | 1 | - | 37 |
| Baoma | 654 | 108 | 60 | 131 | 85 | 43 | 26 | 16 | 23 | 26 | 20 | 9 | 17 | 18 | 16 | 2 | 54 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bumpe } \\ & \text { Ngawo } \end{aligned}$ | 1,138 | 114 | 91 | 150 | 182 | 149 | 63 | 26 | 27 | 31 | 37 | 11 | 43 | 19 | 4 | 7 | 184 |
| Gbo | 137 | 12 | 2 | 31 | 16 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 9 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 13 |
| Jaiama- <br> Bongor | 686 | 117 | 53 | 58 | 138 | 39 | 28 | 28 | 19 | 42 | 23 | 7 | 19 | 21 | 1 | 2 | 91 |
| Kakua | 696 | 139 | 49 | 88 | 120 | 34 | 64 | 20 | 50 | 33 | 7 | 8 | 23 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 51 |


 Kpanga

|  | Main disability |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\stackrel{\square}{\circ}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 㞦 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{\cong}{\Sigma}$ |  |  |  | 咅 |  |  |  | $\stackrel{ \pm}{ \pm}$ |
| Kpanga Kemo | 125 | 19 | 8 | 21 | 16 | 15 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 7 | － | 2 | 5 | － | 1 | 1 | 14 |
| Kwamebai Krim | 224 | 27 | 13 | 19 | 29 | 12 | 7 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 31 | 17 | 3 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 35 |
| Nongoba Bullom | 254 | 54 | 40 | 18 | 36 | 17 | 12 | 8 | 12 | 14 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 16 |
| Sittia | 129 | 20 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 11 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 1 | － | － | 3 | 15 |
| Sogbini | 162 | 16 | 12 | 16 | 23 | 11 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 8 | － | － | 1 | 50 |
| Yawbeko | 80 | 17 | 19 | 14 | 8 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | － | 1 | 2 | － | 1 | 3 |
| Bonthe Municipal | 78 | 20 | 8 | 6 | 10 | 13 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | － | － | 2 | 3 |
| MOYAMBA | 5，866 | 978 | 431 | 908 | 964 | 368 | 237 | 195 | 180 | 278 | 305 | 83 | 177 | 132 | 24 | 46 | 560 |
| Bagruwa | 664 | 85 | 24 | 95 | 96 | 35 | 14 | 19 | 18 | 25 | 89 | 13 | 25 | 35 | 5 | 11 | 75 |
| Bumpeh | 571 | 121 | 35 | 69 | 115 | 38 | 19 | 29 | 21 | 13 | 16 | 15 | 9 | 12 | 2 | 7 | 50 |
| Dasse | 257 | 43 | 19 | 92 | 37 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 8 | － | 13 | 1 | － | 2 | 14 |
| Fakunya | 623 | 112 | 41 | 79 | 62 | 61 | 31 | 15 | 20 | 46 | 15 | 7 | 17 | 15 | 1 | － | 101 |



|  | Main disability |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\stackrel{\text { 「00 }}{\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{4}{0} \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{y}{\Sigma}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 長 |  |  |
| Kpanga－ Kabonde | 1，051 | 163 | 70 | 95 | 197 | 48 | 67 | 26 | 22 | 71 | 47 | 45 | 24 | 43 | 5 | 2 | 126 |
| Makpele | 419 | 43 | 41 | 65 | 85 | 22 | 36 | 14 | 12 | 19 | 19 | 7 | 10 | 7 | － | 2 | 37 |
| Malen | 506 | 77 | 37 | 44 | 83 | 44 | 29 | 21 | 13 | 25 | 19 | 10 | 14 | 31 | 3 | 3 | 53 |
| Mano Sakrim | 182 | 30 | 25 | 20 | 26 | 12 | 11 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 3 | － | － | － | 34 |
| Panga Krim | 161 | 19 | 8 | 15 | 21 | 12 | 15 | 9 | 5 | 11 | 11 | － | 8 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 14 |
| Pejeh | 137 | 32 | 12 | 22 | 13 | 11 | 10 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | － | 1 | 9 |
| Soro Gbema | 320 | 59 | 27 | 41 | 27 | 38 | 11 | 12 | 10 | 17 | 11 | 5 | 15 | 14 | 2 | 4 | 27 |
| Sowa | 298 | 57 | 15 | 40 | 45 | 28 | 23 | 13 | 6 | 26 | 11 | 7 | 8 | 12 | 1 | － | 6 |
| YKK | 235 | 27 | 18 | 19 | 55 | 22 | 26 | 9 | 4 | 18 | 5 | 1 | － | 3 | － | 2 | 26 |
| WESTERN | 11，933 | 3，328 | 1，326 | 1，314 | 1，535 | 560 | 388 | 578 | 428 | 444 | 447 | 153 | 210 | 162 | 81 | 80 | 899 |
| WESTERN <br> AREA <br> RURAL | 4，126 | 1，236 | 443 | 489 | 543 | 187 | 152 | 147 | 136 | 143 | 161 | 49 | 59 | 42 | 13 | 23 | 303 |
| Koya | 842 | 258 | 88 | 125 | 94 | 37 | 34 | 15 | 27 | 24 | 59 | 9 | 10 | 12 | 4 | 5 | 41 |



|  | Main disability |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region / District/ Chiefdom | Total | Congenital (from birth) | Disease/ illness | Transport Accident | Occupational injury | Other accident | War | Natural ageing process | Other | Not stated |
| SierraLeone | 93,129 | 15,044 | 37,683 | 4,296 | 4,146 | 8,164 | 3,829 | 7,589 | 9,751 | 2,627 |
| EASTERN | 25,577 | 3,909 | 10,611 | 1,151 | 1,046 | 2,169 | 1,546 | 1,636 | 2,746 | 763 |
| KAILAHUN | 9,666 | 1,537 | 3,985 | 393 | 397 | 835 | 635 | 705 | 981 | 198 |
| Dea | 396 | 87 | 110 | 14 | 17 | 49 | 32 | 26 | 59 | 2 |
| Jawie | 1,041 | 156 | 417 | 54 | 27 | 86 | 48 | 102 | 121 | 30 |
| Kissi Kama | 470 | 101 | 203 | 14 | 27 | 44 | 19 | 24 | 28 | 10 |
| Kissi Teng | 701 | 109 | 335 | 28 | 25 | 35 | 21 | 76 | 66 | 6 |
| Kissi Tongi | 518 | 78 | 163 | 14 | 23 | 39 | 17 | 89 | 82 | 13 |
| Kpeje Bongre | 375 | 61 | 162 | 10 | 15 | 38 | 19 | 23 | 40 | 7 |
| Kpeje West | 363 | 32 | 157 | 7 | 15 | 39 | 45 | 27 | 33 | 8 |
| Luawa | 2,121 | 293 | 919 | 93 | 94 | 202 | 161 | 95 | 199 | 65 |
| Malema | 586 | 132 | 197 | 14 | 21 | 43 | 46 | 45 | 68 | 20 |
| Mandu | 628 | 113 | 249 | 34 | 28 | 45 | 59 | 54 | 44 | 2 |
| Njaluahun | 866 | 117 | 426 | 37 | 30 | 68 | 31 | 47 | 107 | 3 |
| Penguia | 519 | 91 | 231 | 24 | 11 | 43 | 32 | 24 | 48 | 15 |
| Upper Bambara | 530 | 99 | 210 | 28 | 34 | 49 | 45 | 26 | 35 | 4 |
| Yawei | 552 | 68 | 206 | 22 | 30 | 55 | 60 | 47 | 51 | 13 |


|  | Main disability |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region / District/ Chiefdom | Total | Congenital (from birth) | Disease/ illness | Transport Accident | Occupational injury | Other accident | War | Natural ageing process | Other | Not stated |
| KENEMA | 9,155 | 1,417 | 3,615 | 431 | 437 | 678 | 557 | 651 | 1,038 | 331 |
| Dama | 421 | 69 | 147 | 18 | 29 | 32 | 19 | 34 | 58 | 15 |
| Dodo | 303 | 44 | 104 | 8 | 59 | 20 | 18 | 27 | 21 | 2 |
| Gaura | 390 | 71 | 117 | 10 | 18 | 20 | 33 | 43 | 59 | 19 |
| Gorama Mende | 586 | 67 | 290 | 29 | 38 | 46 | 24 | 26 | 58 | 8 |
| Kandu Lekpeama | 352 | 71 | 140 | 12 | 24 | 20 | 15 | 32 | 36 | 2 |
| Koya | 262 | 39 | 87 | 11 | 14 | 24 | 20 | 33 | 31 | 3 |
| Langrama | 67 | 4 | 44 | - | 1 | 3 | 4 |  | 9 | 2 |
| Lower Bambara | 1,219 | 165 | 505 | 38 | 59 | 110 | 59 | 91 | 154 | 38 |
| Malegohun | 456 | 54 | 218 | 24 | 26 | 36 | 34 | 16 | 35 | 13 |
| Niawa | 182 | 29 | 96 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 7 | 22 | 6 | 5 |
| Nomo | 71 | 12 | 23 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 14 | 4 | 6 | 1 |
| Nongowa | 921 | 150 | 312 | 44 | 34 | 69 | 111 | 78 | 80 | 43 |
| Simbaru | 243 | 38 | 105 | 9 | 13 | 19 | 8 | 17 | 29 | 5 |
| Small Bo | 478 | 57 | 202 | 38 | 19 | 34 | 27 | 23 | 68 | 10 |

Table A14.3 Distribution of the Persons with disability by Chiefdom
and Cause of Disability
IIIIII

|  | Main disability |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region / District/ Chiefdom | Total | Congenital (from birth) | Disease/ illness | Transport Accident | Occupational injury | Other accident | War | Natural ageing process | Other | Not stated |
| Tunkia | 564 | 100 | 197 | 25 | 20 | 29 | 64 | 43 | 67 | 19 |
| Wandor | 388 | 64 | 157 | 17 | 14 | 37 | 18 | 21 | 49 | 11 |
| Kenema City | 2,252 | 383 | 871 | 143 | 63 | 162 | 82 | 141 | 272 | 135 |
| KONO | 6,756 | 955 | 3,011 | 327 | 212 | 656 | 354 | 280 | 727 | 234 |
| Fiama | 168 | 29 | 76 | 5 | 1 | 14 | 11 | 4 | 26 | 2 |
| Gbane | 284 | 42 | 117 | 19 | 5 | 31 | 17 | 10 | 28 | 15 |
| Gbane Kandor | 185 | 45 | 77 | 7 | 12 | 12 | 6 | 12 | 12 | 2 |
| Gbense | 267 | 47 | 94 | 11 | 4 | 18 | 40 | 12 | 25 | 16 |
| Gorama Kono | 243 | 32 | 115 | 7 | 8 | 31 | 12 | 17 | 17 | 4 |
| Kamara | 316 | 46 | 169 | 18 | 11 | 25 | 13 | 6 | 20 | 8 |
| Lei | 433 | 53 | 222 | 9 | 14 | 48 | 16 | 29 | 36 | 6 |
| Mafindor | 155 | 26 | 68 | 7 | 4 | 14 | 8 | 6 | 13 | 9 |
| Nimikoro | 746 | 109 | 331 | 39 | 25 | 66 | 45 | 28 | 82 | 21 |
| Nimiyama | 515 | 36 | 243 | 18 | 27 | 45 | 20 | 20 | 90 | 16 |


|  | Main disability |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region / <br> District/ <br> Chiefdom | Total | Congenital (from birth) | Disease/ illness | Transport Accident | Occupational injury | Other accident | War | Natural ageing process | Other | Not stated |
| Sandor | 1,078 | 131 | 526 | 40 | 42 | 114 | 35 | 46 | 90 | 54 |
| Soa | 547 | 77 | 233 | 22 | 15 | 58 | 41 | 19 | 67 | 15 |
| Tankoro | 189 | 37 | 83 | 10 | 5 | 16 | 15 | 3 | 20 | - |
| Toli | 37 | 3 | 25 | 1 | - | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | - |
| Koidu/New | 1,593 | 242 | 632 | 114 | 39 | 161 | 74 | 67 | 198 | 66 |
| NORTHERN | 32,849 | 5,772 | 12,937 | 1,514 | 1,327 | 3,067 | 987 | 3,219 | 3,319 | 707 |
| BOMBALI | 8,797 | 1,658 | 3,526 | 337 | 307 | 759 | 251 | 794 | 943 | 222 |
| Biriwa | 752 | 113 | 368 | 27 | 24 | 57 | 9 | 47 | 92 | 15 |
| Bombali Sebora | 688 | 137 | 202 | 29 | 28 | 59 | 32 | 119 | 71 | 11 |
| GbantiKamaranka | 276 | 49 | 124 | 10 | 12 | 14 | 3 | 25 | 29 | 10 |
| Gbendembu Ngowahun | 803 | 122 | 315 | 23 | 48 | 67 | 11 | 100 | 105 | 12 |
| Libeisaygahun | 198 | 29 | 113 | 11 | 4 | 15 | 5 | 8 | 12 | 1 |
| Magbaimba Ndorhahun | 140 | 20 | 66 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 2 | 9 | 19 | 6 |
| Makari Gbanti | 1,199 | 206 | 429 | 57 | 52 | 124 | 79 | 86 | 143 | 23 |
| Paki Masabong | 430 | 68 | 185 | 13 | 21 | 42 | 4 | 40 | 49 | 8 |

- $\ln \frac{1}{2}$
Region /
District/
Chiefdom Safroko
Limba
Sanda Loko Sanda
Tendaren
Sella Limba
Tambakka
Makeni City
KAMBIA

Magbema
Mambolo
Masungbala

| Samu |
| :--- |
| Tonko |
| Limba |


Table A14.3 Distribution of the Persons with disability by Chiefdom

|  | Main disability |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region $/$ Chiefdom Chiefdom | Total | Congenital (from bith) | Disease/ illness | Transport Accident | Occupational injury | Other accident | War | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Natural } \\ & \text { ageing } \\ & \text { process } \end{aligned}$ | Other | Not stated |
| Dibia | 381 | 70 | 127 | 11 | 25 | 22 | 5 | 98 | 19 | 4 |
| Kaffu Bullom | 1,339 | 312 | 411 | 84 | 58 | 159 | 41 | 149 | 106 | 19 |
| Koya | 1,435 | 323 | 528 | 75 | 52 | 132 | 52 | 144 | 115 | 14 |
| Lokomasa- ma | 695 | 166 | 261 | 37 | 20 | 67 | 8 | 52 | 55 | 29 |
| Maforki | 1,159 | 197 | 383 | 49 | 40 | 141 | 48 | 133 | 134 | 34 |
| Marampa | 1,163 | 238 | 450 | 49 | 45 | 86 | 20 | 116 | 115 | 44 |
| Masimera | 737 | 131 | 283 | 31 | 25 | 82 | 24 | 85 | 51 | 25 |
| Sanda Magbolontor | 558 | 66 | 274 | 16 | 25 | 36 | 20 | 40 | 70 | 11 |
| TMS | 328 | 73 | 109 | 10 | 11 | 30 | 8 | 35 | 33 | 19 |
| TONKOLIL | 6,388 | 996 | 2,641 | 329 | 311 | 632 | 250 | 337 | 745 | 147 |
| Gbonkolen- ken | 1,016 | 148 | 422 | 45 | 65 | 108 | 35 | 46 | 120 | 27 |
| Kafe Simira | 338 | 57 | 146 | 26 | 9 | ${ }^{43}$ | 6 | 10 | 32 | 9 |
| Kalansogoia | 337 | 38 | 142 | 18 | 12 | 34 | 19 | 35 | 20 | 19 |
| Kholifa | 236 | 28 | 99 | 11 | 9 | 20 | 26 | 6 | 30 | 7 |


|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 뮹 } \\ & \text { N } \\ & \text { N} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\cdots$ | ＊ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\bigcirc$ | ๑ | ＊ | g | $\stackrel{J}{6}$ | N | ＇ | $\infty$ | $\wedge$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | mi | － |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \# } \\ & \stackrel{y}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\text { d }}$ | ～ | ＋ | $\ddagger$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | 9 | $\stackrel{0}{\sim}$ | む | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | ก | ～ | 차N | ¢ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\square}$ |
|  |  | g | 9 | \％ | N | $\exists$ | N | $\square$ | $\underset{\sim}{\circ}$ | N | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | ～ิ | ～ | ¢ | あ | $\sigma$ |
|  | $\sum_{3}^{\frac{1}{0}}$ | ले | $\wedge$ | N | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{1}{2}$ | ल | 欠̆ | $\stackrel{\sim}{m}$ | $\bigcirc$ | へ | $\infty$ | $\pm$ | \％ | ค |
|  |  | ๕ | $\infty$ | む | \％ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | ก | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | ¢ | $\vec{m}$ | 8 | $\pm$ | N |
|  |  | F | $\wedge$ | N | $\vec{\sim}$ | $\infty$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | \＆ | $\stackrel{\underset{\sim}{\sim}}{\underset{\sim}{2}}$ | \％ | $\stackrel{\square}{ }$ | へ | － | $\stackrel{m}{0}$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
|  |  | $\not{ }^{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | F | $\wedge$ | $\bullet$ | \％ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | － | $\stackrel{\infty}{m}$ | $\sigma$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\infty$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\sim$ |
|  |  | q | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\vec{m}$ | 욱 | ® | $\stackrel{\circ}{\sim}$ | ד | 苜 |  | ® | 太 | 제 | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | 尔 | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ |
|  |  | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | \％ | へ | $\pm$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | 河 | ה | $\underset{\sim}{n}$ | $\underset{\underset{\sim}{\underset{N}{N}}}{ }$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\bigcirc$ | in | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{7}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ |
|  | 든 | $\stackrel{\text { n}}{\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\overrightarrow{ \pm}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{*}}$ | N | $\vec{F}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{N}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \aleph_{n}^{N} \\ & \sigma \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sim}$ | 尔 | す | 㟧 | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | लิ |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\pi}{0} \\ & \sum_{0}^{\pi} \\ & \frac{\pi}{\pi} \\ & \frac{\pi}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\underset{\underset{\sim}{\square}}{\stackrel{y}{\square}}$ | ¢ |  | \％ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{2} \\ & \text { 䯩 } \\ & \text { n } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |

Table A14.3 Distribution of the Persons with disability by Chiefdom
and Cause of Disability
[11141]

|  | Main disability |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region / District/ Chiefdon | Total | Congenital (from birth) | Disease/ illness | Transport Accident | Occupational injury | Other accident | War | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Natural } \\ & \text { ageing } \\ & \text { processs } \end{aligned}$ | Other | Not stated |
| JaiamaBongor | 686 | 91 | 292 | 26 | 31 | 59 | 23 | 53 | 77 | 34 |
| Kakua | 696 | 133 | 307 | 31 | 31 | 41 | 18 | 45 | 68 | 22 |
| Komboya | 297 | 40 | 121 | 4 | 16 | 21 | 20 | 16 | 55 | 4 |
| Lugbu | 484 | 71 | 238 | 6 | 29 | 37 | 13 | 37 | 29 | 24 |
| Niawa Lenga | 197 | 24 | 64 | 9 | 9 | 15 | 16 | 36 | 19 | 5 |
| Selenga | 158 | 10 | 106 | 6 | 4 | 11 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 3 |
| Tikonko | 1,100 | 165 | 472 | 34 | 76 | 89 | 72 | 91 | 86 | 15 |
| Valunia | 526 | 50 | 254 | 19 | 26 | 46 | 14 | 48 | 57 | 12 |
| Wunde | 246 | 40 | 107 | 8 | 9 | 24 | 10 | 17 | 31 | - |
| Bo City | 1,968 | 349 | 770 | 112 | 72 | 153 | 49 | 155 | 238 | 70 |
| BONTHE | 2,726 | 405 | 1,191 | 79 | 139 | 201 | 108 | 247 | 278 | 78 |
| Bendu Cha | 114 | 18 | 65 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 9 | 6 | 2 |
| Bum | 478 | 52 | 215 | 16 | 19 | 30 | 16 | 49 | 64 | 17 |
| Dema | 96 | 17 | 38 | 1 | 17 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 1 |


|  | Main disability |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region / <br> District/ <br> Chiefdom | Total | Congenital (from birth) | Disease/ illness | Transport Accident | Occupational injury | Other accident | War | Natural ageing process | Other | Not stated |
| Imperi | 294 | 36 | 112 | 10 | 10 | 31 | 13 | 14 | 56 | 12 |
| Jong | 692 | 142 | 290 | 23 | 21 | 50 | 25 | 81 | 50 | 10 |
| Kpanga Kemo | 125 | 9 | 73 | 1 | 11 | 9 | 5 | 3 | 13 | 1 |
| Kwamebai Krim | 224 | 27 | 94 | 6 | 20 | 15 | 13 | 13 | 32 | 4 |
| Nongoba Bullom | 254 | 51 | 103 | 9 | 8 | 18 | 23 | 20 | 16 | 6 |
| Sittia | 129 | 22 | 61 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 2 | 8 | 10 | 9 |
| Sogbini | 162 | 6 | 55 | 4 | 12 | 14 | 3 | 39 | 16 | 13 |
| Yawbeko | 80 | 10 | 40 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| Bonthe Municipal | 78 | 15 | 45 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| MOYAMBA | 5,866 | 762 | 2,526 | 204 | 424 | 422 | 168 | 558 | 632 | 170 |
| Bagruwa | 664 | 81 | 250 | 17 | 76 | 42 | 17 | 90 | 76 | 15 |
| Bumpeh | 571 | 104 | 221 | 24 | 36 | 40 | 13 | 59 | 51 | 23 |
| Dasse | 257 | 41 | 122 | 8 | 20 | 26 | 5 | 17 | 17 | 1 |
| Fakunya | 623 | 65 | 295 | 15 | 20 | 41 | 18 | 42 | 108 | 19 |
| Kagboro | 611 | 52 | 298 | 23 | 43 | 43 | 4 | 93 | 46 | 9 |

Table A14.3 Distribution of the Persons with disability by Chiefdom


|  | Main disability |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region / District/ Chiefdom | Total | Congenital (from birth) | Disease/ illness | Transport Accident | Occupational injury | Other accident | War | Natural ageing process | Other | Not stated |
| Kaiyamba | 459 | 50 | 209 | 21 | 9 | 37 | 17 | 47 | 57 | 12 |
| Kamajei | 175 | 24 | 84 | 7 | 25 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 8 | 6 |
| Kongbora | 317 | 49 | 119 | 15 | 15 | 27 | 14 | 25 | 32 | 21 |
| Kori | 648 | 78 | 281 | 23 | 35 | 51 | 23 | 59 | 70 | 28 |
| Kowa | 235 | 31 | 93 | 6 | 31 | 19 | 11 | 23 | 17 | 4 |
| Lower Banta | 349 | 65 | 155 | 13 | 17 | 26 | 14 | 20 | 25 | 14 |
| Ribbi | 393 | 61 | 144 | 11 | 22 | 36 | 18 | 15 | 80 | 6 |
| Timdale | 338 | 45 | 102 | 13 | 60 | 19 | 4 | 48 | 40 | 7 |
| Upper Banta | 226 | 16 | 153 | 8 | 15 | 9 | 4 | 11 | 5 | 5 |
| PUJEHUN | 4,843 | 666 | 2,129 | 200 | 253 | 352 | 278 | 389 | 472 | 104 |
| Barri | 506 | 64 | 218 | 15 | 20 | 53 | 36 | 47 | 43 | 10 |
| Gallinas Peri | 835 | 123 | 349 | 53 | 46 | 55 | 42 | 55 | 94 | 18 |
| Kpaka | 193 | 21 | 96 | 4 | 6 | 14 | 18 | 7 | 18 | 9 |
| KpangaKabonde | 1,051 | 115 | 534 | 38 | 61 | 75 | 60 | 68 | 81 | 19 |


|  | Main disability |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region / District/ Chiefdom | Total | Congenital (from birth) | Disease/ illness | Transport Accident | Occupational injury | Other accident | War | Natural ageing process | Other | Not stated |
| Makpele | 419 | 40 | 148 | 27 | 34 | 29 | 22 | 42 | 63 | 14 |
| Malen | 506 | 77 | 217 | 21 | 17 | 38 | 17 | 58 | 49 | 12 |
| Mano Sakrim | 182 | 23 | 69 | 5 | 7 | 12 | 29 | 14 | 23 | - |
| Panga Krim | 161 | 26 | 75 | 4 | 12 | 12 | 9 | 9 | 13 | 1 |
| Pejeh | 137 | 25 | 59 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 12 | 8 | 13 | - |
| Soro Gbema | 320 | 48 | 142 | 10 | 14 | 19 | 5 | 35 | 33 | 14 |
| Sowa | 298 | 60 | 108 | 9 | 19 | 17 | 19 | 35 | 28 | 3 |
| YKK | 235 | 44 | 114 | 9 | 10 | 20 | 9 | 11 | 14 | 4 |
| WESTERN | 11,933 | 2,188 | 4,185 | 810 | 475 | 1,170 | 394 | 808 | 1,360 | 543 |
| WESTERN AREA RURAL | 4,126 | 696 | 1,541 | 284 | 181 | 412 | 201 | 178 | 464 | 169 |
| Koya | 842 | 133 | 329 | 48 | 59 | 89 | 53 | 25 | 87 | 19 |
| Mountain | 226 | 45 | 74 | 19 | 17 | 19 | 8 | 14 | 19 | 11 |
| Waterloo | 1,835 | 278 | 721 | 134 | 61 | 159 | 104 | 77 | 224 | 77 |
| York Rural | 1,223 | 240 | 417 | 83 | 44 | 145 | 36 | 62 | 134 | 62 |

[11171]
and Cause of Disability
Table A14.3 Distribution of the Persons with disability by Chiefdom
Main disability

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reeion / <br> District/ <br> Chiefom | Total | Congenital <br> (from bith) | Disease/ <br> illness | Transport <br> Accident | Occupational <br> injury | Other <br> accident | War | Natural <br> ageing <br> process | Other | Not stated |
| WESTERR <br> AREA <br> URBAN | 7,807 | 1,492 | 2,644 | 526 | 294 | 758 | 193 | 630 | 896 | 374 |
| Central 1 | 456 | 108 | 137 | 25 | 13 | 39 | 11 | 56 | 34 | 33 |
| Central 2 | 229 | 23 | 100 | 7 | 4 | 16 | 11 | 24 | 40 | 4 |
| East 1 | 427 | 84 | 141 | 21 | 22 | 52 | 13 | 23 | 59 | 12 |
| East 2 | 652 | 125 | 236 | 50 | 27 | 68 | 6 | 40 | 58 | 42 |
| East 3 | 3,318 | 642 | 1,153 | 239 | 107 | 331 | 82 | 231 | 368 | 165 |
| West 1 | 443 | 69 | 151 | 28 | 14 | 48 | 11 | 56 | 54 | 12 |
| West 2 | 962 | 196 | 271 | 76 | 51 | 97 | 15 | 84 | 125 | 47 |
| West 3 | 1,320 | 245 | 455 | 80 | 56 | 107 | 44 | 116 | 158 | 59 |

## CHAPTER 15: INTERNET, ALCOHOL AND TOBACCO USE

### 15.1 Introduction

### 15.1.1 An overview of the Internet

The Internet is the global system of interconnected computer networks that use the Internet protocol suite (TCP/IP) to link devices worldwide. It is a network of networks that consists of private, public, academic, business, and government networks of local to global scope, linked by a broad array of electronic, wireless, and optical networking technologies.

The Internet carries an extensive range of information resources and services, such as the inter-linked hypertext documents and applications of the World Wide Web (WWW), electronic mail, telephony, and file sharing.

Internet use grew rapidly in the West from the mid-1990s and from the late 1990s in the developing world. In two decades, Internet use has grown 100 times, to over one third of the world's population.

Most traditional communications media, including telephony, radio, television, paper mail and newspapers are being reshaped or redefined by the Internet, giving birth to new services such as email, Internet telephony, Internet television, online music, digital newspapers, and video streaming websites. Newspaper, book, and other print publishing are adapting to website technology, or are reshaped into blogging, web feeds and online news aggregators.

The Internet has enabled and accelerated new forms of personal interactions through instant messaging, Internet forums, and social networking. Online shopping has grown exponentially both for major retailers and small businesses and entrepreneurs, as it enables firms to extend their service to a larger market or even sell goods and services entirely online. Business-to-business and financial services on the Internet affect supply chains across entire industries.

In Chapter II, Section 9(3) of the 1991 Constitution
of the Republic of Sierra Leone it is stated that Government shall promote the learning of indigenous languages and the study and application of modern science, foreign languages, technology, commerce and business. Information, Communication and Technology (ICT) did not became a core component of the Sierra Leonean education reforms until after the Civil War. It was incorporated in higher educational institutions curricula as a way of enhancing the prospects for job opportunities for graduates. A national ICT policy document was launched in 2007 which emphasizes the importance of technology in the development of the country.

### 15.1.2 An overview of alcohol and tobacco intake

Alcohol and tobacco use is a risk factor for many diseases, especially those affecting the heart, liver and lungs, as well as many cancers. Alcohol and tobacco are widely used in Sierra Leonean society, as is the case in many Sub-Saharan African countries.

In 2008, the World Health Organization (WHO) named tobacco as the world's single greatest preventable cause of death. Research on tobacco use is limited mainly to smoking, which has been studied extensively. An estimated 1.1 billion people, and up to one-third of the adult population, use tobacco in some form. Smoking is more prevalent among the poor and developing countries and is done more by men than women. According to the Global Status Report on alcohol and health (WHO, 2011), the rates of smoking continue to rise in developing countries, but have leveled off or declined in developed countries. Smoking rates in the United States of America dropped by half from 1965 to 2006, falling to 20.8 per cent of adults. However in the developing world, tobacco consumption is rising by 3.4 per cent every year.

Sierra Leone is a party to the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco (FCTC), which aims to help countries tackle tobacco's negative impact on development.

The Sierra Leonean Parliament is yet to pass the tobacco bill into law, which will make room for tougher actions. Currently there is no legal minimum age for drinking alcohol or smoking tobacco in Sierra Leone. There is a need to put in place control measures with the aim of reducing their consumption. Increasing taxes and prices of alcohol and tobacco, imposing bans on advertising alcohol and tobacco products, and banning smoking in public places would lead to a reduction in the consumption of those two products.

### 15.2 Data sources

For the first time, the 2015 Census collected data on access level and usage of Internet services from persons aged 10 years and above. Internet use asked about access in the previous week in their homes, office, Internet café and other places. Data were also collected on tobacco and alcohol intake from persons aged 10 years and older.

### 15.3 ICT

ICT is very important in the modern world. Many people use the World Wide Web to access news, weather and sports reports, to plan and book vacations and to pursue their personal interests. People use chat, messaging and email to make and stay in touch with friends worldwide, in the same way as some previously had pen pals. Social networking websites such as Facebook, Twitter, and Myspace have created new ways to socialize and interact. Users of these sites are able to add a wide variety of information to pages, to pursue common interests, and to connect with others. It is also possible to find existing acquaintances, allowing communication among existing groups of people. Sites like LinkedIn foster commercial and business connections. YouTube and Flickr specialize in users' videos and photographs. While social networking sites were initially for individuals only, today they are widely used by businesses and other organizations to promote their brands, to market to their customers and to encourage posts to 'go viral'.

At the time of the census enumeration, there were four mobile phone operators in Sierra Leone: Airtel, Africell, Sierratel and Smart Mobile. They were offering Global System for Mobile (GSM) services, on a prepaid basis. Prepaid cards could be purchased throughout the city and in many
provincial towns.
Africell Sierra Leone started operations in 2005 and had grown to become the first operator with a 64 per cent market share by the end of 2014. Airtel in Sierra Leone was launched in September 2000 and was the second highest operator with 36 per cent of market share. Sierratel, a stateowned fixed-line incumbent, had entered the mobile market, which it was using to provide fixedwireless access and broadband services. It had a monopoly on 3G mobile services before other operators launched their own services based on HSPA technology in 2011 and 2012.

Sierra Leone depended entirely on satellites for international connections until February 2013 when it was connected to the submarine cable. This considerably improved bandwidth capabilities, and resulted in a welcome drop in the price of broadband. At the end of 2015, the 600 km national backbone network was completed, which also links the country to Liberia and Guinea.

### 15.3.1 Accessibility of Internet facility

### 15.3.1.1 Access to Internet facility by age and sex

Overall, the Census showed that 86.7 per cent of the population aged 10 years and over had no access to the Internet (Table 15.1). Only 13 per cent of the population was accessing the Internet. The disaggregation of the population by sex revealed that 16 per cent and 10 per cent of the males and females respectively, were accessing the Internet.

Further disaggregation by broad age group showed that younger people were more likely to be accessing the Internet - 16.4 per cent of persons aged between 15 and 35 years compared to 12.6 per cent of 36 to 60 year-olds. This is probably because the younger generation is more likely to embrace technology faster and could be a result of the Government's efforts since early 2000 to promote the use of ICT.

Table 15.1 Distribution of the population aged 10 years and over
by status of access to Internet facility and selected characteristics

| Sex and broad age group | Total | Have access to Internet facility | Do not have access to Internet facility | Don't Know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | 5,030,016 | 651,826 | 4,359,515 | 18,675 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 13.0 | 86.7 | 0.4 |
| Male | 100.0 | 16.0 | 83.6 | 0.4 |
| Female | 100.0 | 10.0 | 89.6 | 0.3 |
| Broad age groups |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 100.0 | 13.0 | 86.7 | 0.4 |
| 10 to 14 | 100.0 | 4.4 | 95.2 | 0.3 |
| 15 to 35 | 100.0 | 16.4 | 83.2 | 0.4 |
| 36 to 60 | 100.0 | 12.6 | 87.0 | 0.4 |
| Over 60 | 100.0 | 5.9 | 93.6 | 0.4 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Figure 15.1 shows the distribution of the population that had access to the Internet by gender. The results revealed that 60.4 per cent of persons who access the Internet were males and 39.6 per cent were females.

Figure 15.1 Access to Internet by gender of user (per cent)


Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

The distribution of Internet access by age category of user is represented in figure 15.2. It is evident that the biggest proportion (70 per cent) of Internet users was youthful (age range 15-35 years). To most young people all over the world, access to the Internet is a necessity. It is a way of communicating with their peers, a source of learning and knowledge and a way of tapping into opportunities.

Figure 15.2 Access to Internet by age group (per cent)


The distribution of the population aged 10 years and over who were accessing an Internet facility by five-year age group and sex is shown in Table 15.2. Slightly over one fifth of the population accessing the Internet were aged 20 to 24 years. Irrespective of gender, an inverse relationship is revealed between access and the age of the user beyond 24 years.

## 응 <br> Table 15.2 Distribution of persons aged 10 years and over who were accessing Internet facility by age group and sex

| Age group | Total | Male | Female |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | 651,826 | 393,763 | 258,063 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| $10-14$ | 5.8 | 5.0 | 6.9 |
| $15-19$ | 17.5 | 16.0 | 19.9 |
| $20-24$ | 20.6 | 19.5 | 22.2 |
| $25-29$ | 17.3 | 17.4 | 17.2 |
| $30-34$ | 10.7 | 11.1 | 10.1 |
| $35-39$ | 9.0 | 9.5 | 8.3 |
| $40-44$ | 6.0 | 6.6 | 5.0 |
| $45-49$ | 4.7 | 5.4 | 3.6 |
| $50-54$ | 3.2 | 3.6 | 2.6 |
| $55-59$ | 1.9 | 2.2 | 1.4 |
| $60-64$ | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.1 |
| $65+$ | 1.9 | 2.2 | 1.6 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 15.3.1.2 Access to Internet facility by place of residence and sex

The analysis of the data by place of residence revealed better access to the Internet in urban than rural areas (Table 15.3). The findings reflect the way investment in telecommunications is carried out. Preference is usually given to urban areas where there is a concentration of potential clients able to pay for the service.

## EC <br> Table 15.3 Distribution of the population aged 10 years and over by status of access to Internet facility and place of residence

| Selected <br> Characteristics | Total | Have access to <br> Internet facility | Do not have access <br> to Internet facility | Don't Know |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Place of residence | $5,030,016$ | 651,826 | $4,359,515$ | 18,675 |
| Number | 100.0 | 13.0 | 86.7 | 0.4 |
| Total (\%) | 100.0 | 5.5 | 94.0 | 0.4 |
| Rural | 100.0 | 22.6 | 77.1 | 0.3 |
| Urban |  |  |  |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census
Three in every four of the population accessing the Internet were urban dwellers (Figure 15.3). As previously stated, this is probably because the market is more attractive to mobile phone or telecommunication providers in cities and towns. An analysis of gender saw little variation in male and female access.

Figure 15.3 Access to Internet by rural-urban distribution (per cent)


Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015

### 15.3.1.3 Access to Internet facility by region, district and sex

At the regional level, the Western Region had more people ( 25.8 per cent) accessing the Internet at the time of the census enumeration. The lowest percentage was in the Northern and Southern regions. For each of these two regions, only 8.7 per cent of the population aged 10 years above was accessing the Internet.


Table 15.4 Distribution of the population aged 10 years and over by status of access to Internet facility and region

| Region | Total | Have access to <br> Internet facility | Do not have access <br> to Internet facility | Don't Know |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | $5,030,016$ | 651,826 | $4,359,515$ | 18,675 |
| Total | 100.0 | 86.7 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Eastern | 100.0 | 89.5 | 0.3 | 0.4 |
| Northern | 100.0 | 90.9 | 0.4 | 0.3 |
| Southern | 100.0 | 90.8 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| Western | 100.0 | 73.9 | 0.3 | 0.4 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

The results of the analysis of the census data by access to Internet and region presented in Figure 15.4 show that close to half of the Internet users, irrespective of gender, were residing in the Western Region, which has a bigger proportion of the urban population. The findings confirm that the urban dwellers are more likely to adapt to new styles of living faster than their rural counterparts.The Southern Region presented the lowest percentage of the population accessing the Internet. Even after gender considerations, the Southern Region revealed the lowest proportion of the population accessing the Internet.

Figure 15.4 Access to Internet by region (per cent)


Table 15.5 shows the distribution of the population aged 10 years and over by status of access to Internet facility and district. Western Urban ( 29.2 per cent) presented the highest proportion of the population accessing the Internet facility, followed by Western Rural (17.4 per cent), Kenema ( 14.8 per cent), and Bombali (11.7 per cent). Koinadugu ( 4.7 per cent) exhibited the lowest percentage of the population accessing the Internet.


| District | Total | Have access to Internet facility | Do not have access to Internet facility | Don't Know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | 5,030,016 | 651,826 | 4,359,515 | 18,675 |
| Total | 100.0 | 13.0 | 86.7 | 0.4 |
| Kailahun | 100.0 | 8.6 | 91.1 | 0.3 |
| Kenema | 100.0 | 14.8 | 84.9 | 0.2 |
| Kono | 100.0 | 6.2 | 93.5 | 0.4 |
| Bombali | 100.0 | 11.7 | 88.2 | 0.2 |
| Kambia | 100.0 | 6.6 | 93.3 | 0.1 |
| Koinadugu | 100.0 | 4.7 | 94.8 | 0.5 |
| Port Loko | 100.0 | 11.5 | 88.2 | 0.3 |
| Tonkolili | 100.0 | 6.6 | 92.7 | 0.7 |
| Bo | 100.0 | 11.4 | 87.9 | 0.7 |
| Bonthe | 100.0 | 7.6 | 91.8 | 0.6 |
| Moyamba | 100.0 | 5.6 | 94.2 | 0.2 |
| Pujehun | 100.0 | 7.6 | 92.1 | 0.3 |
| Western Area-Rural | 100.0 | 17.4 | 82.2 | 0.5 |
| Western Area-Urban | 100.0 | 29.2 | 70.6 | 0.3 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Further analysis by distribution of the total population accessing the Internet facility by district revealed that Western Urban with 36.8 per cent had the highest percentage share (Table 15.6). The districts with a percentage share of less than five from least to highest were: Bonthe, Moyamba, Koinadugu, Kambia, Pujehun, Kono, Tonkolili and Kailahun. These districts are a long way from Freetown, the capital city. A similar trend was exhibited when the analysis was carried out by gender of the person who was accessing the Internet facility at the time of the census enumeration.

Table 15.6 Distribution of the population aged 10 years and over accessing the Internet facility by district and sex

| District | Total | Male | Female |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | 651,826 | 393,763 | 258,063 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Kailahun | 4.9 | 4.9 | 4.9 |
| Kenema | 9.9 | 9.6 | 10.3 |
| Kono | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.1 |
| Bombali | 7.6 | 7.5 | 7.7 |
| Kambia | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.1 |
| Koinadugu | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Port Loko | 7.4 | 7.5 | 7.1 |
| Tonkolili | 3.6 | 3.8 | 3.3 |
| Bo | 7.1 | 7.1 | 7.1 |
| Bonthe | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| Moyamba | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.8 |
| Pujehun | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.9 |
| Western Area Rural | 8.8 | 8.9 | 8.5 |
| Western Area Urban | 36.8 | 36.2 | 37.6 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 15.3.1.4 Access to Internet facility by selected socio-economic characteristics and sex

Further analysis was carried out on the socio-economic characteristics of the persons who were accessing the Internet facility. The key variables considered are highest educational level attained, employment status and sex. The findings presented in Table 15.7 show that the majority of the persons who reported accessing Internet ( 36 per cent) had attained up to Senior Secondary School (SSS) level. Among the males, 38 per cent of the population that had attained the SSS level was accessing the Internet, while the corresponding figure for the females is 32.9 per cent. It is revealing to note that even those with no education reported accessing the Internet, forming 13.3 per cent of the total. The proportion of females ( 16.4 per cent) with no education accessing the Internet was higher than that for the males (11.3 per cent).

Table 15.7 Distribution of persons aged 10 years and over using Internet facility by highest educational level attained and sex

| Highest educational level attained | Total | Male | Female |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | 651,826 | 393,763 | 258,063 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| No education | 13.3 | 11.3 | 16.4 |
| Kindergarten | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Primary | 8.7 | 7.9 | 9.9 |
| JSS | 17.0 | 16.2 | 18.2 |
| SSS | 36.0 | 38.0 | 32.9 |
| Vocational/ Technical/ Nursing/ | 11.1 | 10.7 | 11.7 |
| Teacher | 8.7 | 9.9 | 6.8 |
| Higher (First Degree) | 2.4 | 2.9 | 1.7 |
| Tertiary (Post-graduate) and PHD | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.1 |
| Koranic | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Other | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Don't know |  |  |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census
Table 15.8 presents the distribution of the population aged 10 years and over who were accessing Internet facility by employment status. The majority of the population ( 82.3 per cent) accessing the Internet facility are full-time students ( 39.9 per cent), self-employed without employees ( 23.7 per cent), and paid employees ( 18.7 per cent). A similar trend is registered when the comparison is carried out by sex of the Internet user. The five employment status categories with smallest proportion ( 3.7 per cent) of those accessing the Internet comprise unpaid family workers, paid apprenticeship, unpaid apprenticeship, worked before but currently looking for work, and retired/ pensioners.


Table 15.8 Distribution of the persons aged 10 years and over who are accessing Internet facility by employment status

| Employment status | Total | Male | Female |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | 651,826 | 393,763 | 258,063 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Paid employee | 18.7 | 22.1 | 13.5 |
| Self-employed without employees | 23.7 | 23.9 | 23.5 |
| Self-employed with employees <br> (employer) | 2.7 | 3.1 | 2.1 |
| Unpaid family worker | 1.1 | 0.9 | 1.3 |
| Paid apprentice | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.2 |
| Unpaid apprentice | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.4 |


| Employment status | Total | Male | Female |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Worked before but currently looking <br> for work | 1.0 | 1.1 | 0.7 |
| Looking for work for the first time | 3.4 | 3.7 | 2.9 |
| Household work | 3.7 | 1.1 | 7.6 |
| Not working \& not looking for work | 3.0 | 2.6 | 3.6 |
| Full time student | 39.9 | 38.3 | 42.3 |
| Retired/pensioner | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.4 |
| Other (specify) | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.0 |
| Don't know | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 15.3.2 Utilization of Internet facility in the past one week

### 15.3.2.1 Utilization of Internet facility by age and sex

Respondents who had access to the Internet were asked to state whether they had been online in the past week preceding the census enumeration. Table 15.9 presents the distribution of the population who had access to Internet facility and had used it in the past one week. Generally, irrespective of gender and age, seven in every 10 of the users had accessed the Internet facility from their homes. The percentage of the population accessing the Internet facility from an office was higher for the population aged 36 to 60 years. The proportion of the population that had used the Internet at the office in the past one week preceding the census enumeration varied from 4.3 for those aged 15 to 35 years to 10.3 per cent for the persons aged 36 to 60 years. The proportion of persons who had used the Internet at the office is comparatively higher for the males at 6.4 per cent.

Table 15.9 Distribution of the population accessing the Internet facility by status of using the facility in the past one week and selected characteristics

| Selected <br> Characteristicc | Total | Used at home | Used at office | Used at <br> Internet cafe | Yes Other | Did not use |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number | 651,826 | 475,428 | 37,623 | 17,935 | 37,918 | 82,922 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 72.9 | 5.8 | 2.8 | 5.8 | 12.7 |
| Male | 100.0 | 73.2 | 6.4 | 2.9 | 5.8 | 11.7 |
| Female | 100.0 | 72.5 | 4.9 | 2.5 | 5.8 | 14.2 |

Table 15.9 Distribution of the population accessing the Internet facility by status of using the facility in the past one week and selected characteristics (continued)

| Selected <br> Characteristics | Total | Used at home | Used at office | Used at <br> Internet cafe | Yes Other | Did not use |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Broad Age Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 to 14 | 100.0 | 70.1 | 5.2 | 2.9 | 5.7 | 15.9 |
| 15 to 35 | 100.0 | 75.0 | 4.3 | 2.9 | 6.3 | 11.6 |
| 36 to 60 | 100.0 | 68.1 | 10.3 | 2.3 | 4.6 | 14.8 |
| Over 60 | 100.0 | 64.8 | 9.7 | 1.7 | 3.7 | 20.0 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Table 15.10 show the distribution of the persons aged 10 years and over who had used the Internet facility one week preceding the Census enumeration. Slightly over one fifth of the persons who had utilized the Internet facility were aged 20 to 24 years. There is little difference in the proportions of males and females.
Table 15.10 Distribution of the persons aged 10 years and over
who had used the Internet facility one week preceding the Census enumeration

| Age group | Total | Male | Female |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | 568,904 | 347,539 | 221,365 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| $10-14$ | 5.6 | 4.8 | 6.7 |
| $15-19$ | 17.7 | 16.1 | 20.2 |
| $20-24$ | 21.1 | 20.0 | 22.8 |
| $25-29$ | 17.6 | 17.7 | 17.5 |
| $30-34$ | 10.7 | 11.2 | 10.0 |
| $35-39$ | 8.9 | 9.5 | 8.1 |
| $40-44$ | 5.9 | 6.5 | 4.9 |
| $45-49$ | 4.5 | 5.2 | 3.4 |
| $50-54$ | 3.1 | 3.5 | 2.5 |
| $55-59$ | 1.8 | 2.1 | 1.4 |
| $60-64$ | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.0 |
| $65+$ | 1.8 | 2.0 | 1.4 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 15.3.2.2 Utilization of Internet facility by place of residence and sex

Table 15.11 shows that the proportion of rural dwellers ( 63.7 per cent) using the Internet at home was lower than that for their urban counterparts ( 75.9 per cent). In contrast, more rural residents were using the Internet at the office.

Table 15.11 Distribution of the population accessing the Internet facility by status of using the facility in the past one week and place of residence

| Place of <br> residence | Total | Used at home | Used at office | Used at <br> Internet cafe | Yes Other | Did not use |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | 651,826 | 475,428 | 37,623 | 17,935 | 37,918 | 82,922 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 72.9 | 5.8 | 2.8 | 5.8 | 12.7 |
| Rural | 100.0 | 63.7 | 6.3 | 2.1 | 4.9 | 23.0 |
| Urban | 100.0 | 75.9 | 5.6 | 3.0 | 6.1 | 9.5 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census
Further examination of Internet facility by place of residence revealed that the majority of the users (more than three quarters) were urban residents (Figure 15.5). In comparison, the proportion of female Internet facility users in urban areas was higher than that registered for males.

Figure 15.5 Distribution of the persons aged 10 years and over who had used an Internet facility one week preceding the census enumeration (per cent)


### 15.3.2.3 Utilization of Internet facility by region, district and sex

At regional level, the results show that the Western Region (75.9 per cent) revealed the highest proportion of Internet facility users who had used it at home (Table 15.12). In comparison, the Southern Region presented the lowest percentage of the population aged 10 years and over who reported having used the Internet facility at home.

Table 15.12 Distribution of the population accessing the Internet facility by status of using the facility in the past one week and selected characteristics

| Region | Total | Used at home | Used at office | Used at <br> Internet cafe | Yes Other | Did not use |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | 651,826 | 475,428 | 37,623 | 17,935 | 37,918 | 82,922 |
| Total | 100.0 | 72.9 | 5.8 | 2.8 | 5.8 | 12.7 |
| Eastern | 100.0 | 70.4 | 4.6 | 2.3 | 4.1 | 18.7 |
| Northern | 100.0 | 71.1 | 69.5 | 5.4 | 1.8 | 4.2 |
| Southern | 100.0 | 75.9 | 6.5 | 2.2 | 3.9 | 17.5 |
| Western | 100.0 |  |  |  | 7.9 | 18.7 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census
Figure 15.6 show the distribution of the Internet facility users by region and sex. Close to half of the total users were residing in the Western Region. A small difference in the proportion of males and females was registered.

Figure 15.6 Utilization of the Internet facility by region and sex (per cent)


Table 15.13 presents the distribution of the population who had access to and had used the Internet facility in the past one week preceding the census enumeration by district of residence. Most of the people had accessed the facility from their homes. The percentage share varied from 64.9 per cent for Kailahun to 77.2 per cent for Port Loko district. The findings presented a shift in the usage of the Internet, given that over 10 years ago most of the users were visiting Internet cafes for the service. The shift has been made possible due to regular improvement in the Internet services by the service providers.


Table 15.13 Distribution of the population accessing the Internet facility by status of using the facility in the past one week and district

| District | Total | Used at home | Used at office | Used at Internet cafe | Yes Other | Did not use |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | 651,826 | 475,428 | 37,623 | 17,935 | 37,918 | 82,922 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 72.9 | 5.8 | 2.8 | 5.8 | 12.7 |
| Kailahun | 100.0 | 64.9 | 4.8 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 24.7 |
| Kenema | 100.0 | 74.7 | 3.7 | 2.1 | 3.8 | 15.8 |
| Kono | 100.0 | 65.7 | 6.9 | 1.9 | 7.0 | 18.5 |
| Bombali | 100.0 | 68.0 | 5.2 | 2.1 | 4.5 | 20.2 |
| Kambia | 100.0 | 68.1 | 5.4 | 3.1 | 3.5 | 19.8 |
| Koinadugu | 100.0 | 68.6 | 6.4 | 1.1 | 6.8 | 17.0 |
| Port Loko | 100.0 | 77.2 | 5.0 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 13.7 |
| Tonkolili | 100.0 | 68.6 | 6.2 | 2.1 | 4.8 | 18.3 |
| Bo | 100.0 | 70.2 | 5.3 | 2.9 | 4.0 | 17.7 |
| Bonthe | 100.0 | 70.0 | 5.7 | 1.0 | 3.6 | 19.7 |
| Moyamba | 100.0 | 71.4 | 6.8 | 0.8 | 3.2 | 17.8 |
| Pujehun | 100.0 | 66.4 | 5.8 | 2.1 | 4.5 | 21.2 |
| Western <br> Area-Rural | 100.0 | 76.1 | 6.7 | 3.2 | 4.1 | 9.9 |
| Western <br> Area-Urban | 100.0 | 75.8 | 6.4 | 3.7 | 8.8 | 5.3 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census
Western Urban had the highest proportion of Internet facility users irrespective of gender (Table 15.14). Four in every 10 persons who had used the Internet facility one week preceding the census enumeration were enumerated here. In contrast, Bonthe district showed the lowest proportion of Internet facility users.

Table 15.14 Distribution of the persons aged 10 years and over who had used the Internet facility one week preceding the census by district and sex

| District | Total | Male | Female |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | 568,904 | 347,539 | 221,365 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Kailahun | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 |
| Kenema | 9.6 | 9.3 | 10.0 |
| Kono | 3.2 | 3.4 | 2.9 |
| Bombali | 6.9 | 7.0 | 6.8 |
| Kambia | 2.1 | 2.3 | 1.8 |
| Koinadugu | 1.9 | 2.0 | 1.9 |
| Port Loko | 7.3 | 7.5 | 7.0 |
| Tonkolili | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.0 |
| Bo | 6.7 | 6.8 | 6.6 |
| Bonthe | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.4 |
| Moyamba | 1.7 | 1.8 | 1.7 |
| Pujehun | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.6 |
| Western Area Rural | 9.0 | 9.2 | 8.8 |
| Western Area Urban | 39.9 | 39.0 | 41.3 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 15.3.2.4 Utilization of Internet facility by selected socio-economic characteristics and sex

The findings on utilization of Internet facility by highest educational level attained are presented in Table 15.15. Overall, persons who reported their highest level of education as SSS presented the largest proportion of Internet users, constituting 37.7 per cent of the total. The analysis of the data by sex revealed a high proportion among the males ( 39.5 per cent) for those who reported their highest level of educational attainment as SSS when compared to the females ( 34.9 per cent). It is interesting to note that close to 11 per cent of the Internet facility users had no formal education at the time of census enumeration.

| Highest <br> educational level attained | Total | Male | Female |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | 568,904 | 347,539 | 221,365 |
| Percent | 568,904 | 347,539 | 221,365 |
| No Education | 10.9 | 9.3 | 13.4 |
| Kindergarten | 1.9 | 1.9 | 2.0 |
| Primary | 7.9 | 7.2 | 9.1 |
| JSS | 16.5 | 15.7 | 17.7 |
| SSS | 37.7 | 39.5 | 34.9 |
| Voc/Technical/ | 11.9 | 11.3 | 12.8 |
| Nursing/Teacher | 9.6 | 10.8 | 7.7 |
| Higher (First Degree) | 2.7 | 3.2 | 1.9 |
| Tertiary (Post-graduate) $\&$ <br> PHD | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.1 |
| Koranic | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| Other | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Don't Know |  |  |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census
Table 15.16 presents the distribution of persons aged 10 years and over who had used the Internet facility one week preceding the census enumeration. With regard to employment status, the major users of the Internet facility were: full-time students ( 41.2 per cent), self-employed without employees ( 21.5 per cent) and paid employees ( 20.0 per cent). It is worth noting that those three categories formed over four-fifths of the total number of persons who had used the Internet facility one week preceding the Census enumeration.No major variations were noted when the analysis was carried out by gender of user.

Table 15.16 Distribution of the persons aged 10 years and over who had used the Internet facility one week preceding the census enumeration by employment status

| Employment status | Total | Male | Female |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | 568,904 | 347,539 | 221,365 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Paid employee | 20.0 | 23.3 | 14.8 |
| Self-employed without <br> employees | 21.5 | 21.8 | 21.0 |
| Self-employed with <br> employees (employer) | 2.7 | 3.1 | 2.1 |
| Unpaid family worker | 1.0 | 0.8 | 1.2 |

Table 15.16 Distribution of the persons aged 10 years and over who had used the Internet facility one week preceding the census enumeration by employment status (continued)

| Employment status | Total | Male | Female |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Paid apprentice | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.2 |
| Unpaid apprentice | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.4 |
| Worked before but currently <br> looking for work | 1.0 | 1.2 | 0.7 |
| Looking for work for the <br> first time | 3.5 | 3.8 | 3.1 |
| Household work | 3.4 | 1.0 | 7.0 |
| Not working \& not looking <br> for work | 3.0 | 2.6 | 3.5 |
| Full time student | 41.2 | 39.4 | 44.2 |
| Retired/pensioner | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.4 |
| Other (specify) | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.0 |
| Don't know | 0.3 | 0.3 |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 15.4 Tobacco and Alcohol Intake

It is important to analyse the census data on tobacco and alcohol intake. Tobacco and alcohol are the leading causes of death, illness and impoverishment. According to a 2014 WHO report, tobacco alone kills more than seven million people each year. More than six million of those deaths are the result of direct tobacco use, while around 890,000 deaths are a result of non-smokers being exposed to the smoke. Non-smokers are often exposed to second-hand smoke in public places like restaurants, bars, buses, offices, and other enclosed spaces. The WHO report further states that in 2004, children accounted for 28 per cent of deaths attributed to second-hand smoke. With regard to alcohol, the WHO statistics report for the year 2010 presented the per capita consumption of alcohol among persons aged 15 years and over. Belarus took the first position with per capita alcohol consumption rate of 14.4 litres per annum, while Pakistan was last in the 191 place with 0.0 litres of alcohol per year. Sierra Leone was ranked 54, with per capita consumption of alcohol of 6.7 litres per year.

### 15.4.1 Tobacco and alcohol intake by age and sex

Table 15.17 shows the distribution of the population aged 10 years and over by status of tobacco and alcohol intake and selected characteristics. The results revealed that irrespective of the population characteristics, the largest part of the population was neither tobacco nor alcohol users. The results indicated that more men than women used the substances. A clear gender variation was depicted when male percentage shares were compared with those of females. Generally, more tobacco was being consumed than alcohol. Furthermore, the highest consumers were male and the persons were aged over 35 years.

| Selected <br> characteristics | Overall | Tobacco only | Alcohol only | Both tobacco <br> and alcohol | None | Don't know |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | $5,030,016$ | 456,815 | 174,414 | 131,171 | $4,195,022$ | 72,594 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 9.1 | 3.5 | 2.6 | 83.4 | 1.4 |
| Male | 100.0 | 12.7 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 77.0 | 1.5 |
| Female | 100.0 | 5.6 | 2.6 | 0.8 | 89.5 | 1.4 |
| Broad Age Group |  | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 95.5 | 2.9 |
| 10 to 14 | 100.0 | 6.7 | 2.9 | 2.0 | 87.2 | 1.2 |
| 15 to 35 | 100.0 | 18.6 | 6.2 | 5.6 | 68.7 | 0.9 |
| 36 to 60 | 100.0 | 20.6 | 6.1 | 4.0 | 67.9 | 1.3 |
| Over 60 | 100.0 |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

The distribution of the persons aged 10 years and over who were using tobacco and alcohol is shown in Figure 15.7. Overall, about one-third of the total number of persons using tobacco and alcohol were female. A significant correlation was noted when the analysis of tobacco and alcohol use was carried out by age group. The majority of the tobacco and alcohol consumers were in the age range 35 to 39 years constituting 14.3 per cent of the total. The disaggregation of the data by sex still confirmed the same age group as having a high proportion of consumers with 14.9 per cent and 13.1 per cent for males and females, respectively. In contrast, the smallest proportion of the tobacco and alcohol consumers was in the age group 10 to 14 years. The rate of tobacco and alcohol consumption increases by age up to 39 years and thereafter decreases.

Figure 15.7 Consumption of tobacco and alcohol by age group (per cent)


Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015
Population and Housing Census

### 15.4.2 Tobacco and alcohol intake by residence and sex

From Table 15.18 and Figure 15.8, it is evident that the consumption of tobacco and alcohol was reported more by rural residents than their urban counterparts. Relatively, the proportion of female consumers of tobacco and alcohol in the rural areas was higher than that of males.


Table 15.18 Distribution of the population aged 10 years and over by status of tobacco and alcohol intake and place of residence

| Place of <br> residence | Overall | Tobacco only | Alcohol only | Both tobacco <br> and alcohol | None | Don't know |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | $5,030,016$ | 456,815 | 174,414 | 131,171 | $4,195,022$ | 72,594 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 9.1 | 3.5 | 2.6 | 83.4 | 1.4 |
| Rural | 100.0 | 12.3 | 3.6 | 2.7 | 79.9 | 1.4 |
| Urban | 100.0 | 4.9 | 3.3 | 2.5 | 87.9 | 1.5 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Figure 15.8 Consumption of tobacco and alcohol by place of residence and sex


### 15.4.3 Tobacco and alcohol intake by region, district and sex

At the regional level, the highest proportion of the population aged 10 years and above who were using tobacco only, as shown in Table 15.19, was enumerated in the Southern Region (13 per cent) followed by the Eastern Region with 10.3 per cent. The Western Region presented the lowest percentage of tobacco consumers of 4.5 per cent. The percentage of the alcohol-only users varied from 2.5 per cent in the Eastern Region to 4.3 per cent in the Northern Region. Table 15.19 Distribution of the population aged 10 years and over by status of tobacco and alcohol intake and region

| Region | Overall | Tobacco only | Alcohol only | Both tobacco <br> and alcohol | None | Don't know |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | $5,030,016$ | 456,815 | 174,414 | 131,171 | $4,195,022$ | 72,594 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 9.1 | 3.5 | 2.6 | 83.4 | 1.4 |
| Eastern | 100.0 | 10.3 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 83.1 | 1.6 |
| Northern | 100.0 | 9.0 | 4.3 | 2.2 | 83.2 | 1.2 |
| Southern | 100.0 | 13.0 | 2.6 | 2.9 | 80.0 | 1.5 |
| Western | 100.0 | 4.5 | 3.9 | 3.0 | 87.0 | 1.5 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

The analysis of the results of the consumption of tobacco and alcohol by region and sex is presented in Figure 15.9. Irrespective of gender, close to one third of consumers were in the Northern Region. The lowest proportion, less than one fifth was in the Western Region. Women consumed comparatively more alcohol and tobacco than men in the Southern and Eastern regions, all though the difference was more pronounced in the Southern Region.

Figure 15.9 Consumption of tobacco and alcohol by region and sex


Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

The distribution of the population aged 10 years and over by status of tobacco and alcohol intake and district of residence is presented in Table 15.20. For tobacco use, the highest proportion was found in Pujehun and the lowest in Western Urban. The percentage of the alcohol users varied from 0.9 per cent in Pujehun to 7.6 per cent in Bombali. Moyamba district with 4.3 per cent presented the highest percentage of the population consuming both tobacco and alcohol, while Pujehun district presented the lowest proportion (1.2 per cent).

| District | Overall | Tobacco only | Alcohol only | Both tobacco and alcohol | None | Don't know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | 5,030,016 | 456,815 | 174,414 | 131,171 | 4,195,022 | 72,594 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 9.1 | 3.5 | 2.6 | 83.4 | 1.4 |
| Kailahun | 100.0 | 10.4 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 83.2 | 1.2 |
| Kenema | 100.0 | 14.2 | 1.7 | 2.1 | 80.2 | 1.9 |
| Kono | 100.0 | 5.5 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 86.4 | 1.6 |
| Bombali | 100.0 | 7.0 | 7.6 | 3.1 | 81.1 | 1.2 |
| Kambia | 100.0 | 10.2 | 1.6 | 1.9 | 85.6 | 0.8 |
| Koinadugu | 100.0 | 5.4 | 6.5 | 2.1 | 84.7 | 1.2 |
| Port Loko | 100.0 | 11.8 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 83.7 | 1.3 |
| Tonkolili | 100.0 | 10.2 | 3.9 | 2.0 | 82.3 | 1.5 |
| Bo | 100.0 | 10.8 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 80.8 | 1.6 |
| Bonthe | 100.0 | 14.1 | 1.8 | 2.2 | 80.9 | 1.0 |
| Moyamba | 100.0 | 12.7 | 3.5 | 4.3 | 77.6 | 1.9 |
| Pujehun | 100.0 | 16.4 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 80.2 | 1.3 |
| Western Area-Rural | 100.0 | 6.2 | 3.4 | 3.1 | 85.8 | 1.5 |
| Western Area-Urban | 100.0 | 3.8 | 4.2 | 2.9 | 87.5 | 1.5 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census
Gender differences were noted when analysing tobacco and alcohol consumption by district of residence. For males, the largest proportion of consumers was in Western Area Urban (13.4 per cent), while for females it was Kenema district ( 12.5 per cent). The smallest proportion of tobacco and alcohol consumers was in Bonthe for males ( 2.9 per cent) and Kambia for females ( 2.8 per cent).


| District | Total | Male | Female |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | 762,400 | 528,411 | 233,989 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Kailahun | 7.6 | 7.3 | 8.4 |
| Kenema | 10.2 | 9.2 | 12.5 |
| Kono | 5.6 | 6.2 | 4.3 |

Table 15.21 Distribution of persons aged 10 years and over using tobacco and alcohol by district and sex (continued)

| District | Total | Male | Female |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bombali | 9.8 | 9.6 | 10.5 |
| Kambia | 4.1 | 4.6 | 2.8 |
| Koinadugu | 5.2 | 4.7 | 6.2 |
| Port Loko | 8.2 | 9.0 | 6.5 |
| Tonkolili | 7.5 | 8.1 | 6.4 |
| Bo | 9.4 | 8.6 | 11.3 |
| Bonthe | 3.3 | 2.9 | 4.1 |
| Moyamba | 5.8 | 5.4 | 6.7 |
| Pujehun | 5.8 | 4.9 | 7.9 |
| Western Area Rural | 5.5 | 6.1 | 4.0 |
| Western Area Urban | 11.8 | 13.4 | 8.2 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 15.4.4 Tobacco and alcohol intake by selected socio-economic characteristics and sex

Looking at persons aged 10 years and over who were consuming tobacco and alcohol by highest educational level attained showed that 65.3 per cent of consumers had no formal education (Table 15.22). Taking into consideration gender, 58.6 per cent of males had no education compared with 80.5 per cent of females. Very few consumers had attained up to tertiary education - 0.8 and 0.3 per cent for males and females respectively.

| Highest educational level attained | Total | Male | Female |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | 762,400 | 528,411 | 233,989 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| No education | 65.3 | 58.6 | 80.5 |
| Kindergarten | 1.3 | 1.5 | 0.9 |
| Primary | 9.1 | 10.0 | 7.2 |
| JSS | 8.8 | 10.6 | 4.8 |
| SSS | 8.6 | 10.9 | 3.6 |
| Vocational/Technical/Nursing/Teacher | 2.9 | 3.5 | 1.6 |
| Higher (First degree) | 1.7 | 2.1 | 0.8 |
| Tertiary (Post-graduate) \& PHD | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.3 |
| Koranic | 1.4 | 1.9 | 0.1 |
| Other | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Don't know | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |

Table 15.23 presents the distribution of the population aged 10 years and over by tobacco and alcohol intake and employment status. Tobacco consumption was most comon amongst the following categories of the population; self-employed without employees ( 14.8 per cent), selfemployed with employees ( 13.6 per cent), paid apprentice ( 12.8 per cent), unpaid family workers ( 12.6 per cent), persons who worked before and now looking for work ( 12.5 per cent), and retired/ pensioners ( 12.3 per cent). It is worth noting that a higher proportion of pensioners drank alcohol compared to the other groups.


Table 15.23 Distribution of the population aged 10 years and over by status of tobacco and alcohol intake and employment status

| Employment Status | Overall | Tobacco only | Alcohol only | Both tobacco and alcohol | None | Don't know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 100.0 | 9.1 | 3.5 | 2.6 | 83.4 | 1.4 |
| Paid employee | 100.0 | 9.3 | 9.7 | 6.3 | 73.6 | 1.1 |
| Self employed without employees | 100.0 | 14.8 | 4.3 | 3.7 | 76.0 | 1.1 |
| Self employed with employees | 100.0 | 13.6 | 5.9 | 5.1 | 73.9 | 1.5 |
| Unpaid family worker | 100.0 | 12.6 | 4.0 | 3.1 | 79.0 | 1.4 |
| Paid apprentice | 100.0 | 12.8 | 4.9 | 6.7 | 73.6 | 1.9 |
| Unpaid apprentice | 100.0 | 10.5 | 3.2 | 3.6 | 80.8 | 1.9 |
| Worked before but now looking for work | 100.0 | 12.5 | 7.4 | 7.5 | 71.4 | 1.1 |
| Looking for work first time | 100.0 | 7.6 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 82.9 | 1.5 |
| Household work | 100.0 | 6.6 | 2.6 | 1.3 | 88.2 | 1.3 |
| Not working | 100.0 | 9.1 | 3.0 | 2.6 | 83.7 | 1.6 |
| Full-time student | 100.0 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 96.3 | 1.9 |
| Retired pensioner | 100.0 | 12.3 | 10.9 | 4.3 | 71.5 | 1.0 |
| Others | 100.0 | 9.3 | 3.9 | 3.7 | 81.3 | 1.8 |
| Don't know | 100.0 | 6.9 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 82.3 | 6.2 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Two groups were most likely to use tobacco and alcohol: those who had worked before but were looking for work at the time of the enumeration, and those who were retired or pensioners (Figure 15.10). The high percentage for those two categories could be due to redundancy and frustration, and having a lot of time to associate with alcohol consumers and tobacco smokers. The full-time students presented the lowest proportion ( 1.8 per cent).

Figure 15.10 Tobacco and alcohol in-takers by employment status (per cent)


Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015
Population and Housing Census

The analysis of data on tobacco and alcohol intake by employment status reveals that the selfemployed without employees are the major consumers, constituting over three fifths of the total, and the same is true when broken down by sex. Paid apprentices were the smallest proportion of tobacco and alcohol consumers.

Table 15.24 Distribution of the persons aged 10 years and over who are using tobacco and alcohol by employment status and sex

| Employment status | Total | Male | Female |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | 762,400 | 528,411 | 233,989 |
| Per cent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Paid employee | 9.1 | 11.6 | 3.6 |
| Self-employed without employees | 63.9 | 64.8 | 62.1 |
| Self-employed with employees (employer) | 3.9 | 4.2 | 3.4 |
| Unpaid family worker | 3.8 | 3.3 | 4.9 |
| Paid apprentice | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.2 |
| Unpaid apprentice | 0.9 | 1.0 | 0.7 |
| Worked before but currently looking for work | 0.8 | 1.0 | 0.3 |
| Looking for work for the first time | 2.0 | 2.4 | 1.1 |

Table 15.24 Distribution of the persons aged 10 years and over who are using tobacco and alcohol by employment status and sex (continued)

| Employment status | Total | Male | Female |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Household work | 4.7 | 1.7 | 11.6 |
| Not working and not looking for work | 4.2 | 3.4 | 6.1 |
| Full-time student | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.2 |
| Retired/pensioner | 0.9 | 0.8 | 1.1 |
| Other (specify) | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.5 |
| Don't know | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 15.5 Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

### 15.5.1 Summary

The 2015 Census questionnaire was the first census to include questions assessing the accessibility and usage of the Internet in Sierra Leone. A question was also included to provide evidence on the consumption of alcohol and tobacco by those aged 10 years and over.

Overall, more than eight out of ten people had no Internet access. Disaggregating the population by sex showed that a higher proportion of males than females were using the Internet and that 60.4 per cent of Internet users were male and 39.6 per cent were female. Nearly a quarter of the population in urban areas had access to Internet facilities whereas only 5.5 per cent had access in rural areas.

The Western Region had more people ( 25.8 per cent) accessing the Internet, while the lowest percentages were registered in the Northern and Southern regions. At the district level, Western Urban (29.2 per cent) presented the highest proportion Internet users, followed by Western Rural (17.4 per cent), Kenema (14.8 per cent), and Bombali (11.7 per cent). Koinadugu (4.7 per cent) exhibited the lowest percentage.

People who had attained up to Senior Secondary School (SSS) level were the most likely to use the Internet ( 36 per cent). Among males, 38 per cent with SSS level were accessing the Internet. The corresponding figure for females was 32.9 per cent. About one in eight of the persons accessing the Internet had never been to school, forming 13.3 per cent of the total. The proportion of females ( 16.4 per cent) with no education accessing the Internet was higher than that for males (11.3 per cent).

The majority of the population ( 82.3 per cent) accessing the Internet facility were full-time students ( 39.9 per cent), self-employed without employees ( 23.7 per cent), and paid employees ( 18.7 per cent). A similar pattern is registered when the comparison is carried out by sex. The five employment status categories with the smallest proportion of those accessing the Internet comprise unpaid family workers, paid apprenticeship, unpaid apprenticeship, worked before but currently looking for work, and retired people or pensioners (3.7 per cent).

Most of the respondents who reported having used the Internet in the past one week preceding the census enumeration had used it at home. At the regional level, the results show that Western Region ( 75.9 per cent) revealed the highest proportion of Internet facility users who had used it at home. In comparison, the Southern Region presented the lowest percentage. Close to half of the total Internet facility users lived in the Western Region.

Western Area Urban district showed the highest proportion of Internet users, irrespective of gender. Four in every 10 persons who had used the Internet facility one week preceding the census enumeration were in Western Urban. In contrast, Bonthe district revealed the lowest proportion of users.

The majority of tobacco and alcohol consumers were aged 35 to 39 years, constituting 14.3 per cent of the total, regardless of sex. In contrast, the smallest proportion of the consumers were aged 10 to 14 years.

At the regional level, the highest proportion of the population using tobacco only were in the Southern Region (13 per cent) followed by Eastern Region (10.3 per cent). The Western Region presented the lowest percentage for tobacco consumers of 4.5 per cent. The percentage of alcohol only users varied from 2.5 per cent in the Eastern Region to 4.3 per cent in the Northern Region.

Pujehun district had the largest proportion (16.4 per cent) and Western Urban the lowest percentage ( 3.8 per cent) of tobacco only users. The percentage of alcohol users varied from 0.9 per cent in Pujehun to 7.6 per cent in Bombali. Moyamba district with 4.3 per cent presented the highest percentage of the population consuming both tobacco and alcohol, while Pujehun district presented the lowest proportion (1.2 per cent).

The findings revealed that the majority of the consumers ( 65.3 per cent) had no formal education. Tobacco was most consumed by the: self-employed without employees (14.8 per cent), self-employed with employees ( 13.6 per cent), paid apprentice (12.8 per cent), unpaid family workers ( 12.6 per cent), persons who worked before and now looking for work (12.5
per cent), and retired/ pensioners (12.3 per cent).

### 15.5.2 Conclusion

The ICT sector is essential in the modern world. Many people use the World Wide Web (www)to access information, transact business and make critical decisions. With the www, it is easy to access news, weather forecast reports, to plan and access opportunities for development.

Sierra Leone has embraced ICT transformations, as reflected in the policies and campaigns aimed at ensuring that no one is left behind. The country depended entirely on satellites for international connections until February 2013 when it was connected to the submarine cable. This considerably improved bandwidth capabilities and resulted in a drop in the price of broadband.

The 2015 Census results have revealed that the majority of Internet users were urban residents constituting over three quarters of persons aged 10 years and over. This is an indication that urban residents have better access to the Internet than their rural counterparts. The findings reflect the way investment in telecommunications is carried out. Preference is mainly given to urban areas where there is a concentration of potential clients able to pay for services. The Internet services should be extended to rural areas to enable residents to access information for better standards of living.

Sierra Leone is a party to the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco (FCTC), which aims to help countries tackle tobacco's negative impact on development. However, there is no law to control the consumption of tobacco and alcohol. The lack of a law means that more people will start or continue to drink alcohol and smoke tobacco. Alcohol and tobacco use is a risk factor for many diseases, especially those affecting the heart, liver, and lungs, as well as many cancers. Alcohol and tobacco are widely used in Sierra Leonean society, as in many Sub Saharan Africa countries.

### 15.5.3 Recommendations

There is a need for Government to support the Internet service providers to expand facilities to reach the majority of the population, especially in rural areas. The support could be in the form of tax reduction and other incentives, to enable the service providers to deliver affordable packages to their customers.

Service providers should sensitize the masses on the importance of the WWW. ICT training in schools should be enhanced to encourage children and young people to use the Internet. Adult training should also be provided.

With regard to tobacco and alcohol, there is clearly a need to put in place controls to try and reduce consumption. Currently there is no legal minimum age for drinking alcohol or smoking tobacco and legislation is needed to enforce one.

There is also a need to increase taxes and prices of alcohol and tobacco and there should be a ban on advertising products and tobacco smoking in public places. Such measures have been proven in many countries to lead to a reduction in drinking and smoking.

The Government, in collaboration with development partners and civil society, should launch nationwide campaigns to sensitize the masses on the dangers of tobacco and alcohol consumption.

## REFERENCES

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (2011) Issues in the Global Tobacco Economy

Hafner, Katie (1998) Where Wizards Stay Up Late: The Origins of the Internet.
Miniwatts Marketing Group (2012) World Stats. Internet World Stats.
Segal Ben (1995) A Short History of Internet Protocols at CERN.
World Health Organization Report (2008) Global tobacco epidemic.
World Health Organization Report (2011) Global status report on alcohol and health.

## APPENDIX



Table A15.1 Distribution of the population aged 10 years and over by chiefdom and access to Internet facility

| Region/District/ Chiefdom | Access to Internet facility |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Access Internet | Do not access Internet | Don't Know |
| SierraLeone | 5,030,016 | 651,826 | 4,359,515 | 18,675 |
| EASTERN | 1,167,420 | 118,570 | 1,045,229 | 3,621 |
| KAILAHUN | 373,668 | 31,961 | 340,489 | 1,218 |
| Dea | 8,784 | 811 | 7,788 | 185 |
| Jawie | 35,661 | 3,157 | 32,454 | 50 |
| Kissi Kama | 14,538 | 1,689 | 12,840 | 9 |
| Kissi Teng | 35,066 | 5,074 | 29,941 | 51 |
| Kissi Tongi | 34,268 | 3,209 | 31,016 | 43 |
| Kpeje Bongre | 19,454 | 675 | 18,590 | 189 |
| Kpeje West | 20,182 | 1,285 | 18,872 | 25 |
| Luawa | 56,385 | 7,416 | 48,793 | 176 |
| Malema | 26,772 | 1,145 | 25,320 | 307 |
| Mandu | 21,422 | 1,469 | 19,933 | 20 |
| Njaluahun | 41,655 | 3,243 | 38,347 | 65 |
| KENEMA | 18,458 | 582 | 17,825 | 51 |
| Dama | 18,606 | 1,558 | 17,024 | 24 |
| Dodo | 22,417 | 648 | 21,746 | 23 |
| Gaura | 435,624 | 64,566 | 370,056 | 1,002 |
| Gorama Mende | 21,011 | 354 | 20,634 | 23 |
| Kandu Lekpeama | 16,232 | 1,558 | 14,658 | 16 |
| Koya | 12,179 | 575 | 11,575 | 29 |
| Langrama | 28,875 | 834 | 27,976 | 65 |
| Lower Bambara | 12,589 | 104 | 12,473 | 12 |
| Malegohun | 9,015 | 287 | 8,717 | 11 |
| Niawa | 2,238 | 216 | 2,018 | 4 |
| Nomo | 53,881 | 6,185 | 47,562 | 134 |
| Nongowa | 15,228 | 708 | 14,512 | 8 |
| Simbaru | 5,287 | 157 | 5,106 | 24 |

Table A15.1 Distribution of the population aged 10 years and over by chiefdom and access to Internet facility (continued)

| Region/ <br> District/ <br> Chiefdom | Access to Internet facility |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Access <br> Internet | Do not access Internet | Don't Know |
| Small Bo | 20,136 | 772 | 19,296 | 68 |
| Tunkia | 24,662 | 1,693 | 22,910 | 59 |
| Wandor | 14,166 | 2,466 | 11,633 | 67 |
| Kenema City | 152,528 | 45,616 | 106,486 | 426 |
| KONO | 358,128 | 22,043 | 334,684 | 1,401 |
| Fiama | 10,523 | 227 | 10,292 | 4 |
| Gbane | 17,272 | 392 | 16,798 | 82 |
| Gbane Kandor | 7,565 | 317 | 7,244 | 4 |
| Gbense | 10,874 | 540 | 10,291 | 43 |
| Gorama Kono | 13,797 | 565 | 13,220 | 12 |
| Kamara | 14,286 | 778 | 13,405 | 103 |
| Lei | 18,084 | 509 | 17,550 | 25 |
| Mafindor | 9,236 | 118 | 9,113 | 5 |
| Nimikoro | 43,866 | 3,581 | 40,210 | 75 |
| Nimiyama | 19,415 | 673 | 18,396 | 346 |
| Sandor | 61,529 | 2,215 | 58,991 | 323 |
| Soa | 28,236 | 353 | 27,849 | 34 |
| Tankoro | 5,989 | 107 | 5,860 | 22 |
| Toli | 3,694 | 25 | 3,597 | 72 |
| Koidu/New | 93,762 | 11,643 | 81,868 | 251 |
| NORTHERN | 1,709,916 | 149,291 | 1,554,251 | 6,374 |
| BOMBALI | 423,778 | 49,397 | 373,631 | 750 |
| Biriwa | 30,438 | 2,036 | 28,355 | 47 |
| Bombali Sebora | 24,822 | 2,425 | 22,354 | 43 |
| Gbanti-Kamaranka | 18,458 | 1,051 | 17,385 | 22 |
| Gbendembu Ngowahun | 27,405 | 798 | 26,564 | 43 |
| Libeisaygahun | 10,955 | 651 | 10,293 | 11 |
| Magbaimba Ndorhahun | 8,538 | 385 | 8,146 | 7 |
| Makari Gbanti | 57,092 | 8,265 | 48,704 | 123 |
| Paki Masabong | 13,382 | 398 | 12,954 | 30 |
| Safroko Limba | 22,053 | 1,305 | 20,704 | 44 |

Table A15.1 Distribution of the population aged 10 years and over by chiefdom and access to Internet facility (continued)

| Region/ <br> District/ <br> Chiefdom |  | Access to Internet facility |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Access Internet | Do not access Internet | Don't Know |
| Sanda Loko | 29,827 | 414 | 29,387 | 26 |
| Sanda Tendaren | 18,527 | 1,803 | 16,713 | 11 |
| Sella Limba | 40,927 | 9,110 | 31,768 | 49 |
| Tambakka | 26,143 | 489 | 25,620 | 34 |
| Makeni City | 95,211 | 20,267 | 74,684 | 260 |
| KAMBIA | 229,379 | 15,087 | 214,000 | 292 |
| Bramaia | 23,919 | 1,516 | 22,381 | 22 |
| Gbinle-Dixing | 14,954 | 486 | 14,457 | 11 |
| Magbema | 64,179 | 7,310 | 56,738 | 131 |
| Mambolo | 25,175 | 1,054 | 24,086 | 35 |
| Masungbala | 19,437 | 528 | 18,890 | 19 |
| Samu | 43,149 | 2,841 | 40,267 | 41 |
| Tonko Limba | 38,566 | 1,352 | 37,181 | 33 |
| KOINADUGU | 281,559 | 13,209 | 266,875 | 1,475 |
| Dembelia Sinkunia | 14,462 | 1,466 | 12,908 | 88 |
| Diang | 20,993 | 770 | 20,179 | 44 |
| Follosaba Dembelia | 14,984 | 883 | 14,048 | 53 |
| Kasunko | 17,253 | 497 | 16,722 | 34 |
| Mongo | 32,978 | 132 | 32,809 | 37 |
| Neya | 29,122 | 132 | 28,957 | 33 |
| Nieni | 52,918 | 1,193 | 50,690 | 1,035 |
| Sengbe | 26,007 | 3,350 | 22,618 | 39 |
| Sulima | 23,616 | 114 | 23,475 | 27 |
| Wara Wara Bafodia | 23,559 | 178 | 23,358 | 23 |
| Wara Wara Yagala | 25,667 | 4,494 | 21,111 | 62 |
| PORT LOKO | 419,890 | 48,126 | 370,376 | 1,388 |
| BKM | 26,649 | 2,045 | 24,563 | 41 |
| Buya Romende | 22,340 | 1,229 | 21,073 | 38 |
| Dibia | 10,277 | 423 | 9,842 | 12 |
| Kaffu Bullom | 87,121 | 16,542 | 70,389 | 190 |
| Koya | 58,070 | 3,191 | 54,798 | 81 |

Table A15.1 Distribution of the population aged 10 years and over by chiefdom and access to Internet facility (continued)

| Region/ <br> District/ |  | Access to Internet facility |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Access Internet | Do not access Internet | Don't Know |
| Lokomasama | 52,938 | 5,554 | 47,307 | 77 |
| Maforki | 59,420 | 10,550 | 48,772 | 98 |
| Marampa | 41,451 | 6,537 | 34,763 | 151 |
| Masimera | 25,980 | 811 | 25,146 | 23 |
| Sanda Magbolontor | 15,718 | 675 | 15,028 | 15 |
| TMS | 19,926 | 569 | 18,695 | 662 |
| TONKOLILI | 355,310 | 23,472 | 329,369 | 2,469 |
| Gbonkolenken | 41,292 | 3,145 | 38,071 | 76 |
| Kafe Simira | 26,199 | 957 | 24,335 | 907 |
| Kalansogoia | 26,689 | 2,993 | 23,572 | 124 |
| Kholifa Mabang | 11,481 | 1,309 | 10,144 | 28 |
| Kolifa Rowalla | 45,819 | 4,537 | 41,187 | 95 |
| Kunike Barina | 17,600 | 1,835 | 15,706 | 59 |
| Kunike Sanda | 47,646 | 2,120 | 44,675 | 851 |
| Malal Mara | 18,438 | 1,052 | 17,348 | 38 |
| Sambaya | 22,153 | 634 | 21,491 | 28 |
| Tane | 21,951 | 1,071 | 20,840 | 40 |
| Yoni | 76,042 | 3,819 | 72,000 | 223 |
| SOUTHERN | 1,001,795 | 87,233 | 909,724 | 4,838 |
| BO | 406,442 | 46,179 | 357,437 | 2,826 |
| Badjia | 5,252 | 80 | 5,136 | 36 |
| Bagbo | 17,494 | 267 | 17,177 | 50 |
| Bagbwe | 14,378 | 610 | 13,735 | 33 |
| Baoma | 31,029 | 1,101 | 29,880 | 48 |
| Bumpe Ngawo | 30,090 | 1,755 | 28,259 | 76 |
| Gbo | 3,698 | 381 | 3,308 | 9 |
| Jaiama-Bongor | 20,562 | 780 | 18,176 | 1,606 |
| Kakua | 36,283 | 3,777 | 32,384 | 122 |
| Komboya | 10,362 | 641 | 9,714 | 7 |
| Lugbu | 17,232 | 815 | 16,310 | 107 |
| Niawa Lenga | 9,220 | 292 | 8,921 | 7 |



Table A15.1 Distribution of the population aged 10 years and over by chiefdom and access to Internet facility (continued)

| Region/ <br> District/ |  | Acces | net facility |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Access Internet | Do not access Internet | Don't Know |
| Timdale | 6,832 | 105 | 6,713 | 14 |
| Upper Banta | 7,128 | 220 | 6,905 | 3 |
| PUJEHUN | 240,852 | 18,425 | 221,723 | 704 |
| Barri | 25,929 | 3,325 | 22,579 | 25 |
| Gallinas Peri | 37,831 | 1,300 | 36,479 | 52 |
| Kpaka | 11,174 | 697 | 10,448 | 29 |
| Kpanga-Kabonde | 34,351 | 2,747 | 31,415 | 189 |
| Makpele | 21,038 | 3,147 | 17,763 | 128 |
| Malen | 36,425 | 3,818 | 32,499 | 108 |
| Mano Sakrim | 8,613 | 334 | 8,226 | 53 |
| Panga Krim | 5,980 | 373 | 5,594 | 13 |
| Pejeh | 9,231 | 213 | 9,003 | 15 |
| Soro Gbema | 28,658 | 1,582 | 27,013 | 63 |
| Sowa | 12,319 | 204 | 12,093 | 22 |
| YKK | 9,303 | 685 | 8,611 | 7 |
| WESTERN | 1,150,885 | 296,732 | 850,311 | 3,842 |
| WESTERN AREA RURAL | 328,748 | 57,038 | 270,229 | 1,481 |
| Koya | 50,383 | 4,696 | 45,578 | 109 |
| Mountain | 23,208 | 6,372 | 16,785 | 51 |
| Waterloo | 157,986 | 27,126 | 130,103 | 757 |
| York Rural | 97,171 | 18,844 | 77,763 | 564 |
| WESTERN AREA URBAN | 822,137 | 239,694 | 580,082 | 2,361 |
| Central 1 | 49,335 | 16,071 | 33,122 | 142 |
| Central 2 | 15,895 | 5,585 | 10,269 | 41 |
| East 1 | 48,117 | 12,898 | 35,061 | 158 |
| East 2 | 69,857 | 18,907 | 50,774 | 176 |
| East 3 | 344,664 | 86,161 | 257,381 | 1,122 |
| West 1 | 42,711 | 14,520 | 28,084 | 107 |
| West 2 | 102,538 | 32,449 | 69,830 | 259 |
| West 3 | 149,020 | 53,103 | 95,561 | 356 |

Table A15.2 Distribution of the population aged 10 years and over
by chiefdom and status of access to Internet facility in the past one week

| Region/ <br> District/ <br> Chiefdom |  |  | Internet usage in the past one week |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Table A15.2 Distribution of the population aged 10 years and over by chiefdom and status of access to Internet facility in the past one week (continued)
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Table A15.2 Distribution of the population aged 10 years and over by chiefdom and status of access to Internet facility in the past one week (continued)


Table A15.2 Distribution of the population aged 10 years and over by chiefdom and status of access to Internet facility in the past one week (continued)

| Region/ <br> District/ <br> Chiefdom |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Table A15.2 Distribution of the population aged 10 years and over by chiefdom and status of access to Internet facility in the past one week (continued)

| Region/ <br> District/ <br> Chiefdom |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Table A15.2 Distribution of the population aged 10 years and over by chiefdom and status of access to Internet facility in the past one week (continued)


Table A15.2 Distribution of the population aged 10 years and over by chiefdom and status of access to Internet facility in the past one week (continued)

| Region/ <br> District/ <br> Chiefdom |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Table A15.3 Distribution of the population aged 10 years and over by chiefdom and status of tobacco and alcohol intake facility in the past one week

| Region/ <br> District/ <br> Chiefdom | Tobacco and/or alcohol intake |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Tobacco only | Alcohol only | Both Tobacco and Alcohol | None | Don't Know |
| SierraLeone | 5,030,016 | 456,815 | 174,414 | 131,171 | 4,195,022 | 72,594 |
| EASTERN | 1,167,420 | 120,386 | 28,742 | 29,964 | 969,794 | 18,534 |
| KAILAHUN | 373,668 | 38,935 | 9,889 | 9,372 | 311,055 | 4,417 |
| Dea | 8,784 | 1,340 | 82 | 104 | 7,197 | 61 |
| Jawie | 35,661 | 5,263 | 354 | 649 | 28,884 | 511 |
| Kissi Kama | 14,538 | 391 | 1,155 | 502 | 12,340 | 150 |
| Kissi Teng | 35,066 | 935 | 2,166 | 1,168 | 30,550 | 247 |
| Kissi Tongi | 34,268 | 1,790 | 1,621 | 1,315 | 29,259 | 283 |
| Kpeje Bongre | 19,454 | 1,879 | 331 | 458 | 16,670 | 116 |
| Kpeje West | 20,182 | 2,045 | 374 | 409 | 17,133 | 221 |
| Luawa | 56,385 | 5,969 | 921 | 1,235 | 47,207 | 1,053 |
| Malema | 26,772 | 4,151 | 614 | 491 | 21,282 | 234 |
| Mandu | 21,422 | 2,924 | 215 | 268 | 17,793 | 222 |
| Njaluahun | 41,655 | 5,420 | 830 | 1,278 | 33,456 | 671 |
| Penguia | 18,458 | 1,564 | 382 | 594 | 15,746 | 172 |
| Upper Bambara | 18,606 | 2,158 | 308 | 351 | 15,558 | 231 |
| Yawei | 22,417 | 3,106 | 536 | 550 | 17,980 | 245 |
| KENEMA | 435,624 | 61,663 | 7,296 | 9,181 | 349,246 | 8,238 |
| Dama | 21,011 | 5,448 | 181 | 268 | 14,347 | 767 |
| Dodo | 16,232 | 3,678 | 208 | 287 | 11,935 | 124 |
| Gaura | 12,179 | 3,775 | 110 | 123 | 7,917 | 254 |
| Gorama Mende | 28,875 | 4,103 | 551 | 816 | 23,140 | 265 |
| Kandu <br> Lekpeama | 12,589 | 2,312 | 261 | 399 | 9,476 | 141 |
| Koya | 9,015 | 2,125 | 96 | 169 | 6,531 | 94 |
| Langrama | 2,238 | 338 | 32 | 46 | 1,765 | 57 |
| Lower <br> Bambara | 53,881 | 9,868 | 1,031 | 1,852 | 40,366 | 764 |

Table A15.3 Distribution of the population aged 10 years and over by chiefdom and status of tobacco and alcohol intake facility in the past one week (continued)

| Region/ <br> District/ <br> Chiefdom |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Table A15.3 Distribution of the population aged 10 years and over by chiefdom and status of tobacco and alcohol intake facility in the past one week (continued)


Table A15.3 Distribution of the population aged 10 years and over by chiefdom and status of tobacco and alcohol intake facility in the past one week (continued)

| Region/ <br> District/ <br> Chiefdom | Tobacco and/or alcohol intake |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Tobacco only | Alcohol only | Both Tobacco and Alcohol | None | Don't Know |
| Neya | 29,122 | 1,943 | 223 | 302 | 26,354 | 300 |
| Nieni | 52,918 | 3,653 | 1,134 | 1,025 | 46,534 | 572 |
| Sengbe | 26,007 | 1,197 | 234 | 294 | 23,994 | 288 |
| Sulima | 23,616 | 1,544 | 254 | 186 | 21,341 | 291 |
| Wara Wara Bafodia | 23,559 | 606 | 6,573 | 1,028 | 15,073 | 279 |
| Wara Wara Yagala | 25,667 | 818 | 3,020 | 709 | 20,852 | 268 |
| PORT LOKO | 419,890 | 49,753 | 6,079 | 7,054 | 351,385 | 5,619 |
| BKM | 26,649 | 2,966 | 222 | 409 | 22,775 | 277 |
| Buya Romende | 22,340 | 3,485 | 182 | 359 | 18,134 | 180 |
| Dibia | 10,277 | 1,394 | 57 | 119 | 8,529 | 178 |
| Kaffu Bullom | 87,121 | 5,333 | 1,767 | 1,618 | 77,374 | 1,029 |
| Koya | 58,070 | 8,760 | 1,131 | 1,060 | 46,310 | 809 |
| Lokomasama | 52,938 | 7,628 | 489 | 708 | 43,213 | 900 |
| Maforki | 59,420 | 6,995 | 771 | 1,022 | 49,904 | 728 |
| Marampa | 41,451 | 4,008 | 816 | 946 | 35,108 | 573 |
| Masimera | 25,980 | 4,650 | 103 | 266 | 20,745 | 216 |
| Sanda <br> Magbolontor | 15,718 | 1,589 | 408 | 428 | 13,158 | 135 |
| TMS | 19,926 | 2,945 | 133 | 119 | 16,135 | 594 |
| TONKOLILI | 355,310 | 36,281 | 13,985 | 7,226 | 292,376 | 5,442 |
| Gbonkolenken | 41,292 | 4,047 | 506 | 836 | 35,356 | 547 |
| Kafe Simira | 26,199 | 2,793 | 4,553 | 1,329 | 17,141 | 383 |
| Kalansogoia | 26,689 | 1,139 | 6,020 | 1,276 | 17,937 | 317 |
| Kholifa Mabang | 11,481 | 1,560 | 112 | 115 | 9,419 | 275 |
| Kolifa Rowalla | 45,819 | 3,816 | 819 | 929 | 39,645 | 610 |
| Kunike <br> Barina | 17,600 | 3,230 | 229 | 331 | 13,369 | 441 |
| Kunike Sanda | 47,646 | 4,901 | 424 | 558 | 41,395 | 368 |

Table A15.3 Distribution of the population aged 10 years and over by chiefdom and status of tobacco and alcohol intake facility in the past one week (continued)


Table A15.3 Distribution of the population aged 10 years and over by chiefdom and status of tobacco and alcohol intake facility in the past one week (continued)

| Region/ <br> District/ <br> Chiefdom |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Table A15.3 Distribution of the population aged 10 years and over by chiefdom and status of tobacco and alcohol intake facility in the past one week (continued)

| Region/ <br> District/ <br> Chiefdom |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## CHAPTER 16: EBOLA SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACTS

### 16.1 Introduction

The first Ebola outbreak in West Africa was reported in December 2013 in Guéckédou, a forest area of Guinea near the border with Liberia and Sierra Leone. By March 2014, Liberia had reported eight suspected cases and the first case was officially confirmed on 25 May 2014. The outbreak lasted for 18 months until 7 November 2015 when Sierra Leone was declared Ebola free.

Ebola is a viral haemorrhagic fever which affects humans and other primates. Signs and symptoms typically start between two days and three weeks after contracting the virus with a fever, sore throat, muscular pain and headaches. Then, vomiting, diaorrhea and rash usually follow, along with decreased function of the liver and kidneys. At this time, some people begin to bleed both internally and externally.

The disease has a high risk of death, killing between 25 and 90 per cent of those infected, with an average of about 50 per cent. This is often due to low blood pressure from fluid loss, and typically happens six to 16 days after symptoms appear. The virus spreads by direct contact with body fluids, such as blood, of infected human or other animals.

According to Wikipedia ${ }^{3}$, the disease was first identified in 1976 in two simultaneous outbreaks, one in Nzara, and the other in Yambuku, a village near the Ebola River from which the disease takes its name. Outbreaks occur intermittently in tropical regions of sub-Saharan Africa. Between 1976 and 2013, the World Health Organization reported a total of 24 outbreaks involving 1,716 cases. The largest outbreak to date was the epidemic in West Africa, which occurred from December 2013 to January 2016 with 28,616 cases and 11,310 deaths.

### 16.2 Data sources

The 2015 Census questionnaire collected information from every household member who had been confirmed positive of contracting Ebola
and their sex, age and status. Information was also collected on children below 18 years who had been orphaned. In addition, information on a person's main occupation before the Ebola outbreak, main current occupation, the Ebola impact on the person's revenue, health seeking behaviour and pregnancy status of women aged 10 to 54 years was collected.

### 16.3 Incidence of Ebola

### 16.3.1 Demographic characteristics of persons infected with Ebola

The 2015 Census showed that a total of 13,575 people contracted Ebola. The disease affected males and females almost equally ( 6,827 or 50.3 per cent males to 6,748 or 49.7 per cent females). Respondents were asked to indicate the number of persons infected by Ebola in their households. For most of the households (31.9 per cent) only one person had been infected, followed by those who reported to have had five people infected ( 28.3 per cent), as seen in Figure 16.1. Given that Ebola is a highly contagious disease, it is likely to spread faster in household with many members.

Figure 16.1 Percentage of people infected with Ebola by household size


Table 16.1 presents the distribution of the population affected by Ebola by selected characteristics and number of household members infected. For households that reported that one person was infected, more males than females were recorded. However, where there were two or more persons infected, more females were recorded. This could be attributed to the fact that more women than men cared for the sick household members and were therefore at higher risk of being infected. The analysis by age of the infected persons revealed that irrespective of the numbers infected in the households, the majority of the victims were young (aged 15 to 35 years), followed by persons aged 36 to 60 years.

Table 16.1 Distribution of the population infected with Ebola by sex and age group

| Sex and age | Total | Number of household members confirmed Ebola positive |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | $5+$ |  |
| Number | 13,575 | 4,332 | 2,314 | 1,785 | 1,308 | 3,836 |  |
| Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |
| Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 50.3 | 54.2 | 48.7 | 49.4 | 46.7 | 48.5 |  |
| Female | 49.7 | 45.8 | 51.3 | 50.6 | 53.3 | 51.5 |  |
| Age group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $0-14$ | 21.4 | 14.5 | 19.2 | 22.2 | 26.3 | 28.7 |  |
| $15-35$ | 42.4 | 42.9 | 44.4 | 42.2 | 40.9 | 41.2 |  |
| $36-60$ | 27.5 | 33.4 | 28.7 | 26.6 | 23.9 | 21.6 |  |
| $60+$ | 8.7 | 9.3 | 7.7 | 9.0 | 8.9 | 8.5 |  |

[^20]
### 16.3.2 Socio-economic characteristics of persons infected with Ebola

A distribution of the number of household members infected with Ebola by place of residence and region shows that for most of the households, only one member got infected in every three out of five cases (Table 16.2). There were no major differences between rural and urban areas.

At the regional level, the proportion of households where only one member was infected by the virus varied from 58.2 per cent in the Northern Region to 69 per cent in the Southern Region.

The Northern Region reported the highest percentage ( 9.6 per cent) where five or more persons in a household were infected with Ebola. On the other hand, the Eastern Region presented the smallest proportion ( 4.6 per cent) where five or more members of the household were infected.


Table 16.2 Distribution of the number of household members infected with Ebola by place of residence and region

| Place of <br> residence/ <br> region | Number | Percent |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 16.3.3 Status of infected persons by age, sex, place of residence and region

Overall, 81.1 per cent of those infected with Ebola did not survive (Table 16.3). Among the males who contracted the virus, 82.1 per cent died compared to 80.2 per cent for females. The results showed that slightly more males ( 50.9 per cent) died of Ebola than females.
$\left.\begin{array}{lcccc}\hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Selected } \\ \text { characteristics }\end{array} & \text { Total } & \text { Status of household members confirmed } \\ \text { with Ebola virus }\end{array}\right]$ Not Stated

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Analysis by age group showed that the youth (those between 15 to 35 years of age) registered the highest proportion of deaths ( 40.5 per cent) followed by persons between 36 to 60 years ( 29.1 per cent) as shown in Figure 16.2. However, the survival chances were lower for persons aged over 60 years as 90.4 per cent of those that were affected by the virus, died (Table 16.3).

Figure 16.2 Distribution of persons who died from Ebola by age group category (per cent)


Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015
Population and Housing Census

Distribution of the deaths from Ebola by place of residence showed that the rural areas registered more deaths ( 55.6 per cent) than the urban areas ( 44.4 per cent), with the Northern Region leading in deaths due to the virus by 49 per cent (Figures 16.3). It is however worth noting that for people that were infected, those from the Southern Region registered the lowest percentage ( 7.8 per cent).

Figure 16.3 Deaths from Ebola by locality (per cent)


Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015
Population and Housing Census

Table 16.4 shows the distribution of the population infected with Ebola by district and status of patient. From the table, it is evident that the disease spread to all districts despite a number of control measures, including community engagement, being put in place. At the district level the number of Ebola patients ranged from 17 in Bonthe to 3,594 in Port Loko. The proportion of Ebola patients who died was highest in Kenema district ( 87.4 per cent) and lowest in Koinadugu ( 70.5 per cent). Koinadugu district registered the highest survival rate from Ebola ( 25 per cent) while Bonthe ( 5.9 per cent) indicated the lowest. The detailed information at chiefdom level is presented in Appendix Table A16.1.

Table 16.4 Distribution of the population infected with Ebola
by district and status

| District | Status of Ebola patient |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Per cent | Dead | Survived | Not stated |
| Total | 13,575 | 100.0 | 81.1 | 17.2 | 1.7 |
| Kailahun | 1,727 | 100.0 | 80.5 | 18.2 | 1.2 |
| Kenema | 802 | 100.0 | 87.4 | 11.5 | 1.1 |
| Kono | 454 | 100.0 | 84.4 | 13.9 | 1.8 |
| Bombali | 1,461 | 100.0 | 75.1 | 23.1 | 1.8 |
| Kambia | 416 | 100.0 | 80.5 | 17.5 | 1.9 |
| Koinadugu | 132 | 100.0 | 70.5 | 25.0 | 4.5 |
| Port Loko | 3,594 | 100.0 | 84.7 | 14.3 | 1.0 |
| Tonkolili | 963 | 100.0 | 85.4 | 12.0 | 2.6 |
| Bo | 477 | 100.0 | 79.9 | 17.8 | 2.3 |
| Bonthe | 17 | 100.0 | 76.5 | 5.9 | 17.6 |
| Moyamba | 388 | 100.0 | 76.0 | 22.2 | 1.8 |
| Pujehun | 208 | 100.0 | 82.7 | 15.9 | 1.4 |
| Western Area Rural | 1,502 | 100.0 | 78.4 | 20.1 | 1.5 |
| Western Area Urban | 1,434 | 100.0 | 77.4 | 19.5 | 3.1 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 16.4 Orphans

Overall, a total of 2,247 children were orphaned by Ebola. The majority ( 57.4 per cent) of the orphaned children lived in rural areas (Table 16.5). Many households were left with three or more orphans. At the regional level, the Northern Region was more affected with close to 45 per cent of the total orphans (Figure 16.4). The Southern Region had the lowest percentage share of the Ebola orphans.

## E- <br> Table 16.5 Distribution of children orphaned by Ebola by place of residence and region

| Place of <br> residence/region | Number | Percent | Number of household members confirmed <br> Ebola positive |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 2,247 | 100.0 | 35.2 | 21.5 | $3+$ |
| Rural | 1,290 | 100.0 | 35.3 | 20.7 | 43.3 |
| Urban | 957 | 100.0 | 35.1 | 22.6 | 42.3 |
| Region | 580 | 100.0 | 31.7 | 20.9 | 47.4 |
| Eastern | 1,009 | 100.0 | 36.0 | 22.0 | 42.0 |
| Northern | 279 | 100.0 | 40.1 | 19.0 | 40.9 |
| Southern | 379 | 100.0 | 35.1 | 23.0 | 42.0 |
| Western | 1,453 | 100.0 | 61.5 | 17.5 | 7.8 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Figure 16.4 Distribution of Ebola orphans (per cent)


### 16.5 Socio-Economic Impacts

### 16.5.1 Main occupation before and after Ebola

The proportion of the economically active persons who maintained the same occupation before and after the Ebola outbreak varied from 69.1 per cent for technicians and associate professionals to 98.6 per cent for agricultural and fisheries workers (Table 16.6). Agriculture and fisheries workers registered the least change of occupation compared to others. Further examination of the results show that those who were employed as technicians and associate professionals before Ebola but reported another field after Ebola had mainly become agriculture and fisheries workers, service workers or had moved into craft and its related trade.

Table 16.6 Distribution of the economically active persons
by main occupation before and after the Ebola outbreak

| Main occupation <br> before Ebola <br> outbreak |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Table 16.6 Distribution of the economically active persons by main occupation before and after the Ebola outbreak (continued)

| Main occupation <br> before Ebola <br> outbreak |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

Table 16.7 Distribution of population in working ages by impact of Ebola on personal income by place of residence and region

| Place of residence/ region | Number | Percent | Ebola impact on the person's revenue |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Increased substantially | Increased | No change | Decreased | Decreased substantially | Not stated |
| Number | 2,194,738 |  | 36,537 | 156,277 | 451,455 | 1,217,811 | 298,446 | 34,212 |
| Total |  | 100.0 | 1.7 | 7.1 | 20.6 | 55.5 | 13.6 | 1.6 |
| Rural | 1,430,784 | 100.0 | 1.4 | 5.8 | 17.2 | 58.8 | 15.2 | 1.5 |
| Urban | 763,954 | 100.0 | 2.2 | 9.6 | 26.8 | 49.2 | 10.5 | 1.7 |
| Eastern | 523,376 | 100.0 | 1.4 | 6.0 | 17.9 | 58.8 | 14.3 | 1.6 |
| Northern | 815,864 | 100.0 | 1.6 | 7.2 | 17.0 | 60.4 | 12.0 | 1.7 |
| Southern | 434,830 | 100.0 | 1.5 | 5.5 | 21.3 | 51.7 | 18.6 | 1.4 |
| Western | 420,668 | 100.0 | 2.3 | 10.0 | 30.0 | 45.7 | 10.6 | 1.4 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

The majority of the population of working age in all districts indicated that their income had decreased (Table 16.8). The proportion of the population in the working ages that indicated that their income decreased varied from, 42.7 per cent for Western Area Urban to 74.9 per cent in Koinadugu district. Western Area Urban showed the highest proportion ( 33.6 per cent) of the working population that indicated that their income increased, while Koinadugu district showed the lowest (8.1 per cent). In all districts there were people who reported that their incomes decreased substantially. The proportion varied from 9.2 per cent in Kambia district to 22.3 per cent in Pujehun district. The detailed information at chiefdom level is presented in Appendix Table A16.2.

## EO <br> Table 16.8 Distribution of population in working ages by impact of Ebola on a person's income by district

|  |  |  | Ebola impact on the person's revenue |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | Number | Percent | Increased substantially | Increased | No change | Decreased | Decreased substantially | Not stated |
| Total | 2,194,740 | 100.0 | 1.7 | 7.1 | 20.6 | 55.5 | 13.6 | 1.6 |
| Kailahun | 176,383 | 100.0 | 1.0 | 4.7 | 11.9 | 67.1 | 14.6 | 0.8 |
| Kenema | 190,930 | 100.0 | 2.2 | 8.9 | 26.5 | 50.6 | 10.1 | 1.7 |
| Kono | 156,063 | 100.0 | 0.8 | 4.0 | 14.2 | 59.7 | 19.1 | 2.3 |
| Bombali | 189,123 | 100.0 | 1.7 | 8.0 | 21.6 | 54.5 | 12.2 | 2.1 |
| Kambia | 125,444 | 100.0 | 1.9 | 8.6 | 15.5 | 63.5 | 9.2 | 1.4 |
| Koinadugu | 147,052 | 100.0 | 0.3 | 2.9 | 8.1 | 74.9 | 12.4 | 1.3 |

Table 16.8 Distribution of population in working ages by impact of Ebola on a person's income by district (continued)

|  |  |  | Ebola impact on the person's revenue |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | Number | Percent | Increased substantially | Increased | No change | Decreased | Decreased substantially | Not stated |
| Port Loko | 196,169 | 100.0 | 2.4 | 9.5 | 18.5 | 54.9 | 12.8 | 2.0 |
| Tonkolili | 158,076 | 100.0 | 1.7 | 6.4 | 19.2 | 58.4 | 12.8 | 1.4 |
| Bo | 162,429 | 100.0 | 1.2 | 5.8 | 20.1 | 54.4 | 16.9 | 1.5 |
| Bonthe | 65,944 | 100.0 | 0.7 | 3.8 | 21.6 | 51.4 | 21.1 | 1.3 |
| Moyamba | 112,944 | 100.0 | 2.0 | 6.2 | 26.0 | 47.5 | 16.5 | 1.8 |
| Pujehun | 93,513 | 100.0 | 1.8 | 5.2 | 17.6 | 52.2 | 22.3 | 0.9 |
| Western Area Rural | 132,433 | 100.0 | 2.0 | 8.9 | 22.1 | 52.3 | 13.4 | 1.4 |
| Western Area Urban | 288,237 | 100.0 | 2.4 | 10.6 | 33.6 | 42.7 | 9.4 | 1.4 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 16.6 Sick household members who did not seek medical attention

According to the World Health Organization, Ebola is a virus that causes an acute, serious illness which is often fatal if untreated. Control of outbreaks calls for collaboration among the various stakeholders including government, medical workers, community leaders and the entire population. The medical services include rapid detection of cases of disease, contact tracing of those who have come into contact with infected individuals, quick access to laboratory services, proper healthcare for those who are infected, and proper disposal of the dead through cremation or burial. No specific treatment or vaccine for the virus is available, although a number of potential treatments are being studied.

### 16.6.1 Sick household members who did not seek medical attention by age and sex

The distribution of the persons who were sick during the Ebola period but did not seek medical attention is given in Table 16.9. Overall, a total of 12,865 people (constituting 0.2 per cent of the total population) fell sick during the Ebola outbreak but did not seek for medical attention. Women and girls made up more than half of that number ( 53.3 per cent). Women aged 20 to 29 formed the largest proportion of those who fell sick with but not seek for medical attention (20.8 per cent).

Close to 20 per cent of the patients who didn't seek treatment were under nine years of age. Those aged 65-69 years formed the lowest proportion. Among the males, the largest proportion ( 21.8 per cent) were aged under nine years.

Table 16.9. Distribution of persons who got sick during the Ebola outbreak but did not seek medical attention by age and sex

| Age group | Total | Male | Female |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | 12,865 | 6,002 | 6,863 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| $0-4$ | 9.8 | 10.4 | 9.2 |
| $5-9$ | 9.8 | 11.4 | 8.4 |
| $10-14$ | 7.5 | 7.8 | 7.2 |
| $15-19$ | 8.7 | 7.9 | 9.5 |
| $20-24$ | 9.3 | 8.3 | 10.2 |
| $25-29$ | 9.7 | 8.7 | 10.6 |
| $30-34$ | 7.5 | 6.6 | 8.3 |
| $35-39$ | 7.8 | 7.6 | 7.9 |
| $40-44$ | 6.0 | 6.4 | 5.7 |
| $45-49$ | 5.1 | 5.7 | 4.5 |
| $50-54$ | 4.2 | 4.0 | 4.3 |
| $55-59$ | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 |
| $60-64$ | 3.0 | 3.1 | 2.8 |
| $65-69$ | 1.9 | 2.0 | 1.8 |
| $70-74$ | 2.0 | 2.1 | 1.8 |
| $75+$ | 5.1 | 5.1 | 5.1 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census


### 16.6.2 Sick household members during the Ebola outbreak but did not seek medical attention by place of residence and region

Table 16.10 presents the distribution of the persons who got sick during the Ebola outbreak but did not seek medical attention by place of residence, region and sex. The evidence from the table shows that over one-third of the persons who were sick during the outbreak but did not seek medical attention were in the Northern Region. A trend similar to that overall is revealed when the analysis is done by sex. Analysis by place of residence confirmed the Northern Region (44.8 per cent) and the Western Region ( 46.9 per cent) as having the highest proportion for rural and urban, respectively.

Table 16.10 Distribution of persons who were sick but did not seek for medical attention by place of residence and sex

| Region | Total |  |  | Rural |  |  | Urban |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Number | 12,865 | 6,002 | 6,863 | 7,227 | 3,545 | 3,682 | 5,638 | 2,457 | 3,181 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Eastern | 20.3 | 19.7 | 20.8 | 19.1 | 18.4 | 19.8 | 21.8 | 21.6 | 21.9 |
| Northern | 34.6 | 35.1 | 34.1 | 44.8 | 44.2 | 45.3 | 21.5 | 21.9 | 21.2 |
| Southern | 24.2 | 26.1 | 22.4 | 35.3 | 36.4 | 34.2 | 9.8 | 11.3 | 8.7 |
| Western | 21.0 | 19.1 | 22.7 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 46.9 | 45.2 | 48.2 |

Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

### 16.6.3 Sick persons who did not seek medical attention by sex and region

From table 16.11, it can be seen that overall more people in the rural areas ( 57.1 per cent) did not seek medical care as compared to their counterparts in urban areas. There were more females ( 54.6 per cent) than males ( 45.4 per cent) who fell sick during the Ebola outbreak but did not seek medical care.

The only place where more males failed to seek medical attention than females was the Western Area Rural. The proportion of females who did not seek medical attention varied from 41.3 per cent in Western Area Rural to 58.1 per cent in Western Area Urban.


|  | Region by place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex | All Regions |  |  | Eastern |  |  | Northern |  |  |
|  | Total | Rural | Urban | Total | Rural | Urban | Total | Rural | Urban |
| Number | 15,120 | 8,635 | 6,485 | 2,922 | 1,535 | 1,387 | 5,400 | 3,930 | 1,470 |
| Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Male | 45.4 | 47.3 | 42.8 | 44.3 | 45.9 | 42.5 | 46.0 | 47.0 | 43.1 |
| Female | 54.6 | 52.7 | 57.2 | 55.7 | 54.1 | 57.5 | 54.0 | 53.0 | 56.9 |

Table 16.11 Distribution of the population who got sick during the Ebola outbreak but did not seek medical attention by sex, region and place of residence (continued)

|  | Region by place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex | Southern |  |  |  |  |  |  | Western |
|  | Total | Rural | Urban | Total | Rural | Urban |  |  |
| Number | 3,756 | 3,107 | 649 | 3,042 | 63 | 2,979 |  |  |
| Percent | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |  |
| Male | 48.0 | 48.2 | 47.1 | 42.2 | 58.7 | 41.9 |  |  |
| Female | 52.0 | 51.8 | 52.9 | 57.8 | 41.3 | 58.1 |  |  |



Source: Statistics Sierra Leone, 2015 Population and Housing Census

The respondents were asked to state whether the women aged 10 to 54 years who were sick during the Ebola but did not seek medical attention were pregnant. Overall, a total of 1,165 women were aged 10 to 54 years and 81 of them were pregnant at the time of the outbreak. Within each region, the proportion of the total female population not seeking medical attention who were pregnant at the time of the outbreak varied from 5 per cent in the Western Region to 8.2 per cent in the Northern Region (Figure 16.6).

Figure 16.6 Female population aged 10-54 years sick during the Ebola but did not seek medical attention by pregnancy status and region


### 16.7 Summary, conclusions and recommendations

### 16.7.1 Summary

The 2015 Census included questions to assess the socio-economic impacts of Ebola. The findings revealed that a total of 13,575 people were infected with Ebola in all districts of Sierra Leone. More males ( 50.3 per cent) than females were infected. The majority of the victims were aged between 15 and 35 years, followed by persons aged 36 to 60 years. The youth ( $15-35$ years) also registered the highest death rate ( 40.5 per cent) from Ebola. However the survival rates were lowest for those aged over 60 years - 90.4 per cent who were infected in this age group died. The rural areas registered more deaths ( 55.6 per cent) than the urban areas.

Furthermore, a number of socio-economic and demographic impacts were noted. A total of 2,247 children were orphaned by Ebola. Fifty five per cent of the population of working age reported that their income decreased due to the outbreak. More people in the rural areas ( 57.1 per cent) who got sick during the Ebola but did not seek medical care compared to those in urban areas ( 42.9 per cent). A total of 1,165 women in the age range 10 to 54 years were sick during the Ebola and 81 of them were pregnant at the time of the Ebola outbreak.

The proportion of economically active persons who maintained the same occupation varied from 69.1 per cent for technicians and associate professionals to 98.6 per cent for agricultural and fisheries workers. The findings show that agriculture and fisheries workers were the the least likely to have changed occupation as a result of the outbreak. Further examination of the results shows that technicians and associate professionals who changed occupation after the outbreak mainly became agriculture and fisheries workers, service workers or moved into craft and other related occupations.

### 16.7.2 Conclusion

In Sierra Leone, 81.1 per cent of those who were infected with Ebola died. The disease negatively impacted on the income of the working population. There is also evidence that many people changed jobs because of the outbreak.

### 16.7.3 Recommendations

Given that Ebola is known to kill on average half of those who contract it, the Government should sensitize the entire population about the virus and how it is spread.

The disease spread quickly across every district in the country. To prevent this in future, the Government should put in place mechanisms to enable local leaders to report, and get timely responses, whenever a strange disease affects community members.

Community engagement is key to successfully controlling Ebola outbreaks. The ministry responsible for health needs to collaborate with community leaders to ensure that good disease outbreak controls are in place.

The key aspects of disease outbreak controls include: case management, infection prevention and control practices, surveillance and contact tracing, a good laboratory service, safe burials and social mobilization. Community leaders should also enforce safe sanitation as a way of avoiding spread of diseases.

Ebola negatively impacted on the socio-economic and demographic status of households. Household incomes were reduced, some household members lost their jobs and children were orphaned. The Government should put in place mechanisms to support affected households. For instance, the Ebola orphans should be supported to access the basic necessities of life and education.
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## APPENDIX

## 통 <br> Table A16.1 Distribution of the population affected by district and Ebola by status of patient

| Region/ District/ Chiefdom | Status of Ebola Patient |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Dead | Survived | Not Stated |
| SierraLeone | 13,575 | 11,015 | 2,330 | 230 |
| EASTERN | 2,983 | 2,475 | 470 | 38 |
| KAILAHUN | 1,727 | 1,391 | 315 | 21 |
| Dea | 12 | 9 | 3 | - |
| Jawie | 487 | 418 | 67 | 2 |
| Kissi Kama | 8 | 1 | 7 | - |
| Kissi Teng | 291 | 223 | 59 | 9 |
| Kissi Tongi | 99 | 65 | 32 | 2 |
| Kpeje Bongre | 121 | 102 | 17 | 2 |
| Kpeje West | 27 | 19 | 8 | - |
| Luawa | 327 | 272 | 51 | 4 |
| Malema | 12 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| Mandu | 28 | 12 | 16 | - |
| Njaluahun | 120 | 97 | 23 | - |
| Penguia | 2 | 2 | - | - |
| Upper Bambara | 116 | 91 | 25 | - |
| Yawei | 77 | 71 | 5 | 1 |

Table A16.1 Distribution of the population affected by district and Ebola by status of patient (continued)

| Region/District/ Chiefdom | Status of Ebola Patient |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Dead | Survived | Not Stated |
| KENEMA | 802 | 701 | 92 | 9 |
| Dama | 3 | 3 | - | - |
| Dodo | 2 | 2 | - | - |
| Gaura | 28 | 27 | 1 | - |
| Gorama Mende | 40 | 36 | 4 | - |
| Kandu Lekpeama | 17 | 16 | 1 | - |
| Koya | 6 | 6 | - | - |
| Langrama | - | - | - | - |
| Lower Bambara | 45 | 40 | 5 | - |
| Malegohun | 1 | 1 | - | - |
| Niawa | 3 | 3 | - | - |
| Nomo | 2 | 2 | - | - |
| Nongowa | 160 | 153 | 5 | 2 |
| Simbaru | - | - | - | - |
| Small Bo | 6 | 6 | - | - |
| Tunkia | 12 | 12 | - | - |
| Wandor | 52 | 45 | 7 | - |
| Kenema City | 425 | 349 | 69 | 7 |

Table A16.1 Distribution of the population affected
by district and Ebola by status of patient (continued)

| Region/District/ <br> Chiefdom | Status of Ebola Patient |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Dead | Survived | Not Stated |
| KONO | 454 | 383 | 63 | 8 |
| Fiama | - | - | - | - |
| Gbane | 6 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Gbane Kandor | - | - | - | - |
| Gbense | 14 | 13 | 1 | - |
| Gorama Kono | 2 | 2 | - | - |
| Kamara | 63 | 58 | 5 | - |
| Lei | 1 | 1 | - | - |
| Mafindor | 2 | 2 | - | - |
| Nimikoro | 124 | 109 | 13 | 2 |
| Nimiyama | 38 | 31 | 7 | - |
| Sandor | 15 | 12 | 2 | 1 |
| Soa | 17 | 17 | - | - |
| Tankoro | - | - | - | - |
| Toli | - | - | - | - |
| Koidu/New | 172 | 134 | 34 | 4 |
| NORTHERN | 6,566 | 5,392 | 1,074 | 100 |
| BOMBALI | 1,461 | 1,097 | 338 | 26 |
| Biriwa | 16 | 9 | 3 | 4 |
| Bombali Sebora | 188 | 148 | 40 | - |

Table A16.1 Distribution of the population affected by district and Ebola by status of patient (continued)

| Region/District/ Chiefdom | Status of Ebola Patient |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Dead | Survived | Not Stated |
| GbantiKamaranka | 35 | 28 | 6 | 1 |
| Gbendembu Ngowahun | 20 | 15 | 5 | - |
| Libeisaygahun | - | - | - | - |
| Magbaimba Ndorhahun | 2 | 1 | - | 1 |
| Makari Gbanti | 501 | 392 | 97 | 12 |
| Paki Masabong | 121 | 97 | 16 | 8 |
| Safroko Limba | 85 | 54 | 31 | - |
| Sanda Loko | 16 | 11 | 5 | - |
| Sanda Tendaren | - | - | - | - |
| Sella Limba | 5 | 5 | - | - |
| Tambakka | 1 | 1 | - | - |
| Makeni City | 471 | 336 | 135 | - |
| KAMBIA | 416 | 335 | 73 | 8 |
| Bramaia | 10 | 9 | 1 | - |
| Gbinle-Dixing | 57 | 42 | 11 | 4 |
| Magbema | 251 | 206 | 44 | 1 |
| Mambolo | 17 | 12 | 4 | 1 |
| Masungbala | 14 | 13 | - | 1 |
| Samu | 30 | 20 | 10 | - |
| Tonko Limba | 37 | 33 | 3 | 1 |

Table A16.1 Distribution of the population affected by district and Ebola by status of patient (continued)

| Region/District/ <br> Chiefdom | Status of Ebola Patient |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Dead | Survived | Not Stated |
| KOINADUGU | 132 | 93 | 33 | 6 |
| Dembelia Sinkunia | - | - | - | - |
| Diang | - | - | - | - |
| Follosaba Dembelia | - | - | - | - |
| Kasunko | 1 | 1 | - | - |
| Mongo | - | - | - | - |
| Neya | - | - | - | - |
| Nieni | 120 | 83 | 32 | 5 |
| Sengbe | 4 | 3 | 1 | - |
| Sulima | - | - | - | - |
| Wara Wara Bafodia | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| Wara Wara Yagala | 6 | 6 | - | - |
| PORT LOKO | 3,594 | 3,045 | 514 | 35 |
| BKM | 179 | 170 | 7 | 2 |
| Buya Romende | 530 | 444 | 85 | 1 |
| Dibia | 51 | 48 | 1 | 2 |
| Kaffu Bullom | 317 | 249 | 67 | 1 |
| Koya | 843 | 700 | 141 | 2 |
| Lokomasama | 316 | 269 | 46 | 1 |
| Maforki | 359 | 301 | 53 | 5 |

Table A16.1 Distribution of the population affected by district and Ebola by status of patient (continued)

| Region/District/ Chiefdom | Status of Ebola Patient |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Dead | Survived | Not Stated |
| Marampa | 710 | 601 | 94 | 15 |
| Masimera | 191 | 181 | 10 | - |
| Sanda <br> Magbolontor | 29 | 27 | 2 | - |
| TMS | 69 | 55 | 8 | 6 |
| TONKOLILI | 963 | 822 | 116 | 25 |
| Gbonkolenken | 124 | 105 | 19 | - |
| Kafe Simira | 7 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Kalansogoia | - | - | - | - |
| Kholifa Mabang | 21 | 20 | 1 | - |
| Kolifa Rowalla | 277 | 239 | 28 | 10 |
| Kunike Barina | 13 | 13 | - | - |
| Kunike Sanda | 166 | 144 | 15 | 7 |
| Malal Mara | 81 | 66 | 10 | 5 |
| Sambaya | - | - | - | - |
| Tane | 73 | 70 | 3 | - |
| Yoni | 201 | 161 | 39 | 1 |
| SOUTHERN | 1,090 | 861 | 205 | 24 |
| BO | 477 | 381 | 85 | 11 |
| Badjia | 3 | 3 | - | - |
| Bagbo | 2 | - | 2 | - |

Table A16.1 Distribution of the population affected
by district and Ebola by status of patient (continued)

| Region/District/ <br> Chiefdom | Status of Ebola Patient |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Dead | Survived | Not Stated |
| Bagbwe | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| Baoma | 45 | 43 | 2 | - |
| Bumpe Ngawo | 36 | 23 | 13 | - |
| Gbo | 6 | 6 | - | - |
| Jaiama-Bongor | 12 | 10 | 1 | 1 |
| Kakua | 88 | 70 | 16 | 2 |
| Komboya | - | - | - | - |
| Lugbu | - | - | - | - |
| Niawa Lenga | 50 | 42 | 8 | - |
| Selenga | - | - | - | - |
| Tikonko | 56 | 46 | 8 | 2 |
| Valunia | 24 | 16 | 7 | 1 |
| Wunde | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| Bo City | 153 | 122 | 27 | 4 |
| BONTHE | 17 | 13 | 1 | 3 |
| Bendu Cha | - | - | - | - |
| Bum | 1 | 1 | - | - |
| Dema | 1 | 1 | - | - |
| Imperi | 4 | 4 | - | - |
| Jong | 6 | 5 | 1 | - |

Table A16.1 Distribution of the population affected by district and Ebola by status of patient (continued)

| Region/District/ Chiefdom | Status of Ebola Patient |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Dead | Survived | Not Stated |
| Kpanga Kemo | 1 | 1 | - | - |
| Kwamebai Krim | - | - | - | - |
| Nongoba Bullom | 2 | - | - | 2 |
| Sittia | - | - | - | - |
| Sogbini | 1 | 1 | - | - |
| Yawbeko | - | - | - | - |
| Bonthe Municipal | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| MOYAMBA | 388 | 295 | 86 | 7 |
| Bagruwa | 3 | 2 | 1 | - |
| Bumpeh | 40 | 35 | 4 | 1 |
| Dasse | - | - | - | - |
| Fakunya | 60 | 36 | 24 | - |
| Kagboro | 13 | 10 | 2 | 1 |
| Kaiyamba | 66 | 50 | 13 | 3 |
| Kamajei | 2 | 1 | - | 1 |
| Kongbora | 1 | 1 | - | - |
| Kori | 69 | 59 | 9 | 1 |
| Kowa | - | - | - | - |
| Lower Banta | 22 | 9 | 13 | - |
| Ribbi | 106 | 87 | 19 | - |

Table A16.1 Distribution of the population affected by district and Ebola by status of patient (continued)

| Region/District/ Chiefdom | Status of Ebola Patient |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Dead | Survived | Not Stated |
| Timdale | 6 | 5 | 1 | - |
| Upper Banta | - | - | - | - |
| PUJEHUN | 208 | 172 | 33 | 3 |
| Barri | 11 | 8 | 3 | - |
| Gallinas Peri | 29 | 16 | 13 | - |
| Kpaka | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| Kpanga-Kabonde | 25 | 22 | 2 | 1 |
| Makpele | 122 | 111 | 11 | - |
| Malen | 5 | 4 | - | 1 |
| Mano Sakrim | 3 | 2 | 1 | - |
| Panga Krim | 7 | 5 | 2 | - |
| Pejeh | 1 | - | - | 1 |
| Soro Gbema | 2 | 2 | - | - |
| Sowa | - | - | - | - |
| YKK | 2 | 2 | - | - |
| WESTERN | 2,936 | 2,287 | 581 | 68 |
| WESTERN AREA RURAL | 1,502 | 1,177 | 302 | 23 |
| Koya | 400 | 341 | 47 | 12 |
| Mountain | 82 | 22 | 60 | - |
| Waterloo | 559 | 428 | 123 | 8 |

Table A16.1 Distribution of the population affected
by district and Ebola by status of patient (continued)

| Region/District/ Chiefdom | Status of Ebola Patient |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Dead | Survived | Not Stated |
| York Rural | 461 | 386 | 72 | 3 |
| WESTERN AREA URBAN | 1,434 | 1,110 | 279 | 45 |
| Central 1 | 55 | 45 | 10 | - |
| Central 2 | 15 | 11 | 4 | - |
| East 1 | 137 | 106 | 28 | 3 |
| East 2 | 249 | 191 | 32 | 26 |
| East 3 | 682 | 514 | 153 | 15 |
| West 1 | 34 | 27 | 7 | - |
| West 2 | 119 | 104 | 14 | 1 |
| West 3 | 143 | 112 | 31 | - |

## Table A16.2 Distribution of the population infected by Ebola

 by socio-economic impact| Region/District/ <br> Chiefdom | Status of Ebola Patient |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Increased substantially | Increased | No change | Decreased | Decreased substantially | Not stated |
| Sierra Leone | 2,194,740 | 36,537 | 156,277 | 451,455 | 1,217,811 | 298,446 | 34,214 |
| EASTERN | 523,376 | 7,120 | 31,356 | 93,878 | 307,994 | 74,788 | 8,240 |
| KAILAHUN | 176,383 | 1,738 | 8,218 | 21,042 | 118,328 | 25,717 | 1,340 |
| Dea | 5,309 | 2 | 92 | 126 | 4,378 | 678 | 33 |
| Jawie | 18,260 | 117 | 1,134 | 1,751 | 12,831 | 2,287 | 140 |
| Kissi Kama | 7,192 | 275 | 433 | 946 | 4,917 | 583 | 38 |
| Kissi Teng | 13,720 | 79 | 789 | 1,844 | 8,852 | 2,087 | 69 |
| Kissi Tongi | 12,363 | 166 | 663 | 1,336 | 8,618 | 1,458 | 122 |
| Kpeje <br> Bongre | 8,582 | 418 | 957 | 1,146 | 5,084 | 900 | 77 |
| Kpeje West | 9,228 | 79 | 290 | 553 | 6,653 | 1,617 | 36 |
| Luawa | 27,889 | 394 | 1,871 | 7,486 | 14,858 | 3,054 | 226 |
| Malema | 14,358 | 48 | 221 | 931 | 12,227 | 837 | 94 |
| Mandu | 10,225 | 14 | 204 | 673 | 6,173 | 3,114 | 47 |
| Njaluahun | 19,667 | 85 | 1,075 | 2,811 | 12,482 | 3,059 | 155 |
| Penguia | 8,524 | 8 | 208 | 561 | 6,483 | 1,139 | 125 |
| Upper Bambara | 10,362 | 49 | 242 | 531 | 6,111 | 3,309 | 120 |
| Yawei | 10,704 | 4 | 39 | 347 | 8,661 | 1,595 | 58 |

Table A16.2 Distribution of the population infected by Ebola by socio-economic impact (continued)

| Region/District/ Chiefdom |  | Status of Ebola Patient |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Increased substantially | Increased | No change | Decreased | Decreased substantially | Not stated |
| KENEMA | 190,930 | 4,172 | 16,915 | 50,631 | 96,566 | 19,320 | 3,326 |
| Dama | 7,019 | 40 | 565 | 2,664 | 3,090 | 617 | 43 |
| Dodo | 9,335 | 753 | 1,026 | 974 | 4,785 | 1,668 | 129 |
| Gaura | 5,641 | 85 | 443 | 1,739 | 2,509 | 676 | 189 |
| Gorama Mende | 17,248 | 194 | 676 | 4,372 | 9,962 | 1,949 | 95 |
| Kandu Lekpeama | 6,806 | 62 | 504 | 1,434 | 3,920 | 768 | 118 |
| Koya | 5,626 | 18 | 111 | 2,095 | 2,240 | 1,130 | 32 |
| Langrama | 1,332 | 6 | 121 | 314 | 373 | 518 | - |
| Lower Bambara | 28,426 | 487 | 1,919 | 6,382 | 17,027 | 2,297 | 314 |
| Malegohun | 8,462 | 33 | 510 | 1,335 | 5,565 | 641 | 378 |
| Niawa | 2,982 | 48 | 59 | 317 | 1,241 | 1,263 | 54 |
| Nomo | 2,371 | 1 | 92 | 692 | 1,104 | 246 | 236 |
| Nongowa | 19,224 | 381 | 2,132 | 4,381 | 10,611 | 1,498 | 221 |
| Simbaru | 7,100 | 19 | 526 | 2,166 | 3,740 | 487 | 162 |
| Small Bo | 9,908 | 65 | 663 | 2,124 | 5,124 | 1,537 | 395 |
| Tunkia | 11,792 | 134 | 1,173 | 3,201 | 6,306 | 653 | 325 |
| Wandor | 8,885 | 337 | 958 | 1,549 | 4,887 | 1,081 | 73 |
| Kenema City | 38,773 | 1,509 | 5,437 | 14,892 | 14,082 | 2,291 | 562 |

Table A16.2 Distribution of the population infected by Ebola
by socio-economic impact (continued)

| Region/District/ Chiefdom |  | Status of Ebola Patient |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Increased substantially | Increased | No change | Decreased | Decreased substantially | Not stated |
| KONO | 156,063 | 1,210 | 6,223 | 22,205 | 93,100 | 29,751 | 3,574 |
| Fiama | 5,353 | 4 | 157 | 727 | 3,413 | 815 | 237 |
| Gbane | 9,515 | 5 | 61 | 858 | 7,000 | 1,540 | 51 |
| Gbane Kandor | 2,855 | - | 9 | 24 | 1,490 | 764 | 568 |
| Gbense | 3,398 | 15 | 57 | 403 | 2,333 | 550 | 40 |
| Gorama Kono | 5,863 | 7 | 38 | 119 | 3,501 | 2,106 | 92 |
| Kamara | 5,218 | 5 | 194 | 756 | 2,739 | 1,379 | 145 |
| Lei | 8,417 | 16 | 422 | 576 | 5,154 | 1,951 | 298 |
| Mafindor | 4,108 | 2 | 8 | 62 | 3,127 | 880 | 29 |
| Nimikoro | 19,098 | 343 | 1,540 | 3,475 | 8,473 | 4,796 | 471 |
| Nimiyama | 8,684 | 112 | 400 | 2,046 | 4,740 | 1,241 | 145 |
| Sandor | 35,080 | 195 | 1,489 | 6,138 | 20,074 | 6,866 | 318 |
| Soa | 12,649 | 39 | 438 | 575 | 9,264 | 2,162 | 171 |
| Tankoro | 3,327 | 19 | 49 | 396 | 2,462 | 325 | 76 |
| Toli | 2,227 | 3 | 13 | 56 | 1,926 | 72 | 157 |
| Koidu/New | 30,271 | 445 | 1,348 | 5,994 | 17,404 | 4,304 | 776 |

Table A16.2 Distribution of the population infected by Ebola by socio-economic impact (continued)

| Region/District/ Chiefdom |  | Status of Ebola Patient |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Increased substantially | Increased | No change | Decreased | Decreased substantially | Not stated |
| NORTHERN | 815,864 | 13,446 | 58,861 | 138,792 | 492,844 | 98,118 | 13,803 |
| BOMBALI | 189,123 | 3,244 | 15,118 | 40,774 | 103,030 | 23,069 | 3,888 |
| Biriwa | 12,837 | 417 | 1,112 | 3,162 | 6,630 | 1,054 | 462 |
| Bombali Sebora | 11,008 | 278 | 1,671 | 2,592 | 5,016 | 1,239 | 212 |
| GbantiKamaranka | 9,348 | 26 | 474 | 3,270 | 4,466 | 891 | 221 |
| Gbendembu Ngowahun | 9,302 | 162 | 938 | 2,749 | 3,740 | 1,335 | 378 |
| Libeisaygahun | 6,857 | 40 | 286 | 814 | 5,256 | 419 | 42 |
| Magbaimba Ndorhahun | 4,144 | 184 | 116 | 197 | 2,769 | 825 | 53 |
| Makari Gbanti | 25,083 | 470 | 1,793 | 6,033 | 13,330 | 2,938 | 519 |
| Paki <br> Masabong | 7,117 | 9 | 179 | 755 | 3,692 | 2,388 | 94 |
| Safroko Limba | 10,958 | 49 | 436 | 2,102 | 7,127 | 1,132 | 112 |
| Sanda Loko | 14,117 | 106 | 800 | 3,933 | 7,894 | 975 | 409 |
| Sanda Tendaren | 9,325 | 371 | 786 | 1,369 | 5,673 | 966 | 160 |
| Sella Limba | 20,003 | 459 | 2,674 | 4,496 | 9,804 | 1,987 | 583 |
| Tambakka | 16,715 | 24 | 633 | 1,732 | 9,949 | 4,270 | 107 |
| Makeni City | 32,309 | 649 | 3,220 | 7,570 | 17,684 | 2,650 | 536 |

Table A16.2 Distribution of the population infected by Ebola by socio-economic impact (continued)

| Region/District/ <br> Chiefdom |  |  | Status of Ebola Patient |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Region/District/ <br> Chiefdom |  |  |  | Status of Ebola Patient |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Table A16.2 Distribution of the population infected by Ebola by socio-economic impact (continued)

| Region/District/ Chiefdom | Status of Ebola Patient |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Increased substantially | Increased | No change | Decreased | Decreased substantially | Not stated |
| Malal Mara | 6,717 | 51 | 580 | 1,034 | 4,316 | 702 | 34 |
| Sambaya | 7,227 | 205 | 616 | 3,052 | 2,593 | 599 | 162 |
| Tane | 12,102 | 101 | 653 | 3,381 | 6,760 | 976 | 231 |
| Yoni | 29,034 | 332 | 1,312 | 5,033 | 17,267 | 4,691 | 399 |
| SOUTHERN | 434,830 | 6,347 | 23,818 | 92,733 | 224,821 | 80,835 | 6,276 |
| BO | 162,429 | 1,995 | 9,501 | 32,656 | 88,425 | 27,395 | 2,457 |
| Badjia | 3,863 | 349 | 982 | 717 | 1,750 | 37 | 28 |
| Bagbo | 10,736 | 159 | 424 | 1,977 | 5,861 | 2,174 | 141 |
| Bagbwe | 6,297 | 36 | 315 | 1,318 | 3,937 | 624 | 67 |
| Baoma | 13,910 | 158 | 859 | 2,329 | 8,247 | 1,805 | 512 |
| Bumpe Ngawo | 16,292 | 61 | 480 | 3,168 | 9,832 | 2,445 | 306 |
| Gbo | 2,295 | 2 | 40 | 381 | 1,251 | 612 | 9 |
| JaiamaBongor | 11,525 | 24 | 377 | 2,213 | 6,329 | 2,461 | 121 |
| Kakua | 10,327 | 173 | 568 | 3,187 | 5,155 | 1,183 | 61 |
| Komboya | 5,881 | 87 | 738 | 1,476 | 3,428 | 103 | 49 |
| Lugbu | 7,378 | 5 | 25 | 719 | 4,132 | 2,406 | 91 |
| Niawa <br> Lenga | 3,409 | 7 | 31 | 203 | 2,482 | 645 | 41 |
| Selenga | 1,503 | 6 | 121 | 309 | 789 | 267 | 11 |
| Tikonko | 13,239 | 151 | 997 | 2,871 | 5,804 | 3,265 | 151 |
| Valunia | 15,968 | 61 | 927 | 2,307 | 9,530 | 2,943 | 200 |

Table A16.2 Distribution of the population infected by Ebola by socio-economic impact (continued)

| Region/District/ Chiefdom |  | Status of Ebola Patient |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Increased substantially | Increased | No change | Decreased | Decreased substantially | Not stated |
| Wunde | 5,929 | 2 | 64 | 233 | 3,968 | 1,630 | 32 |
| Bo City | 33,877 | 714 | 2,553 | 9,248 | 15,930 | 4,795 | 637 |
| BONTHE | 65,944 | 459 | 2,493 | 14,273 | 33,913 | 13,935 | 871 |
| Bendu Cha | 2,528 | 15 | 194 | 129 | 1,737 | 383 | 70 |
| Bum | 9,713 | 2 | 79 | 1,067 | 4,891 | 3,608 | 66 |
| Dema | 3,232 | 28 | 155 | 557 | 1,577 | 891 | 24 |
| Imperi | 7,943 | 264 | 542 | 1,961 | 3,961 | 1,016 | 199 |
| Jong | 10,673 | 21 | 249 | 2,660 | 5,525 | 2,176 | 42 |
| Kpanga Kemo | 2,798 | 8 | 133 | 766 | 1,389 | 449 | 53 |
| Kwamebai Krim | 4,923 | 4 | 16 | 36 | 2,309 | 2,464 | 94 |
| Nongoba Bullom | 7,396 | 35 | 251 | 753 | 4,996 | 1,228 | 133 |
| Sittia | 7,791 | 41 | 335 | 2,509 | 4,186 | 662 | 58 |
| Sogbini | 3,286 | 21 | 271 | 1,719 | 831 | 355 | 89 |
| Yawbeko | 2,993 | 7 | 14 | 1,039 | 1,431 | 483 | 19 |
| Bonthe Municipal | 2,668 | 13 | 254 | 1,077 | 1,080 | 220 | 24 |
| MOYAMBA | 112,944 | 2,205 | 7,003 | 29,344 | 53,686 | 18,617 | 2,089 |
| Bagruwa | 7,915 | 144 | 279 | 1,301 | 3,436 | 2,537 | 218 |
| Bumpeh | 14,819 | 274 | 1,433 | 3,508 | 7,043 | 2,340 | 221 |
| Dasse | 5,938 | 119 | 624 | 1,173 | 3,169 | 804 | 49 |
| Fakunya | 9,580 | 27 | 488 | 1,111 | 6,192 | 1,552 | 210 |

## Table A16.2 Distribution of the population infected by Ebola

 by socio-economic impact (continued)| Region/District/ <br> Chiefdom |  |  | Status of Ebola Patient |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Table A16.2 Distribution of the population infected by Ebola by socio-economic impact (continued)

| Region/District/ <br> Chiefdom |  |  | Status of Ebola Patient |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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