

DRAFT REPORT

THE ASSESSMENT OF POVERTY IN ST LUCIA

VOLUME III: QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF POVERTY IN ST. LUCIA

Submitted to:

The Division Chief
Project Finance Division
Caribbean Development Bank
P.O. Box 408, Wildey
St. Michael, Barbados
Tel.: (246) 431-1600; Fax: (246) 426-7269

Submitted by:

Kairi Consultants Limited
14 Cochrane Street, Tunapuna
Trinidad and Tobago, W.I.
Tel.: (868) 663-2677; Fax: (868) 663-1442
E-mail: mail@kairi.com

August ♦ 2006

DRAFT REPORT

THE ASSESSMENT OF POVERTY
IN ST LUCIA

VOLUME III:
QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF POVERTY IN ST. LUCIA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	IV
ACRONYMS.....	VI
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	VIII
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 SLC/HBS OBJECTIVE AND METHODOLOGY.....	2
2.0 THE MAGNITUDE OF POVERTY.....	4
2.1 POVERTY AND LABOUR FORCE PARTICIPATION	9
2.2 POVERTY BY DISTRICT	11
2.3 UNEMPLOYMENT BY DISTRICT	13
3.0 POVERTY BY FUNCTIONAL SUB-POPULATIONS AND DISTRICT	16
3.1 CHILDREN	16
3.2 WOMEN.....	16
3.3 MEN	17
3.4 ELDERLY PERSONS.....	18
3.5 YOUTH	20
4.0 CHARACTERISTICS OF THE POOR.....	22
4.1 AGE OF INDIVIDUALS	22
4.2 SEX OF INDIVIDUALS	23
4.3 ETHNIC CHARACTERISTICS OF INDIVIDUALS	24
4.5 HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	25
4.5.1 Age of Head	25
4.5.2 Sex of Head.....	26
4.5.3 Educational Attainment of Head	26
4.5.4 Employment Status of Head.....	28
4.6 OCCUPATION	30
5.0 EDUCATION AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS.....	33
5.1 HIGHEST EXAMINATION	33
5.1.1 Highest Examination Passed by Quintiles.....	33
5.1.2 Highest Examination Passed by Socio-Economic Status.....	35
5.2 ACCESS TO TEXTBOOKS	37
6.0 HEALTH, ENVIRONMENT AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS	39
6.1 LIFESTYLE DISEASES BY TYPE	39
6.2 USE OF HEALTH CARE FACILITIES BY TYPE.....	40
6.3 HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE.....	42
7.0 HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS.....	43
7.1 TENANCY OF DWELLING	43

7.2	TYPE OF DWELLING UNIT.....	44
7.3	MAIN ROOFING MATERIAL	44
7.4.	MATERIAL OF OUTER WALLS.....	45
7.5	MAIN COOKING FUEL.....	47
7.6	TOILET FACILITIES	47
7.7	MAIN SOURCE OF WATER	48
APPENDICES.....		50
APPENDIX ONE.....		50
APPENDIX TWO: STATISTICAL TABLES		57

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 2.1: INDIGENCE AND POVERTY 1995 AND 2005/06 (%)	4
TABLE 2.2: COMPARATIVE QUINTILE ESTIMATES 1995/2005	6
TABLE 2.3: HEAD COUNT, POVERTY GAP, POVERTY SEVERITY BY DISTRICT	6
TABLE 2.4: POVERTY BY AGE IN ST LUCIA.....	7
TABLE 2.5: LABOUR FORCE PARTICIPATION BY CONSUMPTION QUINTILE	10
TABLE 2.6: EMPLOYMENT STATUS □ * SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS CROSS-TABULATION.....	11
TABLE 2.7: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY DISTRICT ACCORDING TO SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS.....	12
TABLE 2.8: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS ACCORDING TO DISTRICT.....	13
TABLE 2.9: DISTRIBUTION OF POOR PERSONS IN THE LABOUR FORCE BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS ACCORDING TO DISTRICT AND SEX	14
TABLE 2.10: DISTRIBUTION OF POOR PERSONS IN THE LABOUR FORCE BY PARISH ACCORDING TO EMPLOYMENT STATUS AND SEX	15
TABLE 3.1: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN AGED 0-14 YEARS BY DISTRICT ACCORDING TO SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS	16
TABLE 3.2: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALES AGED 15 YEARS AND OVER BY DISTRICT ACCORDING TO SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS	17
TABLE 3.3: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF MALES AGED 15 YEARS AND OVER BY DISTRICT ACCORDING TO SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS	18
TABLE 3.4: DISTRIBUTION OF ELDERLY PERSONS 65 YEARS AND OVER BY DISTRICT AND SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS ACCORDING TO SEX.....	19
TABLE 3.5: DISTRIBUTION OF YOUNG PERSONS AGED 15-24 YEARS BY DISTRICT AND SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS ACCORDING TO SEX.....	21
TABLE 4.1: DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY FIVE-YEAR AGE GROUP ACCORDING TO SOCIO- ECONOMIC STATUS.....	22
TABLE 4.2: DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY SEX ACCORDING TO SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS.....	24
TABLE 4.4: DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY ETHNICITY ACCORDING TO SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS	24
TABLE 4.5: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLD HEADS BY AGE GROUP ACCORDING TO SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS.....	25
TABLE 4.6: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLD HEADS BY SEX ACCORDING TO SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS	26
TABLE 4.7: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLD HEADS BY HIGHEST EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT ACCORDING TO SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND SEX	27
TABLE 4.8: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLD HEADS BY LABOUR FORCE PARTICIPATION ACCORDING TO SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND SEX	29
TABLE 4.9: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLD HEADS IN THE LABOUR FORCE BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS ACCORDING TO SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND SEX.....	30
TABLE 4.10: DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLD HEADS IN THE OCCUPATION ACCORDING TO SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND SEX.....	31

TABLE 5.1: DISTRIBUTION OF THE POPULATION AGED 15 YEARS AND OVER BY HIGHEST EXAMINATION PASSED ACCORDING TO PER CAPITA CONSUMPTION QUINTILES AND SEX	34
TABLE 5.2: DISTRIBUTION OF THE POPULATION AGED 15 YEARS AND OVER BY HIGHEST EXAMINATION PASSED ACCORDING TO SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND SEX.....	36
TABLE 5.3: DISTRIBUTION OF THE POPULATION ATTENDING SCHOOL BY ACCESS TO TEXTBOOKS REQUIRED FOR SCHOOL ACCORDING TO SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND SEX	38
TABLE 6.1: PERSONS SUFFERING FROM DISEASE BY TYPE OF DISEASE AND QUINTILES, NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE.....	40
TABLE 6.2: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONS WITH MAIN LIFESTYLE DISEASES OR ILLNESS AND INJURY DUE TO ACCIDENTS IN THE PAST 30 DAYS BY TYPE OF PLACE FIRST VISITED FOR MEDICAL ATTENTION ACCORDING TO PER CAPITA CONSUMPTION QUINTILES	41
TABLE 6.3: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE ACCORDING TO PER CAPITA CONSUMPTION QUINTILES.....	42
TABLE 7.1: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY TENANCY OF DWELLING ACCORDING TO HOUSEHOLD QUINTILES	43
TABLE 7.2: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY TYPE OF DWELLING UNIT ACCORDING TO HOUSEHOLD QUINTILES	44
TABLE 7.3: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY MAIN ROOFING MATERIAL OF DWELLING ACCORDING TO HOUSEHOLD QUINTILES	46
TABLE 7.4: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY MATERIAL OF OUTER WALLS OF DWELLING ACCORDING TO HOUSEHOLD QUINTILES	46
TABLE 7.5: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY MAIN COOKING FUEL USED ACCORDING TO HOUSEHOLD QUINTILES.....	47
TABLE 7.6: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY TOILET FACILITIES USED ACCORDING TO HOUSEHOLD QUINTILES	48
TABLE 7.7: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY MAIN SOURCE OF WATER ACCORDING TO HOUSEHOLD QUINTILES	49

ACRONYMS

ACP	-	Africa, Caribbean and Pacific
BNTF	-	Basic Needs Trust Fund
CARE	-	Centre for Adolescent Rehabilitation and Education
CARICOM	-	Caribbean Community
CBI	-	Caribbean Basin Initiative
CBO(s)	-	Community Based Organisation(s)
CDB	-	Caribbean Development Bank
CET	-	Common External Tariff
CFCs	-	Chlorofluorocarbons
CIDA	-	Canadian International Development Agency
CRED	-	
CSME	-	Caribbean Single Market and Economy
DFID	-	UK Department of International Development
DOTS	-	
EC	-	Eastern Caribbean
EC	-	European Commission
ECTEL	-	Eastern Caribbean Telecommunications Authority
EDF	-	European Development Fund
EIB	-	European Investment Bank
EM-DAT	-	
EU	-	European Union
FAO	-	Food and Agriculture Organisation
FGT	-	Foster-Greer-Thorbecke
GDP	-	Gross Domestic Product
GOSL	-	Government of St Lucia
HIV/AIDS Syndrome	-	Human Immunodeficiency Virus/ Acquired Immunodeficiency
HDI	-	Human Development Index
HBS	-	Household Budgetary Survey
IBRD	-	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
ICC	-	International Cricket Council
IDB	-	Inter-American Development Bank
ILO	-	International Labour Organisation
LUCELEC	-	St. Lucia Electricity Services Ltd
MDGs	-	Millennium Development Goals
MoSSaiC	-	Management of Slope Stability in Communities
NAFTA	-	North American Free Trade Area
NAT	-	National Assistance Team

NELP	-	National Learning and Enrichment Programme
NGO(s)	-	Non-Government Organisation(s)
NIC	-	National Insurance Corporation
OECD	-	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OECS	-	Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States
OFDA	-	USAID's Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance
OPSR	-	Office of Private Sector Relations
PPA	-	Participatory Poverty Assessment
PRF	-	Poverty Reduction Fund
PROUD	-	Programme for the Rationalisation of Unplanned Developments
PSIP	-	Public Sector Investment Programme
PWDs	-	Persons with Disabilities
RC	-	Roman Catholics
REDIP	-	Rural Economic Diversification Incentives Project
SEDU	-	Small Enterprise Development Unit
SFA	-	Special Framework of Assistance
SIDS	-	Small Island Developing State(s)
SLBC	-	St Lucia Banana Corporation
SLBGA	-	St Lucia Banana Growers Association
SMEs	-	Small and Medium Sized Enterprises
SPICES	-	
SLC	-	Survey of Living Conditions
SLADA	-	St. Lucia Agricultural Diversification Agency Ltd
SLBGA	-	St. Lucia Banana Growers Association
TFRs	-	Total Fertility Rates
TRP	-	Textbook Rental Programme
UNDP	-	United Nations Development Programme
UNECLAC Caribbean	-	United Nations Economic Commission in Latin America and the Caribbean
UNESCO	-	United Nations' Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNIFEM	-	United Nations' Development Fund for Women
UNODC	-	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
VAT	-	Value Added Tax
WIAP	-	Windward Islands Action Plan
WIBDECO	-	Windward Islands Banana Development and Exporting Company
WINBAN	-	Windward Islands Banana Grower's Association
WTO	-	World Trade Organisation

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This section of the report provides estimates of the poverty in St. Lucia in 2005/06. It focuses on the social characteristics of the poor that can be derived from the quantitative data that have been collected for the Survey of Living Conditions (SLC)/Household Budgetary Survey (HBS).

From a conceptual standpoint cross sectional living conditions surveys of Caribbean society capture, or embody three fundamentally different categories of persons living below the poverty line. These surveys usually are incapable of differentiating and categorizing those who fall under the general rubric of 'the poor'. The first of these groupings is the chronic poor, or those individuals and households that have been poor for more than one generation.

Secondly, there are those individuals, or households living below the poverty line that have only recently come to experience impoverishment as a result of recent changes in the economy. Finally, there are those individuals or households that move into and out of poverty on a seasonal basis.¹ The nonexistence of systematic panel data does not make it possible to identify these categories in any definitive way using the data collected from the quantitative surveys. It therefore does not allow for any estimation of the proportions these groups occupy within the totality of the poor as identified by the poverty line.

However, qualitative data collected in the PPA, in the form of in-depth interviews, do allow for some understanding of the features associated with chronic or long term poverty, and shall be adduced sparingly in this section, but shall be examined in greater depth in the following sections. The fact that the country conducted a poverty assessment some ten years ago does allow for some comparative analysis of the degree to which there has been change. In addition, there has been a pilot study using welfare indicators derived from a Core Welfare Indicators Questionnaire Survey (CWIQ), completed in 2004 that provide insights into social conditions.²

The chronic or long term poor evince certain features that appear integral to their condition. First of all, they are usually poorly endowed in terms of capabilities that allow them to function adequately in the labour, credit and financial markets. In practical terms, this means that they are lacking in educational and skill certification, have no access to land, or other forms of physical capital, beyond miniscule parcels, and tend not to be richly endowed in terms of social capital. Certainly, they are lacking in terms of social networks that extend outside of their immediate communities and which would place them in good standing for accessing these markets.

The fertility behaviour of poor women tends to run counter to national (and regional) trends of decline and this is usually associated with unstable family relationships and single parenthood. Finally, because of their educational and financial capital deficiencies the chronic poor tend to be socially marginalized and disempowered. These social characteristics act as 'maintainers' of

¹This characterisation has been developed by C.Y. Thomas.

²While these other surveys provide some sense of the changes taking place, they are not equivalent to studies using panel data: the present survey is based on an SLC/HBS which is far more complete in data than the SLC of 1995, and the CWIQ.

poverty across the generations. The obverse of these features of chronic poverty, where they emerge in the cycle of life that transmits poverty across the generations, tends to act as 'interrupters.'³

The grounds for such attention are two fold. The first is normative. Chronic poverty is, perhaps, the most debilitating of the forms of poverty that afflict Caribbean countries. It is an affront to the dignity of the people of the region and where a substantial section of the population inherits poverty across the generations this makes a mockery of the notion of stable and viable nationhood. The second reason for the emphasis is positive. Its existence represents a long term drag on the efficient working of the economy. Two areas in which this effect can be readily understood to operate is in terms of the cumulative impact of educational investment in the form of the development of technical and cultural skills that would accrue if the chronic poor did not suffer from low endowments in education and the efficiencies of small scale entrepreneurship that might result from the chronic poor having access to credit markets.

It is the understanding of the factors that lead to these three forms of poverty that allow researchers to speak to the origins and causes of poverty and to answer the question why some people are poor. St. Lucia has been undergoing one of its most challenging structural changes since the post World War II period. There are people who would have been in poverty before this process started. There are others who have been hard-done by the changes for some of whom this is a temporary set-back while for others is a calamity. There are yet others who suffer episodic events that lead to the collapse of income and well-being. All of these may present under the poverty line. They are also likely to be endowed with a differential capacity to rise above the line.

1.1 SLC/HBS OBJECTIVE AND METHODOLOGY

This combined survey addresses two objectives. Firstly as it relates to the SLC, it is a rich source of socio-economic information on the household population and is often regarded as an essential source of data for the determination of social needs and establishment of targets for development planning. Secondly, as it relates to the HBS, it is designed to collect information from the country's households and families on their buying habits (expenditures), income and other characteristics. The combined survey therefore allows data users to relate the expenditures and income of consumers to the characteristics of those same consumers.

More importantly however, the HBS component of the survey is also used for the purpose of revising the list of goods and services in the "basket" and consequently the weighting patterns of the CPI (Consumer Price Index). A change in the Consumer Price Index (CPI) is sometimes referred to as "the inflation rate" and is one of the key economic indicators. The "inflation rate" measures the changes in the purchasing power of money and is closely monitored by economic planners, policy makers, the business community and labour unions.

³ The terms belong to Hulme, D., K. Moore and A. Shepherd, 'Chronic Poverty: Meanings and Analytical Frameworks', CPRC Working Paper 2, Manchester: IDPM, University of Manchester, 2001.

The sample for the SLC/HBS 2005/2006 in St. Lucia was selected from a sample frame derived from the 2001 census of population. It is a 'grand sample' from which samples of 2.0 per cent, 4.0 per cent, 6.0 per cent can be selected depending on the number of replicates/sub-samples selected. The sample frame for St. Lucia is made up of two sub-samples/replicates selected from the 'grand sample', named a,h. For the SLC/HBS 2005/2006 these two replicates have an expected sample size of 2.78 per cent of the population.

For convenience both in selecting the sample and for field enumeration, a two stage stratified systematic random sample selection process was used. At the first stage, Enumeration Districts (EDs) were selected based on a sampling frame constructed from Census Enumeration Districts (EDs), the size of each ED included in the frame was measured in units of clusters of households, of approximately ten households per cluster.

2.0 THE MAGNITUDE OF POVERTY

The data reveal that 28.8 per cent of the population of St. Lucia fell below the poverty line. The poverty line, as has been outlined above, provides a measure of the value of a lowest cost basket of goods that provide the minimum number of kilocalories needed for proper functioning by human beings on a daily basis. It also consists of the value of all other basic non-dietary needs of the individual or household. Those living below the line cannot afford both sets of items.

The data also reveal that 1.6 per cent of the total population existed in a state of indigence. This means that not only did they fall below the poverty line, but unlike the other persons who did so they were not able to afford the consumption of nutrients necessary to maintain 'life and limb'. In other words, these persons suffered levels of malnutrition that meant they were not obtaining the kilocalories deemed by nutritionists to be basic for the proper functioning of the human organism.

Table 2.1 presents a comparison between the SLC of 1995 and the SLC/HBS of 2005/06. It must be emphasised that the SLC of 1995 was based on the recall of expenditures of representatives of 600 households or 2200 persons. The SLC/HBS of 2005/06 is based on data collected from 1,222 households, or 4,319 persons representing 2.78 per cent of the population: the data collected on expenditures came from diaries of the individual spenders in the households. This latter survey is far more robust than the first in terms of the quantum of data collected.

Table 2.1: Indigence and Poverty 1995 and 2005/06 (%)

	1995	2005/05
Poor Households	18.7	21.4
Poor Population	25.1	28.8
Indigent Households	5.3	1.2
Indigent Population	7.1	1.6
Gini Coefficient	0.5	0.42

The data suggest that poverty has increased from 25.1 per cent of individuals to 28.8 per cent over the period. However, indigence seemed to have dropped substantially from 7.1 per cent to 1.6 per cent of individuals. In other words, while poverty might have increased, the percentage of the population that was extremely poor had dropped. It must be noted that comparisons of indigence are based on standards derived from outside of the data set, while comparisons of poverty include relative data. Indigence is derived from the costs of securing cheapest food that could provide for bodily requirements. Comparisons of indigence are 'purer' in what they stand for, in that they relate to basic bodily survival.

The poverty line, on the other hand takes the average non-food expenditure of the poorest 40 per cent of households as the criterion marker and this is added to the indigence line in arriving at poverty. It might well be that the poor in St. Lucia in 2005/06 had a much improved standard

of living and quality of life than in 1995 than are suggested by the data. Thus, food or the indigence component represented a much larger percentage of the poverty line in 1995 compared to 2005/06.

Another interesting result is the level of inequality in the society. The Gini coefficient provides an index of inequality. This was estimated to be 0.42 which is lower than the estimated result for the 1995 SLC – 0.5. The lower the Gini, the lower is the level of inequality. In effect then, as incomes grew in the society, the poor were able to secure a larger percentage of the improved income. However, while the decline in the Gini was considerable, inequality was still high. The poorest 20 per cent enjoyed just 5.7 per cent of the expenditures compared to almost 50 per cent enjoyed by the richest 20 per cent. It must be noted as well, that the Gini presents distribution of private expenditure or income, and may not reflect the entire picture on distribution: there are ‘public goods’, the distribution of which could have been even more pro-poor, thus improving the quality of life of poorer citizens. If the poor can access free medication, and highly subsidized goods in much greater quantum than the rich, the differences in their condition need not be as wide as reflected in the Gini.

Table 2.2 compares the results on certain critical variables over the two surveys. The average size of households seems to have fallen slightly from 3.8 persons to 3.6 persons. Likewise, the number of children has fallen from 1.5 to 1.1. The number of children falls as income increases in both surveys. Importantly, the number of children in the poorest quintile in 2005 was much lower than in 1995 – 1.9 as compared to 2.7. There was a slightly larger number of earners per household in 2005 than in 1995. A smaller percentage of household heads in the poorest quintile were female in 2005 than were in 1995. Indeed and interestingly, a larger percentage of households were female headed in the two highest quintiles in 2005 than in 1995, even though over the period, the percentage of the households that were male and female headed for the entire population was remarkably similar. Clearly, women who have been able to escape the barriers in the world of work and could rise to the top of their profession or occupational category would be equally likely to be heads of households as men.

Table 2.3 provides information on the geographic distribution of poverty and indigence and the poverty gap and poverty severity. While at the national level, indigence fell, there were some districts in the country where indigence was much above the national average. Thus, in Anse-la-Raye and Canaries, 5.3 per cent of the population was indigent. These two areas of the country seemed to have suffered a stasis in the development for more than one generation. Soil and weather did not permit for competitive banana production in those areas, and, therefore they could not participate actively in the banana industry when bananas were ‘green gold’.

In Vieux-Fort and Micoud also the rates were much above the average. Vieux-Fort witnessed the collapse of much of its manufacturing sector and Micoud succumbed to a decline in the competitiveness of its banana industry. In effect, there was some change in the geography of poverty as the stagnation that characterized much of the west and south-west of the island, spread to the east of the island. For the country as a whole, the poverty gap in 1995 was 8.6 and the FGT index was 4.4.

Table 2.2: Comparative Quintile Estimates 1995/2005

	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
2005						
Sex of Head of Household	%					
Male	57.5	56.6	50.3	53.3	62.0	56.4
Female	42.5	43.4	49.7	46.7	38.0	43.6
Both Sexes	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Mean					
Age of Head	49	50	49	50	53	51
Household Size	4.7	4.3	3.9	3.3	2.6	3.6
Children Per Household	1.9	1.5	1.2	0.9	0.5	1.1
Earners Per Household	1.6	1.5	1.3	1.1	0.7	1.2
1995						
Sex of Head of Household	%					
Male	51.7	49.0	49.1	58.3	67.0	56.7
Female	48.3	51.0	50.9	41.7	33.0	43.3
Both Sexes	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Mean					
Age of Head	49.2	48.7	46.5	44.5	45.7	46.6
Household Size	5.3	4.6	4.2	3.7	2.6	3.8
Children Per Household	2.7	2.0	1.7	1.4	0.7	1.5
Earners Per Household	1.1	1.2	1.4	1.5	1.4	1.3

Table 2.3: Head Count, Poverty Gap, Poverty Severity by District

	Population	Per cent Indigent	Per cent Poor	Poverty Gap	Poverty Severity
St Lucia 2005/06	164,842	1.6	28.8	9.0	4.1
St Lucia 1995	144,000	7.1	25.1	8.6	4.4
Castries City 2005/06	16,594	1.7	13.1	3.4	1.8
Castries City 1995		---	15.2	4.4	1.7
Castries Sub-Urban	51,100	0.6	22.2	6.7	2.9
Castries Sub-Urban 1995		---	22.6	8.2	3.8
Anse-La-Raye / Canaries	10,287	5.3	44.9	17.7	9.6
Soufriere	9,329	0.4	42.5	12.4	4.8
Choiseul	5,401		38.4	9.7	3.8
Laborie	7,190		42.1	10.6	3.5
Vieux-Fort	14,096	4.8	23.1	10.2	5.9
<i>Micoud</i>	<i>18,071</i>	<i>4.0</i>	<i>43.6</i>	<i>14.1</i>	<i>6.8</i>
Dennerly	11,986		34.2	11.4	5.2
Gros-Islet	20,787	0.4	24.4	5.8	2.2

The data reveal, as has been found in most Caribbean countries, that those persons living below the poverty line are disproportionately young in comparison to the proportion of youth in the general population. One causal factor that seems to be at work in this instance is the family dynamics associated with being chronically poor. This manifests itself in high rates of fertility. Poor women, it has emerged out of both the quantitative and qualitative studies, tend to begin childbirth much earlier than their non-poor counterparts and have less reason for restraining themselves from childbearing during their fecund years. Poverty influences mating and fertility and mating and fertility exacerbate poverty. Herein lies one significant contributor to the disproportionate representation of youth and women among those living below the poverty line.

Table 2.4 shows that some 51 per cent of those living below the poverty line are below the age of 20. Among the non poor the corresponding figure was 37 per cent. Note however that the fertility among poor women is slowly coming into line with the rest of the general population. This is reflected in gradual reduction in difference in proportionate size between the age groups that reflect the young in the two populations. Note that the difference between the 0-4 group of the poor and the non-poor (the most recent fertility experience of both groups) is much less than that between 5 to 9 and 15 to 19 and that these differences have been in steady decline over the past 20 years. Given this trend it seems safe to conjecture that in the next five years there might be no difference in the proportionate share of the 0-4 age groups in the total poor and non-poor populations. This would have meant that poor women had reduced their rate of childbearing to that of their non-poor counterparts⁴.

Table 2.4: Poverty by Age in St Lucia

Five Year Age Groups	Socio Economic Status				Total	
	Poor		Non Poor			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0-4	3844	8.1	8763	7.5	12607	7.6
5-9	6624	13.9	10286	8.8	16910	10.3
10-14	7923	16.7	12387	10.6	20310	12.3
15-19	5932	12.5	11404	9.7	17336	10.5
20-24	3923	8.3	9100	7.8	13023	7.9
25-29	2642	5.6	7713	6.6	10355	6.3
30-34	2153	4.5	8027	6.8	10180	6.2
35-39	3063	6.4	8776	7.5	11839	7.2
40-44	2951	6.2	7917	6.7	10867	6.6
45-49	1912	4.0	6584	5.6	8496	5.2
50-54	1271	2.7	4892	4.2	6163	3.7
55-59	1077	2.3	4527	3.9	5604	3.4
60-64	1121	2.4	3898	3.3	5018	3.0
65+	3080	6.5	13053	11.1	16133	9.8
Total	47516	100.0	117326	100.0	164842	100.0

⁴ This postulate, of course, assumes that there is no differential mortality or migration affecting the two groups.

In the Caribbean a complex pattern of mating and union formation exists. This has its genesis in the region's African cultural antecedents and its historical experiences in the era of Plantation slavery. The outcome among the population of African descent has been a system of union formation in which formal marriage often represents the culmination of a mating system, takes place late in life and, more often than not, represents the embellishment of an existing union between a man and a woman rather than its initiation.

The majority of women are involved in a socially, but not formally sanctioned relationship with a man at any given point in time. Some of the households counted as being single mother female headed, in fact represent a family spread between two households with the male member of the family living in a separate household. This type of relationship is known as a visiting union. Not all visiting relationships lead to cohabitation and a woman might in the course of her childbearing years enter into a number of visiting or common law relationships without ever entering into formal marriage.

A man, on the other hand, may be involved in more than one visiting relationship, or may be involved in a formal marriage or common law relationship even whilst being involved in the visiting relationship. Against this background the fact that many of the chronically poor women with large families are 'single,' begins to make sense. The seemingly 'missing men' are either involved in simultaneous or serial relationships with these women. The facts of their gender and biology, it can be hypothesised, gives men special favour in the labour market. It also frees them from the constraint of spending their income on nurturing all the children they have had a role of bringing into the world, unlike women.

This pattern of family formation and dissolution more often than not, therefore, has an immediately deleterious impact on women and the children that they bear. As the nurturer the woman bears a disproportionate share of the responsibility of providing for family. In addition she is constrained by these responsibilities from participation in the labour market. In the case of the chronically poor woman, lack of educational endowment also acts as a constraining factor. She fails to meet the super-ordinate responsibility of providing for herself and her many children: this attests to the lack of endowment associated with chronic poverty and ensures its continuity. Immediately, this is manifested in terms of negative outcomes as far as satisfying the basic needs of the young are concerned. Their educational attainment and, sometimes, their physiological development are limited because of scarce household resources.⁵ This in turn affects their future ability to effectively participate in the labour market. If they are female, this fact in itself further limits their labour market options both from the standpoint of the constraints imposed by the personal responsibilities they will have to undertake as women, as well as the opportunity and reward structures of the market itself.

The negative effect of poverty through the institutions of mating and family also affects males through their gender roles. As youngsters, educational and physiological needs go unfulfilled because of constraints imposed by scarce household resources. The question of whether or not

⁵ It also is likely to lead to poor school attendance on the part of the young since oftentimes household resources will not be able to afford transportation costs, books, uniforms and other school related expenses.

they are the beneficiaries of a skewed household distribution of resources because of their gender is a moot point and perhaps is best categorized as an empirical one.

In their early manhood, males have the socially expected role of provider, but not that of nurturer. Another 'socially sanctioned attribute' of manhood is the ability to impregnate a woman. Low levels of educational endowment in the context of a labour market that is highly segmented (primary and secondary) means that whereas most men are able to meet the second expectation they are oftentimes unable to meet the first. It would be simplistic to argue that poor men seem to excel at the second in order to make up for shortcomings in the first. There are a host of social and cultural factors that have to be taken into account in explaining this behaviour pattern.

Certainly though, the way in which the satisfaction of the physiological need for sexual gratification on the part of men is institutionalized ought not to be entirely divorced from a labour market in which poor women are seriously disadvantaged and men from a background of chronic poverty are limited to relatively low paying spasmodic employment. The following subsection examines some labour market issues. First, attention is directed at the extent to which the human resource is prepared for effective participation in this market. Secondly, the nature of this participation is analyzed.

2.1 POVERTY AND LABOUR FORCE PARTICIPATION

Since poverty is being measured by income this indicator is particularly important as it tells of the effort made to earn income and how this is in turn related to poverty status. Neither income, nor effort at participating in the labour market, though, tells of the relative advantages that the respective socioeconomic groups bring to the labour market and how this influences the success they achieve as a result of this participation. It is these endowments and the extent to which they are unevenly divided within the population that perhaps reflect the real underlying cause of income poverty.

Thus, two labour force participants in the area of agriculture might work equal amounts of time but if one has 20 acres of land whereas the other has two then, all other things being equal, they will have vastly different incomes. Similarly, two labour force participants within the commercial sector with one having access to the credit market whereas the other does not will, all other things being equal, have different levels of income notwithstanding the fact that they make equal levels of effort in participating in the labour force. Similar arguments apply to education as an endowment factor.

It is the differential distribution of these endowments within the economy and society of St. Lucia that make the critical difference between the incomes earned by persons and therefore their poverty status. The broader macroeconomic and institutional arrangements in the society are the determinants of this distribution. Some of these issues are addressed in the sections of the report that deal with these two areas. In a sense, the understanding of the determinant role of endowments or capabilities suggests that our conceptual tools have failed to keep pace with our understanding of the phenomenon of poverty. Even though we know of the importance of

differential endowments on poverty outcomes we are still stuck with defining and measuring poverty in terms of incomes rather than endowments. This is because of the sheer technical difficulty involved in doing otherwise. Against the backdrop of this caveat, one can examine for any relationship between socioeconomic status (including poverty) and labour force participation.

Labour force participants are those persons who are either employed or those seeking work. Those not in the labour force are the aged, infants, young people attending school, those too disabled to work, those of working age who are not interested in employment and those participating in the domestic sphere or family owned business for which they receive no pay. Table 2.5 indicates a clear positive relationship between socioeconomic status and labour force participation. Labour force participation increases as we move from Quintile 1 to Quintile 5, poorest to wealthiest. Quintile 1 has the lowest rate at 33 per cent. This rises steadily and peaks at 52 per cent for Quintile 5.

The data in the table should not be interpreted to mean that persons in Quintile 1 are there simply because they choose to participate less in the labour force than persons in Quintiles 2-5. Lack of endowments can mean:

- labour force participation is constrained
- labour force participation brings limited returns.

Table 2.5: Labour Force Participation by Consumption Quintile

	Adult Equivalent Per Capita Consumption Quintiles										Total	
	Poorest		II		III		IV		Richest			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No	%
Participant	11077	33.4	12400	37.7	13773	42.0	15625	47.5	17082	51.7	69957	42.4
Not in Labour Force	22113	66.6	20508	62.3	19033	58.0	17294	52.5	15936	48.3	94884	57.6
Total	33190	100.0	32908	100.0	32807	100.0	32919	100.0	33018	100.0	164842	100.0

Thus, there are some labour force participants whose level of participation is high, but because of lack of endowments the returns they obtain from the participation are low and they remain in poverty. There are poor persons who are employed, but do not earn enough income to afford them a standard of living above the poverty line. Table 2.6 indicates that some 81.6 per cent of the poor in the labour force are employed. Indeed, given that the unemployment rate for the country was 15.7 per cent in the last quarter of 2005, and 13.0 per cent, on the basis of this sample, at 18.4 per cent, the poor had a higher unemployment rate than the national average.

Table 2.6: Employment Status * Socio Economic Status Cross-tabulation

Employment Status		Socio Economic Status		Total
		Poor	Non Poor	
Employed	No.	12977	47881	60858
	% within Employment Status	21.3	78.7	100.0
	% within Socio Economic Status	81.6	88.6	87.0
	% of Total	18.5	68.4	87.0
Unemployed	No.	2928	6171	9099
	% within Employment Status	32.2	67.8	100.0
	% within Socio Economic Status	18.4	11.4	13.0
	% of Total	4.2	8.8	13.0
Total	No.	15905	54052	69957
	% within Employment Status	22.7	77.3	100.0
	% within Socio Economic Status	100.0	100.0	100.0
	% of Total	22.7	77.3	100.0

When these variables are analyzed by sex it turns out that more than twice the per centage of poor women are unemployed than poor men, 13 and 27 per cent respectively. Among the non-poor the distribution of unemployment across the sexes is much more equitable, 10.5 per cent of non-poor men are unemployed as opposed to 12 per cent of non-poor women ($p=.000$). This statistic again illustrates the point that poverty increases the relative disadvantage of women vis-à-vis men.

2.2 POVERTY BY DISTRICT

Table 2.7 shows the distribution of the population by district according to socio-economic status. The district of Micoud deserves special attention: Micoud has the highest concentration of Indigence (27.4%) and the second highest concentration of the non-indigent poor (15.9%). High concentrations of indigence can also be found in Vieux Fort (25.6%) and in Anse La Raye (20.4%); in these areas indigence levels are significantly higher than those observed for northern districts such as the City of Castries, Sub-Urban Castries and Gros Islet, despite their relatively smaller population sizes.

With respect to the non-indigent poor, the highest concentrations were found in Sub-Urban Castries (24.3%), a finding not inconsistent with the fact that Sub-Urban Castries has the largest share of the national population. Sub-Urban Castries also recorded the highest level of vulnerable persons (34.4%). Most of the non-poor were concentrated in Sub-Urban Castries (34.4%) and Gros Islet (14.1%).

Table 2.7: Percentage Distribution of Population by District according to Socio Economic Status

District	Socio-Economic Status				Total
	Indigent	Poor But Not Indigent	Vulnerable	Non Poor	
	%				
Castries City	10.9	4.2	13.1	12.1	10.1
Castries Sub-Urban	11.3	24.7	32.1	34.4	31.0
Anse-La-Raye	20.4	9.1	10.1	3.3	6.2
Soufriere	1.5	8.7	4.0	4.7	5.7
Choiseul	-	4.6	2.0	3.1	3.3
Laborie	-	6.7	3.0	3.7	4.4
Vieux-Fort	25.6	5.7	8.1	9.6	8.6
Micoud	27.4	15.9	8.8	8.6	11.0
Dennerly	-	9.1	7.6	6.5	7.3
Gros-Islet	2.9	11.1	11.2	14.1	12.6
Total %	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)
No.	2670	44845	26680	90646	164842

Table 2.8 shows the distribution of the population in each district by socio-economic status. For St. Lucia as a whole, 28.8 per cent of the population were estimated to be poor of which, 1.6 per cent was found to be indigent. Another 16.2 per cent were deemed vulnerable of falling into poverty. Generally poverty in St. Lucia appears to be a rural phenomenon as the rural districts such as Anse La Raye (44.9%), Soufriere (42.4%), Choiseul (38.4%), Laborie (42.1%) and Micoud (43.6%) exhibit relatively higher rates of poverty. Moreover, Anse La Raye and Micoud also showed high rates of indigence; 5.3 per cent and 4.1 per cent respectively. Lower rates of poverty have been estimated in the City of Castries, Sub-Urban Castries and Gros Islet, the three predominantly urban districts in the northern part of the island.

While the City of Castries recorded the lowest incidence of poverty (13.1%), it is noteworthy that a relatively high proportion of its population is considered vulnerable (21.0%). Similarly, the high prevalence of poverty in Anse La Raye, coupled with the fact that another 26.1 per cent of its population is classified as vulnerable is cause for concern.

Table 2.8: Percentage Distribution of Population by Socio Economic Status according to District

District	Socio-Economic Status				Total
	Indigent	Poor But Not Indigent	Vulnerable	Non Poor	
	%				
Castries City	1.7	11.4	21.0	65.9	16594 (100.0)
Castries Sub-Urban	0.6	21.6	16.8	61.0	51100 (100.0)
Anse-La-Raye	5.3	39.6	26.1	29.0	10287 (100.0)
Soufriere	0.4	42.0	11.5	46.0	9329 (100.0)
Choiseul	-	38.4	9.9	51.7	5401 (100.0)
Laborie	-	42.1	11.1	46.8	7190 (100.0)
Vieux-Fort	4.8	18.2	15.4	61.5	14096 (100.0)
Micoud	4.1	39.5	13.0	43.4	18071 (100.0)
Dennery	-	34.2	16.9	48.9	11986 (100.0)
Gros-Islet	0.4	24.0	14.3	61.3	20787 (100.0)
Total	1.6	27.2	16.2	55.0	164842 (100.0)

2.3 UNEMPLOYMENT BY DISTRICT

Table 2.9 examines the employment status of poor persons in the labour force by geographic distribution and sex. Overall, a greater proportion of poor females were unemployed (27.4%), compared to poor males (12.7%), with notable exceptions in Choiseul and Vieux Fort. In respect of Vieux Fort, this may be explained by the availability of employment opportunities for women in the manufacturing zone.

Table 2.10 shows the concentration of employed and unemployed poor persons in St. Lucia's labour force. Not surprisingly, variations in the concentrations within the districts are consistent with variations in the number of poor persons in the labour force of the different districts. As such, the greatest concentration of unemployed persons is found in Sub-Urban Castries and is evident irrespective of individuals' sex. A similar observation emerges in the context of districts such as Micoud and Gros Islet that have relatively high concentrations of unemployed persons who are deemed to be poor.

Table 2.9: Distribution of Poor Persons in the Labour Force by Employment Status according to District and Sex

District	Employment Status				Total	
	Employed		Unemployed			
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
MALE						
Castries City	399	100.0	-	-	399	100.0
Castries Sub-Urban	2604	85.2	453	14.8	3057	100.0
Anse-La-Raye	800	100.0	-	-	800	100.0
Soufriere	578	77.8	165	22.2	743	100.0
Choiseul	179	62.6	107	37.4	286	100.0
Laborie	454	100.0	-	-	454	100.0
Vieux-Fort	683	80.9	161	19.1	843	100.0
Micoud	1340	86.8	203	13.2	1543	100.0
Dennergy	590	100.0	-	-	590	100.0
Gros-Islet	890	85.2	155	14.8	1045	100.0
Total	8517	87.3	1244	12.7	9761	100.0
FEMALE						
Castries City	182	71.3	73	28.7	254	100.0
Castries Sub-Urban	1245	67.3	604	32.7	1849	100.0
Anse-La-Raye	473	92.9	36	7.1	509	100.0
Soufriere	206	62.4	124	37.6	330	100.0
Choiseul	286	73.5	107	26.5	393	100.0
Laborie	265	69.8	114	30.2	378	100.0
Vieux-Fort	442	84.7	80	15.3	522	100.0
Micoud	447	64.6	244	35.4	690	100.0
Dennergy	295	66.6	148	33.4	443	100.0
Gros-Islet	619	80.0	155	20.0	774	100.0
Total	4460	72.6	1684	27.4	6144	100.0
BOTH SEXES						
Castries City	581	88.9	73	11.1	654	100.0
Castries Sub-Urban	3849	78.5	1057	21.5	4906	100.0
Anse-La-Raye	1272	97.2	36	2.8	1309	100.0
Soufriere	784	73.1	289	26.9	1073	100.0
Choiseul	465	68.4	215	31.6	680	100.0
Laborie	719	86.3	114	13.7	832	100.0
Vieux-Fort	1124	82.3	241	17.7	1365	100.0
Micoud	1787	80.0	447	20.0	2234	100.0
Dennergy	885	85.7	148	14.3	1033	100.0
Gros-Islet	1510	83.0	310	17.0	1819	100.0
Total	12977	81.6	2928	18.4	15905	100.0

Table 2.10: Distribution of Poor Persons in the Labour Force by Parish according to Employment Status and Sex

District	Employment Status				Total	
	Employed		Unemployed			
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
MALE						
Castries City	399	4.7	-	-	399	4.1
Castries Sub-Urban	2604	30.6	453	36.4	3057	31.3
Anse-La-Raye	800	9.4	-	-	800	8.2
Soufriere	578	6.8	165	13.3	743	7.6
Choiseul	179	2.1	107	8.6	286	2.9
Laborie	454	5.3	-	-	454	4.7
Vieux-Fort	683	8.0	161	12.9	843	8.6
Micoud	1340	15.7	203	16.3	1543	15.8
Dennerly	590	6.9	-	-	590	6.0
Gros-Islet	890	10.5	155	12.4	1045	10.7
Total	8517	100.0	1244	100.0	9761	100.0
FEMALE						
Castries City	182	4.1	73	4.3	254	4.1
Castries Sub-Urban	1245	27.9	604	35.9	1849	30.1
Anse-La-Raye	473	10.6	36	2.2	509	8.3
Soufriere	206	4.6	124	7.4	330	5.4
Choiseul	286	6.4	107	6.4	393	6.4
Laborie	265	5.9	114	6.7	378	6.2
Vieux-Fort	442	9.9	80	4.8	522	8.5
Micoud	447	10.0	244	14.5	690	11.2
Dennerly	295	6.6	148	8.8	443	7.2
Gros-Islet	619	13.9	155	9.2	774	12.6
Total	4460	100.0	1684	100.0	6144	100.0
BOTH SEXES						
Castries City	581	4.5	73	2.5	654	4.1
Castries Sub-Urban	3849	29.7	1057	36.1	4906	30.8
Anse-La-Raye	1272	9.8	36	1.2	1309	8.2
Soufriere	784	6.0	289	9.9	1073	6.7
Choiseul	465	3.6	215	7.3	680	4.3
Laborie	719	5.5	114	3.9	832	5.2
Vieux-Fort	1124	8.7	241	8.2	1365	8.6
Micoud	1787	13.8	447	15.3	2234	14.0
Dennerly	885	6.8	148	5.0	1033	6.5
Gros-Islet	1510	11.6	310	10.6	1819	11.4
Total	12977	100.0	2928	100.0	15905	100.0

3.0 POVERTY BY FUNCTIONAL SUB-POPULATIONS AND DISTRICT

3.1 CHILDREN

Table 3.1 shows that the largest proportion of children aged 0-14, who have been classified as indigent live in Micoud (32.9%); relatively large concentrations of indigence, within this age group, were also observed in Anse La Raye (26.8%) and Vieux Fort (19.5%). Castries Sub-Urban, which accounted for 30.4 per cent of all children, registered a high concentration of all non-indigent poor (24.2%) and vulnerable (33.8%) children. Disproportionately large concentrations of non-indigent poor children were found in Micoud (14.4%), Anse-La Raye (10.6%), Soufriere (11.3%) and Dennery (10.3%).

Table 3.1: Percentage Distribution of Children Aged 0-14 years by District according to Socio Economic Status

District	Socio-Economic Status				Total
	Indigent	Poor But Not Indigent	Vulnerable	Non Poor	
	%	%	%	%	%
Castries City	11.8	3.6	12.6	10.7	8.6
Castries Sub-Urban	6.1	24.2	33.8	35.1	30.4
Anse-La-Raye	26.5	10.6	11.0	2.9	7.6
Soufriere	-	11.3	2.8	4.8	6.5
Choiseul	-	4.8	1.2	3.0	3.2
Laborie	-	7.1	1.3	3.0	4.0
Vieux-Fort	19.5	4.4	8.5	10.0	8.1
Micoud	32.9	14.4	9.1	10.1	12.0
Dennery	-	10.3	11.1	7.5	9.0
Gros-Islet	3.2	9.2	8.7	12.9	10.6
Total	1234 (100.0)	17158 (100.0)	8940 (100.0)	22495 (100.0)	49826 (100.0)

3.2 WOMEN

With regard to females 15 years and over, Table 3.2 shows that Micoud (27.5%), Vieux Fort (21.8%) and Sub-Urban Castries (15.3%) have the largest proportions of females who were classified as indigent poor in St. Lucia. With respect to those females who were classified as non-indigent poor, the largest proportions were observed in Sub-Urban Castries (23.2%), Micoud (15.9%) and Gros Islet (12.2%). Disproportionately high proportions of the non-indigent poor females were also found to be living in Anse La Raye (9.3%), Laborie (7.3%) and

Dennery (7.6%). According to Table 3.2, over one half (56.2%) of the female population aged 15 years and over were estimated to have been living in urban areas such as the City of Castries, Sub-Urban Castries and Gros Islet. Whether in the context of the indigent poor, the non-indigent poor or the vulnerable, the spatial distributions observed among females aged 15 years and over are consistent with those observed among children under 14 years and thus, indicative of the co-existence of children and adult females living within specific districts in circumstances where their social and economic well being is either impaired or under threat from external shocks.

Table 3.2: Percentage Distribution of Females Aged 15 years and over by District according to Socio Economic Status

District	Socio-Economic Status				Total %
	Indigent	Poor But Not Indigent	Vulnerable	Non Poor	
	%	%	%	%	
Castries City	9.9	5.2	16.6	13.1	11.8
Castries Sub-Urban	15.3	23.2	30.1	35.4	31.6
Anse-La-Rayé	14.7	9.3	8.1	3.0	5.4
Soufriere	5.5	6.8	5.3	4.7	5.3
Choiseul	-	5.6	2.7	2.8	3.4
Laborie	-	7.3	4.4	3.8	4.6
Vieux-Fort	21.8	6.9	7.3	9.3	8.6
Micoud	27.5	15.9	7.8	8.1	10.1
Dennery	-	7.6	6.3	6.2	6.5
Gros-Islet	5.3	12.2	11.5	13.5	12.8
Total	739 (100.0)	14009 (100.0)	9405 (100.0)	36962 (100.0)	61114 (100.0)

3.3 MEN

Some attention ought to be paid to the socio-economic status of males aged 15 years and over in Vieux Fort. However, with respect to entire population of males who were aged 15 years and over and among the indigent poor, Table 3.3 shows that the largest concentration was estimated to be in Vieux Fort (40.3%) being more than twice as large when compared with concentrations in any of the other districts. Though lower, concentrations of similar magnitudes were observed in Micoud (17.5%), Sub-Urban Castries (16.2%) and Anse La Raye (15.6%). In the remaining districts, the concentrations of indigence did not appear to be as profound. With respect to those males who were classified as non-indigent poor, the largest proportion was observed in Sub-Urban Castries (26.8%). Notably high proportions were observed in Micoud (17.8%) and Gros Islet (12.4%) and to a somewhat lesser extent in Dennery (9.2%) and Soufriere (7.5%). In the context of males aged 15 years and over who were deemed to be vulnerable, the largest concentrations were observed in the two most highly populated districts, namely, Sub-

Urban Castries (32.6%) and Gros Islet (13.5%). Though notably high in Micoud (9.7%), the disproportionately high concentration in Anse La Raye (11.3%) is worthy of attention.

Table 3.3: Percentage Distribution of Males Aged 15 years and over by District according to Socio Economic Status

District	Socio-Economic Status				Total %
	Indigent	Poor But Not Indigent	Vulnerable	Non Poor	
	%	%	%	%	
Castries City	10.5	4.0	9.6	11.9	9.5
Castries Sub-Urban	16.2	26.8	32.6	32.7	30.9
Anse-La-Raye	15.6	6.9	11.3	3.8	5.9
Soufriere	-	7.5	4.0	4.8	5.3
Choiseul	-	3.4	2.1	3.4	3.2
Laborie	-	5.8	3.2	4.1	4.4
Vieux-Fort	40.3	6.2	8.7	9.5	8.9
Micoud	17.5	17.8	9.7	8.2	11.0
Dennery	-	9.2	5.3	6.0	6.6
Gros-Islet	-	12.4	13.5	15.5	14.2
Total	698 (100.0)	13679 (100.0)	8335 (100.0)	31189 (100.0)	53901 (100.0)

3.4 ELDERLY PERSONS

Based upon estimates derived from the survey results for elderly persons aged 65 years and over in St. Lucia, Table 3.4 reveals that Vieux Fort and the City of Castries were the two districts that ought to be focus of attention with regard to interventions targeting the indigent poor among the elderly. When examined in the context of individuals' sex, elderly males in Vieux Fort appeared to be the principal targets of such interventions whereas, in the case of elderly females, similar treatment ought to be meted out in the City of Castries. Being the district with the largest population, it was not surprising that one of the higher concentrations among the non-indigent poor elderly persons was observed in Sub-Urban Castries (15.1%). However, it is worth stating that notable and disproportionately large numbers were classified as non-indigent poor in Micoud (17.6%) and Gros Islet (24.5%). Some attention ought to be directed to disproportionately large numbers in Vieux Fort (9.4%), Dennery (8.6%) and Laborie (7.6%) among non-indigent poor elderly persons. With respect to vulnerable elderly persons, high concentrations were primarily an urban phenomenon that was evident in Sub-Urban Castries (23.5%) and Gros Islet (22.4%).

Taking the sex of elderly persons classified a non-indigent poor into account, the spatial distribution among the male and the female populations was observed to be similar to that observed in the context of the entire population of non-indigent poor elderly persons with Gros

Islet and Micoud being districts found to have among the largest concentrations of elderly persons on the island. It is worth noting however that the high concentration of elderly persons in Sub-Urban Castries was due principally to the high concentrations that were evident among the female elderly population rather than among their male counterparts. In terms of vulnerable elderly persons, the observed urban bias persisted in districts such as Sub-Urban Castries and Gros Islet across the sexes.

Table 3.4: Distribution of Elderly Persons 65 years and over by District and Socio Economic Status according to Sex

District	Socio-Economic Status				Total
	Indigent	Poor But Not Indigent	Vulnerable	Non Poor	
	%	%	%	%	%
<i>Elderly Females</i>					
Castries City	100.0	6.8	5.6	14.2	12.0
Castries Sub-Urban	-	18.8	29.0	32.0	29.1
Anse-La-Rayé	-	4.5	2.8	2.4	2.8
Soufriere	-	2.5	6.4	6.1	5.4
Choiseul	-	4.5	5.5	2.3	3.1
Laborie	-	7.1	8.8	6.1	6.7
Vieux-Fort	-	7.5	6.1	4.6	5.3
Micoud	-	15.2	9.4	9.9	10.7
Dennery	-	6.9	5.7	6.0	6.1
Gros-Islet	-	26.4	20.8	16.4	18.7
Total	36 (100.0)	1610 (100.0)	1301 (100.0)	6138 (100.0)	9086 (100.0)
<i>Elderly Males</i>					
Castries City	-	2.6	7.7	10.1	8.2
Castries Sub-Urban	-	10.8	15.9	30.7	24.6
Anse-La-Rayé	-	2.6	11.5	2.3	3.6
Soufriere	-	6.0	-	9.7	7.6
Choiseul	-	5.2	7.6	3.1	4.1
Laborie	-	8.2	8.0	6.5	7.0
Vieux-Fort	100.0	11.6	8.4	7.7	9.1
Micoud	-	20.4	8.6	5.2	8.6
Dennery	-	10.6	7.8	6.3	7.3
Gros-Islet	-	22.3	24.5	18.3	19.8
Total	40 (100.0)	1393 (100.0)	947 (100.0)	4667 (100.0)	7048 (100.0)

Table 3.4: Distribution of Elderly Persons 65 years and over by District and Socio Economic Status according to Sex (Continued)

District	Socio-Economic Status				Total
	Indigent	Poor But Not Indigent	Vulnerable	Non Poor	
	%	%	%	%	%
Castries City	47.4	4.8	6.5	12.4	10.4
Castries Sub-Urban	-	15.1	23.5	31.4	27.1
Anse-La-Raye	-	3.6	6.5	2.4	3.2
Soufriere	-	4.1	3.7	7.6	6.4
Choiseul	-	4.8	6.4	2.6	3.5
Laborie	-	7.6	8.4	6.3	6.8
Vieux-Fort	52.6	9.4	7.2	6.0	7.0
Micoud	-	17.6	9.0	7.9	9.8
Dennery	-	8.6	6.6	6.1	6.6
Gros-Islet	-	24.5	22.4	17.2	19.2
Total	76 (100.0)	3004 (100.0)	2248 (100.0)	10805 (100.0)	16133 (100.0)

3.5 YOUTH

According to Table 3.5, the largest proportions of young persons aged 15-24 years and classified as indigent poor were observed in Vieux Fort (42.3%) and Micoud (34.1%). This pattern persisted across the sexes though it is worth stating that noteworthy levels of indigence appeared to be characteristic of young females in Anse La Raye (15.3%). With respect to non-indigent young persons, the highest concentrations were observed in Sub-Urban Castries (22.1%) and Micoud (16.9%). Though lower, notable concentrations of similar magnitudes were observed in Gros Islet (11.6%) and Anse La Raye (10.9%). Districts such as Choiseul and Laborie were observed to have had disproportionately large concentrations among non-indigent young persons (3.8% and 6.4% respectively). With respect to non-indigent young males, the highest concentrations were also observed in Sub-Urban Castries (25.0%) and Micoud (16.3%). Though lower, notable concentrations were also observed in Gros Islet (14.0%) and Dennery (12.8%), the latter being disproportionately high. For non-indigent young females, a similar pattern emerged with the highest concentrations being observed in Sub-Urban Castries (18.9%) and Micoud (17.5%). It is worth noting that Anse La Raye had disproportionately high concentrations of non-indigent young females, an outcome that is consistent with that observed among indigent young females. As in the case of other age-based sub-populations, larger concentrations among vulnerable young persons were evident in urban districts such as the City of Castries, Sub-Urban Castries and Gros Islet though some concern ought to focus on the observed levels of prevalence in rural districts such as Micoud and Anse La Raye. While a similar pattern prevails among young vulnerable males, the pattern that emerges among their female counterparts is similar except that a higher prevalence is evident in Vieux Fort than in Micoud.

Table 3.5: Distribution of Young Persons Aged 15-24 years by District and Socio Economic Status according to Sex

District	Socio-Economic Status				Total %
	Indigent	Poor But Not Indigent	Vulnerable	Non Poor	
	%	%	%	%	
<i>All Young Persons</i>					
Castries City	-	5.0	18.7	12.1	10.9
Castries Sub-Urban	15.8	22.1	25.2	33.9	28.5
Anse-La-Rayé	7.6	10.9	11.1	4.3	7.5
Soufriere	-	6.6	5.5	4.9	5.4
Choiseul	-	3.8	2.0	2.1	2.6
Laborie	-	6.4	2.9	3.2	4.1
Vieux-Fort	42.3	6.9	9.2	13.4	11.1
Micoud	34.1	16.9	10.1	11.4	13.2
Dennerly	-	9.8	3.5	6.8	7.0
Gros-Islet	-	11.6	11.8	7.9	9.6
Total	475 (100.0)	9380 (100.0)	5244 (100.0)	15260 (100.0)	30360 (100.0)
<i>Young Males</i>					
Castries City	-	4.4	12.2	10.1	8.4
Castries Sub-Urban	15.9	25.0	28.2	29.3	27.5
Anse-La-Rayé	-	8.0	10.9	5.6	7.2
Soufriere	-	5.8	4.6	4.6	4.9
Choiseul	-	2.9	1.3	3.0	2.6
Laborie	-	5.3	2.8	4.7	4.5
Vieux-Fort	50.2	5.6	10.5	12.8	10.6
Micoud	33.9	16.3	13.6	13.0	14.5
Dennerly	-	12.6	1.4	5.1	6.8
Gros-Islet	-	14.0	14.5	11.8	12.8
Total	239 (100.0)	4977 (100.0)	2678 (100.0)	7203 (100.0)	15098 (100.0)
<i>Young Females</i>					
Castries City	-	5.8	25.5	14.0	13.3
Castries Sub-Urban	16.1	18.9	22.1	37.9	29.4
Anse-La-Rayé	15.3	14.0	11.3	3.2	7.9
Soufriere	-	7.5	6.4	5.1	5.9
Choiseul	-	4.9	2.8	1.3	2.6
Laborie	-	7.7	3.0	1.9	3.7
Vieux-Fort	33.9	8.2	7.8	14.0	11.6
Micoud	34.3	17.5	6.3	10.1	12.0
Dennerly	-	6.7	5.8	8.2	7.2
Gros-Islet	0.4	8.8	9.0	4.3	6.3
Total	236 (100.0)	4403 (100.0)	2566 (100.0)	8057 (100.0)	15262 (100.0)

4.0 CHARACTERISTICS OF THE POOR

4.1 AGE OF INDIVIDUALS

Despite variations, there is ample evidence suggesting that poverty is characteristic of the lives of all persons irrespective of age, in a given country. According to Table 4.1, an examination of the pattern exhibited according to five-year age groups reveals that the poor consists primarily of children under 14 years (almost 39% collectively) and teenagers (just over 29% collectively). Compared to the national population, larger proportions were found in these age groups among the poor. This might be explained by a dependency phenomenon fueled by the need for larger families including extended family arrangements as means of coping with the vicissitudes associated with poverty and further bolstered within a culture that is associated with higher levels of fertility among women folk.

Table 4.1: Distribution of Population by Five-Year Age Group according to Socio-Economic Status

Age Group	Socio Economic Status				Total	
	Poor		Non Poor			
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
0-4	3844	8.1	8763	7.5	12607	7.6
5-9	6624	13.9	10286	8.8	16910	10.3
10-14	7923	16.7	12387	10.6	20310	12.3
15-19	5932	12.5	11404	9.7	17336	10.5
20-24	3923	8.3	9100	7.8	13023	7.9
25-29	2642	5.6	7713	6.6	10355	6.3
30-34	2153	4.5	8027	6.8	10180	6.2
35-39	3063	6.4	8776	7.5	11839	7.2
40-44	2951	6.2	7917	6.7	10867	6.6
45-49	1912	4.0	6584	5.6	8496	5.2
50-54	1271	2.7	4892	4.2	6163	3.7
55-59	1077	2.3	4527	3.9	5604	3.4
60-64	1121	2.4	3898	3.3	5018	3.0
65+	3080	6.5	13053	11.1	16133	9.8
Total	47516	100.0	117326	100.0	164842	100.0

Relatively greater proportions in excess of 6.0% have been observed for persons aged 35-39 years, 40-44 years and 65 years and over. This might be indicative of the age profile of persons bearing the responsibility for large families consisting of poor persons. In the case of persons aged 65 years and over, some consideration may have to be given to the impact of their living arrangements on their socio-economic well being. This arises due to the fact that such persons

have a greater prospect of living in extended family settings that threaten individual well being or living alone without adequate means of sustenance.

4.2 SEX OF INDIVIDUALS

The demographics of poverty tend to be revealing of important differences within the population. Of the 28.8 per cent of the population living below the poverty line in 2005/06, 51.3 per cent were male and 48.7 per cent were female. This amounts to a fairly even balance of poverty between the sexes, although it does not tell us of the situation regarding men and women. Of the 28.8 per cent of the population living below the poverty line 51.3 per cent were female and 49.7 per cent were male. This reflects the distribution of females and males in the total population (52% and 48% respectively) and amounts to a fairly even balance of poverty between the sexes, although it does not tell us of the situation regarding specific age groups. When the data are broken down by age groups it emerges that in the 0-19 (poor) age group the sexes are distributed in the same proportions as in the general population. However, in the 20-64 age groups the position is reversed with women constituting 52 per cent of the age category. There is, therefore, a greater likelihood that poor persons above the age of 20 will be female than male. However, there is a greater likelihood that a poor child will be male rather than female ($p=.000$).

The greater preponderance of females among the poor 20-64 age grouping probably has a demographic rather than a socioeconomic basis, since the ratio reversal among adults is evident in the non-poor population as well. Still, the greater preponderance of females among the poor adult population ought to be reflected in policy formulation for poverty eradication. In this regard, as will be demonstrated by the qualitative data, special burdens borne by chronically poor women are related to the responsibilities associated with their gender. Thus, for example, their responsibilities relating to reproduction and nurturing creates limitations for them in regard to their ability to participate in the job market. This seems to present a case for policy targeted at young girls in poverty to help them avoid fertility behaviour that acts as a mechanism of transference of poverty across the generations.

Based upon Table 4.2 a total of 48% of St. Lucia's population were male and indicative of a national sex ratio of 92.3 males per 100 females. When compared to the national population, it is worth noting that males were over-represented among the poor. For example, 52% of the indigent poor and 51.3% of the non-indigent poor were estimated to be males. In St. Lucia, sex ratios at birth have traditionally favoured male births to the extent that the higher prevalence of poverty among males could be a function of larger juvenile male cohorts having exposure to poverty in childhood and as teenagers when compared to their female counterparts. As such, it should not be surprising that higher sex ratios are evident among the indigent and non-indigent poor being 108.3 and 105.3 males per 100 females respectively. This could be further compounded insofar as a higher proportion of elderly males is likely to be among the ranks of the poor when compared to elderly females. This could be explained by life time choices of some elderly men who live below subsistence level devoid of care and support from their children and significant others.

Table 4.2: Distribution of Population by Sex according to Socio-Economic Status

Sex	Socio-Economic Status								Total	
	Indigent		Poor But Not Indigent		Vulnerable		Non Poor		N	%
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Male	1389	52.0	22998	51.3	12582	47.2	42187	46.5	79157	48.0
Female	1281	48.0	21847	48.7	14098	52.8	48459	53.5	85685	52.0
Total	2670	100.0	44845	100.0	26680	100.0	90646	100.0	164842	100.0

4.3 ETHNIC CHARACTERISTICS OF INDIVIDUALS

On examining Table 4.3, a vast majority of almost 86.0% of St. Lucia's population were of African descent. Much smaller proportions were Mixed (9.3%) or of East Indian descent (2.8%). Each of the other groups such as Amerindians, Caucasians, Syrian/Lebanese and Chinese accounted for less than 1.0% of the islands population. Given the distribution of St. Lucia's population by ethnic characteristics, it should not be surprising that a similar pattern emerges among the indigent and non-indigent poor except that the population of African descent and to a somewhat lesser extent, that of East Indian descent were observed to be over-represented among the indigent and non-indigent poor.

Table 4.3: Distribution of Population by Ethnicity according to Socio-Economic Status

	Socio-Economic Status								Total	
	Indigent		Poor But Not Indigent		Vulnerable		Non Poor			
Ethnicity	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	N	%
African Descent/Negro/Black	2509	94.0	40639	90.6	23393	87.7	74441	82.1	140982	85.5
Indigenous People (Amerindian/Carib)	-	-	39	.1	36	.1	1474	1.6	1548	.9
East Indian	80	3.0	1410	3.1	873	3.3	2197	2.4	4560	2.8
Chinese/Asian	-	-	-	-	-	-	39	.0	39	.0
Syrian/Lebanese	-	-	-	-	-	-	423	.5	423	.3
White/Caucasian	-	-	-	-	-	-	877	1.0	877	.5
Mixed	80	3.0	2387	5.3	2193	8.2	10675	11.8	15335	9.3
Other	-	-	-	-	73	.3	39	.0	111	.1
Don't know/Not Stated	-	-	371	.8	113	.4	482	.5	967	.6
Total	2670	100.0	44845	100.0	26680	100.0	90646	100.0	164842	100.0

4.5 HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD

This discussion examines the characteristics of poor household heads as opposed to individuals. It focuses specifically on household heads in the context of characteristics such as age, sex, educational attainment, employment status and occupation.

4.5.1 Age of Head

Table 4.4 shows that the overall age distribution of household heads does not change despite differences in their socio-economic status. In general, the majority of household heads are 65 years and over, an outcome that is likely to be associated with the prevalence of elderly persons among individuals living alone. Among poor households, as much as 21.5% of household heads were 65 years and over. Despite consistency in the age distribution of household heads irrespective of their socio-economic status, it is worthwhile to highlight those age groups that account for notably larger concentrations among the poor heads when compared to non-poor heads. This is the case among poor heads aged 10-14 years, 15-19 years, 20-24 years and especially those aged 40-44 years. This has implications for targeting specific sets of household headed by young persons and juveniles for when mounting poverty alleviation and reduction programmes.

Table 4.4: Distribution of Household Heads by Age Group according to Socioeconomic Status

Age Group	Socio Economic Status				Total	
	Poor		Non Poor			
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
10-14	113	1.1	153	.4	266	.6
15-19	78	.8	121	.3	199	.4
20-24	227	2.3	727	2.0	954	2.1
25-29	536	5.3	1963	5.4	2500	5.4
30-34	613	6.1	2882	7.9	3494	7.5
35-39	1224	12.2	4378	12.1	5602	12.1
40-44	1695	16.9	4580	12.6	6274	13.5
45-49	1002	10.0	4338	12.0	5340	11.5
50-54	802	8.0	2878	7.9	3679	7.9
55-59	770	7.7	3066	8.4	3836	8.3
60-64	813	8.1	2326	6.4	3139	6.8
65+	2154	21.5	8878	24.5	11032	23.8
Total	10025	100.0	36290	100.0	46315	100.0

4.5.2 Sex of Head

According to Table 4.5, the sex composition of household heads is indicative of a preponderance of male heads irrespective of socio-economic status. Interestingly, the sex composition in the case of poor and non-poor households is virtually identical suggesting that in poor households, the observed preponderance of male heads persists to the extent that 57.4% of household heads in poor households have been estimated to be male.

Table 4.5: Distribution of Household Heads by Sex according to Socioeconomic Status

Sex	Socio Economic Status				Total	
	Poor		Non Poor			
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Male	5756	57.4	20377	56.2	26133	56.4
Female	4269	42.6	15913	43.8	20182	43.6
Total	10025	100.0	36290	100.0	46315	100.0

4.5.3 Educational Attainment of Head

Table 4.6 examines variations in the educational attainment of household heads according to socio-economic status of sex. In St. Lucia, the majority (approximately 60.0%) of household heads were estimated to have attained a maximum of primary education. This was the case irrespective of sex with the respective estimated proportions for male and female heads being 60.8% and 59.5%. While a maximum of about 22.2% of household heads attained secondary education, just about 4.0% had attained a maximum of a university level education. Interestingly, the observed pattern remained virtually unchanged irrespective of the sex of household heads.

Table 4.6: Distribution of Household Heads by Highest Educational Attainment according to Socio-Economic Status and Sex

Highest Educational Attainment	Socio Economic Status				Total	
	Poor		Non Poor			
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
BOTH SEXES						
None	38	.4	189	.6	227	.5
Nursery/Kindergarten	-	-	72	.1	72	.1
Primary	6585	74.3	19299	56.6	25884	60.2
Secondary	1215	13.7	8424	24.7	9638	22.4
SALCC	114	1.3	1558	4.6	1672	3.9
Other Tech/Vocational	75	.9	793	2.3	869	2.0
University	-	-	1912	5.6	1912	4.4
Other Not Specified	76	.9	269	.8	345	.8
Don't Know	760	8.6	1477	4.3	2237	5.2
Not Stated	-	-	118	.3	118	.3
Total	8864	100.0	34110	100.0	42973	100.0
MALE						
None	38	.7	151	.8	189	.8
Nursery/Kindergarten	-	-	36	.2	36	.2
Primary	4120	80.2	10680	55.6	14799	60.8
Secondary	411	8.0	4661	24.3	5072	20.8
SALCC	75	1.5	950	4.9	1025	4.2
Other Tech/Vocational	-	-	337	1.8	337	1.4
University	-	-	1144	6.0	1144	4.7
Other Not Specified	76	1.5	193	1.0	269	1.1
Don't Know	418	8.1	947	4.9	1365	5.6
Not Stated	-	-	118	.6	118	.5
Total	5138	100.0	19216	100.0	24354	100.0
FEMALE						
None	-	-	38	.3	38	.2
Nursery/Kindergarten	-	-	36	.2	36	.2
Primary	2465	66.2	8619	57.9	11084	59.5
Secondary	804	21.6	3763	25.3	4566	24.5
SALCC	39	1.0	608	4.1	647	3.5
Other Tech/Vocational	75	2.0	456	3.1	531	2.9
University	-	-	768	5.2	768	4.1
Other Not Specified	-	-	76	.5	76	.4
Don't Know	342	9.2	530	3.6	872	4.7
Not Stated	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	3726	100.0	14894	100.0	18619	100.0

Table 4.6 shows the predominance of primary education as the highest level attained by household heads irrespective of their socio-economic status. Moreover, it shows that poor household heads were much more likely to have attained a maximum of a primary education and less likely to have attained higher levels when compared to their non-poor counterparts. When the sex of household heads is taken into account, this pattern persists especially among male heads for whom it was much more pronounced. In the case of female heads however, sex differentials in educational attainment across socio-economic status were observed but were not as pronounced as in the case of their male counterparts. The difference in the proportions of poor and non-poor female household heads attaining a maximum of secondary education was 3.7 percentage points. The corresponding difference for male heads was 16.3 percentage points. This implies that despite attaining secondary level education, greater proportions of females rather than males end up being the heads of households that may be unable to sustain the well being of its members. Accordingly, the answers to such outcomes may lie in socio-structural arrangements that preclude the fuller participation of some females in labour market activities and restrain specific cross-sections who end up engaging in activities that neither redounds to their material well being nor that of their families.

4.5.4 Employment Status of Head

Table 4.7 permits an examination of the relationship between labour force participation, socio-economic status and sex of household heads. Overall, 66.1% of all household heads actively participated in the labour force. Moreover, substantially higher levels of participation were observed among male household heads than among female heads being estimated to be 75.8% and 53.6% respectively. Nevertheless, there were greater rates of participation than non-participation irrespective of the sex of household heads.

Among poor heads of households, however, Table 4.7 shows lower levels of participation in the labour force when compared to participation rates observed for all household heads (59.1% as opposed to 66.1%). Upon taking the sex of household heads into account, a greater proportion among male heads appears to have participated than to have not participated in the labour force. Among female heads, however, the situation is reversed with a lower proportion claiming to have participated than to have not participated in the labour force. While 73.7% of poor male household heads participated in the labor force, the corresponding proportion among females was 39.4%. This suggests that poor male heads would have had greater prospects than their female counterparts of obtaining income through employment either because the former were employed or may have exposed themselves to prospects of obtaining work. It also suggests that poor female household heads may have to be more creative in developing coping strategies to obtain income from sources other than employment. There might also be a host of structural and cultural factors that preclude greater participation in the labour force among poor female heads of households.

Table 4.7: Distribution of Household Heads by Labour Force Participation according to Socio-economic Status and Sex

Labour Force Participants	Socio Economic Status				Total	
	Poor		Non Poor		N	%
	N	%	N	%		
MALE						
Participant	4245	73.7	15558	76.4	19803	75.8
Non Participant	1511	26.3	4818	23.6	6330	24.2
Total	5756	100.0	20377	100.0	26133	100.0
FEMALE						
Participant	1684	39.4	9129	57.4	10813	53.6
Non Participant	2585	60.6	6784	42.6	9369	46.4
Total	4269	100.0	15913	100.0	20182	100.0
BOTH SEXES						
Participant	5929	59.1	24687	68.0	30616	66.1
Non Participant	4097	40.9	11602	32.0	15699	33.9
Total	10025	100.0	36290	100.0	46315	100.0

It is worth noting that among non-poor female heads of households, there were greater levels of participation in the labour force than non-participation (57.4% as opposed to 42.6%). By comparing poor female heads of households with their non-poor counterparts, it might be possible to discern factors that are likely to be associated with differential levels of participation across the two groups of women and as such, deemed to be ideal levers that can be manipulated to empower poor female heads with regard to their participation in the labour force.

Table 4.8 examines the relationship between employment status, socio-economic status and sex of household heads who have been economically active. Overall, 7.2% of the all economically active household heads were estimated to be unemployed, a greater proportion being observed among female heads than among male heads (12.5% as opposed to 4.2%). Among poor household heads, 11.0% were estimated to be unemployed. When compared to heads of households in general, higher rates of unemployment were estimated among poor household heads irrespective of the sex of the household head. Moreover, the rate of unemployment among poor female heads was estimated to be substantially lower than that of their male counterparts and the magnitude of this difference was greater than that observed in the case of the overall population of household heads.

Table 4.8: Distribution of Household Heads in the Labour Force by Employment Status according to Socioeconomic Status and Sex

Employment Status	Socio Economic Status				Total	
	Poor		Non Poor		N	%
	N	%	N	%		
MALE						
Employed	3935	92.7	15026	96.6	18961	95.8
Unemployed	309	7.3	532	3.4	842	4.2
Total	4245	100.0	15558	100.0	19803	100.0
FEMALE						
Employed	1341	79.6	8117	88.9	9458	87.5
Unemployed	343	20.4	1012	11.1	1355	12.5
Total	1684	100.0	9129	100.0	10813	100.0
BOTH SEXES						
Employed	5276	89.0	23143	93.7	28419	92.8
Unemployed	652	11.0	1544	6.3	2196	7.2
Total	5929	100.0	24687	100.0	30616	100.0

These findings reinforce earlier statements suggesting that poor male should have greater prospects than their female counterparts of obtaining income through employment and the need for greater creativity on the part of poor female heads to obtain income from alternative sources. Apart from social and biographical characteristics that may have differential impact upon the economic activity of household heads across socio-economic status, one needs to consider a host of structural and cultural factors that may have implications for gender stereotyping, gender discrimination and other artifacts of gender relations. These would have to be systematically studied to determine their impact upon differential outcomes with regard to outcomes associated with the economic activity across and within sex groups taking into account variations in the socio-economic status of household heads.

4.6 OCCUPATION

Table 4.9 addresses the relationship between occupation, socio-economic status and sex of household heads. Overall, the majority of heads who declared having a job were engaged in work related to sales and services. The respective proportions for males, females and all heads were 8.8%, 7.0% and 8.0% indicating that the same pattern persisted across the sexes. Among male heads, work related to craft activities and skilled agricultural pursuits appeared to be popular and were reported by respective proportions of 7.3% and 6.0% of the all household heads. Among female heads, work related to craft activities and elementary tasks appeared to be popular and were reported by respective proportions of 4.5% and 4.3% of all heads.

Table 4.9: Distribution of Household Heads in the Occupation according to Socioeconomic Status and Sex

Occupation	Socio Economic Status				Total	
	Poor		Non Poor			
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
MALE						
Legislator/Manager	111	2.0	1333	6.6	1444	5.6
Professional	38	.7	689	3.4	726	2.8
Technical	-	-	494	2.4	494	1.9
Clerical	-	-	489	2.4	489	1.9
Services/Sales	344	6.1	1941	9.6	2286	8.8
Skilled/Agricultural	397	7.0	1149	5.7	1546	6.0
Craft	380	6.7	1522	7.5	1901	7.3
Machine Operator	77	1.4	722	3.6	799	3.1
Elementary	386	6.8	959	4.7	1346	5.2
Not Stated	3909	69.3	11002	54.2	14911	57.5
Total	5642	100.0	20300	100.0	25942	100.0
FEMALE						
Legislator/Manager	38	.9	309	2.0	347	1.7
Professional	-	-	683	4.3	683	3.4
Technical	-	-	263	1.7	263	1.3
Clerical	-	-	486	3.1	486	2.4
Services/Sales	304	7.2	1107	7.0	1411	7.0
Skilled/Agricultural	192	4.5	155	1.0	347	1.7
Craft	195	4.6	716	4.5	911	4.5
Machine Operator	80	1.9	116	.7	196	1.0
Elementary	150	3.5	719	4.6	870	4.3
Not Stated	3272	77.3	11246	71.2	14519	72.5
Total	4233	100.0	15800	100.0	20032	100.0
BOTH SEXES						
Legislator/Manager	149	1.5	1642	4.5	1791	3.9
Professional	38	.4	1371	3.8	1409	3.1
Technical	-	-	757	2.1	757	1.6
Clerical	-	-	974	2.7	974	2.1
Services/Sales	648	6.6	3048	8.4	3697	8.0
Skilled/Agricultural	589	6.0	1304	3.6	1893	4.1
Craft	575	5.8	2238	6.2	2813	6.1
Machine Operator	157	1.6	838	2.3	995	2.2
Elementary	537	5.4	1679	4.7	2215	4.8
Not Stated	7181	72.7	22248	61.6	29430	64.0
Total	9874	100.0	36100	100.0	45975	100.0

Among all poor household heads, the pattern of occupational activities does not appear to be different from that observed for all heads of households insofar as the most dominant occupational pursuits appeared to be work related to sales and services, craft activities and skilled agricultural pursuits. While the three main occupational activities that were characteristic of all male heads persisted among poor male heads, their order of predominance was different. Specifically, work akin to skilled agricultural pursuits became the most popular activity among poor male heads followed by elementary occupations and craft-related work. To this end, the respective proportions engaged in such activities were 7.0%, 6.8% and 6.7%. Their pattern of occupational activity among poor female heads did not depart too far from that observed among all female heads as the former engaged primarily in work activities associated with sales and services and craft-related tasks, the respective proportions being 7.2% and 4.6%. For poor female household heads, however, there was a notable thrust in the direction of skilled agricultural activities as 4.5% reported engaging in such pursuits as opposed to 1.7% among all female heads.

In sum, it appears as though poor male heads were primarily engaged in skilled agricultural work, elementary occupations and craft-related work. In contrast, female heads were primarily engaged in work akin to sales and services, craft-related work and skilled agricultural activities.

5.0 EDUCATION AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

5.1 HIGHEST EXAMINATION

Highest examination passed is analyzed for all individuals 15 years and over and has been reclassified to reflect the attainment of tertiary level qualifications “en masse” rather than at specific levels. For the purposes of these analyses, the attainment of tertiary level qualifications is consistent with the certification at different levels including A Level, Diploma, Associate Degree, Undergraduate Degree, Post Graduate Degree and Professional Qualification. Variations associated with lower levels of education have been retained and include None, School Leaving, CXC Basic, CXC 1-4 passes and CXC 5 or more passes. Provision has also been made for two residual categories that have been classified as Other and Not Stated.

5.1.1 Highest Examination Passed by Quintiles

Table 5.1 shows that 51.4% of the population aged 15 years and over had no certification and that 10.0% had at least acquired tertiary level certification. Among the male population, 53.1% had attained no certification as opposed to a smaller proportion (49.7%) among the female population. With respect to tertiary certification, the situation was reversed as a higher proportion of the female population had at least acquired tertiary level certification when compared to the corresponding proportion among the male population, the respective proportions being estimated to be 10.4% and 9.7%. With respect to the attainment of different levels of certification at the secondary level, a similar pattern was observed among the male and female populations.

Table 5.1 is indicative of a negative association between highest examination passed and per capita consumption quintile. For the population aged 15 years and over, the proportion with no certification decreased with progression to higher consumption quintiles so that while 69.0% of persons from the poorest quintile had attained no certification, a lower proportion amounting to 51.4% had attained no certification in the wealthiest quintile. For those persons who had attained tertiary level qualifications, the pattern was reversed so that while 1.1% from the poorest quintile had attained tertiary level certification, the corresponding proportion in the wealthiest quintile was estimated to be 25.6%. There appears to be little variation in the proportions that attained a maximum of a school leaving certificate as one progresses from the poorest to the wealthiest quintile. This might be a function of age as older persons were more likely to have attained a maximum of a school leaving certificate and at the same time progress differentially per capita consumption quintiles.

Table 5.1: Distribution of the Population Aged 15 years and over by Highest Examination Passed according to Per Capita Consumption Quintiles and Sex

Highest Examination Passed	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles										Total	
	Poorest		II		III		IV		Richest			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
MALE												
None	7538	71.6	6056	57.6	5654	58.0	5137	48.7	4072	33.3	28457	53.1
School Leaving	1434	13.6	1928	18.3	1527	15.7	1678	15.9	2067	16.9	8634	16.1
CXC Basic	38	.4	190	1.8	233	2.4	450	4.3	304	2.5	1214	2.3
CXC 1-4 Passes	646	6.1	1078	10.3	832	8.5	912	8.6	699	5.7	4168	7.8
CXC 5 and More Passes	298	2.8	540	5.1	710	7.3	1077	10.2	1528	12.5	4154	7.8
Tertiary Certification	36	.3	453	4.3	530	5.4	993	9.4	3158	25.9	5171	9.7
Other	153	1.5	112	1.1	153	1.6	150	1.4	114	.9	682	1.3
Not Stated	389	3.7	153	1.5	117	1.2	152	1.4	270	2.2	1080	2.0
Total	10531	100.0	10510	100.0	9756	100.0	10549	100.0	12213	100.0	53561	100.0
FEMALE												
None	6673	66.4	5332	53.9	6138	52.8	6040	47.6	4345	33.1	28528	49.7
School Leaving	1302	12.9	2064	20.9	1796	15.4	2324	18.3	2865	21.8	10351	18.0
CXC Basic	76	.8	372	3.8	487	4.2	339	2.7	116	.9	1390	2.4
CXC 1-4 Passes	732	7.3	777	7.8	1289	11.1	911	7.2	909	6.9	4617	8.0
CXC 5 and More Passes	465	4.6	753	7.6	807	6.9	1215	9.6	1264	9.6	4504	7.8
Tertiary Certification	196	2.0	299	3.0	497	4.3	1602	12.7	3328	25.4	5922	10.4
Other	226	2.2	186	1.9	228	2.0	73	.6	151	1.1	863	1.5
Not Stated	387	3.8	112	1.1	382	3.3	197	1.6	151	1.2	1229	2.1
Total	10056	100.0	9895	100.0	11626	100.0	12701	100.0	13127	100.0	57404	100.0
BOTH SEXES												
None	14211	69.0	11388	55.8	11792	55.1	11177	48.1	8417	33.2	56985	51.4
School Leaving	2736	13.3	3993	19.6	3323	15.5	4002	17.2	4932	19.5	18985	17.1
CXC Basic	114	.6	562	2.8	720	3.4	790	3.4	420	1.7	2605	2.3
CXC 1-4 Passes	1378	6.7	1855	9.1	2121	9.9	1823	7.8	1608	6.3	8785	7.9
CXC 5 and More Passes	763	3.7	1293	6.3	1518	7.1	2293	9.9	2792	11.0	8658	7.8
Tertiary Certification	232	1.1	753	3.4	1028	4.9	2596	10.2	6485	25.6	11093	10.0
Other	379	1.8	298	1.5	381	1.8	223	1.0	265	1.0	1545	1.4
Not Stated	775	3.8	264	1.3	499	2.3	349	1.5	421	1.7	2309	2.1
Total	20587	100.0	20405	100.0	21382	100.0	23251	100.0	25340	100.0	110965	100.0

A further examination of Table 5.1 reveals that the negative association between highest examination passed and per capita consumption quintiles is generally borne out among males and among females aged 15 years and over. This is especially true when one considers persons who had no certification and those who had at least tertiary level certification. Notwithstanding these observations, the results contained in Table 3.25 point towards interesting conclusions. The first relates to the fact that 2.0% of females with tertiary level certification were in the poorest quintile group as opposed to 0.3% among males. Such an outcome points towards an inequitable distribution of resources across the sexes with respect to persons attaining tertiary level certification and at the same time, being among the ranks of the poorest in St. Lucia. In order to undertake such an analysis, it would be necessary to embrace a gender perspective that focuses upon individual and group perspectives pertaining to roles and expectations in the context of living arrangements, duties and responsibilities of the sexes in different spheres such as the household and the workplace, and discriminatory behaviour and labour market segmentation. The second point relates to the fact that relatively more females than males attaining a maximum of school leaving certification had progressed to quintile 4 and the wealthiest quintile. This might be indicative of the resilience of some older women who had no more than a school leaving certificate but the same time, had been able to acquire the means to sustain a standard of living commensurate with that of the two wealthiest quintile group.

5.1.2 Highest Examination Passed by Socio-Economic Status

Similar to Table 5.1, Table 5.2 shows variation in highest examination passed but instead focuses on an absolute conception of poverty status in St. Lucia. In particular, it explores variations in the highest examination passed among persons aged 15 years and over who are poor and those who are non-poor. Among poor persons overall, 64.5% had no certification as opposed to a smaller proportion amounting to 46.7% among non-poor persons. With respect to persons who had attained at least tertiary level certification, a substantially lower proportion was observed among the poor than among the non-poor, the respective estimates being 1.7% and 12.0%. A consistent pattern emerged across the sexes. For males who had no certification, 67.2% were poor and 47.8% were non poor. For females, the corresponding proportions were 61.7% and 45.7%. With respect to persons who attained at least tertiary certification, the respective proportions among the poor and the non-poor were 0.9% and 13.0% in the case of males and 2.4% and 13.0% in the case of females. The results contained in Table 5.1 and Table 5.2 reinforce the view that the attainment of certification enhances one's socio-economic status and facilitates one's prospects of being among the ranks of the non-poor.

Moreover, it emphasizes the value associated with the attainment of tertiary level certification, enhanced socio-economic status and the prospect of not being deprived of basic human needs for engaging in sustainable livelihood.

Table 5.2: Distribution of the Population Aged 15 years and over by Highest Examination Passed according to Socio-Economic Status and Sex

Highest Examination Passed	Socio Economic Status				Total	
	Poor		Non Poor			
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
MALE						
None	9861	67.2	18596	47.8	28457	53.1
School Leaving	2456	16.7	6178	15.9	8634	16.1
CXC Basic	38	.3	1177	3.0	1214	2.3
CXC 1-4 Passes	990	6.7	3178	8.2	4168	7.8
CXC 5 and More Passes	492	3.4	3661	9.4	4154	7.8
A Level	149	.9	5022	13.0	5171	9.7
Other	229	1.6	454	1.2	682	1.3
Not Stated	466	3.2	614	1.6	1080	2.0
Total	14682	100.0	38878	100.0	53561	100.0
FEMALE						
None	8911	61.7	19617	45.7	28528	49.7
School Leaving	2488	17.2	7863	18.3	10351	18.0
CXC Basic	112	.8	1278	3.0	1390	2.4
CXC 1-4 Passes	1165	8.1	3452	8.0	4617	8.0
CXC 5 and More Passes	652	4.5	3852	9.0	4504	7.8
A Level	344	2.4	5578	13.0	5922	10.4
Other	337	2.3	526	1.2	863	1.5
Not Stated	424	2.9	805	1.9	1229	2.1
Total	14434	100.0	42971	100.0	57404	100.0
BOTH SEXES						
None	18773	64.5	38213	46.7	56985	51.4
School Leaving	4944	17.0	14041	17.2	18985	17.1
CXC Basic	150	.5	2455	3.0	2605	2.3
CXC 1-4 Passes	2155	7.4	6630	8.1	8785	7.9
CXC 5 and More Passes	1144	3.9	7514	9.2	8658	7.8
A Level	494	1.7	10599	12.0	11093	10.0
Other	566	1.9	979	1.2	1545	1.4
Not Stated	891	3.1	1418	1.7	2309	2.1
Total	29116	100.0	81849	100.0	110965	100.0

5.2 ACCESS TO TEXTBOOKS

For persons attending primary and secondary schools, Table 5.3 permits an examination of the relationship between access to text books, socio-economic status and individuals' sex. Accordingly, a greater proportion of such persons were observed to have had access to all text books than to have access to some or none of the textbooks. Specifically, it was estimated that 56.2%. On examining the association between access to textbooks and individuals' sex, the pattern remained virtually unchanged suggesting that there did not appear to be any sex differentials in access to textbooks. However, Table 5.3 is indicative of a relationship between socio-economic status and access to textbooks. Thus, while 60.3% of non-poor school attendees were observed to have had access to all of their textbooks, the corresponding proportion among their poor counterparts was 48.3%. Such findings are consistent with expectations suggesting that non-poor school attendees were more likely than their poor counterparts to have had access to all of their textbooks whether or not shared than to have some or none of the textbooks. In contrast, poor school attendees were more likely than their non-poor counterparts to have some or none of their textbooks than to have all of their textbooks.

On taking individuals' sex into account, some interesting patterns emerge indicating that the observed relationship between access to textbooks and socio-economic status persisted among male school attendees but was somewhat different for their female counterparts. Among the latter, socio-economic status did not appear to impact on access to textbooks as greater proportions of female school attendees irrespective of socio-economic status had access to all textbooks as opposed to having access to some or none. Nonetheless, a slightly greater proportion was observed to have had access to all textbooks among non-poor female attendees than among poor female attendees (59.1% as opposed to 50.4%). The corresponding proportions among non-poor male attendees and poor male attendees were 61.9% and 46.4%).

Table 5.3: Distribution of the Population Attending School by Access to Textbooks Required for School according to Socio-Economic Status and Sex

Has All Textbooks Required For School	Socio Economic Status				Total	
	Poor		Non Poor			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<i>Male</i>						
Yes, has books for exclusive use	4444	46.0	9807	61.9	14251	55.8
Yes, but shares with other family members	36	.4			36	.1
Has only some books	4721	48.8	4185	26.4	8906	34.9
Has None	427	4.4	1257	7.9	1684	6.6
Not Stated	41	.4	604	3.8	644	2.5
Total	9668	100.0	15853	100.0	25522	100.0
<i>Female</i>						
Yes, has books for exclusive use	4294	50.0	11415	58.5	15709	55.9
Yes, but shares with other family members	36	.4	113	.6	150	.5
Has only some books	3793	44.2	5111	26.2	8905	31.7
Has None	380	4.4	1174	6.0	1554	5.5
Not Stated	78	.9	1699	8.7	1778	6.3
Total	8582	100.0	19513	100.0	28095	100.0
<i>Both Sexes</i>						
Yes, has books for exclusive use	8737	47.9	21223	60.0	29960	55.9
Yes, but shares with other family members	73	.4	113	.3	186	.3
Has only some books	8514	46.7	9296	26.3	17811	33.2
Has None	807	4.4	2431	6.9	3238	6.0
Not Stated	119	.7	2303	6.5	2422	4.5
Total	18250	100.0	35366	100.0	53617	100.0

6.0 HEALTH, ENVIRONMENT AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

6.1 LIFESTYLE DISEASES BY TYPE

This discussion addresses the prevalence of the main lifetime diseases among persons who have indicated that they are suffering from some disease. The prevalence rates relate to five main lifestyle diseases notably diabetes, high blood pressure, heart disease, cancer and HIV/AIDS. For each lifestyle disease, the prevalence rates are examined in the context of socio-economic status that is predicated upon per capita consumption quintiles. The main thrust of the discussion is compare prevalence rates for the different diseases, and in the context of each disease, to assess variations in prevalence across per capita consumption quintiles.

Table 6.1 shows the number of persons suffering from the main lifestyle diseases and their specific prevalence rates relative to all persons who indicated that they were suffering from diseases. However, in order to interpret these results, it is critical that one bears in mind differential levels of awareness, knowledge and pursuit of treatment that are likely to be associated with socio-economic status. Irrespective of per capita consumption quintile, Table 6.1 shows that the high blood pressure is the most prevalent lifestyle disease affecting persons with diseases in St. Lucia. In every quintile group, Table 6.1 also shows that the prevalence of diabetes ranks second to high blood pressure as a lifetime disease affecting persons with diseases in St. Lucia. In each of the quintile groups, more than three fifths of the persons with diseases reported suffering from high blood pressure while more than one quarter reported suffering from diabetes. According to Table 6.1, heart diseases have been observed to be more prevalent than cancer in each of the quintile groups. In conclusion, Table 6.1 indicates that socio-economic status as gleaned from the quintile groups has no impact on the pattern of lifestyle diseases affecting the population of St. Lucia. It is worth noting that data on the prevalence of HIV/AIDS were not forthcoming and as such precluded any further analyses.

Table 6.1 presents results that permit assessments of variation in prevalence rates of the different main lifestyle diseases due to individuals' socio-economic status. With reference to persons who claim to have had a disease, the highest prevalence rates among persons claiming to be living with a heart condition or cancer have been observed for persons in the wealthiest quintile. For persons claiming to be living with diabetes, higher prevalence rates have been observed among persons in wealthier quintiles than among those in the two poorest quintiles.

Table 6.1: Persons Suffering from Disease by Type of Disease and Quintiles, Number and Percentage

Per Capita Consumption	Diabetes		High Blood Pressure		Heart Condition		Cancer		HIV/AIDS	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Poorest	771	28.7	1711	63.7	194	7.2	41	1.5	-	-
II	915	29.2	2099	67.0	347	11.1	41	1.3	-	-
III	1440	38.7	2501	67.3	307	8.3	79	2.1	-	-
IV	1601	35.2	3095	68.1	483	10.6	77	1.7	-	-
Richest	2569	37.6	4598	67.3	1151	16.9	189	2.8	-	-

It should be noted that these differential prevalence rates across socio-economic status groups are likely to be a function of status differentials in awareness of the onset of specific diseases, access to treatment, interpretation of diagnosis and orientation towards reporting the condition. For persons living with high blood pressure, there is no clear pattern of variation in prevalence rates across socio-economic status as prevalence rates appear to have stabilized at a little over two thirds of the persons claiming to have had a disease. This, however, was not the case for persons in the poorest quintile for whom, a slightly lower prevalence rate was observed when compared to the four wealthier quintiles.

6.2 USE OF HEALTH CARE FACILITIES BY TYPE

Individuals' use of health care facilities is being gauged in accordance with the type of medical facility first visited during the last thirty days as a result of an illness or injury. According to Table 6.2, 87.8% of persons who reported having a main lifestyle disease or in the past 30 days, experienced other forms of illness or injury due to accidents, indicated that they had either first visited a public hospital, a community health clinic or a private physician/dentist. Given that good personal health is a critical factor in enhancing individuals' prospects of pursuing educational opportunities and obtaining education credentials on one hand, and participating in productive enterprise through participating in the labour force on the other, it is absolutely essential that such individuals have access to quality health care. In the event that there is evidence that is indicative of variations in the delivery of quality health across different types of health care facilities, it becomes important to learn more about variations in the use of such facilities resulting from differences in individuals' socio-economic status.

Table 6.2: Percentage Distribution of Persons with Main Lifestyle Diseases or Illness and Injury due to Accidents in the Past 30 days by Type of Place First Visited for Medical Attention according to Per Capita Consumption Quintiles

Place First Visit Made	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%	%	%	%	%	
Public Hospital	33.7	26.8	34.7	29.3	24.5	29.1
Private Hospital	1.5	-	-	7.2	10.8	5.0
Community Health Clinic	30.1	35.2	33.3	26.4	13.9	25.9
Polyclinic	2.8	5.0	-	2.7	2.7	2.6
Private Doctor/Dentist	24.5	30.6	29.9	28.2	43.4	32.8
Out of state hospital	-	-	-	1.8	1.3	.8
Pharmacy/Chemist	2.8	1.2	1.0	1.8	2.6	2.0
Other	3.0	1.2	-	2.7	.7	1.4
Not Stated	1.5	-	1.1	-	-	.4
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

In the poorest quintile group, for instance, the majority of individuals used public hospitals (33.7%) with lower percentages using community health clinics (30.1%) and private physicians/dentists (24.5%). In the case of the wealthiest quintile group, the majority of individuals used private physicians/dentists (43.4%) with lower percentages using public hospitals (24.5%) and community health clinics (13.9%). A few other interesting observations are made in the context of the use of health facilities across socio-economic status groups. First, it is worth noting that the proportion of individuals visiting private physicians/dentists is lower in the poorest quintile than in any or the wealthier quintiles. Second, there is relatively greater use of private hospitals among individuals belonging to the two wealthiest quintiles than among their counterparts from the poorer quintiles. In particular, the use of private hospitals is most pronounced among the members of the wealthiest quintile.

Assuming that the individuals have been seeking similar medical services from different sources that may differ in the quality of their service delivery, some attention ought to be placed in redressing any imbalance that might arise in terms of differential access to quality services across socio-economic status groups. The relatively greater use of private physicians/dentists and private hospitals among individuals from wealthier quintiles relative to their counterparts from the poorest quintile is a critical determinant that could facilitate public policy reform geared towards improving health delivery systems. This may have implications for the redistribution of health coverage and resources that could provide better access to quality health care among poorer sub-populations. Moreover, other implications might include building capacity in public hospitals and community health care facilities to render health care services at higher standards that are deemed to be acceptable and in line with best practices.

6.3 HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE

Health insurance coverage is a function of the extent to which individuals are covered by private health insurance, employee medical plan, National Insurance Scheme or Social Welfare. Table 6.3 shows that the vast majority of individuals, estimated to be in the vicinity of 72.5% of the national population, did not have any medical coverage. This means that just 26.3% had such coverage. Altogether, Table 6.3 suggests that relatively fewer persons had health coverage when compared to those who had no such coverage, a pattern that persisted irrespective of individuals' socio-economic status group. Notwithstanding this, persons belonging to the poorest quintile were the least likely to have had insurance coverage which seem generally increased relatively speaking with a progression to wealthier quintiles, in particular, the two wealthiest quintiles. While just 5.7% of the persons belonging to the poorest quintile were estimated to have had health insurance coverage, the corresponding proportion among persons from the wealthiest cohort was estimated to be 40.9%. Such results should provide further means for explaining and appreciating outcomes indicating relatively greater use of private hospitals among persons belonging to the two wealthiest quintiles.

Table 6.3: Percentage Distribution of Population by Health Insurance Coverage according to Per Capita Consumption Quintiles

Covered By Health Insurance	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	5.7	21.7	16.1	31.6	40.9	26.3
No	92.8	75.9	83.9	67.5	57.8	72.5
Not Stated	1.5	2.3	-	.9	1.4	1.2
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

7.0 HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

7.1 TENANCY OF DWELLING

Home ownership is a means towards the acquisition of wealth. It is the outcome of an investment that provides owners with an asset base that can potentially enhance the well being of household members. Table 7.1 shows that 78.5% of all households lived in dwelling units that were owner-occupied with or without mortgage. Not surprisingly, the greatest proportion of households in owner-occupied dwelling units was evident in the wealthiest household quintile with rates of ownership amounting to 82.8%. In general, rates exceeding 75.0% were observed among households in each of the remaining household quintiles and thus indicative of prospects for owners to have substantial command over one of the most valuable assets of humankind. While the pattern of accommodating owner-occupied dwelling units does not vary much across household quintile groups, the quality of housing and the amenities available to household members are likely to vary across household quintile groups. While this concern will be addressed in the following sections, it will be pursued in the context of standards that persist irrespective of ownership status of dwelling units and not solely in the context of owner-occupied dwelling units.

Table 7.1: Percentage Distribution of Households by Tenancy of Dwelling according to Household Quintiles

		Household Quintiles – AE										Total	
		Poorest		II		III		IV		V		N	%
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Tenancy of Dwelling	Owned With Mortgage	338	3.6	559	6.0	686	7.4	1142	12.3	2002	21.3	4727	10.1
	Owned Without Mortgage	7115	76.0	6558	70.8	6522	70.3	5897	63.7	5788	61.5	31880	68.4
	Rented-Furnished	-	-	36	.4	-	-	110	1.2	268	2.8	414	.9
	Rented-Unfurnished	1223	13.1	1698	18.3	1615	17.4	1733	18.7	1209	12.8	7479	16.1
	Rent-free	541	5.8	415	4.5	411	4.4	340	3.7	74	.8	1781	3.8
	Squatted	73	.8	-	-	38	.4	-	-	77	.8	188	.4
	Other	38	.4	-	-	-	-	39	.4	-	-	76	.2
	Not Stated	39	.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	39	.1
Total		9367	100.0	9267	100.0	9272	100.0	9261	100.0	9417	100.0	46584	100.0

7.2 TYPE OF DWELLING UNIT

Despite the wide array of dwelling units, Table 7.2 shows that the vast majority (85.2%) of households occupied undivided private houses. Another 8.6% of all households shared a private house while 4.8% occupied a flat, apartment or condominium. It is clear that the occupation of undivided private houses is commonplace in St. Lucia transcending the socio-economic status of households. Notwithstanding such an outcome, the proportion of households occupying undivided private houses increases with declining household socio-economic status. Thus, while 80.7% of all households in the wealthiest quintile occupied undivided private houses, the corresponding proportion for the poorest quintile was 90.2%. Such a pattern suggests that household members from wealthier quintiles may have a wider array of housing options as reflected in the relatively larger proportions sharing private houses, occupying flats, apartments or condominiums, and living in units that assume other forms.

Table 7.2: Percentage Distribution of Households by Type of Dwelling Unit according to Household Quintiles

		Household Quintiles – AE										Total	
		Poorest		II		III		IV		V		N	%
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Type of Dwelling Unit	Undivided Private House	8448	90.2	8321	89.8	7765	83.7	7572	81.8	7597	80.7	39703	85.2
	Part of a Private House	660	7.0	572	6.2	831	9.0	1049	11.3	905	9.6	4016	8.6
	Flat, Apartment, Condominium	221	2.4	259	2.8	563	6.1	526	5.7	682	7.2	2250	4.8
	Double House/Duplex	-	-	-	-	-	-	38	.4	38	.4	75	.2
	Combined Business & Dwelling	38	.4	76	.8	76	.8	38	.4	195	2.1	423	.9
	Barracks	-	-	39	.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	39	.1
	Other	-	-	-	-	38	.4	39	.4	-	-	76	.2
Total		9367	100.0	9267	100.0	9272	100.0	9261	100.0	9417	100.0	46584	100.0

7.3 MAIN ROOFING MATERIAL

In St. Lucia, the use of sheet metal as an option for roofing is virtually universal. According to Table 7.3, 96.2% of all households lived in dwelling units that used sheet metal (galvanize) as the main roofing material. At the same time, Table 7.3 also shows that the proportion of households living in dwelling units that use sheet metal as the primary roofing material increases with declining household socio-economic status. While 90.3% of all households in the

wealthiest quintile lived in dwelling units that used sheet metal as the main roofing material, the corresponding proportion for the poorest quintile was 98.4%. The results are interesting and indicate that households belonging to the wealthiest quintile group may have been able to exercise greater choice in the purchase of dwelling units and the use of roofing material. Despite the prevalence of sheet metal across socio-economic status groups, there is virtually no means of evaluating the configuration and resistance of roofing options in providing adequate protection from the elements especially since such a criterion can be used to assess living standards that persist across the different socio-economic status groups.

7.4. MATERIAL OF OUTER WALLS

In St. Lucia, dwelling units are built of mainly with materials such as wood, concrete, a combination of wood and concrete or plywood. According to Table 7.3, the majority of households (43.4%) occupied dwelling units with outer walls of concrete. A further 20.2% occupied dwelling units with wooden outer walls while a slightly lower proportion amounting to 18.3% occupied dwelling units with outer walls of wood and concrete. Plywood was used to construct the outer walls of dwelling units that contained 15.5% of all households. Except for households belonging to the poorest quintile, those belonging to wealthier quintile groups occupied dwelling units with outer walls of concrete more frequently than units built with any other materials.

Outer walls of concrete are highly likely to enhance the physical strength of dwelling units and provide occupants with a greater sense of security against environmental agents. To this end, Table 7.3 shows that the proportion of households occupying dwelling units with outer walls built of concrete decreases with declining household socio-economic status. While 68.5% of all households in the wealthiest quintile occupied such dwelling units, the corresponding proportion for the poorest quintile was 20.9%. In contrast, the situation was reversed in the context of household occupying dwelling units with outer walls made of plywood. In such cases, the proportion of households living in units with outer walls of plywood has been increasing with declining household socio-economic status. According to Table 7.4, 1.6% of all households in the wealthiest quintile occupied dwelling units with outer walls made of plywood as opposed to a much higher proportion amounting to 30.7% in the case of households belonging to the poorest quintile.

Given the inferior quality of plywood as a means of constructing durable outer walls that can maximize protection against environmental and other external agents, considerable attention ought to be placed on this dimension of housing characteristics. The evidence pertaining to materials used for constructing outer walls point towards imbalances that place lower socio-economic status groups at clear disadvantages that have implications for the social and physical well being of group members.

Table 7.3: Percentage Distribution of Households by Main Roofing Material of Dwelling according to Household Quintiles

		Household Quintiles – AE										Total	
		Poorest		II		III		IV		V		N	%
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Main Roofing Material	Sheet Metal (galvanize)	9214	98.4	9112	98.3	9043	97.5	8952	96.7	8500	90.3	44821	96.2
	Shingle Asphalt	40	.4	40	.4	77	.8	234	2.5	462	4.9	853	1.8
	Shingle Wood	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	77	.8	77	.2
	Shingle Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	115	1.2	115	.2
	Tile	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	112	1.2	112	.2
	Concrete	-	-	114	1.2	72	.8	-	-	76	.8	263	.6
	Makeshift/ Thatched	-	-	-	-	38	.4	-	-	-	-	38	.1
	Other	38	.4	-	-	41	.4	75	.8	75	.8	229	.5
	Don't Know	75	.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	75	.2
Total		9367	100.0	9267	100.0	9272	100.0	9261	100.0	9417	100.0	46584	100.0

Table 7.4: Percentage Distribution of Households by Material of Outer Walls of Dwelling according to Household Quintiles

		Household Quintiles – AE										Total	
		Poorest		II		III		IV		V		N	%
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Material of Outer Walls	Wood/Timber	2997	32.0	2192	23.7	1774	19.1	1488	16.1	953	10.1	9404	20.2
	Concrete/Concrete Blocks	1955	20.9	2833	30.6	3860	41.6	5120	55.3	6455	68.5	20222	43.4
	Wood & Concrete	1309	14.0	2205	23.8	1721	18.6	1634	17.6	1670	17.7	8540	18.3
	Stone	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	41	.4	41	.1
	Brick/Blocks	194	2.1	227	2.4	224	2.4	188	2.0	111	1.2	943	2.0
	Plywood	2872	30.7	1774	19.1	1655	17.9	790	8.5	150	1.6	7241	15.5
	Makeshift	40	.4	36	.4	38	.4	-	-	-	-	114	.2
	Other/Don't Know	-	-	-	-	-	-	41	.4	-	-	41	.1
	Not Stated	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	38	.4	38	.1
Total		9367	100.0	9267	100.0	9272	100.0	9261	100.0	9417	100.0	46584	100.0

7.5 MAIN COOKING FUEL

Cooking gas was the principal cooking fuel of choice in St. Lucia being used by 91.1% of all households as a means of preparing meals. Coal and to a lesser extent, wood, were used by 5.2% and 2.2% of all households. Table 7.5 shows that the proportion of households using cooking gas decreased with declining socio-economic status. While 96.8% of all households in the wealthiest quintile used cooking gas, the corresponding proportion for the poorest quintile was 78.4%. In contrast, the situation was reversed with respect to the use of coal and wood as main fuels, the respective proportions actually increasing with declining socio-economic status within households.

Table 7.5: Percentage Distribution of Households by Main Cooking Fuel Used according to Household Quintiles

		Household Quintiles – AE										Total	
		Poorest		II		III		IV		V		N	%
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Main Cooking Fuel Used	Coal	1043	11.1	489	5.3	529	5.7	262	2.8	115	1.2	2438	5.2
	Wood	742	7.9	116	1.2	111	1.2	36	.4	36	.4	1042	2.2
	Gas/LPG/ Cooking Gas	7348	78.4	8662	93.5	8596	92.7	8734	94.3	9112	96.8	42451	91.1
	Kerosene	-	-	-	-	-	-	76	.8	-	-	76	.2
	Electricity	39	.4	-	-	36	.4	116	1.3	154	1.6	345	.7
	Other	195	2.1	-	-	-	-	36	.4	-	-	231	.5
Total		9367	100.0	9267	100.0	9272	100.0	9261	100.0	9417	100.0	46584	100.0

7.6 TOILET FACILITIES

In the main, the majority of households had toilet facilities that assume the form of water closets that are either linked to sewer systems or septic tanks. Altogether, Table 7.6 reveals that 66.6% of all households claimed to have such facilities. Another 28.7% of households relied upon pit latrines while 2.5% had no facilities whatsoever. Table 7.6 shows that the proportion of households with water closets decreased with declining socio-economic status so that while 93.0% of all households in the wealthiest quintile used toilet facilities that assume the form of water closets, the corresponding proportion for the poorest quintile was 31.0%. With respect to the proportion of households with toilet facilities that assume the form of pit latrines or where no toilet facilities were available, proportions actually increased as the socio-economic status of households declined. It is also worth noting that except for households belonging to the poorest quintile, those belonging to wealthier quintile groups claimed that they used water closets more frequently than any other type of toilet facility. In contrast, households in the poorest quintile claimed that they used pit latrines more frequently than any other type of facility. Insofar as the

use of pit latrines is so prevalent among households belonging to the poorest quintile, public health policy has to embrace infrastructural interventions in communities overwhelmed by poverty as a means of reducing the risks of succumbing to infectious and communicable diseases.

**Table 7.6: Percentage Distribution of Households by Toilet Facilities
Used according to Household Quintiles**

		Household Quintiles – AE										Total	
		Poorest		II		III		IV		V		N	%
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Toilet Facilities Used	W.C. Linked to sewer	263	2.8	412	4.4	337	3.6	381	4.1	1377	14.6	2770	5.9
	W.C. Linked to Septic tank/Soak-away	2644	28.2	5013	54.1	6136	66.2	7088	76.5	7388	78.4	28269	60.7
	Pit-latrine	5415	57.8	3399	36.7	2386	25.7	1524	16.5	652	6.9	13375	28.7
	Ventilated Pit-latrine	38	.4	38	.4	75	.8	-	-	-	-	151	.3
	Other	300	3.2	293	3.2	183	2.0	77	.8	-	-	853	1.8
	None	707	7.5	73	.8	154	1.7	192	2.1	-	-	1126	2.4
	Not Stated	-	-	39	.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	39	.1
Total		9367	100.0	9267	100.0	9272	100.0	9261	100.0	9417	100.0	46584	100.0

7.7 MAIN SOURCE OF WATER

In St. Lucia, the majority of households claimed that they relied mainly upon water being piped into dwelling from a public source (68.6%), piped into yard from public source (19.9%) or obtained from a public standpipe (5.3%). Thus, according to Table 7.7, almost 94.0% of all household relied principally upon public sources for their water supply. Table 7.7 shows that the proportion of households with water piped into their dwelling units from public sources decreased with declining socio-economic status so that while 90.1% of all households in the wealthiest quintile obtained pipe borne water from public sources, the corresponding proportion for the poorest quintile was 40.1%. Altogether, pipe borne water from public sources was the most frequently cited main source of water supply in spite of household socio-economic status. Nonetheless, it is worth noting that in the proportions of households that relied principally on a public supply of water in a yard or standpipe increased with declining socio-economic status. While only 7.0% of all households in the wealthiest quintile reported having their main supply of water piped into a yard from a public source, the corresponding proportion within the poorest quintile was estimated to be 34.4%. With respect to time-consuming means of gathering water, whether by means of a public standpipe, a public well,

tank or truck, or a private catchment area, relatively greater numbers of households from the poorest quintile relied upon such means when compared to households in the wealthier quintile groups.

Table 7.7: Percentage Distribution of Households by Main Source of Water according to Household Quintiles

	Household Quintiles – AE										Total	
	Poorest		II		III		IV		V		N	%
Main Source of Water	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Public, piped into dwelling	3795	40.5	5546	59.8	6546	70.6	7604	82.1	8488	90.1	31979	68.6
Public, piped into yard	3220	34.4	2408	26.0	2008	21.7	1000	10.8	657	7.0	9293	19.9
Public standpipe	1266	13.5	601	6.5	341	3.7	272	2.9	-	-	2480	5.3
Public well/tank or truck	39	.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	39	.1
Private, piped into dwelling	38	.4	221	2.4	109	1.2	112	1.2	110	1.2	590	1.3
Private catchment not piped	38	.4	151	1.6	36	.4	-	-	41	.4	266	.6
Private catchment piped	77	.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	41	.4	117	.3
Other	894	9.5	302	3.3	231	2.5	274	3.0	79	.8	1780	3.8
Not Stated	-	-	39	.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	39	.1
Total	9367	100.0	9267	100.0	9272	100.0	9261	100.0	9417	100.0	46584	100.0

In addition to satisfying the daily preparation of meals and individuals' daily dietary requirements, adequate means of accessing a potential supply of water permits the household members to accomplish a number of other personal daily functions that enhance their quality of life and overall living standards. Thus, Table 7.7 produces results that point towards a greater engagement in more time-consuming water-gathering practices by members of poorer households. Such an allocation of time is likely to reduce the amount of time available for individuals to develop their human capabilities and retard their transition to more favourable conditions and opportunities in life. Altogether, the main sources of water supply are distributed inequitably across household socio-economic status groups and will require infrastructural interventions within the public arena to enhance the quality of service delivery and reduce inequities.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX ONE

THE RISK OF BEING POOR IN ST. LUCIA - LOGISTIC REGRESSION MODEL

A logistic regression model was elaborated, using the micro-dataset from the SLC/HBS 2005/06, following similar works by a number of researchers in other parts of the world (Ruben 1996, Ray 1999 and Geda 2001). The logit model attempts to estimate a household's odds of being poor, given various conditioning factors, including but not restricted to age, gender, adult equivalent family size⁶, education, sector of employment, region, unemployment and participation in the labour force.

The variables in focus "poverty" or alternatively "vulnerability", take one of two conditions for every household that is, poor or non-poor when the variable in question is "poverty" and "vulnerable" or "not vulnerable" in the case of vulnerability. The choice of exogenous variables was influenced by confounding and effect modifying (interaction) impacts, but the final selection was based on theory, precedent of use in other studies and limitations in the dataset. Several different variable types were used based on inherent natural contrast, as in the case of the unemployed in contrast to the employed; participants versus non participants in the labour force; and female versus male-headed households. Variables such as age, number of persons employed or unemployed in the household or adult equivalent family size are continuous variables and their impact on the condition of poverty or vulnerability was interpreted in terms of the percentage contribution of an additional year or household member to the odds of being poor. The model also utilizes variables with less obvious contrasts, as in the case of regions - urban/rural or north/south.

RESULTS/FINDINGS

1. Employment

Most research on poverty has identified unemployment as a major contributing factor. Since the issue of employment or unemployment is potentially a problem for all household members we examined this issue in such a way that all household members impact the model from the perspective of how much additional income each member brings to the household. The model concludes that households reduce the risk of poverty by a factor of 96% for every additional \$100 EC earned by an employed person in the household. The use of income focuses not only on the availability of employment to eligible household members but it also serves as a proxy for the quality of employment obtained.

The model was also tested with both the unemployment status of the head of household as an explanatory variable, but although significant, the presence of this variable adversely affected

⁶ The use of adult equivalent scales in this study improves the specification of the absolute poverty line when compared to a per capita measure by according higher relative weights to adults over children. This study however does not explore the possibility of economies of household size in consumption which has been shown in some studies to be significant (Ranjan Ray 1999).

the model's overall validity and was consequently dropped in favour of the number of employed persons, which though not significant improved the overall validity of the model. While the inclusion of the number of persons employed masks, to some extent, the effect of specific occupation groups, two such groups were defined and tested in the model: households containing at least one agricultural worker and households containing at least one worker in the construction sector. These two variables were selected/defined due to their significance to the economic dynamics of St Lucia at this time.

The construction sector, for example, employs large numbers of unskilled labour but is cyclical: at the moment St Lucia is experiencing a construction "boom" due to increased economic activity in preparation for the hosting of the 2007 Cricket World Cup. The result has been a reduction of unemployment and increasing employment rates in St. Lucia. However, workers in the construction sector are a special group of predominately males coming from either marginal farmers/farm labourers class on the one hand or senior primary/primary school leavers on the other, this variable was thus included in the model.

The variable for "at least one member of the household is engaged in employment in the construction sector" is the single most important variable which can be associated with poverty. While persons are employed, and the unemployment rate is 13% nationally, the lowest rate on record, this employment is largely being driven by jobs created by urban construction activity. These jobs require low levels of skill and provide very modest levels of compensation not sufficient to lift person engaged in the sector out of poverty. When household members are employed in the construction sector the odds of a household being "poor" increased by 172%.

2. Housing conditions

A variable normally considered as an indicator of "un-met" basic housing needs, the number of persons per bedroom, though not usually considered from precedent set in other studies or by theory was also introduced for two reasons. First, it is intuitively appealing to make an association between the risk of poverty and housing conditions of members of households; and second the statistical properties of this variable in the model are very appealing - it significantly enhances the model's overall validity based on Wald and log likelihood test results.

Overcrowding at the household level was found to be a statistically significant variable affecting the determination of a poor household. The model suggests that improvement of housing conditions can, conditioned on the other variables included in this model, improve the situation of the poor by up to 65%.

3. Family Size and dependents

The adult equivalent family size was included as a continuous variable in this model and was found to be significant at the 1% level on the chi square distributed Wald test; for each additional equivalent adult added to the household the risk of poverty increases by 146%. This is not an unexpected result as larger household sizes are associated with greater levels of deprivation, social and material deficiencies.

The model also attempts to make a direct link between the presence of children in a household and poverty. This was found to be one of the most important variables impacting the risk of being “poor”: each additional child adds 120% to the risk of being “poor”.

4. Education

The issue of education was introduced as a categorical variable in the model (it was found to be significant at the 1% level) and its components were classified, broadly as none (no education), primary, secondary and tertiary. It was found that households with heads that had primary education were 54% less likely to be poor than households where the head had no education. This finding provides very strong evidence in support of ensuring that poverty reduction should be accompanied by very deliberate and sustained emphasis on primary education. Secondary education is also an important factor: households where household heads had secondary or higher levels of education were generally not poor.

5. District/Region

The region variable examines the districts most affected by poverty and the odds associated with the extent of the problem in given districts. Anse-la-raye/Canaries, Choiseul and Laborie appear to have “odds” ratios greater than the reference “Castries City” area by a factor of at least 25% more than the remaining parts of St. Lucia.

ANNEX TO LOGISTIC REGRESSION MODEL

This logistic regression model for St. Lucia is similar to work done by a number of researchers in other parts of the world (see: Marc Ruben 1996, Ranjan Ray 1999, Alemayehu Geda 2001 etc.). The techniques applied in this exercise have been elaborated in various texts which deal with the specification of models with a dichotomous dependent variable (see: Maddala 1983, Aldrich and Nelson 1984).

The variables in focus “poverty” or alternatively “vulnerability”, take one of two conditions for every household in the micro-dataset under consideration (St. Lucia SLC/HBS 2005/06) that is, ‘poor’ or ‘non-poor’ when the variable in question is “poverty” and “vulnerable” or “not vulnerable”, when the variable is “vulnerability”.

The general form of the model being tested is given below in the following equation:

$$\text{Logit}P(X) = \beta_0 + \sum_i \beta_i E_i + \sum_i \beta_i V_i + \sum_j \beta_j W_j$$

where:

- $P(X)$ =probability of event X occurring
- β_0 =baseline odds
- β_i =coefficients of the exposure effect variables E_i
- β_i =coefficients of the confounding variables V_i
- β_j =coefficients of the effect modifying variables W_j

This equation was defined in the first instance very broadly.

Theory and prior research has shown that variables mentioned previously should be included as a matter of model validity, and hence are not removed in every case on the basis of tests of statistical significance since systematic as opposed to random error may result. In specifying the

model, interaction effects between variables are considered and variable removal was done in the case of multiplicative variables which are too complex or which cause a rejection of the null hypothesis at the 5% level. These restrictions ensure the reduction of multicollinearity errors and improve the interpretation of odds/risk ratios associated with the equation coefficients.

Model Results:

In arriving at the “gold standard” logistic regression equation the general hierarchically well formulated (HWF)⁷ model has been refined by a backward elimination procedure based on chi-squared test if interaction is involved. The vast majority of interaction terms which were not significant at the 10% level or better were eliminated.

Variables	Definition	Symbol in estimated equation
Dependent variable (model I)	P=1 if poor, 0 otherwise Poverty estimate based on consumption per adult equivalent	Poor in binary logit model
Dependent variable (model II)	I=1 if indigent, 0 otherwise Poverty estimate based on consumption per adult equivalent	Vul in binary logit model
Explanatory variables		
Sex of Household Head	Sex = 1 if Female, 0 Male	fhead
Employed	=1 if unemployed, 0 otherwise	employed
Age	Five year age group of household head's	yr5
Adult Equivalent	Equivalent number of adults	adeq
Education (all)	Education at all levels	EDUCAT1
1) Education(none)	No Education or No Education but OJT=1, 0 otherwise	EDUCAT1(1)
2) Education(primary)	Primary or Primary with training=1, 0 otherwise	EDUCAT1(2)
3) Education(Secondary)	Secondary =1, 0 otherwise	EDUCAT1(3)
4) Education(Secondary)	Tertiary =1, 0 otherwise	EDUCAT1(4)
5) Head unemployed	Unemployed=1, 0 otherwise	hunemp
6) Head in Labour force	Head in Labour Force=1, 0 otherwise	hlforce
7) Dependants under 15	No of dependants less than 15 years	Depend15
8) Household Type	Female head with no adult male=1 Female head with adult male=2 Male headed household=3	
9) Construction	In Construction=1, 0 otherwise	Constr
10) Persons per Bed	More than 2 per bed=1, otherwise 0	PERBED1
11) District of Residence	All regions	DISTRICT
1) Castries City	Castries City =1, otherwise 0	DISTRICT(1)
2) Castries Suburban	Castries Suburban =1, otherwise 0	DISTRICT(2)
3) Anse-la-Rayé/Canaries		
4) Soufriere	Anse-la-Rayé/Canaries =1, otherwise 0	DISTRICT(3)
5) Choiseul		DISTRICT(4)
6) Laborie	Soufriere=1, otherwise 0	DISTRICT(5)
7) Vieux-Fort	Choiseul =1, otherwise 0	DISTRICT(6)
8) Micoud	Laborie=1, otherwise 0	DISTRICT(7)
9) Dennery	Vieux-Fort =1, otherwise 0	DISTRICT(8)
12) Income	Micoud =1, otherwise 0 Dennery =1, otherwise 0 Household Income in Hundreds of Dollars	DISTRICT(9) Hinc1

⁷ Tests about retention of lower order components are independent of coding.

Overall test for the validity of the model follows⁸. Unlike classical regression analysis, logistic regression does not produce goodness of fit statistics that are unambiguous and universally accepted. While two of these summary model statistics are reported for each of the two models presented, the following is a model of the “poor” versus the “non-poor” followed by a model for the “vulnerable” versus the “not vulnerable”. A more reliable assessment of the validity of the regression equation can be obtained by an examination of the Wald and Likelihood ratio test:

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

	Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1 Step	276.552	18	.000
Block	276.552	18	.000
Model	276.552	18	.000

Model Summary

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	950.343 ^a	.205	.321

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 20 because maximum iterations has been reached. Final solution cannot be found.

The model for the “poor” vs “the non poor” is specified as follows:

Classification Table^a

		Predicted		
		poor		Percentage Correct
		0	1	
Step 1	Observed			
	poor 0	911	43	95.5
	1	171	78	31.3
	Overall Percentage			82.2

a. The cut value is .500

⁸ When choosing between competing logit models, the decision to reject depends on whether the addition/deletion of some explanatory variable(s) contributes to the model's overall statistical validity. Both the log likelihood function and the Wald test measure this, and are distributed Chi square.

Variables in the Model of the "Poor"

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1	perbed1	-.439	.227	3.734	1	.053	.645
	depend15	.187	.084	5.007	1	.025	1.206
	educat			29.846	4	.000	
	educat(1)	-.624	.219	8.162	1	.004	.536
	educat(2)	-1.503	.292	26.539	1	.000	.222
	educat(3)	-1.668	.587	8.063	1	.005	.189
	educat(4)	-19.395	4784.074	.000	1	.997	.000
	constr	.542	.219	6.136	1	.013	1.719
	district			28.082	9	.001	
	district(1)	.764	.379	4.068	1	.044	2.147
	district(2)	.944	.477	3.918	1	.048	2.571
	district(3)	1.363	.509	7.173	1	.007	3.906
	district(4)	1.632	.522	9.774	1	.002	5.114
	district(5)	1.616	.485	11.109	1	.001	5.033
	district(6)	1.292	.438	8.709	1	.003	3.640
	district(7)	1.709	.424	16.285	1	.000	5.524
	district(8)	1.468	.431	11.618	1	.001	4.339
	district(9)	1.361	.411	10.962	1	.001	3.902
	hhinc1	-.045	.007	42.223	1	.000	.956
	adeq	.379	.078	23.652	1	.000	1.461
	Constant	-2.349	.466	25.393	1	.000	.095

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: perbed1, depend15, educat, constr, district, hhinc1, adeq.

The model for the “vulnerable” vs “the non vulnerable” is specified as follows:

Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

		Chi-square	df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	297.710	18	.000
	Block	297.710	18	.000
	Model	297.710	18	.000

Model Summary

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	1258.742 ^a	.219	.302

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 7 because parameter estimates changed by less than .001.

Variables in the Equation for the "Vulnerable"

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1 ^a	district			16.034	9	.066	
	district(1)	.348	.261	1.781	1	.182	1.416
	district(2)	1.139	.371	9.399	1	.002	3.122
	district(3)	.325	.420	.596	1	.440	1.384
	district(4)	.831	.410	4.105	1	.043	2.296
	district(5)	.919	.390	5.537	1	.019	2.506
	district(6)	.629	.327	3.706	1	.054	1.875
	district(7)	.693	.322	4.649	1	.031	2.001
	district(8)	.688	.326	4.465	1	.035	1.990
	district(9)	.688	.296	5.418	1	.020	1.990
	employed	-.554	.093	35.672	1	.000	.575
	educat			28.639	4	.000	
	educat(1)	-.573	.203	7.974	1	.005	.564
	educat(2)	-.993	.239	17.250	1	.000	.370
	educat(3)	-1.129	.390	8.373	1	.004	.323
	educat(4)	-3.778	1.054	12.842	1	.000	.023
	depend15	.072	.079	.842	1	.359	1.075
	constr	.562	.194	8.377	1	.004	1.754
	perbed1	-.819	.188	18.951	1	.000	.441
	adeq	.455	.082	30.948	1	.000	1.576
	Constant	-.733	.358	4.197	1	.041	.481

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: district, employed, educat, depend15, constr, perbed1, adeq.

This model was also tested the unemployment status of the head of household as an explanatory variable; while this variable was significant only at the 5% level, its presence in the model adversely affected the Wald statistic of the household income variable which reduced the model's overall validity. Consequently it was dropped from the model in favour of the number of employed persons which though not significant improved the overall validity of the model.

APPENDIX TWO: STATISTICAL TABLES

LIST OF TABLES

DEMOGRAPHIC TABLES

TABLE 1: RELATIONSHIP TO HEAD OF HOUSEHOLDS BY QUINTILES -----	63
TABLE 2: DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY SEX AND BY QUINTILES -----	63
TABLE 3: AGE DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY QUINTILES -----	64
TABLE 4: DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY ETHNICITY AND QUINTILES -----	64
TABLE 5: DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY RELIGION AND QUINTILES-----	65
TABLE 6: DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED AGE GROUPINGS BY QUINTILES-----	65

ACTIVITY STATUS TABLES

TABLE 7: LABOUR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATE: PERSONS AGE 15+ BY GENDER AND QUINTILES---	67
TABLE 8: DISTRIBUTION OF MALE LABOUR FORCE PARTICIPANTS BY HIGHEST EXAMINATION PASSED BY QUINTILES-----	67
TABLE 8: DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALE LABOUR FORCE PARTICIPANTS BY HIGHEST EXAMINATION PASSED BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)-----	68
TABLE 8: DISTRIBUTION OF BOTH SEXES OF LABOUR FORCE PARTICIPANTS BY HIGHEST EXAMINATION PASSED BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	68
TABLE 9: DISTRIBUTION OF MALE LABOUR FORCE PARTICIPANTS BY TYPE OF WORKER -----	69
TABLE 9: DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALE LABOUR FORCE PARTICIPANTS BY TYPE OF WORKER (CONT'D)	69
TABLE 9: DISTRIBUTION OF BOTH SEXES OF LABOUR FORCE PARTICIPANTS BY TYPE OF WORKER (CONT'D) -----	70
TABLE 10: DISTRIBUTION OF MALE EMPLOYED BY NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED BY QUINTILES----	70
TABLE 10: DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALE EMPLOYED BY NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	71
TABLE 10: DISTRIBUTION OF BOTH SEXES EMPLOYED BY NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	71
TABLE 11: DISTRIBUTION OF MALE EMPLOYEES BY REASON OR WORKING LESS THEN 40 HOURS BY QUINTILES -----	72
TABLE 11: DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALE EMPLOYEES BY REASON FOR WORKING LESS THEN 40 HOURS BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	72
TABLE 11: DISTRIBUTION OF BOTH SEXES OF EMPLOYEES BY REASON FOR WORKING LESS THEN 40 HOURS BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	73

EDUCATION TABLES

TABLE 12: DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONS ATTENDING SCHOOL BY SEX AND QUINTILES-----	75
TABLE 12: DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONS ATTENDING SCHOOL BY SEX AND QUINTILES (CONT'D)----	75
TABLE 12: DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONS ATTENDING SCHOOL BY SEX AND QUINTILES (CONT'D)----	76
TABLE 12: DISTRIBUTION OF MALES ATTENDING SCHOOL BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	76
TABLE 12: DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALES ATTENDING SCHOOL BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)-----	77
TABLE 12: DISTRIBUTION OF BOTH SEXES ATTENDING SCHOOL BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	77
TABLE 13: DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONS ATTENDING SCHOOL BY AGE AND QUINTILES-----	78

TABLE 14: DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONS NOT ATTENDING SCHOOL BY AGE AND QUINTILES -----	78
TABLE 14: DISTRIBUTION OF MALES BY REPORTED LITERACY STATUS BY QUINTILES -----	79
TABLE 14: DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALES BY REPORTED LITERACY STATUS BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) --	79
TABLE 14: DISTRIBUTION OF BOTH SEXES BY REPORTED LITERACY STATUS BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)	79
TABLE 15: NUMBER OF DAYS MALES ATTENDING SCHOOL WEEKLY BY QUINTILES -----	80
TABLE 15: NUMBER OF DAYS FEMALES ATTENDING SCHOOL WEEKLY BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) ----	80
TABLE 15: NUMBER OF DAYS BOTH SEXES ATTENDING SCHOOL WEEKLY BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)-	81
TABLE 16: HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION ATTAINED BY MALE HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS BY QUINTILES -----	81
TABLE 16: HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION ATTAINED BY FEMALE HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	82
TABLE 16: HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION ATTAINED BY MALE AND FEMALE HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)-----	82
TABLE 17: HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION ATTAINED BY MALES COMPLETING SCHOOL BY QUINTILES -----	83
TABLE 17: HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION ATTAINED BY FEMALES COMPLETING SCHOOL BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	83
TABLE 17: HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION ATTAINED BY BOTH SEXES COMPLETING SCHOOL BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	84
TABLE 18: DISTRIBUTION OF MALES WITH TECHNICAL OR VOCATIONAL TRAINING BY QUINTILES	84
TABLE 18: DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALES WITH TECHNICAL OR VOCATIONAL TRAINING BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	85
TABLE 18: DISTRIBUTION OF BOTH SEXES WITH TECHNICAL OR VOCATIONAL TRAINING BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	85
TABLE 19: DISTRIBUTION OF MALE YOUTHS WITH TECHNICAL OR VOCATIONAL TRAINING BY QUINTILES -----	85
TABLE 19: DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALE YOUTHS WITH TECHNICAL OR VOCATIONAL TRAINING BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	86
TABLE 19: DISTRIBUTION OF BOTH SEXES OF YOUTHS WITH TECHNICAL OR VOCATIONAL TRAINING BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	86
TABLE 20: DISTRIBUTION OF MALES RECEIVING FREE MEALS OR SNACKS FROM MEAL SERVICE BY QUINTILES -----	86
TABLE 20: DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALES RECEIVING FREE MEALS OR SNACKS FROM MEAL SERVICE BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	87
TABLE 20: DISTRIBUTION OF BOTH SEXES RECEIVING FREE MEALS OR SNACKS FROM MEAL SERVICE BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	87
TABLE 21: REPORTED OWNERSHIP OF SCHOOL BOOKS BY MALES BY QUINTILES-----	87
TABLE 21: REPORTED OWNERSHIP OF SCHOOL BOOKS BY FEMALES BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)-----	88
TABLE 21: REPORTED OWNERSHIP OF SCHOOL BOOKS BY BOTH SEXES BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) ----	88
TABLE 22: REPORTED REASONS FOR NOT OWNING ALL TEXT BOOKS BY MALES BY QUINTILES ----	88
TABLE 22: REPORTED REASONS FOR NOT OWNING ALL TEXT BOOKS BY FEMALES BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	89
TABLE 22: REPORTED REASONS FOR NOT OWNING ALL TEXT BOOKS BY BOTH SEXES BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	89

TABLE 23: DISTRIBUTION OF MALES ATTENDING SCHOOL USING BOOK LOAN FACILITY BY QUINTILES -----	89
TABLE 23: DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALES ATTENDING SCHOOL USING BOOK LOAN FACILITY BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	90
TABLE 23: DISTRIBUTION OF BOTH SEXES ATTENDING SCHOOL USING BOOK LOAN FACILITY BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	90
TABLE 24: HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION OF MALES NOT ATTENDING SCHOOL BY QUINTILES ---	90
TABLE 24: HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION OF FEMALES NOT ATTENDING SCHOOL BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	91
TABLE 24: HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION OF BOTH SEXES NOT ATTENDING SCHOOL BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	91
TABLE 25: HIGHEST EXAMINATION PASSED BY MALES NOT ATTENDING SCHOOL BY QUINTILES ---	92
TABLE 25: HIGHEST EXAMINATION PASSED BY FEMALES NOT ATTENDING SCHOOL BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	92
TABLE 25: HIGHEST EXAMINATION PASSED BY BOTH SEXES NOT ATTENDING SCHOOL BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	93

HEALTH TABLES

TABLE 26: DISTRIBUTION OF MALES CONFINED TO BED BY QUINTILES -----	95
TABLE 26: DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALES CONFINED TO BED BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)-----	95
TABLE 26: DISTRIBUTION OF BOTH SEXES CONFINED TO BED BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	95
TABLE 27: TYPE OF ILLNESS OR INJURY CONFINING MALES TO BED BY QUINTILES-----	96
TABLE 27: TYPE OF ILLNESS OR INJURY CONFINING FEMALES TO BED BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) ----	97
TABLE 27: TYPE OF ILLNESS OR INJURY CONFINING BOTH SEXES TO BED BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -	98
TABLE 28: MALES REPORTING ILLNESS OR INJURY BY QUINTILES-----	99
TABLE 28: FEMALES REPORTING ILLNESS OR INJURY BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	99
TABLE 28: BOTH SEXES REPORTING ILLNESS OR INJURY BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	99
TABLE 29: TYPE OF ILLNESS OR INJURY CONFINING MALES TO BED BY QUINTILES-----	100
TABLE 29: TYPE OF ILLNESS OR INJURY CONFINING FEMALES TO BED BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) ----	101
TABLE 29: TYPE OF ILLNESS OR INJURY CONFINING BOTH SEXES TO BED BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)	102
TABLE 30: DISTRIBUTION OF MALES SUFFERING FROM LIFESTYLE DISEASES BY QUINTILES -----	103
TABLE 30: DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALES SUFFERING FROM LIFESTYLE DISEASES BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	103
TABLE 30: DISTRIBUTION OF BOTH SEXES SUFFERING FROM LIFESTYLE DISEASES BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	103
TABLE 31: TOTAL NUMBER OF MALES REPORTING INJURY OR ILLNESS BY QUINTILES-----	104
TABLE 31: TOTAL NUMBER OF FEMALES REPORTING INJURY OR ILLNESS BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)	104
TABLE 31: TOTAL NUMBER OF BOTH SEXES REPORTING INJURY OR ILLNESS BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)	104
TABLE 32: DISTRIBUTION OF MALES SEEKING MEDICAL ATTENTION BY QUINTILES-----	105
TABLE 32: DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALES SEEKING MEDICAL ATTENTION BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) ---	105
TABLE 32: DISTRIBUTION OF BOTH SEXES SEEKING MEDICAL ATTENTION BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)	105
TABLE 33: REASONS FOR MALES NOT SEEKING MEDICAL ATTENTION BY QUINTILES-----	106
TABLE 33: REASONS FOR FEMALES NOT SEEKING MEDICAL ATTENTION BY SEX AND QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	106
TABLE 33: REASONS FOR BOTH SEXES NOT SEEKING MEDICAL ATTENTION BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)	106

TABLE 34: MEAN DAYS MALES UNABLE TO WORK AND DAYS WITHOUT PAY BY QUINTILES-----	107
TABLE 34: MEAN DAYS FEMALES UNABLE TO WORK AND DAYS WITHOUT PAY BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	107
TABLE 34: MEAN DAYS BOTH SEXES UNABLE TO WORK AND DAYS WITHOUT PAY BY QUINTILES (CONT'D) -----	107
TABLE 35: PLACE FIRST VISITED BY MALES FOR MEDICAL ATTENTION BY QUINTILES -----	108
TABLE 35: PLACE FIRST VISITED BY FEMALES FOR MEDICAL ATTENTION BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)-	108
TABLE 35: PLACE FIRST VISITED BY BOTH SEXES FOR MEDICAL ATTENTION BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)	109
TABLE 36: PERSON PROVIDING MEDICAL ATTENTION TO MALES BY QUINTILES-----	109
TABLE 36 (CONT'D): PERSON PROVIDING MEDICAL ATTENTION TO FEMALES BY QUINTILES -----	110
TABLE 36 (CONT'D): PERSON PROVIDING MEDICAL ATTENTION TO BOTH SEXES BY QUINTILES---	110
TABLE 37: REPORTED LEVEL OF SATISFACTION OF MALES WITH MEDICAL SERVICE BY QUINTILES	110
TABLE 37 (CONT'D): REPORTED LEVEL OF SATISFACTION OF FEMALES WITH MEDICAL SERVICE BY QUINTILES -----	111
TABLE 37 (CONT'D): REPORTED LEVEL OF SATISFACTION OF BOTH SEXES WITH MEDICAL SERVICE BY QUINTILES-----	111
TABLE 38: REASONS FOR DISSATISFACTION OF MALES WITH REPORTED LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH MEDICAL SERVICE BY QUINTILES-----	112
TABLE 38 (CONT'D): REASONS FOR DISSATISFACTION OF FEMALES WITH REPORTED LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH MEDICAL SERVICE BY QUINTILES-----	112
TABLE 38 (CONT'D): REASONS FOR DISSATISFACTION OF BOTH SEXES WITH REPORTED LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH MEDICAL SERVICE BY SEX AND QUINTILES-----	113
TABLE 39: MEAN TIME (MINS.) MALES SPENT WAITING FOR MEDICAL TREATMENT BY QUINTILES	113
TABLE 39 (CONT'D): MEAN TIME (MINS.) FEMALES SPENT WAITING FOR MEDICAL TREATMENT BY SEX AND QUINTILES-----	113
TABLE 39 (CONT'D): MEAN TIME (MINS.) BOTH SEXES SPENT WAITING FOR MEDICAL TREATMENT BY SEX AND QUINTILES-----	114
TABLE 40: MEAN TIME SPENT WAITING FOR TREATMENT BY PLACE VISITED FOR MEDICAL CARE	114
TABLE 41: DISTRIBUTION OF MALES COVERED BY MEDICAL INSURANCE BY QUINTILES -----	114
TABLE 41 (CONT'D): DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALES COVERED BY MEDICAL INSURANCE BY QUINTILES	115
TABLE 41 (CONT'D): DISTRIBUTION OF BOTH SEXES COVERED BY MEDICAL INSURANCE BY QUINTILES -----	115

ANTHROPOMETRIC TABLES

TABLE 42: CHARACTERISTICS OF CHILDREN UNDER 5 YEARS IN QUINTILES -----	117
TABLE 43: PLACE CHILD DELIVERED BY QUINTILES-----	117
TABLE 44: CHILDREN SUFFERING FROM DIARRHOEA BY SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS BY QUINTILES	117
TABLE 45: CHILDREN PREVIOUSLY BREAST FED BY SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS -----	118
TABLE 46: CHILDREN PRESENTLY BREAST FED BY AGE AND SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS-----	118
TABLE 47: IMMUNIZATION RECEIVED BY CHILDREN UNDER 5 YEARS BY QUINTILES -----	118
TABLE 48: IMMUNIZATION RECEIVED BY AGE OF CHILD BY QUINTILES-----	119

HOUSING TABLES

TABLE 49: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: MAIN MATERIAL OF OUTER WALLS BY QUINTILES ---	121
TABLE 50: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: TYPE OF DWELLING UNIT BY QUINTILES -----	121

TABLE 51: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: TYPE OF DWELLING UNIT BY DISTRICT -----	122
TABLE 52: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: MAIN ROOFING MATERIAL BY QUINTILES-----	122
TABLE 53: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: MAIN ROOFING MATERIAL BY DISTRICT-----	123
TABLE 54: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: TENANCY OF LAND BY QUINTILES-----	123
TABLE 55: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: TENANCY OF LAND BY DISTRICT-----	124
TABLE 56: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: TENANCY OF DWELLING BY QUINTILES -----	124
TABLE 57: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: TENANCY OF DWELLING BY DISTRICT -----	125
TABLE 58: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: MAIN COOKING FUEL USED BY QUINTILES -----	125
TABLE 59: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: MAIN COOKING FUEL USED BY DISTRICT-----	126
TABLE 60: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: MAIN COOKING FUEL USED BY QUINTILES -----	126
TABLE 61: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: MAIN COOKING FUEL USED BY DISTRICT-----	127
TABLE 62: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: MAIN COOKING FUEL USED BY QUINTILES -----	127
TABLE 63: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: MAIN COOKING FUEL USED BY DISTRICT-----	128
TABLE 64: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: TOILET FACILITY USED BY QUINTILES -----	128
TABLE 65: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: TOILET FACILITIES USED BY DISTRICT -----	129
TABLE 66: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: FACILITIES SHARED BY QUINTILES -----	129
TABLE 67: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: MAIN SOURCE OF WATER BY QUINTILES -----	130
TABLE 68: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: MAIN SOURCE OF WATER BY DISTRICT -----	130
TABLE 69: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: MAIN FREQUENCY OF WATER SUPPLY BY QUINTILES	131
TABLE 70: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: FREQUENCY OF WATER SUPPLY BY DISTRICT-----	131
TABLE 71: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: MAIN SOURCE OF LIGHTING BY QUINTILES-----	132
TABLE 72: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: MAIN SOURCE OF LIGHTING BY DISTRICT-----	132
TABLE 73: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: AGE OF DWELLING BY QUINTILES -----	133
TABLE 74: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: AGE OF DWELLING BY DISTRICT -----	133
TABLE 75: SOCIO ECONOMIC RATING OF HOUSEHOLD BY QUINTILES-----	134
TABLE 76: SOCIO ECONOMIC RATING OF HOUSEHOLDS BY DISTRICT-----	134
TABLE 77: MEAN NUMBER OF ROOMS AND USE OF ROOMS BY QUINTILES -----	135

DEMOGRAPHIC TABLES

TABLE 1: RELATIONSHIP TO HEAD OF HOUSEHOLDS BY QUINTILES

Relationship to Head of Household	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Head	20.8	23.3	26.0	30.4	40.0	28.1
Spouse/partner	9.7	11.8	12.1	14.4	18.4	13.3
Child	51.0	43.7	38.9	38.7	29.2	40.3
Son/ daughter-in-law	.3	.7	.7	.6	.1	.5
Grandchild	11.3	12.9	11.5	8.3	4.8	9.8
Parent/parent-in-law	1.2	.9	1.8	.9	1.3	1.2
Other relative	5.3	5.2	7.8	4.6	5.7	5.7
Non-relative	.5	1.4	1.1	1.9	.6	1.1
Not Stated	-	.1	-	.1	-	.0
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 2: DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY SEX AND BY QUINTILES

Sex	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					Total
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Male	52.7	48.6	46.3	45.3	47.1	48.0
Female	47.3	51.4	53.7	54.7	52.9	52.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 3: AGE DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY QUINTILES

Groups	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	<i>Poorest</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>Richest</i>	
	%					
0-4	8.9	7.8	8.0	7.7	5.9	7.6
5-9	14.4	11.3	10.4	9.2	5.9	10.3
10-14	16.7	15.9	12.1	10.3	6.6	12.3
15-19	13.0	11.6	12.4	9.0	6.5	10.5
20-24	8.1	8.5	8.4	8.7	5.8	7.9
25-29	5.6	6.2	6.0	8.0	5.6	6.3
30-34	4.1	5.5	6.8	7.4	7.1	6.2
35-39	6.5	6.8	8.1	6.5	8.0	7.2
40-44	6.0	5.9	5.8	7.8	7.4	6.6
45-49	3.9	4.8	4.8	5.3	7.0	5.2
50-54	2.8	2.6	2.4	4.5	6.4	3.7
55-59	1.7	3.1	3.9	2.9	5.4	3.4
60-64	2.2	2.1	3.0	3.5	4.5	3.0
65+	6.0	7.8	8.0	9.3	17.9	9.8
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 4: DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY ETHNICITY AND QUINTILES

Ethnicity	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
African Descent/Negro/Black	89.8	89.4	90.1	84.0	74.2	85.5
Indigenous People (Amerindian/Carib)	.1	.1	.3	2.6	1.6	.9
East Indian	4.5	2.2	1.2	2.0	3.9	2.8
Chinese/Asian	-	-	-	-	.1	.0
Syrian/Lebanese	-	-	-	-	1.3	.3
White/Caucasian	-	-	.2	-	2.4	.5
Mixed	5.3	7.0	7.5	10.8	16.0	9.3
Other	-	.2	-	-	.1	.1
Don't know/Not Stated	.3	1.0	.7	.6	.3	.6
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 5: DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY RELIGION AND QUINTILES

Religion	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Anglican	1.3	1.3	.5	2.0	5.9	2.2
Baptist	1.2	.9	.8	2.3	2.4	1.5
Brethren	-	-	-	.9	.1	.2
Church of God	1.5	1.1	2.1	3.0	1.1	1.8
Evangelical	-	.7	3.5	2.4	3.0	1.9
Hindu	-	-	-	-	.6	.1
Jehovah Witnesses	.1	1.3	1.6	-	2.8	1.2
Methodist	.5	-	-	.9	.9	.5
Muslim	-	.6	-	-	-	.1
Pentecostal	6.8	8.8	4.5	8.9	6.6	7.1
Presbyterian	-	.1	-	.2	-	.1
Rastafarian	3.1	1.4	.7	1.0	1.3	1.5
Roman Catholic	75.1	67.9	67.5	67.0	66.0	68.7
Salvation Army	.2	.2	.2	.2	-	.2
Seventh Day Adventist	6.3	11.0	13.0	7.0	4.8	8.4
None	1.9	3.9	4.0	2.2	2.5	2.9
Not Stated	.5	.6	.7	.7	.5	.6
Other	1.6	.2	.9	1.3	1.5	1.1
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 6: DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED AGE GROUPINGS BY QUINTILES

Age Groups	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Under 5	8.9	7.8	8.0	7.7	5.9	7.6
Youths (15-24)	21.1	20.1	20.8	17.7	12.3	18.4
Elderly	6.0	7.8	8.0	9.3	17.9	9.8
Other	64.0	64.2	63.2	65.3	64.0	64.1
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

ACTIVITY STATUS TABLES

TABLE 7: LABOUR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATE: PERSONS AGE 15+ BY GENDER AND QUINTILES

Sex	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	<i>Poorest</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>Richest</i>	
	%					
Male	52.4	46.4	47.9	45.2	49.0	48.0
Female	47.6	53.6	52.1	54.8	51.0	52.0
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 8: DISTRIBUTION OF MALE LABOUR FORCE PARTICIPANTS BY HIGHEST EXAMINATION PASSED BY QUINTILES

Highest Examination Passed	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	<i>Poorest</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>Richest</i>	
	%					
None	81.7	59.8	56.1	58.7	40.3	56.7
School Leaving	7.3	22.5	19.2	20.4	13.3	16.5
CXC Basic	-	-	-	4.4	3.7	1.9
CXC 1-4 Passes	1.9	8.9	5.5	2.9	3.9	4.6
CXC 5 and More Passes	3.6	1.4	8.2	3.0	11.3	6.2
A Level	-	-	-	1.6	1.0	.6
Diploma	-	4.5	2.9	6.1	6.5	4.3
Associate Degree	-	-	-	-	1.0	.3
Undergraduate Degree	-	-	-	-	3.8	1.1
Post Graduate Degree	-	1.5	-	1.5	9.4	3.2
Professional Qualification	-	-	2.7	-	3.8	1.6
Other	-	-	2.8	1.5	-	.8
Not Stated	5.5	1.4	2.7	-	1.9	2.2
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 8: DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALE LABOUR FORCE PARTICIPANTS
BY HIGHEST EXAMINATION PASSED BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)**

Highest Examination Passed	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
None	69.1	58.8	55.5	47.0	35.1	51.0
School Leaving	17.0	24.0	18.7	23.8	20.5	21.0
CXC Basic	-	3.9	4.6	2.2	.9	2.4
CXC 1-4 Passes	5.3	4.0	8.1	9.1	5.4	6.5
CXC 5 and More Passes	3.4	5.3	3.6	11.1	12.1	7.7
A Level	1.8	-	-	1.1	1.8	1.0
Diploma	-	1.3	2.5	3.4	7.5	3.4
Associate Degree	-	1.3	-	1.1	2.7	1.2
Undergraduate Degree	-	-	-	-	3.7	1.0
Post Graduate Degree	-	-	-	-	2.8	.7
Professional Qualification	-	-	-	1.2	4.7	1.5
Other	-	1.3	3.4	-	.9	1.2
Not Stated	3.4	-	3.4	-	1.8	1.6
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 8: DISTRIBUTION OF BOTH SEXES OF LABOUR FORCE PARTICIPANTS
BY HIGHEST EXAMINATION PASSED BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)**

Highest Examination Passed	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
None	75.3	59.3	55.8	52.1	37.7	53.7
School Leaving	12.3	23.3	18.9	22.3	17.0	18.9
CXC Basic	-	2.1	2.5	3.2	2.3	2.1
CXC 1-4 Passes	3.6	6.3	6.9	6.4	4.7	5.6
CXC 5 and More Passes	3.5	3.5	5.7	7.6	11.7	7.0
A Level	.9	-	-	1.3	1.4	.8
Diploma	-	2.8	2.7	4.6	7.0	3.8
Associate Degree	-	.7	-	.7	1.9	.8
Undergraduate Degree	-	-	-	-	3.8	1.0
Post Graduate Degree	-	.7	-	.6	6.1	1.9
Professional Qualification	-	-	1.2	.7	4.2	1.5
Other	-	.7	3.1	.6	.5	1.0
Not Stated	4.4	.7	3.1	-	1.8	1.9
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 9: DISTRIBUTION OF MALE LABOUR FORCE PARTICIPANTS BY TYPE OF WORKER

Type of Worker	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Paid Employee - Government	4.1	6.2	3.9	13.3	12.8	8.7
Paid Employee - Statutory	-	1.6	1.2	1.6	4.6	2.2
Paid Employee - private	36.8	38.1	38.6	50.3	38.0	40.2
Self employed without employees	12.0	7.7	10.5	10.3	16.9	12.1
Self employed with employees	2.0	1.7	1.2	-	2.8	1.6
Other	2.0	-	-	-	-	.3
Not Stated	43.1	44.7	44.6	24.5	24.9	34.9
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 9: DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALE LABOUR FORCE PARTICIPANTS BY TYPE OF WORKER (CONT'D)

Type of Worker	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	V	
	%					
Paid Employee - Government	3.5	2.6	4.4	8.3	12.8	7.0
Paid Employee - Statutory	1.8	-	1.0	2.0	-	.9
Paid Employee - private	19.3	14.9	22.4	17.7	24.9	20.3
Self employed without employees	1.6	7.4	6.5	4.2	6.9	5.6
Self employed with employees	-	-	-	-	.9	.2
Other	-	-	-	-	.9	.2
Not Stated	73.8	75.1	65.7	67.7	53.7	65.8
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 9: DISTRIBUTION OF BOTH SEXES OF LABOUR FORCE PARTICIPANTS BY TYPE OF WORKER (CONT'D)

Type of Worker	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Paid Employee - Government	3.8	4.1	4.2	10.4	12.8	7.7
Paid Employee - Statutory	1.0	.7	1.1	1.9	2.2	1.5
Paid Employee - private	27.6	25.1	29.8	31.2	31.2	29.3
Self employed without employees	6.5	7.5	8.3	6.7	11.7	8.6
Self employed with employees	1.0	.7	.6	-	1.8	.9
Other	1.0	-	-	-	.4	.3
Not Stated	59.2	61.8	56.1	49.8	39.8	51.8
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 10: DISTRIBUTION OF MALE EMPLOYED BY NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED BY QUINTILES

Hours Worked Past Week	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Under 1 Hour	46.5	45.8	42.3	24.0	21.1	34.5
1-8 Hours	-	-	1.5	-	-	.3
9-16 Hours	-	1.4	-	4.2	1.1	1.3
17-24 Hours	-	-	4.2	1.4	1.1	1.4
25-34 Hours	5.1	-	2.7	1.3	2.9	2.4
35-40 Hours	24.3	30.6	27.1	32.7	43.1	32.6
41-50 Hours	10.2	17.8	13.9	17.3	8.3	13.2
51-60 Hours	8.8	1.5	6.9	13.3	9.1	8.0
61-70 Hours	1.7	-	1.4	4.3	2.0	1.9
71+ Hours	3.4	2.9	-	1.5	10.2	4.1
Not Stated	-	-	-	-	1.1	.3
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 10: DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALE EMPLOYED BY NUMBER OF HOURS
WORKED BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)**

Hours Worked Past Week	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	<i>Poorest</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>Richest</i>	
	%					
Under 1 Hour	76.0	70.4	62.8	64.6	48.6	63.1
1-8 Hours	-	-	-	-	2.0	.5
9-16 Hours	1.8	2.5	3.3	-	-	1.4
17-24 Hours	1.7	1.3	-	2.2	.9	1.2
25-34 Hours	5.1	3.8	3.4	2.4	3.0	3.4
35-40 Hours	8.5	12.9	22.9	24.0	29.7	20.8
41-50 Hours	5.2	9.2	5.4	5.7	12.7	7.9
51-60 Hours	1.7	-	2.2	1.1	2.1	1.4
61-70 Hours	-	-	-	-	.9	.2
71+ Hours	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not Stated	-	-	-	-	-	-
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 10: DISTRIBUTION OF BOTH SEXES EMPLOYED
BY NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)**

Hours Worked Past Week	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Under 1 Hour	61.2	59.0	53.7	46.5	35.0	49.6
1-8 Hours	-	-	.6	-	1.0	.4
9-16 Hours	.9	2.0	1.8	1.9	.5	1.4
17-24 Hours	.8	.7	1.9	1.9	1.0	1.3
25-34 Hours	5.1	2.0	3.1	1.9	2.9	2.9
35-40 Hours	16.4	21.1	24.8	27.9	36.4	26.4
41-50 Hours	7.7	13.2	9.2	10.8	10.5	10.4
51-60 Hours	5.2	.7	4.3	6.5	5.6	4.5
61-70 Hours	.9	-	.6	1.9	1.5	1.0
71+ Hours	1.7	1.4	-	.6	5.1	1.9
Not Stated	-	-	-	-	.5	.1
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 11: DISTRIBUTION OF MALE EMPLOYEES BY REASON
OR WORKING LESS THEN 40 HOURS BY QUINTILES**

Reason Working For Less Than 35 Years	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Own illness/injury	-	-	5.4	4.3	4.2	2.7
Personal/family responsibilities	-	-	-	-	-	-
Job ended in reference week	3.5	3.0	5.7	4.3	-	3.4
Firm not getting enough work	-	-	-	-	-	-
Could not find more work	3.3	-	2.7	4.4	3.7	2.7
Part Time Work	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	3.1	-	2.7	-	3.7	2.0
99	90.1	97.0	83.5	86.9	88.4	89.2
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 11: DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALE EMPLOYEES BY REASON
FOR WORKING LESS THEN 40 HOURS BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)**

Reason Working For Less Than 35 Years - Female	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	<i>Poorest</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>Richest</i>	
	%					
Own illness/injury	-	-	-	-	-	-
Personal/family responsibilities	-	-	-	-	1.9	.4
Job ended in reference week	8.1	1.8	1.7	3.5	1.7	3.2
Firm not getting enough work	1.9	-	-	-	-	.3
Could not find more work	2.1	3.1	1.5	1.6	1.8	2.0
Part Time Work	2.0	3.2	4.6	-	5.6	3.1
Other	-	1.5	-	1.6	1.8	1.0
99	86.0	90.4	92.1	93.3	87.2	90.0
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 11: DISTRIBUTION OF BOTH SEXES OF EMPLOYEES BY REASON FOR WORKING LESS THEN 40 HOURS BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)

Reason Working For Less Than 35 Years – All St Lucia	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Own illness/injury	-	-	2.0	1.2	1.3	.9
Personal/family responsibilities	-	-	-	-	1.3	.2
Job ended in reference week	6.3	2.2	3.2	3.7	1.2	3.3
Firm not getting enough work	1.2	-	-	-	-	.2
Could not find more work	2.6	2.0	2.0	2.4	2.4	2.3
Part Time Work	1.2	2.1	2.9	-	3.8	2.0
Other	1.2	1.0	1.0	1.2	2.4	1.3
Not Stated	87.5	92.7	88.9	91.6	87.6	89.7
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

EDUCATION TABLES

TABLE 12: DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONS ATTENDING SCHOOL BY SEX AND QUINTILES

Groups - Poorest	Attending School			All St Lucia
	Yes	No	Not Stated	
	%			
10-14	100.0	.6	100.0	1.6
15-19	-	1.1	-	1.1
20-24	-	2.8	-	2.8
25-29	-	6.2	-	6.1
30-34	-	3.9	-	3.8
35-39	-	13.6	-	13.5
40-44	-	18.2	-	18.0
45-49	-	10.7	-	10.6
50-54	-	9.0	-	8.9
55-59	-	6.2	-	6.1
60-64	-	7.4	-	7.3
65+	-	20.3	-	20.1
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 12: DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONS ATTENDING SCHOOL BY SEX AND QUINTILES (CONT'D)

Groups - II	Attending School			All St Lucia
	Yes	No	Not Stated	
	%			
10-14	-	-	-	-
15-19	-	-	-	-
20-24	-	2.1	-	2.0
25-29	100.0	6.4	-	6.9
30-34	-	8.5	-	8.5
35-39	-	11.9	-	11.8
40-44	-	13.0	-	12.9
45-49	-	12.6	-	12.5
50-54	-	7.5	-	7.4
55-59	-	9.5	-	9.5
60-64	-	7.5	-	7.5
65+	-	21.1	-	21.0
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	-	100.0

TABLE 12: DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONS ATTENDING SCHOOL BY SEX AND QUINTILES (CONT'D)

Groups - III	Attending School			All St Lucia
	Yes	No	Not Stated	
	%			
10-14	-	-	-	-
15-19	-	-	-	-
20-24	-	1.8	-	1.8
25-29	-	5.4	-	5.3
30-34	-	9.7	-	9.7
35-39	-	16.6	-	16.5
40-44	-	12.4	-	12.4
45-49	100.0	11.7	-	12.0
50-54	-	5.7	-	5.7
55-59	-	10.7	-	10.7
60-64	-	6.3	-	6.2
65+	-	19.7	-	19.6
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	-	100.0

TABLE 12: DISTRIBUTION OF MALES ATTENDING SCHOOL BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)

Groups - IV	Attending School			All St Lucia
	Yes	No	Not Stated	
	%			
10-14	-	-	-	-
15-19	-	.4	-	.4
20-24	-	2.3	-	2.2
25-29	33.8	6.1	-	6.4
30-34	66.2	8.5	-	9.1
35-39	-	11.1	-	10.9
40-44	-	15.6	-	15.5
45-49	-	10.8	-	10.7
50-54	-	9.1	-	9.0
55-59	-	5.9	-	5.8
60-64	-	6.9	-	6.8
65+	-	23.4	-	23.2
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	-	100.0

**TABLE 12: DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALES ATTENDING SCHOOL BY QUINTILES
(CONT'D)**

Groups - Richest	Attending School			All St Lucia
	Yes	No	Not Stated	
	%			
10-14	-	1.2	-	1.2
15-19	-	.6	-	.6
20-24	-	1.8	-	1.8
25-29	-	3.6	-	3.5
30-34	27.9	5.7	-	6.4
35-39	27.3	9.0	-	9.5
40-44	8.8	10.9	-	10.9
45-49	36.0	11.0	-	11.8
50-54	-	8.7	-	8.4
55-59	-	9.3	-	9.0
60-64	-	6.6	-	6.4
65+	-	31.6	-	30.6
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	-	100.0

**TABLE 12: DISTRIBUTION OF BOTH SEXES ATTENDING SCHOOL BY QUINTILES
(CONT'D)**

Groups	Attending School			All St Lucia
	Yes	No	Not Stated	
	%			
10-14	5.9	.4	100.0	.6
15-19	-	.4	-	.4
20-24	-	2.1	-	2.1
25-29	11.9	5.3	-	5.4
30-34	29.6	7.2	-	7.5
35-39	17.7	12.0	-	12.1
40-44	5.7	13.7	-	13.5
45-49	29.2	11.3	-	11.5
50-54	-	8.1	-	7.9
55-59	-	8.4	-	8.3
60-64	-	6.9	-	6.8
65+	-	24.2	-	23.8
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 13: DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONS ATTENDING SCHOOL BY AGE AND QUINTILES

Groups	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
0-4	5.4	8.6	9.9	11.1	16.0	9.7
5-9	37.9	29.5	30.0	31.0	24.6	31.1
10-14	41.3	40.9	33.5	33.8	25.3	35.9
15-19	13.8	18.2	21.6	18.2	15.9	17.6
20-24	1.3	2.2	3.0	2.8	3.9	2.5
25-29	.3	.6	.7	.4	1.5	.6
30-34	-	-	.7	1.6	3.5	.9
35-39	-	-	-	1.2	3.4	.7
40-44	-	-	-	-	2.4	.3
45-49	-	-	.7	-	3.0	.6
50-54	-	-	-	-	.5	.1
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 14: DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONS NOT ATTENDING SCHOOL BY AGE AND QUINTILES

Groups	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
0-4	11.0	7.4	7.0	6.3	2.8	6.7
5-9	.2	.2	-	.2	.3	.2
10-14	1.5	.4	.5	.5	.9	.8
15-19	12.5	7.7	7.6	5.3	3.7	7.1
20-24	12.3	12.4	11.3	11.2	6.3	10.5
25-29	8.9	9.6	8.8	11.2	6.9	9.0
30-34	6.6	8.9	10.2	9.8	8.2	8.7
35-39	10.5	10.9	12.5	8.7	9.4	10.3
40-44	9.7	9.5	8.8	11.1	9.0	9.6
45-49	6.3	7.7	6.9	7.5	8.3	7.4
50-54	4.5	4.3	3.7	6.3	8.2	5.5
55-59	2.8	5.1	5.9	4.1	7.0	5.0
60-64	3.6	3.4	4.6	4.9	5.8	4.5
65+	9.7	12.6	12.2	13.1	23.3	14.5
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 14: DISTRIBUTION OF MALES BY REPORTED LITERACY STATUS BY QUINTILES

Can Read and Write	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Yes	79.4	81.4	81.8	85.6	88.4	83.2
No	20.6	18.4	17.9	14.4	11.6	16.7
Not Stated	-	.2	.2	-	-	.1
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 14: DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALES BY REPORTED LITERACY STATUS BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)

Can Read and Write	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Yes	79.1	85.1	84.9	82.9	92.8	85.1
No	20.7	14.9	15.1	16.9	7.2	14.8
Not Stated	.2	-	-	.2	-	.1
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 14: DISTRIBUTION OF BOTH SEXES BY REPORTED LITERACY STATUS BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)

Can Read and Write	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Yes	79.3	83.3	83.5	84.1	90.7	84.2
No	20.6	16.6	16.4	15.8	9.3	15.7
Not Stated	.1	.1	.1	.1	-	.1
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 15: NUMBER OF DAYS MALES ATTENDING SCHOOL WEEKLY BY QUINTILES

Days Actually Went To School/Classes	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
One	.5	1.4	-	-	-	.4
Two	2.1	1.4	-	-	1.2	1.0
Three	4.9	1.4	.7	1.7	-	2.1
Four	5.4	2.0	2.9	4.3	1.1	3.4
Five	83.3	87.2	90.8	85.5	85.1	86.3
Not Stated	3.8	6.7	5.5	8.5	12.6	6.8
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 15: NUMBER OF DAYS FEMALES ATTENDING SCHOOL WEEKLY BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)

Days Actually Went To School/Classes	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
One	1.4	.5	.6	.7	.9	.8
Two	2.0	.5	-	.7	.9	.8
Three	-	1.1	3.1	5.0	.9	2.0
Four	.7	5.4	3.1	4.5	5.2	3.8
Five	91.9	84.9	83.1	76.8	65.3	81.3
Not Stated	4.0	7.5	10.1	12.3	26.8	11.2
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 15: NUMBER OF DAYS BOTH SEXES ATTENDING SCHOOL WEEKLY BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)

Days Actually Went To School/Classes	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
One	.9	.9	.3	.4	.5	.6
Two	2.1	.9	-	.4	1.0	.9
Three	2.7	1.2	2.0	3.5	.5	2.0
Four	3.3	3.9	3.0	4.4	3.4	3.6
Five	87.1	85.9	86.8	80.7	73.9	83.7
Not Stated	3.9	7.2	7.9	10.6	20.7	9.1
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 16: HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION ATTAINED BY MALE HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS BY QUINTILES

Highest Examination Passed	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	<i>Poorest</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>Richest</i>	
	%					
None	76.7	71.6	53.5	56.4	34.8	54.9
School Leaving	12.8	15.1	20.5	20.0	19.8	18.1
CXC Basic	-	1.8	1.8	2.1	2.4	1.8
CXC 1-4 Passes	.9	1.8	9.0	6.4	4.4	4.6
CXC 5 and More Passes	1.9	3.5	5.4	5.7	9.5	5.9
A Level	-	-	.9	.8	1.9	.9
Diploma	.9	2.7	5.4	4.4	7.1	4.6
Associate Degree	-	-	-	.7	.5	.3
Undergraduate Degree	-	-	-	-	1.9	.6
Post Graduate Degree	-	.9	-	-	7.2	2.4
Professional Qualification	-	1.8	1.7	.7	6.7	2.8
Other	1.9	-	.9	2.1	1.4	1.3
Not Stated	5.0	.9	1.0	.8	2.4	2.0
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE16: HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION ATTAINED BY
FEMALE HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)**

Highest Examination Passed	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	<i>Poorest</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>Richest</i>	
	%					
None	70.7	63.5	57.1	51.4	36.8	53.9
School Leaving	14.6	18.3	19.5	24.8	22.9	20.7
CXC Basic	-	4.5	4.4	1.7	.8	2.3
CXC 1-4 Passes	2.6	3.5	8.9	5.7	3.1	4.9
CXC 5 and More Passes	4.0	3.4	.9	7.4	7.8	5.0
A Level	-	-	-	-	.8	.2
Diploma	-	2.2	4.6	1.6	7.1	3.5
Associate Degree	-	-	.9	1.7	3.9	1.5
Undergraduate Degree	-	-	-	-	4.0	1.0
Post Graduate Degree	-	-	-	-	2.4	.6
Professional Qualification	-	-	-	3.3	8.0	2.7
Other	3.9	3.3	.9	1.6	1.6	2.1
Not Stated	4.2	1.1	2.7	.9	.8	1.8
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 16: HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION ATTAINED BY MALE
AND FEMALE HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)**

Highest Examination Passed	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	<i>Poorest</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>Richest</i>	
	%					
None	74.1	68.1	55.3	54.1	35.6	54.4
School Leaving	13.6	16.5	20.0	22.2	21.0	19.2
CXC Basic	-	3.0	3.1	1.9	1.8	2.0
CXC 1-4 Passes	1.6	2.5	9.0	6.0	3.9	4.7
CXC 5 and More Passes	2.8	3.5	3.2	6.5	8.9	5.5
A Level	-	-	.5	.4	1.5	.6
Diploma	.5	2.5	5.0	3.1	7.1	4.1
Associate Degree	-	-	.4	1.2	1.8	.8
Undergraduate Degree	-	-	-	-	2.7	.7
Post Graduate Degree	-	.5	-	-	5.4	1.6
Professional Qualification	-	1.0	.9	1.9	7.2	2.7
Other	2.7	1.4	.9	1.9	1.5	1.6
Not Stated	4.6	1.0	1.8	.8	1.8	1.9
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 17: HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION ATTAINED
BY MALES COMPLETING SCHOOL BY QUINTILES**

Highest Examination Passed	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	<i>Poorest</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>Richest</i>	
	%					
None	71.6	57.6	58.0	48.7	33.3	53.1
School Leaving	13.6	18.3	15.7	15.9	16.9	16.1
CXC Basic	.4	1.8	2.4	4.3	2.5	2.3
CXC 1-4 Passes	6.1	10.3	8.5	8.6	5.7	7.8
CXC 5 and More Passes	2.8	5.1	7.3	10.2	12.5	7.8
A Level	-	.3	.8	1.8	2.2	1.1
Diploma	.3	1.8	3.1	5.5	7.4	3.8
Associate Degree	-	1.1	.4	.4	1.0	.6
Undergraduate Degree	-	-	-	.3	2.8	.7
Post Graduate Degree	-	.4	-	.4	5.3	1.3
Professional Qualification	-	.7	1.1	1.0	7.2	2.2
Other	1.5	1.1	1.6	1.4	.9	1.3
Not Stated	3.7	1.5	1.2	1.4	2.2	2.0
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 17: HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION ATTAINED
BY FEMALES COMPLETING SCHOOL BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)**

Highest Examination Passed	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
None	66.4	53.9	52.8	47.6	33.1	49.7
School Leaving	12.9	20.9	15.4	18.3	21.8	18.0
CXC Basic	.8	3.8	4.2	2.7	.9	2.4
CXC 1-4 Passes	7.3	7.8	11.1	7.2	6.9	8.0
CXC 5 and More Passes	4.6	7.6	6.9	9.6	9.6	7.8
A Level	.8	-	-	1.8	2.0	1.0
Diploma	1.2	1.9	2.7	4.9	7.3	3.8
Associate Degree	-	1.1	1.3	3.0	4.1	2.1
Undergraduate Degree	-	-	-	.6	4.1	1.1
Post Graduate Degree	-	-	-	-	2.9	.7
Professional Qualification	-	-	.3	2.4	5.0	1.7
Other	2.2	1.9	2.0	.6	1.1	1.5
Not Stated	3.8	1.1	3.3	1.6	1.2	2.1
All St Lucia	100.0%	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 17: HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION ATTAINED
BY BOTH SEXES COMPLETING SCHOOL BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)**

Highest Examination Passed	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	<i>Poorest</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>Richest</i>	
	%					
None	69.0	55.8	55.1	48.1	33.2	51.4
School Leaving	13.3	19.6	15.5	17.2	19.5	17.1
CXC Basic	.6	2.8	3.4	3.4	1.7	2.3
CXC 1-4 Passes	6.7	9.1	9.9	7.8	6.3	7.9
CXC 5 and More Passes	3.7	6.3	7.1	9.9	11.0	7.8
A Level	.4	.2	.4	1.8	2.1	1.0
Diploma	.7	1.9	2.9	5.1	7.4	3.8
Associate Degree	-	1.1	.9	1.8	2.6	1.3
Undergraduate Degree	-	-	-	.5	3.5	.9
Post Graduate Degree	-	.2	-	.2	4.0	1.0
Professional Qualification	-	.4	.7	1.8	6.0	2.0
Other	1.8	1.5	1.8	1.0	1.0	1.4
Not Stated	3.8	1.3	2.3	1.5	1.7	2.1
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 18: DISTRIBUTION OF MALES WITH TECHNICAL OR VOCATIONAL
TRAINING BY QUINTILES**

Technical or Vocation Training	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Vocational	1.7	4.6	3.5	4.9	8.0	4.7
Technical	12.8	18.0	20.3	26.2	28.3	21.3
Both	2.2	7.4	4.3	7.5	10.6	6.6
None	82.3	69.2	71.2	60.0	52.8	66.6
Not Stated	1.1	.7	.8	1.4	.3	.9
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 18: DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALES WITH TECHNICAL OR VOCATIONAL TRAINING BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)

Technical or Vocation Training	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Vocational	4.9	8.7	9.0	14.2	15.3	10.8
Technical	2.7	4.6	6.6	8.1	14.5	7.7
Both	.7	3.8	5.5	4.5	7.3	4.6
None	90.2	82.2	77.2	72.3	62.0	75.8
Not Stated	1.5	.8	1.6	.9	.9	1.1
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 18: DISTRIBUTION OF BOTH SEXES WITH TECHNICAL OR VOCATIONAL TRAINING BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)

Technical or Vocation Training	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	<i>Poorest</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>Richest</i>	
	%					
Vocational	3.3	6.6	6.5	10.0	11.8	7.9
Technical	7.8	11.5	12.9	16.3	21.1	14.3
Both	1.5	5.7	5.0	5.9	8.9	5.5
None	86.1	75.5	74.4	66.7	57.6	71.3
Not Stated	1.3	.7	1.2	1.1	.6	1.0
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 19: DISTRIBUTION OF MALE YOUTHS WITH TECHNICAL OR VOCATIONAL TRAINING BY QUINTILES

Technical or Vocation Training	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	<i>Poorest</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>Richest</i>	
	%					
Vocational		3.0	2.0	-	10.8	2.5
Technical	18.6	23.7	26.4	45.0	30.4	27.1
Both	6.2	13.0	2.0	12.6	8.0	8.2
None	75.2	60.4	67.8	42.5	50.8	61.8
Not Stated	-	-	1.9	-	-	.4
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 19: DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALE YOUTHS WITH
TECHNICAL OR VOCATIONAL TRAINING BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)**

Technical or Vocation Training	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	<i>Poorest</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>Richest</i>	
	%					
Vocational	7.5	6.8	5.5	17.0	6.7	9.0
Technical	7.8	11.0	3.8	15.1	18.0	10.4
Both	1.8	4.4	11.1	5.6	10.3	6.4
None	81.1	77.8	79.6	60.5	61.6	72.9
Not Stated	1.8	-	-	1.9	3.3	1.3
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 19: DISTRIBUTION OF BOTH SEXES OF YOUTHS WITH
TECHNICAL OR VOCATIONAL TRAINING BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)**

Technical or Vocation Training	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Vocational	2.9	4.6	3.8	9.0	9.0	5.4
Technical	14.3	18.5	15.1	29.1	24.9	19.6
Both	4.5	9.5	6.5	8.9	9.0	7.4
None	77.6	67.4	73.7	52.0	55.6	66.8
Not Stated	.7	-	.9	1.0	1.5	.8
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 20: DISTRIBUTION OF MALES RECEIVING FREE MEALS
OR SNACKS FROM MEAL SERVICE BY QUINTILES**

Receives Meal Or Snack From This Service	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Yes	88.5	89.1	82.7	87.7	83.4	86.5
No	11.5	10.9	17.3	12.3	16.6	13.5
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 20: DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALES RECEIVING FREE MEALS OR SNACKS FROM MEAL SERVICE BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)

Receives Meal Or Snack From This Service	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	<i>Poores t</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>Richest</i>	
	%					
Yes	86.7	85.5	92.9	75.1	95.7	86.7
No	13.3	14.5	7.1	24.9	4.3	13.3
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 20: DISTRIBUTION OF BOTH SEXES RECEIVING FREE MEALS OR SNACKS FROM MEAL SERVICE BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)

Receives Meal Or Snack From This Service	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Yes	87.7	86.9	87.3	80.9	89.3	86.6
No	12.3	13.1	12.7	19.1	10.7	13.4
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 21: REPORTED OWNERSHIP OF SCHOOL BOOKS BY MALES BY QUINTILES

Has All Textbooks Required For School	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Yes, has books for exclusive use	41.2	58.0	62.4	68.0	56.4	55.8
Yes, but shares with other family members	-	.7	-	-	-	.1
Has only some books	53.2	36.4	28.7	23.3	19.5	34.9
Has None	5.0	4.2	6.2	7.0	13.8	6.6
Not Stated	.6	.7	2.8	1.7	10.3	2.5
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 21: REPORTED OWNERSHIP OF SCHOOL BOOKS BY FEMALES BY QUINTILES
(CONT'D)**

Has All Textbooks Required For School	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Yes, has books for exclusive use	47.3	58.9	55.9	61.4	55.5	55.9
Yes, but shares with other family members	.7		.6	.7	.9	.5
Has only some books	47.9	34.0	31.5	22.7	18.3	31.7
Has None	3.5	4.3	8.2	6.4	5.3	5.5
Not Stated	.7	2.8	3.7	8.7	20.0	6.3
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 21: REPORTED OWNERSHIP OF SCHOOL BOOKS BY BOTH SEXES BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)

Has All Textbooks Required For School	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Yes, has books for exclusive use	43.9	58.5	59.0	64.4	55.9	55.9
Yes, but shares with other family members	.3	.3	.3	.4	.5	.3
Has only some books	50.8	35.1	30.2	23.0	18.9	33.2
Has None	4.3	4.3	7.3	6.7	9.0	6.0
Not Stated	.6	1.8	3.3	5.5	15.8	4.5
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 22: REPORTED REASONS FOR NOT OWNING ALL TEXT BOOKS BY MALES BY QUINTILES

Reasons For Not Having Required Textbooks	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Books not available	34.9	61.3	48.3	59.3	34.1	45.6
Could not afford	50.8	21.8	24.1	5.3	8.0	29.0
Books available in school library	1.9	1.7		2.6		1.4
To be purchased	3.9	3.2	3.8	5.3		3.4
Other	6.6	8.5	14.6	16.5	31.7	12.9
Not Stated	2.0	3.4	9.1	10.9	26.2	7.8
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 22: REPORTED REASONS FOR NOT OWNING ALL TEXT BOOKS
BY FEMALES BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)**

Reasons For Not Having Required Textbooks	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Books not available	39.2	55.0	28.8	41.5	35.7	40.5
Could not afford	44.8	27.7	33.4	9.3	4.4	26.3
Books available in school library	1.4	1.4	1.5			1.0
To be purchased	4.0		10.2	9.3		4.6
Other	9.3	7.9	15.9	15.1	10.0	11.4
Not Stated	1.3	8.0	10.2	24.8	49.9	16.1
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 22: REPORTED REASONS FOR NOT OWNING ALL TEXT BOOKS
BY BOTH SEXES BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)**

Reasons For Not Having Required Textbooks	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Books not available	36.7	57.8	37.4	48.9	35.0	42.9
Could not afford	48.3	25.1	29.3	7.6	6.0	27.6
Books available in school library	1.7	1.5	.8	1.1	-	1.2
To be purchased	3.9	1.4	7.4	7.6	-	4.1
Other	7.7	8.2	15.4	15.7	19.4	12.1
Not Stated	1.7	6.0	9.7	19.1	39.6	12.1
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 23: DISTRIBUTION OF MALES ATTENDING SCHOOL
USING BOOK LOAN FACILITY BY QUINTILES**

Made Use Of Loan Book Facility	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Yes	5.3	.7	1.4	.9	1.2	2.2
No	94.1	97.3	94.4	96.6	86.3	94.3
Not Stated	.6	2.0	4.2	2.6	12.5	3.5
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 23: DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALES ATTENDING SCHOOL
USING BOOK LOAN FACILITY BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)**

Made Use Of Loan Book Facility	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Yes	1.3	3.2	3.7	.7	2.6	2.4
No	98.7	93.5	92.5	90.6	78.3	91.4
Not Stated	-	3.3	3.7	8.7	19.1	6.2
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 23: DISTRIBUTION OF BOTH SEXES ATTENDING SCHOOL
USING BOOK LOAN FACILITY BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)**

Using Loan Book Facility By Quintiles (Cont'd)						
Made Use Of Loan Book Facility	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Yes	3.5	2.1	2.6	.8	2.0	2.3
No	96.1	95.2	93.4	93.3	81.8	92.8
Not Stated	.3	2.7	3.9	5.9	16.2	4.9
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 24: HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION OF MALES NOT ATTENDING SCHOOL
BY QUINTILES**

Highest Level Education	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
None	.4	1.3	.9	.4	.3	.6
Nursery	-	-	.5	.4	-	.2
Kindergarten	-	-	-	-	-	-
Special Education	-	.4	-	.7	-	.2
Primary	66.6	55.0	48.2	46.8	45.9	52.1
Secondary	21.1	33.4	34.7	36.9	27.2	30.5
SALCC	1.3	4.5	4.1	5.9	9.0	5.2
Other Tech/Vocational	2.2	.9	3.1	2.0	2.3	2.1
University	-	.4	.9	1.6	11.6	3.3
Other Not Specified	.9	1.7	.9	1.2	.7	1.0
Don't Know	7.6	2.5	6.8	4.3	2.0	4.4
Not Stated	-	-	-	-	1.0	.2
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 24: HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION OF FEMALES
NOT ATTENDING SCHOOL BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)**

Highest Level Education	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
None	1.9	.4	.4	-	-	.5
Nursery	-	-	-	.3	-	.1
Kindergarten	-	-	.4	-	-	.1
Special Education	1.0	-	-	.7	-	.3
Primary	58.4	52.1	48.7	47.9	42.5	49.2
Secondary	28.7	35.9	39.1	34.1	29.8	33.5
SALCC	2.9	3.5	4.1	9.2	8.9	6.1
Other Tech/Vocational	1.9	1.3	2.6	2.0	2.5	2.1
University	-		.4	3.4	12.1	3.8
Other Not Specified	-	.8	.4	-	1.5	.6
Don't Know	5.2	5.6	4.0	2.0	2.7	3.7
Not Stated	-	.4	-	.3	-	.1
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 24: HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION OF BOTH SEXES
NOT ATTENDING SCHOOL BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)**

Highest Level Education	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
None	1.1	.8	.6	.2	.2	.5
Nursery	-	-	.2	.4	-	.1
Kindergarten	-	-	.2	-	-	.0
Special Education	.4	.2	-	.7	-	.3
Primary	62.7	53.6	48.5	47.4	44.1	50.6
Secondary	24.7	34.6	37.1	35.4	28.5	32.1
SALCC	2.0	4.0	4.1	7.7	9.0	5.7
Other Tech/Vocational	2.1	1.1	2.8	2.0	2.4	2.1
University	-	.2	.6	2.5	11.8	3.6
Other Not Specified	.4	1.3	.6	.5	1.1	.8
Don't Know	6.4	4.0	5.3	3.1	2.4	4.1
Not Stated	-	.2	-	.2	.5	.2
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 25: HIGHEST EXAMINATION PASSED BY MALES NOT ATTENDING SCHOOL
BY QUINTILES**

Highest Examination Passed	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
None	71.6	57.6	58.0	48.7	33.3	53.1
School Leaving	13.6	18.3	15.7	15.9	16.9	16.1
CXC Basic	.4	1.8	2.4	4.3	2.5	2.3
CXC 1-4 Passes	6.1	10.3	8.5	8.6	5.7	7.8
CXC 5 and More Passes	2.8	5.1	7.3	10.2	12.5	7.8
A Level	-	.3	.8	1.8	2.2	1.1
Diploma	.3	1.8	3.1	5.5	7.4	3.8
Associate Degree	-	1.1	.4	.4	1.0	.6
Undergraduate Degree	-	-	-	.3	2.8	.7
Post Graduate Degree	-	.4	-	.4	5.3	1.3
Professional Qualification	-	.7	1.1	1.0	7.2	2.2
Other	1.5	1.1	1.6	1.4	.9	1.3
Not Stated	3.7	1.5	1.2	1.4	2.2	2.0
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 25: HIGHEST EXAMINATION PASSED BY FEMALES
NOT ATTENDING SCHOOL BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)**

Highest Examination Passed	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
None	66.4	53.9	52.8	47.6	33.1	49.7
School Leaving	12.9	20.9	15.4	18.3	21.8	18.0
CXC Basic	.8	3.8	4.2	2.7	.9	2.4
CXC 1-4 Passes	7.3	7.8	11.1	7.2	6.9	8.0
CXC 5 and More Passes	4.6	7.6	6.9	9.6	9.6	7.8
A Level	.8	-	-	1.8	2.0	1.0
Diploma	1.2	1.9	2.7	4.9	7.3	3.8
Associate Degree	-	1.1	1.3	3.0	4.1	2.1
Undergraduate Degree	-	-	-	.6	4.1	1.1
Post Graduate Degree	-	-	-	-	2.9	.7
Professional Qualification	-	-	.3	2.4	5.0	1.7
Other	2.2	1.9	2.0	.6	1.1	1.5
Not Stated	3.8	1.1	3.3	1.6	1.2	2.1
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 25: HIGHEST EXAMINATION PASSED BY BOTH SEXES
NOT ATTENDING SCHOOL BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)**

Highest Examination Passed	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
None	69.0	55.8	55.1	48.1	33.2	51.4
School Leaving	13.3	19.6	15.5	17.2	19.5	17.1
CXC Basic	.6	2.8	3.4	3.4	1.7	2.3
CXC 1-4 Passes	6.7	9.1	9.9	7.8	6.3	7.9
CXC 5 and More Passes	3.7	6.3	7.1	9.9	11.0	7.8
A Level	.4	.2	.4	1.8	2.1	1.0
Diploma	.7	1.9	2.9	5.1	7.4	3.8
Associate Degree	-	1.1	.9	1.8	2.6	1.3
Undergraduate Degree	-	-	-	.5	3.5	.9
Post Graduate Degree	-	.2	-	.2	4.0	1.0
Professional Qualification	-	.4	.7	1.8	6.0	2.0
Other	1.8	1.5	1.8	1.0	1.0	1.4
Not Stated	3.8	1.3	2.3	1.5	1.7	2.1
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

HEALTH TABLES

TABLE 26: DISTRIBUTION OF MALES CONFINED TO BED BY QUINTILES

Confined to Bed Due To Accident	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Yes	2.4	2.8	3.5	3.5	6.1	3.6
No	97.6	96.9	96.3	96.5	93.9	96.3
Not Stated		.2	.2	-	-	.1
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 26: DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALES CONFINED TO BED BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)

Per Capita Consumption Quintiles						
Confined to Bed Due To Accident	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	All St Lucia
			%			
Yes	2.0	3.3	5.6	5.3	5.3	4.4
No	97.8	96.7	94.4	94.3	94.7	95.5
Not Stated	.2	-	-	.4	-	.1
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 26: DISTRIBUTION OF BOTH SEXES CONFINED TO BED BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)

Confined to Bed Due To Accident	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Yes	2.2	3.1	4.6	4.5	5.7	4.0
No	97.7	96.8	95.2	95.3	94.3	95.9
Not Stated	.1	.1	.1	.2	-	.1
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 27: TYPE OF ILLNESS OR INJURY CONFINING MALES TO BED BY QUINTILES

Type of Illness	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Influenza/Cold	-	-	7.1	7.4	-	2.7
Pneumonia	-	-	-	-	4.0	1.3
Eye Disease	-	-	-	-	3.9	1.3
Ear Disease	-	-	-	7.0	-	1.3
Broken Limbs	9.7	-	-	-	-	1.4
Cuts/Wounds	9.1	-	7.1	-	-	2.6
Internal Injury	-	-	-	-	-	-
Diabetes	-	-	-	-	3.9	1.3
Hypert/Heart Attack	9.1	9.1	7.1	-	20.3	10.8
Headache	-	8.0	-	6.9	-	2.5
Dizziness	-	-	-	-	3.9	1.3
Asthma	-	8.0	7.1	-	-	2.6
Dysentery/Diarroh	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arthritis	-	-	7.1	-	-	1.3
Backache	-	-	-	-	3.9	1.3
Injury due to Accident	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stomach Ache	-	-	-	-	3.9	1.3
Chest Pain	-	-	-	-	4.0	1.3
Stroke	-	-	7.1	7.2	3.9	3.9
Gastro	8.7	8.9	-	-	-	2.7
Dont Know - Other	36.4	32.8	14.3	21.3	8.0	19.6
Not Stated	27.0	33.3	43.0	50.2	40.1	39.5
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 27: TYPE OF ILLNESS OR INJURY CONFINING FEMALES TO BED BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)

Type of Illness	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Influenza/Cold	11.9	-	19.0	-	4.1	7.0
Pneumonia	-	-	-	-	-	-
Eye Disease	-	-	-	4.2	-	1.1
Ear Disease	-	-	-	-	-	-
Broken Limbs	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cuts/Wounds	-	-	-	-	-	-
Internal Injury	-	-	-	4.2	-	1.1
Diabetes	-	-	-	-	3.9	1.0
Hypert/Heart Attack	-	-	-	4.2	12.4	4.1
Headache	-	-	7.6	-	-	2.0
Dizziness	-	6.5	7.6	3.8	-	4.0
Asthma	-	-	4.0	-	-	1.1
Dysentry/Diarroh	-	-	3.8	-	-	1.0
Arthritis	-	6.8	-	-	3.9	2.0
Backache	-	6.4	3.8	-	-	2.0
Injury due to Accident	-	-	-	4.1	4.3	2.1
Stomach Ache	-	6.4	3.8	-	-	2.0
Chest Pain	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stroke	-	-	-	7.6	12.9	5.1
Gastro	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't Know - Other	25.5	6.7	3.7	32.1	16.6	16.4
Not Stated	62.6	67.1	46.7	39.8	41.9	48.1
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 27: TYPE OF ILLNESS OR INJURY CONFINING BOTH SEXES TO BED BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)

Type of Illness	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Influenza/Cold	5.1	-	14.9	2.6	2.0	5.1
Pneumonia	-	-	-	-	2.1	.6
Eye Disease	-	-	-	2.7	2.0	1.2
Ear Disease	-	-	-	2.5	-	.6
Broken Limbs	5.5	-	-	-	-	.6
Cuts/Wounds	5.2	-	2.5	-	-	1.1
Internal Injury	-	-	-	2.7	-	.6
Diabetes	-	-	-	-	3.9	1.1
Hypert/Heart Attack	5.2	4.0	2.5	2.7	16.4	7.0
Headache	-	3.6	5.0	2.5		2.2
Dizziness	-	3.6	5.0	2.5	2.0	2.8
Asthma	-	3.6	5.1	-	-	1.7
Dysentry/Diarroh	-	-	2.5	-	-	.6
Arthritis	-	3.8	2.5	-	1.9	1.7
Backache	-	3.6	2.5	-	2.0	1.7
Injury due to Accident	-	-	-	2.6	2.1	1.2
Stomach Ache	-	3.6	2.5	-	2.0	1.7
Chest Pain	-	-	-	-	2.1	.6
Stroke	-	-	2.5	7.5	8.4	4.6
Gastro	5.0	4.0	-	-	-	1.2
Dont Know - Other	31.8	18.3	7.4	28.3	12.2	17.8
Not Stated	42.2	52.0	45.4	43.5	40.9	44.4
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 28: MALES REPORTING ILLNESS OR INJURY BY QUINTILES

Suffer Illness/Injury Due To Accident	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Yes	9.1	13.1	12.9	10.4	15.7	12.2
No	90.9	86.4	86.6	89.6	84.3	87.6
Not Stated	-	.5	.5	-	-	.2
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 28: FEMALES REPORTING ILLNESS OR INJURY BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)

Suffer Illness/Injury Due To Accident	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Yes	15.3	13.5	17.1	22.6	17.7	17.3
No	84.5	86.5	82.9	77.2	82.3	82.6
Not Stated	.2	-	-	.2	-	.1
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 28: BOTH SEXES REPORTING ILLNESS OR INJURY BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)

Suffer Illness/Injury Due To Accident	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Yes	12.0	13.3	15.2	17.1	16.8	14.9
No	87.8	86.5	84.6	82.8	83.2	85.0
Not Stated	.1	.2	.2	.1	-	.1
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 29: TYPE OF ILLNESS OR INJURY CONFINING MALES TO BED BY QUINTILES

Type of Illness	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	<i>Poorest</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>Richest</i>	
	%					
Influenza/Cold	-	-	7.1	7.4	-	2.7
Pneumonia	-	-	-	-	4.0	1.3
Eye Disease	-	-	-	-	3.9	1.3
Ear Disease	-	-	-	7.0	-	1.3
Broken Limbs	9.7	-	-	-	-	1.4
Cuts/Wounds	9.1	-	7.1	-	-	2.6
Internal Injury	-	-	-	-	-	-
Diabetes	-	-	-	-	3.9	1.3
Hypert/Heart Attack	9.1	9.1	7.1	-	20.3	10.8
Headache	-	8.0	-	6.9	-	2.5
Dizziness	-	-	-	-	3.9	1.3
Asthma	-	8.0	7.1	-	-	2.6
Dysentry/Diarroh	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arthritis	-	-	7.1	-	-	1.3
Backache	-	-	-	-	3.9	1.3
Injury due to Accident	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stomach Ache	-	-	-	-	3.9	1.3
Chest Pain	-	-	-	-	4.0	1.3
Stroke	-	-	7.1	7.2	3.9	3.9
Gastro	8.7	8.9	-	-	-	2.7
Dont Know - Other	36.4	32.8	14.3	21.3	8.0	19.6
Not Stated	27.0	33.3	43.0	50.2	40.1	39.5
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 29: TYPE OF ILLNESS OR INJURY CONFINING FEMALES TO BED BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)

Type of Illness	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Influenza/Cold	11.9	-	19.0	-	4.1	7.0
Pneumonia	-	-	-	-	-	-
Eye Disease	-	-	-	4.2	-	1.1
Ear Disease	-	-	-	-	-	-
Broken Limbs	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cuts/Wounds	-	-	-	-	-	-
Internal Injury	-	-	-	4.2	-	1.1
Diabetes	-	-	-	-	3.9	1.0
Hypert/Heart Attack	-	-	-	4.2	12.4	4.1
Headache	-	-	7.6	-	-	2.0
Dizziness	-	6.5	7.6	3.8	-	4.0
Asthma	-	-	4.0	-	-	1.1
Dysentry/Diarroh	-	-	3.8	-	-	1.0
Arthritis	-	6.8	-	-	3.9	2.0
Backache	-	6.4	3.8	-	-	2.0
Injury due to Accident	-	-	-	4.1	4.3	2.1
Stomach Ache	-	6.4	3.8	-	-	2.0
Chest Pain	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stroke	-	-	-	7.6	12.9	5.1
Gastro	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dont Know - Other	25.5	6.7	3.7	32.1	16.6	16.4
Not Stated	62.6	67.1	46.7	39.8	41.9	48.1
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 29: TYPE OF ILLNESS OR INJURY CONFINING BOTH SEXES TO BED BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)

Type of Illness	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Influenza/Cold	5.1		14.9	2.6	2.0	5.1
Pneumonia	-	-	-	-	2.1	.6
Eye Disease	-	-	-	2.7	2.0	1.2
Ear Disease	-	-	-	2.5	-	.6
Broken Limbs	5.5	-	-	-	-	.6
Cuts/Wounds	5.2	-	2.5	-	-	1.1
Internal Injury	-	-	-	2.7	-	.6
Diabetes	-	-	-	-	3.9	1.1
Hypert/Heart Attack	5.2	4.0	2.5	2.7	16.4	7.0
Headache	-	3.6	5.0	2.5	-	2.2
Dizziness	-	3.6	5.0	2.5	2.0	2.8
Asthma	-	3.6	5.1	-	-	1.7
Dysentry/Diarroh	-	-	2.5	-	-	.6
Arthritis	-	3.8	2.5	-	1.9	1.7
Backache	-	3.6	2.5	-	2.0	1.7
Injury due to Accident	-	-	-	2.6	2.1	1.2
Stomach Ache	-	3.6	2.5	-	2.0	1.7
Chest Pain	-	-	-	-	2.1	.6
Stroke	-	-	2.5	7.5	8.4	4.6
Gastro	5.0	4.0	-	-	-	1.2
Dont Know - Other	31.8	18.3	7.4	28.3	12.2	17.8
Not Stated	42.2	52.0	45.4	43.5	40.9	44.4
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 30: DISTRIBUTION OF MALES SUFFERING FROM LIFESTYLE DISEASES BY QUINTILES

Suffer From Disease	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					Total
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Diabetes	7.1	6.3	7.8	10.9	14.4	10.3
High Blood Pressure	27.9	21.3	10.6	17.2	21.2	19.2
Heart Condition	2.9	5.1	3.8	1.7	6.7	4.4
Cancer	-	-	-	-	.5	.2
HIV/AIDS	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	5.8	8.7	3.8	2.6	3.9	4.5
Total	39.4	37.6	23.0	29.9	37.9	33.5

TABLE 30: DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALES SUFFERING FROM LIFESTYLE DISEASES BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)

Suffer From Disease	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					Total
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Diabetes	21.6	24.0	28.7	24.3	23.0	24.3
High Blood Pressure	35.9	49.6	52.8	50.9	45.7	47.5
Heart Condition	4.3	6.4	4.9	9.0	10.0	7.6
Cancer	1.5	1.3	2.0	1.7	2.2	1.9
HIV/AIDS	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	7.2	5.1	8.7	5.1	6.7	6.6
Total	60.6	62.4	77.0	70.1	62.1	66.5

TABLE 30: DISTRIBUTION OF BOTH SEXES SUFFERING FROM LIFESTYLE DISEASES BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)

Suffer From Disease	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					Total
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Diabetes	28.7	30.3	36.5	35.2	37.4	34.6
High Blood Pressure	63.7	70.9	63.4	68.1	67.0	66.7
Heart Condition	7.2	11.5	8.7	10.6	16.8	12.0
Cancer	1.5	1.3	2.0	1.7	2.8	2.0
HIV/AIDS	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	13.0	13.9	12.5	7.7	10.6	11.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 31: TOTAL NUMBER OF MALES REPORTING INJURY OR ILLNESS BY QUINTILES

Illness	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	<i>Poorest</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>Richest</i>	
	%					
Ill	14.2	17.4	17.9	19.3	28.3	19.3
Not ill	85.8	82.6	82.1	80.7	71.7	80.7
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 31: TOTAL NUMBER OF FEMALES REPORTING INJURY OR ILLNESS BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)

Illness	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Ill	24.5	23.2	28.1	36.3	36.6	29.9
Not ill	75.5	76.8	71.9	63.7	63.4	70.1
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 31: TOTAL NUMBER OF BOTH SEXES REPORTING INJURY OR ILLNESS BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)

Illness	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	<i>Poorest</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>Richest</i>	
	%					
Ill	19.1	20.4	23.4	28.6	32.7	24.8
Not ill	80.9	79.6	76.6	71.4	67.3	75.2
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 32: DISTRIBUTION OF MALES SEEKING MEDICAL ATTENTION BY QUINTILES

Visited Health Practitioner	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	<i>Poorest</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>Richest</i>	
	%					
Yes	40.4	47.7	46.0	43.7	48.7	45.8
No	58.1	44.3	45.7	53.6	44.3	48.6
Not Stated	1.5	8.0	8.3	2.7	7.0	5.7
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 32: DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALES SEEKING MEDICAL ATTENTION BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)

Visited Health Practitioner	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	<i>Poorest</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>Richest</i>	
	%					
Yes	43.2	45.8	46.9	46.5	55.6	48.3
No	52.9	44.6	49.2	50.6	42.6	47.8
Not Stated	3.9	9.6	3.9	2.9	1.7	4.0
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 32: DISTRIBUTION OF BOTH SEXES SEEKING MEDICAL ATTENTION BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)

Visited Health Practitioner	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	<i>Poorest</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>Richest</i>	
	%					
Yes	42.1	46.6	46.6	45.7	52.8	47.3
No	54.9	44.5	48.0	51.5	43.3	48.1
Not Stated	3.0	9.0	5.4	2.8	3.9	4.6
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 33: REASONS FOR MALES NOT SEEKING MEDICAL ATTENTION BY QUINTILES

Why Did Not Visit Health Practitioner	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	<i>Poorest</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>Richest</i>	
	%					
No Need	84.5	78.9	73.1	90.5	90.3	84.4
Too expensive	2.5	-	3.0	-	-	1.0
Un treatable	5.2	6.3	3.0	2.4	-	3.1
Other	5.1	14.8	20.8	7.1	9.7	11.0
Not Stated	2.6	-	-	-	-	.5
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 33: REASONS FOR FEMALES NOT SEEKING MEDICAL ATTENTION BY SEX AND QUINTILES (CONT'D)

Why Did Not Visit Health Practitioner	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
No Need	83.1	89.1	90.6	88.5	87.2	87.8
Too expensive	3.9	2.2	-	-	2.7	1.6
Un treatable	3.9	2.2	-	1.2	2.9	1.9
Other	9.2	6.6	9.4	7.9	7.2	8.1
Not Stated	-	-	-	2.4	-	.6
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 33: REASONS FOR BOTH SEXES NOT SEEKING MEDICAL ATTENTION BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)

Why Did Not Visit Health Practitioner	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
No Need	83.7	84.9	84.7	89.2	88.5	86.6
Too expensive	3.3	1.3	1.0		1.6	1.3
Un treatable	4.4	3.9	1.0	1.6	1.7	2.4
Other	7.5	9.9	13.3	7.6	8.2	9.1
Not Stated	1.1	-	-	1.6	-	.6
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 34: MEAN DAYS MALES UNABLE TO WORK AND DAYS WITHOUT PAY BY QUINTILES

	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					Total
	<i>Poorest</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>Richest</i>	
	<i>Mean</i>					
Days Unable To Carry On Activities	12	12	12	10	10	11
Days Without Pay	4	20	4	11	8	12

TABLE 34: MEAN DAYS FEMALES UNABLE TO WORK AND DAYS WITHOUT PAY BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)

	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					Total
	<i>Poorest</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>Richest</i>	
	<i>Mean</i>					
Days Unable To Carry On Activities	10	8	12	12	10	11
Days Without Pay	12	.	15	12	9	11

TABLE 34: MEAN DAYS BOTH SEXES UNABLE TO WORK AND DAYS WITHOUT PAY BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)

	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					Total
	<i>Poorest</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>Richest</i>	
	<i>Mean</i>					
Days Unable To Carry On Activities	11	10	12	11	10	11
Days Without Pay	8	20	10	11	8	12

TABLE 35: PLACE FIRST VISITED BY MALES FOR MEDICAL ATTENTION BY QUINTILES

Place First Visit Made	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	<i>Poorest</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>Richest</i>	
	%					
Public Hospital	27.2	28.1	43.1	27.5	30.7	31.4
Private Hospital	-	-	-	6.1	12.4	4.9
Community Health Clinic	41.9	34.3	23.7	26.8	7.0	23.8
Polyclinic	-	5.8	-	6.1	1.8	2.8
Private Doctor/Dentist	15.3	26.1	30.3	24.1	46.3	31.1
Out of state hospital	-	-	-	3.0	-	.5
Pharmacy/Chemist	7.5	2.8	2.9	3.2	1.8	3.3
Other	4.0	2.8	-	3.2	-	1.7
Not Stated	4.1	-	-	-	-	.6
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 35: PLACE FIRST VISITED BY FEMALES FOR MEDICAL ATTENTION BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)

Place First Visit Made	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Public Hospital	37.6	25.9	30.1	30.0	20.8	27.8
Private Hospital	2.3	-	-	7.6	9.8	5.0
Community Health Clinic	23.0	35.9	38.6	26.1	18.1	27.2
Polyclinic	4.6	4.3	-	1.3	3.2	2.5
Private Doctor/Dentist	30.0	33.9	29.6	29.9	41.6	33.8
Out of state hospital	-	-	-	1.2	2.1	.9
Pharmacy/Chemist	-	-	-	1.2	3.2	1.2
Other	2.4	-	-	2.5	1.1	1.3
Not Stated	-	-	1.7	-	-	.3
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 35: PLACE FIRST VISITED BY BOTH SEXES FOR MEDICAL ATTENTION BY QUINTILES (CONT'D)

Place First Visit Made	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Public Hospital	33.7	26.8	34.7	29.3	24.5	29.1
Private Hospital	1.5	-	-	7.2	10.8	5.0
Community Health Clinic	30.1	35.2	33.3	26.4	13.9	25.9
Polyclinic	2.8	5.0	-	2.7	2.7	2.6
Private Doctor/Dentist	24.5	30.6	29.9	28.2	43.4	32.8
Out of state hospital	-	-	-	1.8	1.3	.8
Pharmacy/Chemist	2.8	1.2	1.0	1.8	2.6	2.0
Other	3.0	1.2	-	2.7	.7	1.4
Not Stated	1.5	-	1.1	-	-	.4
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 36: PERSON PROVIDING MEDICAL ATTENTION TO MALES BY QUINTILES

Person Who Attended Individual At First Visit	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Nurse, health care worker	49.8	34.1	21.5	42.1	17.9	30.6
Pharmacist	7.5	2.8	2.9	3.2	1.8	3.3
Doctor	42.7	60.2	75.6	54.7	78.5	65.1
Other	-	2.8	-	-	1.8	1.1
Not Stated	-	-	-	-	-	-
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 36 (CONT'D): PERSON PROVIDING MEDICAL ATTENTION TO FEMALES BY QUINTILES

Person Who Attended Individual At First Visit	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Nurse, health care worker	30.6	36.4	30.7	37.6	21.6	30.6
Pharmacist	-	-	-	1.2	3.2	1.2
Doctor	62.4	63.6	69.3	61.2	75.2	67.3
Other	4.6	-	-	-	-	.6
Not Stated	2.4	-	-	-	-	.3
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 36 (CONT'D): PERSON PROVIDING MEDICAL ATTENTION TO BOTH SEXES BY QUINTILES

Person Who Attended Individual At First Visit	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Nurse, health care worker	37.9	35.4	27.5	38.9	20.2	30.6
Pharmacist	2.8	1.2	1.0	1.8	2.6	2.0
Doctor	54.9	62.2	71.5	59.3	76.5	66.5
Other	2.9	1.2	-	-	.7	.8
Not Stated	1.5	-	-	-	-	.2
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 37: REPORTED LEVEL OF SATISFACTION OF MALES WITH MEDICAL SERVICE BY QUINTILES

Level of Satisfaction With Treatment	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Very satisfied	41.9	37.0	48.2	48.9	51.6	46.3
Satisfied	43.1	49.2	48.8	29.9	39.9	41.9
Dissatisfied	11.0	11.1	-	18.0	6.9	9.0
Very dissatisfied	4.0	2.7	3.0	3.2	1.7	2.7
Not Stated	-	-	-	-	-	-
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 37 (CONT'D): REPORTED LEVEL OF SATISFACTION
OF FEMALES WITH MEDICAL SERVICE BY QUINTILES**

Level of Satisfaction With Treatment	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Very satisfied	41.4	46.8	40.6	47.3	57.1	48.0
Satisfied	51.6	43.0	49.4	35.5	40.8	42.9
Dissatisfied	2.2	8.2	8.4	12.3	1.1	6.4
Very dissatisfied	2.3	-	1.6	3.8	-	1.5
Not Stated	2.4	2.0	-	1.2	1.0	1.2
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 37 (CONT'D): REPORTED LEVEL OF SATISFACTION OF
BOTH SEXES WITH MEDICAL SERVICE BY QUINTILES**

Level of Satisfaction With Treatment	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Very satisfied	41.6	42.6	43.3	47.8	55.0	47.4
Satisfied	48.4	45.6	49.2	33.8	40.4	42.5
Dissatisfied	5.5	9.4	5.4	13.9	3.3	7.3
Very dissatisfied	3.0	1.2	2.1	3.6	.6	2.0
Not Stated	1.5	1.2	-	.8	.6	.8
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 38: REASONS FOR DISSATISFACTION OF MALES WITH
REPORTED LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH MEDICAL SERVICE BY QUINTILES**

Reason Not Satisfied with Treatment	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Drugs not available	-	-	-	-	-	-
Drugs not affordable	25.1	-	-	-	-	4.6
Attitude of Staff	-	-	-	14.1	39.2	13.4
Long waiting time	50.4	79.4	100.0	43.7	20.5	50.3
Equipment not available or operational	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Doctor/Trained staff available	-	-	-	-	19.7	4.4
To many revisits	24.5	-	-	13.8	20.5	13.6
Not Stated	-	20.6	-	28.3		13.8
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 38 (CONT'D): REASONS FOR DISSATISFACTION OF FEMALES
WITH REPORTED LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH MEDICAL SERVICE BY QUINTILES**

Reason Not Satisfied with Treatment	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Drugs not available	-	25.5	17.8	7.7	-	11.9
Drugs not affordable	-	-	-	7.4	-	3.7
Attitude of Staff	51.6	-	-	22.9	-	15.3
Long waiting time	48.4	24.5	50.8	46.8	-	42.6
Equipment not available or operational	-	25.5	15.6	7.6	-	11.3
No Doctor/Trained staff available	-	-	-	-	-	-
To many revisits	-	-	15.9	-	-	3.8
Not Stated	-	24.5	-	7.6	100.0	11.4
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 38 (CONT'D): REASONS FOR DISSATISFACTION OF BOTH SEXES WITH REPORTED LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH MEDICAL SERVICE BY SEX AND QUINTILES

Reason Not Satisfied with Treatment	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Drugs not available	-	11.4	15.3	5.0	-	6.5
Drugs not affordable	16.7	-	-	4.8	-	4.1
Attitude of Staff	17.2	-	-	19.8	32.4	14.4
Long waiting time	49.8	54.9	57.6	45.7	17.0	46.1
Equipment not available or operational	-	11.4	13.4	4.9	-	6.1
No Doctor/Trained staff available	-	-	-	-	16.3	2.0
To many revisits	16.3	-	13.6	4.9	17.0	8.2
Not Stated	-	22.3	-	14.9	17.4	12.5
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 39: MEAN TIME (MINS.) MALES SPENT WAITING FOR MEDICAL TREATMENT BY QUINTILES

	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					Total
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	Mean					
Length of Wait Before Being Attended To	58	69	35	64	45	53

TABLE 39 (CONT'D): MEAN TIME (MINS.) FEMALES SPENT WAITING FOR MEDICAL TREATMENT BY SEX AND QUINTILES

	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					Total
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	Mean					
Length of Wait Before Being Attended To	61	60	42	51	45	50

TABLE 39 (CONT'D): MEAN TIME (MINS.) BOTH SEXES SPENT WAITING FOR MEDICAL TREATMENT BY SEX AND QUINTILES

	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					Total
	<i>Poorest</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>Richest</i>	
	<i>Mean</i>					
Length of Wait Before Being Attended To	60	64	40	55	45	51

TABLE 40: MEAN TIME SPENT WAITING FOR TREATMENT BY PLACE VISITED FOR MEDICAL CARE

Place First Visit Made	Mean Length of Wait Before Being Attended To
Public Hospital	78
Private Hospital	43
Community Health Clinic	49
Polyclinic	57
Private Doctor/Dentist	34
Out of state hospital	14
Pharmacy/Chemist	4
Other	56
Not Stated	33
Total	51

TABLE 41: DISTRIBUTION OF MALES COVERED BY MEDICAL INSURANCE BY QUINTILES

Covered By Health Insurance	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Yes	3.8	22.3	15.1	42.1	48.3	29.9
No	92.4	72.2	84.9	57.9	51.7	68.5
Not Stated	3.8	5.5	-	-	-	1.6
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 41 (CONT'D): DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALES COVERED
BY MEDICAL INSURANCE BY QUINTILES**

Covered By Health Insurance	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Yes	6.9	21.3	16.6	27.2	36.4	24.3
No	93.1	78.7	83.4	71.6	61.4	74.8
Not Stated	-	-	-	1.2	2.2	.9
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**TABLE 41 (CONT'D): DISTRIBUTION OF BOTH SEXES COVERED
BY MEDICAL INSURANCE BY QUINTILES**

Covered By Health Insurance	Per Capita Consumption Quintiles					All St Lucia
	Poorest	II	III	IV	Richest	
	%					
Yes	5.7	21.7	16.1	31.6	40.9	26.3
No	92.8	75.9	83.9	67.5	57.8	72.5
Not Stated	1.5	2.3		.9	1.4	1.2
All St Lucia	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

ANTHROPOMETRIC TABLES

TABLE 42: CHARACTERISTICS OF CHILDREN UNDER 5 YEARS IN QUINTILES

Age in Years	Household Quintiles					Total
	Poorest	II	III	IV	V	
	%					
Under 1 Year	94.5	95.3	96.0	96.7	98.3	96.2
1 < 2 Years	1.3	1.2	1.0	1.0	.2	.9
2 < 3 Years	1.5	.9	.8	.3	.3	.8
3 < 4 Years	1.5	1.4	1.1	1.3	.7	1.2
4 < 5 Years	1.3	1.2	1.1	.7	.4	.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 43: PLACE CHILD DELIVERED BY QUINTILES

Place Child Delivered	Household Quintiles					Total
	Poorest	II	III	IV	V	
	%					
Hospital	9.2	9.0	8.4	7.9	4.5	7.8
Clinic/Center	.6	1.1	1.7	.9	.7	1.0
Home	1.2	.8	1.1	1.3	.9	1.1
Other	1.1	1.1	.9	.8	1.1	1.0
Not Stated	87.8	88.0	87.9	89.0	92.8	89.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 44: CHILDREN SUFFERING FROM DIARRHOEA BY SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS BY QUINTILES

Had Diarrhoea	Household Quintiles					Total
	Poorest	II	III	IV	V	
	%					
Yes	.3	.6	.2	.2	.2	.3
No	6.8	6.2	5.6	4.1	1.8	4.9
Not Stated	92.8	93.2	94.2	95.7	98.0	94.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 45: CHILDREN PREVIOUSLY BREAST FED BY SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS

Breast Fed	Household Quintiles					Total
	Poorest	II	III	IV	V	
	%					
Yes	7.0	6.6	5.6	4.4	1.7	5.0
No	.1	.1	.2	.1	.3	.1
Not Stated	92.9	93.4	94.1	95.5	98.1	94.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 46: CHILDREN PRESENTLY BREAST FED BY AGE AND SOCIO ECONOMIC STATUS

SOURCES						
Still Breast Fed	Household Quintiles					Total
	Poorest	II	III	IV	V	
	%					
Yes	21.4	25.9	25.3	18.9	23.1	23.1
No	75.1	71.6	70.3	81.1	72.1	74.0
Not Stated	3.5	2.5	4.3	-	4.9	2.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 47: IMMUNIZATION RECEIVED BY CHILDREN UNDER 5 YEARS BY QUINTILES

Items Received Within 24 Hours	Vaccination Received						
	<i>Polio</i>	<i>Diphtheria</i>	<i>BCG</i>	<i>HIB</i>	<i>Measles</i>	<i>Hepatitis B</i>	<i>MMR1</i>
	%						
Vitamins and Supplements	53.8	55.0	53.1	55.1	58.6	56.6	54.8
Plain Water	92.8	94.9	92.9	93.6	93.1	91.6	94.7
Sweetened Water Juice Tea	82.3	85.1	82.2	85.1	84.3	81.9	84.6
ORS	5.4	5.8	5.4	7.3	7.3	6.9	3.7
Milk or Infant Formula	81.2	82.4	81.4	82.2	80.7	77.0	82.8
Solid or Semi Solid Food	78.7	81.1	78.2	81.6	80.1	77.0	81.2
Other	13.1	11.2	13.0	9.7	11.8	9.2	11.8
Only Breastmilk	4.9	4.0	4.9	2.5	3.8	.7	2.2
Don't Know	1.0	1.2	1.7	1.5	.9	-	.5
Polio	100.0	99.6	96.3	98.5	99.5	99.3	99.5

TABLE 48: IMMUNIZATION RECEIVED BY AGE OF CHILD BY QUINTILES

Age in Years	Vaccination Received						
	<i>Polio</i>	<i>Diphtheria</i>	<i>BCG</i>	<i>HIB</i>	<i>Measles</i>	<i>Hepatitis B</i>	<i>MMR1</i>
Under 1 Year	23.2	19.0	24.6	20.1	22.0	24.1	18.9
1 < 2 Years	18.5	18.4	18.5	13.0	15.5	12.5	15.9
2 < 3 Years	15.2	16.1	14.8	15.7	14.2	12.6	15.4
3 < 4 Years	24.5	26.4	23.6	27.6	25.9	26.4	27.8
4 < 5 Years	18.7	20.1	18.5	23.6	22.4	24.4	21.9

HOUSING TABLES

TABLE 49: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: MAIN MATERIAL OF OUTER WALLS BY QUINTILES

Material of Outer Walls	Household Quintiles - AE					Total
	Poorest	II	III	IV	V	
	%					
Wood/Timber	32.0	23.7	19.1	16.1	10.1	20.2
Concrete/Concrete Blocks	20.9	30.6	41.6	55.3	68.5	43.4
Wood & Concrete	14.0	23.8	18.6	17.6	17.7	18.3
Stone	-	-	-	-	.4	.1
Brick/Blocks	2.1	2.4	2.4	2.0	1.2	2.0
Plywood	30.7	19.1	17.9	8.5	1.6	15.5
Makeshift	.4	.4	.4	-	-	.2
Other/Don't Know	-	-	-	.4	-	.1
Not Stated	-	-	-	-	.4	.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 50: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: TYPE OF DWELLING UNIT BY QUINTILES

Type of Dwelling	Household Quintiles - AE					Total
	Poorest	II	III	IV	V	
	%					
Undivided Private House	90.2	89.8	83.7	81.8	80.7	85.2
Part of a Private House	7.0	6.2	9.0	11.3	9.6	8.6
Flat, Apartment, Condominium	2.4	2.8	6.1	5.7	7.2	4.8
Double House/Duplex	-	-	-	.4	.4	.2
Combined Business & Dwelling	.4	.8	.8	.4	2.1	.9
Barracks	-	.4	-	-	-	.1
Other	-	-	.4	.4	-	.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 51: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: TYPE OF DWELLING UNIT BY DISTRICT

Type of Dwelling	District											Total
	Castries City	Castries Sub-Urban	Anse-La-Raye	Soufriere	Choiseul	Laborie	Vieux-Fort	Micoud	Dennery	Gros-Islet		
	%											
Undivided Private House	69.4	81.8	85.7	78.8	91.7	94.2	93.9	99.1	99.0	80.3	85.2	
Part of a Private House	15.7	12.0	6.3	19.2	6.3	3.8	3.1		1.0	8.7	8.6	
Flat, Apartment, Condominium	14.9	4.7	7.9	1.9	-	-	-	.9	-	8.2	4.8	
Double House/Duplex	-	.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.2	
Combined Business & Dwelling	-	.8	-	-	2.1	1.9	3.1	-	-	1.6	.9	
Barracks	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.5	.1	
Other	-	.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.5	.2	
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 52: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: MAIN ROOFING MATERIAL BY QUINTILES

Roof Material	Household Quintiles - AE					Total
	Poorest	II	III	IV	V	
	%					
Sheet Metal (galvanize)	98.4	98.3	97.5	96.7	90.3	96.2
Shingle Asphalt	.4	.4	.8	2.5	4.9	1.8
Shingle Wood	-	-	-	-	.8	.2
Shingle Other	-	-	-	-	1.2	.2
Tile	-	-	-	-	1.2	.2
Concrete	-	1.2	.8	-	.8	.6
Makeshift/Thatched	-	-	.4	-	-	.1
Other	.4	-	.4	.8	.8	.5
Don't Know	.8	-	-	-	-	.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 53: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: MAIN ROOFING MATERIAL BY DISTRICT

Roof Material	District											Total
	Castries City	Castries Sub-Urban	Anse-La-Raye	Soufriere	Choiseul	Laborie	Vieux-Fort	Micoud	Dennery	Gros-Islet		
	%											
Sheet Metal (galvanize)	97.0	96.9	98.4	98.1	97.9	100.0	94.9	99.1	97.9	89.6	96.2	
Shingle Asphalt	-	.8	-	-	-	-	3.1	.9	1.0	7.7	1.8	
Shingle Wood	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.1	.2	
Shingle Other	-	.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.1	.2	
Tile	.7	.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.2	
Concrete	2.2	.3	-	-	2.1		2.0	-	-	-	.6	
Makeshift/Thatched	-	.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.1	
Other	-	1.0	-	1.9	-	-	-	-	1.0	-	.5	
Don't Know	-	-	1.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	.5	.2	
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 54: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: TENANCY OF LAND BY QUINTILES

Roof Material	Household Quintiles - AE					Total
	Poorest	II	III	IV	V	
	%					
Sheet Metal (galvanize)	98.4	98.3	97.5	96.7	90.3	96.2
Shingle Asphalt	.4	.4	.8	2.5	4.9	1.8
Shingle Wood	-	-	-	-	.8	.2
Shingle Other	-	-	-	-	1.2	.2
Tile	-	-	-	-	1.2	.2
Concrete	-	1.2	.8	-	.8	.6
Makeshift/Thatched	-	-	.4	-	-	.1
Other	.4	-	.4	.8	.8	.5
Don't Know	.8	-	-	-	-	.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 55: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: TENANCY OF LAND BY DISTRICT

Tenancy of Land	District										Total
	<i>Castries City</i>	<i>Castries Sub-Urban</i>	<i>Anse-La-Raye</i>	<i>Soufriere</i>	<i>Choiseul</i>	<i>Laborie</i>	<i>Vieux-Fort</i>	<i>Micoud</i>	<i>Dennery</i>	<i>Gros-Islet</i>	
	%										
Not Stated	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.5	99.9
Owned With Title	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.5	.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 56: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: TENANCY OF DWELLING BY QUINTILES

Tenancy of Dwelling	Household Quintiles - AE					Total
	<i>Poorest</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>V</i>	
	%					
Owned With Mortgage	3.6	6.0	7.4	12.3	21.3	10.1
Owned Without Mortgage	76.0	70.8	70.3	63.7	61.5	68.4
Rented-Furnished	-	.4	-	1.2	2.8	.9
Rented-Unfurnished	13.1	18.3	17.4	18.7	12.8	16.1
Rent-free	5.8	4.5	4.4	3.7	.8	3.8
Squatted	.8	-	.4	-	.8	.4
Other	.4	-	-	.4	-	.2
Not Stated	.4	-	-	-	-	.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 57: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: TENANCY OF DWELLING BY DISTRICT

Tenancy of Dwelling	District											Total
	<i>Castries City</i>	<i>Castries Sub-Urban</i>	<i>Anse-La-Ray</i>	<i>Soufriere</i>	<i>Choiseul</i>	<i>Laborie</i>	<i>Vieux-Fort</i>	<i>Micoud</i>	<i>Dennerly</i>	<i>Gros-Islet</i>		
	%											
Owned With Mortgage	8.2	10.7	9.5	9.6	6.3	7.7	7.1	2.7	5.2	21.3	10.1	
Owned Without Mortgage	51.5	62.8	79.4	69.2	81.3	84.6	84.7	92.8	80.4	49.7	68.4	
Rented-Furnished	2.2	.5	1.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.7	.9	
Rented-Unfurnished	34.3	20.3	6.3	17.3	6.3	5.8	6.1	3.6	10.3	19.1	16.1	
Rent-free	3.7	5.2	-	3.8	6.3	1.9	2.0	.9	4.1	4.9	3.8	
Squatted	-	.3	3.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.1	.4	
Other	-	.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.5	.2	
Not Stated	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.5	.1	
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 58: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: MAIN COOKING FUEL USED BY QUINTILES

Cooking Fuel Used	Household Quintiles - AE					Total
	Poorest	II	III	IV	V	
	%					
Coal	11.1	5.3	5.7	2.8	1.2	5.2
Wood	7.9	1.2	1.2	.4	.4	2.2
Gas/LPG/Cooking Gas	78.4	93.5	92.7	94.3	96.8	91.1
Kerosene	-	-	-	.8	-	.2
Electricity	.4	-	.4	1.3	1.6	.7
Other	2.1	-	-	.4	-	.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 59: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: MAIN COOKING FUEL USED BY DISTRICT

Cooking Fuel Used	District										Total
	Castries City	Castries Sub-Urban	Anse-La-Rayé	Soufrière	Choiseul	Laborie	Vieux-Fort	Micoud	Dennery	Gros-Islet	
	%										
Coal	3.0	2.6	7.9	13.5	18.8	11.5	5.1	3.6	5.2	4.9	5.2
Wood	.7	-	4.8	1.9	8.3	1.9	7.1	3.6	1.0	2.7	2.2
Gas/LPG/Cooking Gas	94.8	97.1	85.7	80.8	70.8	84.6	86.7	92.8	93.8	88.0	91.1
Kerosene	-	.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.5	.2
Electricity	1.5	-	-	-	-	-	1.0	-	-	3.3	.7
Other	-	-	1.6	3.8	2.1	1.9	-	-	-	.5	.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 60: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: MAIN COOKING FUEL USED BY QUINTILES

Cooking Fuel Used	Household Quintiles - AE					Total
	Poorest	II	III	IV	V	
	%					
Coal	11.1	5.3	5.7	2.8	1.2	5.2
Wood	7.9	1.2	1.2	.4	.4	2.2
Gas/LPG/Cooking Gas	78.4	93.5	92.7	94.3	96.8	91.1
Kerosene	-	-	-	.8	-	.2
Electricity	.4	-	.4	1.3	1.6	.7
Other	2.1	-	-	.4	-	.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 61: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: MAIN COOKING FUEL USED BY DISTRICT

Cooking Fuel Used	District											
	Castries City	Castries Sub-Urban	Anse-La-Raye	Soufriere	Choiseul	Laborie	Vieux-Fort	Micoud	Dennery	Gros-Islet	Total	
	%											
Coal	3.0	2.6	7.9	13.5	18.8	11.5	5.1	3.6	5.2	4.9	5.2	
Wood	.7	-	4.8	1.9	8.3	1.9	7.1	3.6	1.0	2.7	2.2	
Gas/LPG/Cooking Gas	94.8	97.1	85.7	80.8	70.8	84.6	86.7	92.8	93.8	88.0	91.1	
Kerosene	-	.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.5	.2	
Electricity	1.5	-	-	-	-	-	1.0	-	-	3.3	.7	
Other	-	-	1.6	3.8	2.1	1.9	-	-	-	.5	.5	
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 62: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: MAIN COOKING FUEL USED BY QUINTILES

Cooking Fuel Used	Household Quintiles - AE					Total
	Poorest	II	III	IV	V	
	%					
Coal	11.1	5.3	5.7	2.8	1.2	5.2
Wood	7.9	1.2	1.2	.4	.4	2.2
Gas/LPG/Cooking Gas	78.4	93.5	92.7	94.3	96.8	91.1
Kerosene	-	-	-	.8	-	.2
Electricity	.4	-	.4	1.3	1.6	.7
Other	2.1	-	-	.4	-	.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 63: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: MAIN COOKING FUEL USED BY DISTRICT

Cooking Fuel Used	District											Total
	Castries City	Castries Sub-Urban	Anse-La-Rayé	Soufrière	Choiseul	Laborie	Vieux-Fort	Micoud	Dennery	Gros-Islet		
	%											
Coal	3.0	2.6	7.9	13.5	18.8	11.5	5.1	3.6	5.2	4.9	5.2	
Wood	.7	-	4.8	1.9	8.3	1.9	7.1	3.6	1.0	2.7	2.2	
Gas/LPG/Cooking Gas	94.8	97.1	85.7	80.8	70.8	84.6	86.7	92.8	93.8	88.0	91.1	
Kerosene	-	.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.5	.2	
Electricity	1.5	-	-	-	-	-	1.0	-	-	3.3	.7	
Other	-		1.6	3.8	2.1	1.9	-	-	-	.5	.5	
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 64: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: TOILET FACILITY USED BY QUINTILES

Toilet Facilities	Household Quintiles - AE					Total
	Poorest	II	III	IV	V	
	%					
W.C. Linked to sewer	2.8	4.4	3.6	4.1	14.6	5.9
W.C. Linked to Septic tank/Soak-away	28.2	54.1	66.2	76.5	78.4	60.7
Pit-latrline	57.8	36.7	25.7	16.5	6.9	28.7
Ventilated Pit-latrline	.4	.4	.8	-	-	.3
Other	3.2	3.2	2.0	.8	-	1.8
None	7.5	.8	1.7	2.1	-	2.4
Not Stated	-	.4	-	-	-	.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 65: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: TOILET FACILITIES USED BY DISTRICT

Toilet Facilities	District											Total
	Castries City	Castries Sub-Urban	Anse-La-Raye	Soufriere	Choiseul	Laborie	Vieux-Fort	Micoud	Dennery	Gros-Islet		
	%											
W.C. Linked to sewer	11.2	6.8	-	-	-	-	4.1	-	-	15.3	5.9	
W.C. Linked to Septic tank/Soak-away	67.9	71.9	34.9	57.7	62.5	65.4	54.1	49.5	32.0	65.6	60.7	
Pit-latraine	20.1	18.8	39.7	23.1	33.3	28.8	38.8	50.5	62.9	15.3	28.7	
Ventilated Pit-latraine	-	1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.3	
Other	.7	.8	19.0	1.9	4.2	-	-	-	-	2.2	1.8	
None	-	.8	6.3	17.3	-	5.8	3.1	-	5.2	1.1	2.4	
Not Stated	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.5	.1	
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 66: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: FACILITIES SHARED BY QUINTILES

Toilet Facilities	Household Quintiles - AE					Total
	Poorest	II	III	IV	V	
	%					
W.C. Linked to sewer	2.8	4.4	3.6	4.1	14.6	5.9
W.C. Linked to Septic tank/Soak-away	28.2	54.1	66.2	76.5	78.4	60.7
Pit-latrine	57.8	36.7	25.7	16.5	6.9	28.7
Ventilated Pit-latrine	.4	.4	.8	-	-	.3
Other	3.2	3.2	2.0	.8	-	1.8
None	7.5	.8	1.7	2.1	-	2.4
Not Stated	-	.4	-	-	-	.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 67: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: MAIN SOURCE OF WATER BY QUINTILES

Main Source of Water	Household Quintiles - AE					Total
	Poorest	II	III	IV	V	
	%					
Public, piped into dwelling	40.5	59.8	70.6	82.1	90.1	68.6
Public, piped into yard	34.4	26.0	21.7	10.8	7.0	19.9
Public standpipe	13.5	6.5	3.7	2.9	-	5.3
Public well/tank or truck	.4	-	-	-	-	.1
Private, piped into dwelling	.4	2.4	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.3
Private catchment not piped	.4	1.6	.4	-	.4	.6
Private catchment piped	.8	-	-	-	.4	.3
Other	9.5	3.3	2.5	3.0	.8	3.8
Not Stated	-	.4	-	-	-	.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 68: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: MAIN SOURCE OF WATER BY DISTRICT

Main Source of Water	District										Total
	%										
Public, piped into dwelling	88.1	78.4	58.7	51.9	50.0	71.2	53.1	53.2	38.1	81.4	68.6
Public, piped into yard	9.0	14.6	6.3	23.1	37.5	15.4	33.7	37.8	45.4	7.1	19.9
Public standpipe	-	3.6	14.3	13.5	2.1	9.6	3.1	1.8	11.3	7.1	5.3
Public well/tank or truck	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.5	.1
Private, piped into dwelling	1.5	1.6	12.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.3
Private catchment not piped	.7	.3	-	1.9	2.1	1.9	-	-	-	1.1	.6
Private catchment piped	-	-	-	-	-	1.9	-	.9		.5	.3
Other	.7	1.6	7.9	9.6	8.3	-	10.2	6.3	5.2	1.6	3.8
Not Stated	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.5	.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 69: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: MAIN FREQUENCY OF WATER SUPPLY BY QUINTILES

Days Have Water in Tap	Household Quintiles - AE					Total
	Poorest	II	III	IV	V	
	%					
Never	22.8	10.2	7.0	6.3	2.1	9.6
One	2.8	3.6	4.0	2.0	2.8	3.1
Two	6.7	4.1	4.4	3.7	3.6	4.5
Three	8.1	12.9	10.3	12.3	14.0	11.5
Four	6.1	5.0	4.9	6.2	11.1	6.7
Five	6.6	10.3	8.2	6.5	8.1	7.9
Six	5.0	7.6	7.4	3.2	7.2	6.1
Always	37.8	41.5	47.8	50.2	43.4	44.1
Don't Know	4.0	3.6	4.9	6.8	5.6	5.0
Not Stated		1.2	1.2	2.8	2.1	1.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 70: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: FREQUENCY OF WATER SUPPLY BY DISTRICT

Days Have Water in Tap	District										Total
	Castries City	Castries Sub-Urban	Anse-La-Ray	Soufriere	Choiseul	Laborie	Vieux-Fort	Micoud	Demery	Gros-Islet	
	%										
Never	1.5	6.3	20.6	23.1	12.5	11.5	11.2	9.9	13.4	10.4	9.6
One	3.0	2.9	3.2	-	4.2	1.9	-	.9	10.3	3.8	3.1
Two	2.2	3.1	1.6	-	12.5	-	-	.9	24.7	4.9	4.5
Three	17.9	5.2	6.3	13.5	33.3	11.5	4.1	27.0	18.6	6.6	11.5
Four	7.5	7.6	1.6	19.2	-	1.9	3.1	9.0	7.2	5.5	6.7
Five	9.7	9.4	1.6	3.8	-	5.8	4.1	8.1	6.2	12.6	7.9
Six	4.5	7.6	-	3.8	2.1	3.8	14.3	5.4	3.1	6.0	6.1
Always	42.5	47.1	47.6	32.7	35.4	61.5	62.2	38.7	15.5	46.4	44.1
Don't Know	6.0	9.1	15.9	1.9	-	1.9	1.0	-	1.0	2.7	5.0
Not Stated	5.2	1.8	1.6	1.9	-	-	-	-	-	1.1	1.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 71: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: MAIN SOURCE OF LIGHTING BY QUINTILES

Type of Lighting	Household Quintiles - AE					Total
	Poorest	II	III	IV	V	
	%					
Gas	.8	.4	.4	.9	2.1	.9
Kerosene	5.3	1.2	2.5	-	-	1.8
Electricity -Public	82.2	94.2	94.6	95.2	93.4	91.9
Electricity - Private	.4	1.3	1.3	1.3	4.1	1.7
Other	10.0	2.5	.4	1.3	-	2.9
None	1.3	.4	.4	1.3	.4	.8
Not Stated	-	-	.4	-	-	.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 72: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: MAIN SOURCE OF LIGHTING BY DISTRICT

Type of Lighting	District										Total
	Castries City	Castries Sub-Urban	Anse-La-Ray	Soufriere	Choiseul	Laborie	Vieux-Fort	Micoud	Demerary	Gros-Islet	
	%										
Gas	.7	.5	1.6	-	-	-	1.0	2.7	-	1.6	.9
Kerosene	-	2.1	3.2	-	4.2	-	-	3.6	-	3.3	1.8
Electricity - Public	98.5	97.1	87.3	88.5	93.8	92.3	88.8	86.5	94.8	82.5	91.9
Electricity - Private	-	-	1.6	1.9	-	-	1.0	-	-	9.3	1.7
Other	-	.3	3.2	9.6	2.1	5.8	8.2	4.5	5.2	2.2	2.9
None	.7	-	1.6	-	-	1.9	1.0	2.7	-	1.1	.8
Not Stated	-	-	1.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 73: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: AGE OF DWELLING BY QUINTILES

Year Dwelling Built	Household Quintiles - AE					Total
	Poorest	II	III	IV	V	
	%					
Before 1970	8.7	7.3	11.5	14.0	10.5	10.4
1970 - 1979	11.6	7.8	7.4	9.3	17.8	10.8
1980 - 1989	16.0	20.5	13.2	19.0	21.2	18.0
1990 - 1995	14.8	12.0	17.3	13.6	15.2	14.6
1996 - 2000	10.6	11.0	12.0	11.1	11.1	11.2
2001	.8	1.3	1.6	2.5	2.0	1.6
2002	2.1	.9	2.0	.4	.4	1.1
2003	1.6	.8	1.6	.8	.4	1.0
2004	.4	2.2	.8	1.2	1.7	1.3
2005	.8		.4	1.2	.4	.6
Don't Know	32.1	34.7	31.6	25.7	19.3	28.6
Not Stated	.4	1.7	.4	1.2		.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 74: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS: AGE OF DWELLING BY DISTRICT

Year Dwelling Built	District										Total
	Castries City	Castries Sub-Urban	Anse-La-Raye	Soufriere	Choiseul	Laborie	Vieux-Fort	Micoud	Dennerly	Gros-Islet	
	%										
Before 1970	18.7	9.6	11.1	13.5	2.1	19.2	12.2	13.5	5.2	4.4	10.4
1970 - 1979	14.9	11.5	4.8	7.7	10.4	13.5	11.2	12.6	6.2	9.8	10.8
1980 - 1989	11.2	13.3	12.7	15.4	41.7	17.3	30.6	18.9	15.5	23.0	18.0
1990 - 1995	8.2	12.8	14.3	23.1	16.7	26.9	12.2	20.7	11.3	15.3	14.6
1996 - 2000	3.7	12.0	11.1	5.8	10.4	7.7	17.3	13.5	16.5	9.8	11.2
2001	.7	1.8	-	1.9	4.2	3.8	1.0	.9	1.0	2.2	1.6
2002	.7	.8	1.6	3.8	-	-	-	.9	4.1	1.1	1.1
2003	.7	1.0	3.2	-	-	-	1.0	-	5.2	-	1.0
2004	.7	.5	-	1.9	-	-	1.0	3.6	2.1	2.2	1.3
2005	.7	.8	-	-	-	1.9	2.0	-	-	-	.6
Don't Know	39.6	35.7	38.1	26.9	14.6	9.6	11.2	13.5	33.0	30.1	28.6
Not Stated	-	.3	3.2	-	-	-	-	1.8	-	2.2	.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 75: SOCIO ECONOMIC RATING OF HOUSEHOLD BY QUINTILES

Socio-Economic Rating	Household Quintiles - AE					Total
	<i>Poorest</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>V</i>	
	%					
Poor	31.7	14.6	14.6	15.0	2.8	15.7
II	35.5	42.4	34.1	30.3	21.8	32.8
III	27.4	38.0	42.6	48.9	65.9	44.6
IV	3.8	3.7	5.9	3.7	8.7	5.2
Rich	-	.4	.8	.4	.4	.4
Not Stated	1.6	.8	2.0	1.6	.4	1.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 76: SOCIO ECONOMIC RATING OF HOUSEHOLDS BY DISTRICT

Socio-Economic Rating	District											Total
	Castries City	Castries Sub-Urban	Anse-La-Raye	Soufriere	Choiseul	Laborie	Vieux-Fort	Micoud	Demery	Gros-Islet		
	%											
Poor	19.4	14.3	41.3	11.5	6.3	13.5	18.4	15.3	14.4	11.5	15.7	
II	32.1	35.4	30.2	34.6	47.9	38.5	33.7	23.4	40.2	24.6	32.8	
III	44.0	45.6	22.2	50.0	45.8	40.4	42.9	47.7	43.3	49.2	44.6	
IV	3.0	2.9	1.6	3.8	-	7.7	4.1	10.8	1.0	12.6	5.2	
Rich	.7	.5	-	-	-	-	-	.9	-	.5	.4	
Not Stated	.7	1.3	4.8	-	-	-	1.0	1.8	1.0	1.6	1.3	
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 77: MEAN NUMBER OF ROOMS AND USE OF ROOMS BY QUINTILES

	Household Quintiles - AE					Total
	Poorest	II	III	IV	V	
	Mean					
Number of Rooms	3.21	4.06	3.88	4.23	4.32	3.94
Number of Bedrooms	2.08	2.48	2.74	2.52	2.74	2.51
Rooms Used For Business	.02	.02	.03	.01	.07	.03
Rooms Rented	.00	.00	.00	.02	.01	.01
Rooms Vacant	.02	.05	.01	.03	.09	.04