



Republic of The Gambia

The 2020-21 Gambia SDGs Monitoring Survey

The Gambia Bureau of Statistics (GBoS)



Table of Contents

1	FUNCTIONAL DIFFICULTIES (5 YEARS AND ABOVE)	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2	ACCESS TO BASIC SERVICES	5
3	SLUMS, INFORMAL SETTLEMENTS AND INADQUATE HOUSING	10
3.1	INFORMAL SETTLEMENTS	14
3.2	INADEQUATE HOUSING	19
4	ACCESS TO FORMAL FINANCIAL SERVICES.....	25
5	WASTE DISPOSAL	33
6	SAFETY.....	40
7	DISCRIMINATION AND HARASSMENT.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
8	EXPERIENCE WITH PUBLIC SERVICES (BRIBERY)	59
9	BRIBERY (BUSINESSES)	64
10	PARTICIPATION IN FORMAL AND NON-FORMAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING	66
11	RESPONDENTS PERCEPTION OF PUBLIC SERVICES	75
12	PHYSICAL AND SEXUAL HARASSMENT	84
13	PHYSICAL AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE	94
14	OWNERSHIP OR SECURE RIGHTS OVER AGRICULTURAL LAND.....	103
15	ACCESS TO PUBLIC TRANSPORT	104
16	EXPERIENCE OF DISPUTE IN THE PAST TWO YEARS.....	105

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1: Proportion of the population 5 years and above with functional difficulties.....	1
Table 1.2: Population 5 Years and Above with Functional Difficulties by Place of Residence	1
Table 1.3: Population 5 Years and Above with Functional Difficulties by Local Government Area	1
Table 1.4: Population 5 Years and Above with Functional Difficulties by Sex.....	2
Table 1.5: Population 5 Years and Above with Functional Difficulties by population groups.....	2
Table 2.1: Proportion of Households with Access to All Basic Services	5
Table 2.2: Access to All Basic Services by Place of Residence.....	5
Table 2.3: Access to All Basic Services by Local Government Area	5
Table 2.4: Access to All Basic Services by Sex of the Household Head	6
Table 2.5: Access to All Basic Services by Age of the Household Head	7
Table 2.6: Proportion of the Population with Access to Basic Mobility	9
Table 2.7: Access to Basic Mobility by Place of Residence	9
Table 3.1: Proportion of Urban Households Living in Slum Households.....	10
Table 3.2: Proportion of Urban Households Living in Slum Households by LGA	10
Table 3.3: Proportion of Urban Households Living in Slum Households by Sex of Household Head.....	11
Table 3.4: Proportion of Urban Households Living in Slum Households by Ethnicity of Household Head.....	11
Table 3.5: Proportion of Urban Households Living in Slum Households by Religion of Household Head.....	12
Table 3.6: Proportion of Urban Households Living in Slum Households by age of Household Members.....	12
Table 3.7: Proportion of Urban Households Living in Slums by Functional Difficulties.....	14
Table 3.8: Proportion of the Urban Households Living in Informal Settlements.....	14
Table 3.9: Urban Households Living in Informal Settlements by LGA.....	14
Table 3.10: Urban Households Living in Informal Settlements by Ethnicity of Household Head	15
Table 3.11: Urban Households Living in Informal Settlements by Age of Household Members .	17
Table 3.12: Urban Households Living in Informal Settlements by Religion of Household Head .	19
Table 3.13: Proportion of Urban Households Living in Informal Settlements by Functional Difficulties	19
Table 3.14: Proportion of Urban Households with Inadequate Housing	19
Table 3.15: Proportion of Urban Households with Inadequate Housing by LGA	20
Table 3.16: Proportion of Urban Households with Inadequate Housing by Sex	20
Table 3.17: Proportion of Urban Households with Inadequate Housing by Ethnicity	21
Table 3.18: Proportion of Urban Households with Inadequate Housing by Religion.....	22
Table 3.19: Proportion of Urban Households with Inadequate Housing by Age of Household Members.....	22
Table 3.20: Proportion of Urban Households Living in Inadequate Housing by Functional Difficulties	24
Table 3.21: Housing Deprivations.....	24
Table 4.1: Proportion of adults (15 years and older) with an account at a bank or other financial institution or with a mobile-money-service provider	25

Table 4.2: Proportion of adults (15 years and older) with an account at a bank or other financial institution or with a mobile-money-service provider by Place of Residence	25
Table 4.3: Proportion of adults (15 years and older) with an account at a bank or other financial institution or with a mobile-money-service provider by Age	26
Table 4.4: Proportion of adults (15 years and older) with an account at a bank or other financial institution or with a mobile-money-service provider by Level of Education.....	29
Table 4.5: Proportion of adults (15 years and older) with an account at a bank or other financial institution or with a mobile-money-service provider by Sex.....	32
Table 5.1: The proportion of the population with Access to Basic MSW Collection Services.....	33
Table 5.2: The proportion of the population with Access to Basic MSW Collection Services by Place of Residence	33
Table 5.3: The proportion of the population with Access to Basic MSW Collection Services by Local Government Area	33
Table 5.4: Households Waste (rubbish/garbage) Disposal Modes	34
Table 5.5: Households Waste (rubbish/garbage) Disposal Modes by LGA.....	34
Table 5.6: Mode of Waste Collection by Frequency	36
Table 5.7: The most recent expenditure (GMD) on rubbish/garbage disposal.....	37
Table 5.8: Modes of Liquid Waste Disposal.....	38
Table 5.9: Modes of Liquid Waste Disposal by Place of Residence.....	38
Table 6.1: Proportion of Population That Feel Safe Walking Alone Around the Area they Live..	40
Table 6.2: Proportion of population that feel safe walking alone around the area they live by Place of Residence	40
Table 6.3: Proportion of population that feel safe walking alone around the area they live by Local Government Area	41
Table 6.4: Proportion of Population That Feel Safe Walking Alone Around the Area they Live..	42
Table 6.5: Proportion of Population That Feel Safe Walking Alone Around the Area they Live..	42
Table 6.6: Safety at Home during the Night.....	44
Table 6.7: Safety at Home during the Night by Sex.....	45
Table 6.8: Proportion of the Population Who were Worried About being Physically Attacked by Strangers, Including being Mugged or Robbed.....	45
Table 6.9: Proportion of the Population Who were Worried About being Physically Attacked by Strangers, Including being Mugged or Robbed.....	45
Table 6.10: Proportion of the Population Who were Worried About Having their Home Broken into and Something Stolen.....	46
Table 6.11: Proportion of the Population Who were Worried About Having their Home Broken into and Something Stolen by Sex	46
Table 6.12: Proportion of the Population Who Are Worried About Having their Valuables Stolen or Vandalised	46
Table 6.13: Proportion of the Population Who were Worried About Having their Valuables Stolen or Vandalised by Sex.....	46
Table 7.1: Experience of Any Form of Discrimination or Harassment during the Last 5 Years...	47
Table 7.2: Experience of Any Form of Discrimination or Harassment during the Past 12 Months	47
Table 7.3: Experience of any form of discrimination or harassment during the last 5 years by Place of Residence	47

Table 7.4: Experience of Any Form of Discrimination or Harassment during the Past 12 Months by Place of Residence.....	47
Table 7.5: Experience of Any Form of Discrimination or Harassment during the Last 5 Years by Local Government Area	48
Table 7.6: Experience of Any Form of Discrimination or Harassment during the Past 12 Months by LGA	49
Table 7.7: Experience of Any Form of Discrimination or Harassment during the Last 5 Years by Sex.....	49
Table 7.8: : Experience of Any Form of Discrimination or Harassment during the past 12 Months by Sex	50
Table 7.9: Experience of Any Form of Discrimination or Harassment during the Last 5 Years by Functional Difficulties.....	50
Table 7.10: Experience of Any Form of Discrimination or Harassment during the Past 12 Months by Functional Difficulties	50
Table 7.11: Experience of Any Form of Discrimination or Harassment during the Last 5 Years by Ethnicity	51
Table 7.12: Experience of Any Form of Discrimination or Harassment during the Past 12 Months by Ethnicity	52
Table 7.13: Experience of Any Form of Discrimination or Harassment during the Last 5 Years by Income	53
Table 7.14: Experience of Any Form of Discrimination or Harassment during the past 12 by Income	54
Table 7.15: Experience of Any Form of Discrimination or Harassment during the past 12 Months by Age.....	56
Table 7.16: Experience of Any Form of Discrimination or Harassment during the Last 5 Years by Age	57
Table 8.1: Proportion of persons who had at least one contact with a public official and who paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked for a bribe by those public officials, during the previous 12 months.....	59
Table 8.2: Proportion of persons who had at least one contact with a public official and who paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked for a bribe by those public officials, during the previous 12 months by type of official	59
Table 8.3: During the last 12 months, were there any occasion directly or indirectly where a public official asked you to give extra money or a gift for a particular issue or procedure related to his/her function but you did not give anything in relation to that.....	60
Table 8.4: Sex of the Official Who Received the Last Payment/Gift/Bribe	60
Table 8.5: Sex of the Bribe-givers	60
Table 8.6: Age of the Bribe-givers	61
Table 8.7: Income Level of Bribe-Givers	62
Table 9.1: Proportion of businesses that had at least one contact with a public official and that paid a bribe to a public official	64
Table 9.2: Proportion of businesses that had at least one contact with a public official and that paid a bribe to a public official by LGA.....	64
Table 9.3: Proportion of businesses that had at least one contact with a public official and that paid a bribe to a public official by gender of top manager	64

Table 9.4: Proportion of businesses that had at least one contact with a public official and that paid a bribe to a public official by business current legal status	64
Table 9.5: Proportion of businesses that had at least one contact with a public official and that paid a bribe to a public official by primary activity	65
Table 9.6: Proportion of businesses that had at least one contact with a public official and that paid a bribe to a public official by business exporting status.....	65
Table 10.1: Participation rate of youth (15-24) in formal and Non-formal education and training in the previous 12 months.....	66
Table 10.2: Participation rate of youth (15-24) in formal and Non-formal education and training in the previous 12 months by Sex	66
Table 10.3: Participation rate of youth (15-24) in formal and Non-formal education and training in the previous 12 months by Area	66
Table 10.4: Participation rate of youth (15-24) in formal and Non-formal education and training in the previous 12 months by Local Government.....	67
Table 10.5: Participation rate of youth (15-24) in formal and Non-formal education and training in the previous 12 months by Age	68
Table 10.6: Participation rate of youth (15-24) in formal and Non-formal education and training in the previous 12 months by Income	68
Table 10.7: Participation Rate Of Adult (25-64) In Formal and Non-Formal Education and Training in the Previous 12 Months.....	69
Table 10.8: Participation Rate Of Adult (25-64) In Formal and Non-Formal Education and Training in the Previous 12 Months.....	69
Table 10.9: Participation rate of Adult (25-64) in formal and Non-formal education and training in the previous 12 months by Area	70
Table 10.10: Participation rate of Adult (25-64) in formal and Non-formal education and training in the previous 12 months by Local Government Area	70
Table 10.11: Participation rate of Adult (25-64) in formal and Non-formal education and training in the previous 12 months by Age	71
Table 10.12: Participation rate of Adult (25-64) in formal and Non-formal education and training in the previous 12 months by Income	72
Table 10.13: (SDG Indicator 4.3.3) Participation Rate of Youth (15-24) In Education or Training Activities to Improve Your Literacy Skills.....	73
Table 10.14: (SDG Indicator 4.6.3) Participation Rate of Youth (15-24) In Technical or Vocational Programmes.....	73
Table 10.15: (SDG Indicator 4.6.3) Participation of Adults (25-64) In Vocational or Technical Programmes.....	73
Table 10.16: (SDG Indicator 4.3.3) Participation of Adults (25-64) In Education or Training Activities to Improve Literacy Skills	74
Table 11.1: Proportion of the Population Who Responded Positively for the Five Attributes Of Healthcare, Education and Government Services	75
Table 11.2: Share of Respondents Who Said Overall They are Satisfied with Each Service Area	76
Table 11.3: Proportion of the Population Who Responded Positively for the Five Attributes Of Healthcare, Education and Government Services, Urban.....	76
Table 11.4: Proportion of the Population Who Responded Positively for the Five Attributes Of Healthcare, Education and Government Services, Rural	77

Table 11.5: Proportion of the Population Who Responded Positively for the Five Attributes Of Healthcare, Education and Government Services by Sex (Male)	78
Table 11.6: Proportion of the Population Who Responded Positively for the Five Attributes Of Healthcare, Education and Government Services by Sex (Female).....	79
Table 11.7: Proportion of the Population with Functional Difficulties Who Responded Positively for the Five Attributes Of Healthcare, Education and Government Services.....	80
Table 11.8: Share of Respondents Who Said Overall They are Satisfied with Each Service by Area.....	81
Table 11.9: Share of Respondents Who Said Overall They are Satisfied with Each Service by Sex.....	82
Table 11.10: Share of Respondents with Functional Difficulties Who Said Overall They are Satisfied with Each Service	82
Table 11.11: Documents Sought from Civil Registration Services or Other Relevant Agencies.	83
Table 11.12: Reasons for Not Trying to Obtain Documents from Civil Registration or Other Relevant Agencies	83
Table 12.1: Proportion of Persons Victim of Physical or Sexual Harassment in the Past 12 Months	84
Table 12.2: Proportion of Persons Victim of Physical Harassment.....	84
Table 12.3: Proportion of Persons Victim of Physical Harassment.....	84
Table 12.4: Reporting of Physical Harassment Experienced in the Past 12 Months to the Police or Other Competent Authorities	84
Table 12.5: Reporting of Sexual Harassment Experienced in the Past 12 Months to the Police or Other Competent Authorities.....	85
Table 12.6: Reasons for Not Reporting Physical Harassment to the Police or Other Competent Authorities.....	86
Table 12.7: Reasons for Not Reporting Sexual Harassment to the Police or Other Competent Authorities.....	87
Table 12.8: Most Recent Physical Harassment	88
Table 12.9: Most Recent Sexual Harassment	89
Table 12.10: Time Period of Recent Physical Harassment.....	90
Table 12.11: Time Period of Recent Sexual Harassment.....	90
Table 12.12: Place of Occurrence of Last Physical Harassment	90
Table 12.13: Place of Occurrence Last Sexual Harassment.....	91
Table 12.14: Experience of Physical or Sexual Harassment in the Past 12 Months by Functional Difficulties	91
Table 12.15: Most Recent Physical Harassment by Sex.....	92
Table 13.1: Proportion of the Population Subjected to Physical Violence	94
Table 13.2: Proportion of the Population Subjected to Sexual Violence	94
Table 13.3: Proportion of the Population Subjected to Physical or Sexual Violence in the Past 12 Months	94
Table 13.4: Proportion of the Population Subjected to Physical Violence by a Partner or Ex-partner.....	94
Table 13.5: Proportion of the Population Subjected to Sexual Violence by a Partner or Ex-partner.....	95

Table 13.6: (SDG Indicator 16.3.1) Reporting Last Incident of Physical Violence to the Police or Other Competent Authorities	95
Table 13.7: (SDG Indicator 16.3.1) Reporting Last Incident of Sexual Violence to the Police or Other Competent Authorities	95
Table 13.8: Reason for Not Reporting Last Incident of Sexual Violence	96
Table 13.9: Reason for Not Reporting Last Incident of Physical Violence	97
Table 13.10: Proportion of the Population Subjected to Physical Violence by Sex	97
Table 13.11: Proportion of the Population Subjected to Sexual Violence by Sex.....	98
Table 13.12: Proportion of the Population Subjected to Physical or Sexual Violence by Sex	98
Table 13.13: Proportion of the Population Subjected to Physical Violence by Age.....	98
Table 13.14: Proportion of the Population Subjected to Sexual Violence by Age	100
Table 13.15: Proportion of the Population Subjected to Physical or Sexual Violence by Age...	101
Table 14.1: (Indicator 5.a.1) Proportion of total agricultural population with ownership or secure rights over agricultural land.....	103
<i>Table 14.2: (Indicator 5.b.1) Proportion of women in the agricultural population with ownership or tenure rights over agricultural land.....</i>	<i>103</i>
Table 15.1: Percentage Share of Population That Uses Transport Modes for Major Movements (e.g. home to work, home to shopping, home to recreation areas, etc.)	104
Table 15.2: (SDG Indicator 11.2.1) Proportion of Population That Has Convenient Access to Public Transport by Sex, Place of Residence and Persons with Functional Difficulties	104
Table 16.1: Proportion of the population who have experienced a dispute in the past two years and who accessed a formal or informal dispute resolution mechanism	105
Table 16.2: Dispute experienced by Type of Dispute.....	106
Table 16.3: Access to Dispute Resolution Mechanisms	106
Table 16.4: Most Recent Dispute Experienced	107
Table 16.5: Problem or Dispute Ongoing or Done with.....	108
Table 16.6: Reasons for Not Trying to Resolve a Dispute/Problem.....	108
Table 16.7: Institution That Took the Final Decision in the Dispute	109

1 FUNCTIONAL DIFFICULTIES (5 YEARS AND ABOVE)

Table 1.1: Proportion of the population 5 years and above with functional difficulties

	Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Has No functional difficulties	97.2	0.2	96.8	97.5	2.115
Has functional difficulties	2.8	0.2	2.5	3.2	2.115
Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 1.2: Population 5 Years and Above with Functional Difficulties by Place of Residence

Area		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Urban	Has No functional difficulties	97.2	0.2	96.7	97.7	2.618
	Has functional difficulties	2.8	0.2	2.3	3.3	2.618
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Rural	Has No functional difficulties	97.0	0.2	96.5	97.5	1.212
	Has functional difficulties	3.0	0.2	2.5	3.5	1.212
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 1.3: Population 5 Years and Above with Functional Difficulties by Local Government Area

LGA		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Banjul	Has No functional difficulty	96.9	1.0	94.2	98.4	1.132
	Has functional difficulty	3.1	1.0	1.6	5.8	1.132
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Kanifing	Has No functional difficulty	97.0	0.5	96.0	97.9	2.978
	Has functional difficulty	3.0	0.5	2.1	4.0	2.978
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Brikama	Has No functional difficulty	97.4	0.3	96.8	98.0	2.773
	Has functional difficulty	2.6	0.3	2.0	3.2	2.773
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Mansakonko	Has No functional difficulty	97.0	0.8	95.0	98.2	1.407
	Has functional difficulty	3.0	0.8	1.8	5.0	1.407
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Kerewan	Has No functional difficulty	97.0	0.3	96.3	97.6	.916
	Has functional difficulty	3.0	0.3	2.4	3.7	.916
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Kuntaur	Has No functional difficulty	98.0	0.3	97.3	98.5	.299
	Has functional difficulty	2.0	0.3	1.5	2.7	.299
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Janjanbureh	Has No functional difficulty	96.4	0.6	95.1	97.4	1.316
	Has functional difficulty	3.6	0.6	2.6	4.9	1.316
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Basse	Has No functional difficulty	97.0	0.5	95.9	97.8	1.990
	Has functional difficulty	3.0	0.5	2.2	4.1	1.990
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 1.4: Population 5 Years and Above with Functional Difficulties by Sex

Sex		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Male	Has No functional difficulty	97.1	0.2	96.6	97.5	1.569
	Has functional difficulty	2.9	0.2	2.5	3.4	1.569
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Female	Has No functional difficulty	97.3	0.2	96.8	97.6	1.592
	Has functional difficulty	2.7	0.2	2.4	3.2	1.592
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 1.5: Population 5 Years and Above with Functional Difficulties by population groups

Agegroup	Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval	Design Effect
----------	----------	----------------	------------------------	---------------

5-9	Has No functional difficulty	97.1	0.4	96.1	97.9	2.518
	Has functional difficulty	2.9	0.4	2.1	3.9	2.518
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
10-14	Has No functional difficulty	99.3	0.2	98.9	99.6	1.254
	Has functional difficulty	0.7	0.2	0.4	1.1	1.254
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
15-19	Has No functional difficulty	99.4	0.2	98.9	99.7	1.642
	Has functional difficulty	0.6	0.2	0.3	1.1	1.642
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
20-24	Has No functional difficulty	98.9	0.2	98.3	99.3	1.045
	Has functional difficulty	1.1	0.2	0.7	1.7	1.045
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
25-29	Has No functional difficulty	98.7	0.3	97.8	99.2	1.424
	Has functional difficulty	1.3	0.3	0.8	2.2	1.424
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
30-34	Has No functional difficulty	98.5	0.4	97.4	99.2	1.630
	Has functional difficulty	1.5	0.4	0.8	2.6	1.630
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
35-39	Has No functional difficulty	97.5	0.5	96.3	98.3	1.178
	Has functional difficulty	2.5	0.5	1.7	3.7	1.178
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
40-44	Has No functional difficulty	97.5	0.5	96.2	98.4	1.108
	Has functional difficulty	2.5	0.5	1.6	3.8	1.108
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
45-49	Has No functional difficulty	95.2	1.3	91.8	97.2	2.381
	Has functional difficulty	4.8	1.3	2.8	8.2	2.381
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
50-54	Has No functional difficulty	93.5	1.2	90.7	95.5	1.271

	Has functional difficulty	6.5	1.2	4.5	9.3	1.271
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
55-59	Has No functional difficulty	90.5	1.6	86.9	93.1	1.137
	Has functional difficulty	9.5	1.6	6.9	13.1	1.137
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
60-64	Has No functional difficulty	91.0	1.6	87.3	93.8	1.170
	Has functional difficulty	9.0	1.6	6.2	12.7	1.170
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
65-69	Has No functional difficulty	86.7	2.4	81.1	90.8	1.092
	Has functional difficulty	13.3	2.4	9.2	18.9	1.092
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
70-74	Has No functional difficulty	81.1	3.5	73.1	87.2	1.505
	Has functional difficulty	18.9	3.5	12.8	26.9	1.505
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
75-79	Has No functional difficulty	68.6	4.9	58.1	77.4	1.022
	Has functional difficulty	31.4	4.9	22.6	41.9	1.022
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
80-84	Has No functional difficulty	65.0	5.3	53.9	74.6	.982
	Has functional difficulty	35.0	5.3	25.4	46.1	.982
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
85+	Has No functional difficulty	72.9	5.6	60.6	82.4	1.584
	Has functional difficulty	27.1	5.6	17.6	39.4	1.584
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

2 ACCESS TO BASIC SERVICES

Table 2.1: Proportion of Households with Access to All Basic Services

	Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Not have access to all basic services	98.8	0.2	98.3	99.2	1.389
Has access to all basic services	1.2	0.2	0.8	1.7	1.389
Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 2.2: Access to All Basic Services by Place of Residence

Area		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Urban	Not have access to all basic services	98.4	0.3	97.6	98.9	1.416
	Has access to all basic services	1.6	0.3	1.1	2.4	1.416
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Rural	Not have access to all basic services	99.9	0.1	99.5	100.0	.593
	Has access to all basic services	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.5	.593
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 2.3: Access to All Basic Services by Local Government Area

LGA		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Banjul	Not have access to all basic services	93.3	3.3	82.9	97.6	1.257
	Has access to all basic services	6.7	3.3	2.4	17.1	1.257
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Kanifing	Not have access to all basic services	96.2	0.9	93.9	97.6	1.503
	Has access to all basic services	3.8	0.9	2.4	6.1	1.503
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Brikama	Not have access to all basic services	99.8	0.1	99.3	99.9	.858
	Has access to all basic services	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.7	.858
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Mansakonko	Not have access to all basic services	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Kerewan	Not have access to all basic services	99.6	0.4	97.5	99.9	.993
	Has access to all basic services	0.4	0.4	0.1	2.5	.993
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Kuntaur	Not have access to all basic services	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Janjanbureh	Not have access to all basic services	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Basse	Not have access to all basic services	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 2.4: Access to All Basic Services by Sex of the Household Head

Sex		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Male	Not have access to all basic services	98.8	0.3	98.1	99.2	1.412
	Has access to all basic services	1.2	0.3	0.8	1.9	1.412
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Female	Not have access to all basic services	99.0	0.4	98.0	99.5	1.156
	Has access to all basic services	1.0	0.4	0.5	2.0	1.156
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 2.5: Access to All Basic Services by Age of the Household Head

Agegroup		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
15-19	Not have access to all basic services	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
20-24	Not have access to all basic services	99.0	1.0	92.8	99.9	.874
	Has access to all basic services	1.0	1.0	0.1	7.2	.874
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
25-29	Not have access to all basic services	99.4	0.6	95.7	99.9	1.492
	Has access to all basic services	0.6	0.6	0.1	4.3	1.492
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
30-34	Not have access to all basic services	99.0	0.6	96.8	99.7	1.167
	Has access to all basic services	1.0	0.6	0.3	3.2	1.167
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
35-39	Not have access to all basic services	98.7	0.6	97.0	99.5	1.075
	Has access to all basic services	1.3	0.6	0.5	3.0	1.075
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
40-44	Not have access to all basic services	98.7	0.6	96.7	99.5	1.136
	Has access to all basic services	1.3	0.6	0.5	3.3	1.136
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
45-49	Not have access to all basic services	98.9	0.6	96.6	99.6	1.144
	Has access to all basic services	1.1	0.6	0.4	3.4	1.144
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
50-54	Not have access to all basic services	98.9	0.6	96.7	99.7	1.042

	Has access to all basic services	1.1	0.6	0.3	3.3	1.042
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
55-59	Not have access to all basic services	98.4	0.8	95.9	99.4	.937
	Has access to all basic services	1.6	0.8	0.6	4.1	.937
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
60-64	Not have access to all basic services	99.3	0.5	96.8	99.8	.909
	Has access to all basic services	0.7	0.5	0.2	3.2	.909
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
65-69	Not have access to all basic services	98.7	0.9	94.6	99.7	.993
	Has access to all basic services	1.3	0.9	0.3	5.4	.993
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
70-74	Not have access to all basic services	98.6	1.4	90.4	99.8	1.304
	Has access to all basic services	1.4	1.4	0.2	9.6	1.304
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
75-79	Not have access to all basic services	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
80-84	Not have access to all basic services	97.4	2.6	82.8	99.7	.942
	Has access to all basic services	2.6	2.6	0.3	17.2	.942
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
85+	Not have access to all basic services	97.4	2.6	83.0	99.6	1.015
	Has access to all basic services	2.6	2.6	0.4	17.0	1.015
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 2.6: Proportion of the Population with Access to Basic Mobility

	Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
YES	66.5	2.7	60.9	71.6	74.084
NO	33.5	2.7	28.4	39.1	74.084
Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 2.7: Access to Basic Mobility by Place of Residence

Area		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Urban	YES	68.0	3.3	61.1	74.3	76.312
	NO	32.0	3.3	25.7	38.9	76.312
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Rural	YES	63.4	4.6	53.9	72.0	69.176
	NO	36.6	4.6	28.0	46.1	69.176
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

3 SLUMS, INFORMAL SETTLEMENTS AND INADQUATE HOUSING

Table 3.1: Proportion of Urban Households Living in Slum Households

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval	
Urban	Non-Slum	14.0	1.2	11.8	16.6
	Slum	86.0	1.2	83.4	88.2
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0

Table 3.2: Proportion of Urban Households Living in Slum Households by LGA

LGA		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval	
Banjul	Non-Slum	3.5	2.7	0.7	15.3
	Slum	96.5	2.7	84.7	99.3
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
KMC	Non-Slum	16.0	2.3	11.9	21.2
	Slum	84.0	2.3	78.8	88.1
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
Brikama	Non-Slum	13.4	1.6	10.4	17.0
	Slum	86.6	1.6	83.0	89.6
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
Mansakonko	Non-Slum	18.6	4.3	11.6	28.6
	Slum	81.4	4.3	71.4	88.4
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
Kerewan	Non-Slum	25.7	10.9	10.0	51.7
	Slum	74.3	10.9	48.3	90.0
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
Kuntaur	Non-Slum	1.7	1.4	0.3	8.5
	Slum	98.3	1.4	91.5	99.7
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
Janjanbureh	Non-Slum	3.7	4.0	0.4	26.5
	Slum	96.3	4.0	73.5	99.6
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
Basse	Non-Slum	11.7	2.6	7.5	17.8
	Slum	88.3	2.6	82.2	92.5
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0

Table 3.3: Proportion of Urban Households Living in Slum Households by Sex of Household Head

Sex		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Male	Non-Slum	12.5	1.2	10.3	15.0	1.677
	Slum	87.5	1.2	85.0	89.7	1.677
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Female	Non-Slum	17.4	2.0	13.7	21.8	1.751
	Slum	82.6	2.0	78.2	86.3	1.751
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 3.4: Proportion of Urban Households Living in Slum Households by Ethnicity of Household Head

Ethnicity		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Mandinka/Jahanka	Non-Slum	16.9	2.2	13.0	21.6	1.994
	Slum	83.1	2.2	78.4	87.0	1.994
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Fula/Tukulor/ Lorobo	Non-Slum	12.7	2.1	9.1	17.5	1.307
	Slum	87.3	2.1	82.5	90.9	1.307
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Wollof	Non-Slum	17.0	3.4	11.2	24.8	1.814
	Slum	83.0	3.4	75.2	88.8	1.814
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Jola/Karoninka	Non-Slum	7.3	2.1	4.1	12.9	1.320
	Slum	92.7	2.1	87.1	95.9	1.320
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Sarahule	Non-Slum	24.2	5.1	15.5	35.6	1.320
	Slum	75.8	5.1	64.4	84.5	1.320
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Serere	Non-Slum	17.4	4.8	9.8	29.0	1.039
	Slum	82.6	4.8	71.0	90.2	1.039
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Creole/Aku/Marabou Marabout	Non-Slum	24.2	9.3	10.4	46.7	.954
	Slum	75.8	9.3	53.3	89.6	.954
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Manjago	Non-Slum	24.5	8.7	11.3	45.3	1.415
	Slum	75.5	8.7	54.7	88.7	1.415
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Bambara	Non-Slum	16.3	8.7	5.2	40.8	.988
	Slum	83.7	8.7	59.2	94.8	.988

	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Other (specify)____	Non-Slum	18.6	8.0	7.4	39.4	1.628
	Slum	81.4	8.0	60.6	92.6	1.628
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 3.5: Proportion of Urban Households Living in Slum Households by Religion of Household Head

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Islam	Non-Slum	13.8	1.2	11.5	16.5	2.311
	Slum	86.2	1.2	83.5	88.5	2.311
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Christianity	Non-Slum	18.2	5.1	10.1	30.5	1.700
	Slum	81.8	5.1	69.5	89.9	1.700
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 3.6: Proportion of Urban Households Living in Slum Households by age of Household Members

Agegroup		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
0-4	Non-Slum	11.6	1.4	9.1	14.6	3.360
	Slum	88.4	1.4	85.4	90.9	3.360
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
5-9	Non-Slum	11.6	1.3	9.2	14.4	3.322
	Slum	88.4	1.3	85.6	90.8	3.322
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
10-14	Non-Slum	11.8	1.3	9.5	14.6	2.814
	Slum	88.2	1.3	85.4	90.5	2.814
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
15-19	Non-Slum	11.8	1.4	9.3	15.0	3.035
	Slum	88.2	1.4	85.0	90.7	3.035
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
20-24	Non-Slum	13.7	1.5	11.0	17.1	2.670
	Slum	86.3	1.5	82.9	89.0	2.670
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
25-29	Non-Slum	15.1	1.6	12.1	18.6	2.414

	Slum	84.9	1.6	81.4	87.9	2.414
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
30-34	Non-Slum	14.2	1.7	11.2	17.8	2.029
	Slum	85.8	1.7	82.2	88.8	2.029
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
35-39	Non-Slum	16.4	1.8	13.0	20.4	1.875
	Slum	83.6	1.8	79.6	87.0	1.875
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
40-44	Non-Slum	13.5	1.8	10.3	17.4	1.489
	Slum	86.5	1.8	82.6	89.7	1.489
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
45-49	Non-Slum	16.7	2.3	12.6	21.9	1.604
	Slum	83.3	2.3	78.1	87.4	1.604
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
50-54	Non-Slum	13.5	2.0	10.0	18.1	1.119
	Slum	86.5	2.0	81.9	90.0	1.119
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
55-59	Non-Slum	18.2	3.1	12.8	25.2	1.485
	Slum	81.8	3.1	74.8	87.2	1.485
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
60-64	Non-Slum	15.9	2.8	11.1	22.4	1.246
	Slum	84.1	2.8	77.6	88.9	1.246
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
65-69	Non-Slum	21.3	4.1	14.2	30.7	1.303
	Slum	78.7	4.1	69.3	85.8	1.303
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
70-74	Non-Slum	23.1	5.5	13.9	35.7	1.829
	Slum	76.9	5.5	64.3	86.1	1.829
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
75-79	Non-Slum	19.4	5.5	10.7	32.7	1.081
	Slum	80.6	5.5	67.3	89.3	1.081
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
80-84	Non-Slum	23.4	6.1	13.4	37.6	.895
	Slum	76.6	6.1	62.4	86.6	.895
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
85+	Non-Slum	20.2	9.3	7.4	44.3	2.827
	Slum	79.8	9.3	55.7	92.6	2.827
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 3.7: Proportion of Urban Households Living in Slums by Functional Difficulties

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Has No functional difficulty	Non-Slum	13.7	1.2	11.4	16.3	14.678
	Slum	86.3	1.2	83.7	88.6	14.678
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Has functional difficulty	Non-Slum	11.8	2.7	7.4	18.3	2.245
	Slum	88.2	2.7	81.7	92.6	2.245
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

3.1 INFORMAL SETTLEMENTS

Table 3.8: Proportion of the Urban Households Living in Informal Settlements

Urban		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
	Formal settlement	24.5	1.6	21.4	27.9	19.396
	Informal settlement	75.5	1.6	72.1	78.6	19.396
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 3.9: Urban Households Living in Informal Settlements by LGA

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Banjul	Formal settlement	4.9	4.1	0.9	23.2	12.907
	Informal settlement	95.1	4.1	76.8	99.1	12.907
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
KMC	Formal settlement	29.3	3.5	22.9	36.6	22.946
	Informal settlement	70.7	3.5	63.4	77.1	22.946
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Brikama	Formal settlement	22.3	2.1	18.5	26.6	18.235
	Informal settlement	77.7	2.1	73.4	81.5	18.235
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Mansakonko	Formal settlement	21.9	7.5	10.5	40.0	4.061
	Informal settlement	78.1	7.5	60.0	89.5	4.061
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Kerewan	Formal settlement	41.3	10.4	23.1	62.2	17.548
	Informal settlement	58.7	10.4	37.8	76.9	17.548
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Kuntaur	Formal settlement	1.7	1.4	0.3	8.5	.659
	Informal settlement	98.3	1.4	91.5	99.7	.659
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Janjanbureh	Formal settlement	13.3	2.8	8.7	19.9	1.313
	Informal settlement	86.7	2.8	80.1	91.3	1.313
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Basse	Formal settlement	26.3	6.4	15.6	40.7	20.277
	Informal settlement	73.7	6.4	59.3	84.4	20.277
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Urban Households Living in Informal Settlements by Sex of Household Head

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Male	Formal settlement	20.1	1.4	17.3	23.1	1.677
	Informal settlement	79.9	1.4	76.9	82.7	1.677
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Female	Formal settlement	22.5	2.2	18.3	27.2	1.769
	Informal settlement	77.5	2.2	72.8	81.7	1.769
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 3.10: Urban Households Living in Informal Settlements by Ethnicity of Household Head

Ethnicity		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Mandinka/Jahanka	Formal settlement	24.7	2.3	20.4	29.5	1.724
	Informal settlement	75.3	2.3	70.5	79.6	1.724
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Fula/Tukolor/ Lorobo	Formal settlement	18.4	2.5	14.0	23.8	1.302

	Informal settlement	81.6	2.5	76.2	86.0	1.302
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Wollof	Formal settlement	24.8	3.5	18.5	32.4	1.447
	Informal settlement	75.2	3.5	67.6	81.5	1.447
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Jola/Karoninka	Formal settlement	16.6	3.0	11.4	23.5	1.291
	Informal settlement	83.4	3.0	76.5	88.6	1.291
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Sarahule	Formal settlement	34.1	5.8	23.7	46.4	1.401
	Informal settlement	65.9	5.8	53.6	76.3	1.401
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Serere	Formal settlement	23.3	5.1	14.6	34.9	.958
	Informal settlement	76.7	5.1	65.1	85.4	.958
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Creole/Aku/Marabou Marabout	Formal settlement	30.5	10.0	14.7	52.7	.947
	Informal settlement	69.5	10.0	47.3	85.3	.947
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Manjago	Formal settlement	28.1	11.0	11.7	53.6	2.058
	Informal settlement	71.9	11.0	46.4	88.3	2.058
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Bambara	Formal settlement	16.3	8.7	5.2	40.8	.988
	Informal settlement	83.7	8.7	59.2	94.8	.988
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Other (specify)____	Formal settlement	25.8	9.0	12.0	46.8	1.630
	Informal settlement	74.2	9.0	53.2	88.0	1.630
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 3.11: Urban Households Living in Informal Settlements by Age of Household Members

Agegroup		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
0-4	Formal settlement	22.8	1.8	19.4	26.6	3.435
	Informal settlement	77.2	1.8	73.4	80.6	3.435
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
5-9	Formal settlement	20.9	1.7	17.7	24.4	3.394
	Informal settlement	79.1	1.7	75.6	82.3	3.394
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
10-14	Formal settlement	22.1	2.0	18.5	26.3	3.986
	Informal settlement	77.9	2.0	73.7	81.5	3.986
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
15-19	Formal settlement	22.7	1.9	19.1	26.8	3.365
	Informal settlement	77.3	1.9	73.2	80.9	3.365
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
20-24	Formal settlement	25.2	2.2	21.0	29.8	3.508
	Informal settlement	74.8	2.2	70.2	79.0	3.508
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
25-29	Formal settlement	26.6	2.3	22.4	31.4	3.103
	Informal settlement	73.4	2.3	68.6	77.6	3.103
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
30-34	Formal settlement	25.0	2.1	21.1	29.3	2.030
	Informal settlement	75.0	2.1	70.7	78.9	2.030
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
35-39	Formal settlement	26.4	2.1	22.5	30.8	1.724
	Informal settlement	73.6	2.1	69.2	77.5	1.724
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
40-44	Formal settlement	23.1	2.3	18.9	27.9	1.605
	Informal settlement	76.9	2.3	72.1	81.1	1.605

	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
45-49	Formal settlement	25.7	2.6	20.8	31.3	1.502
	Informal settlement	74.3	2.6	68.7	79.2	1.502
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
50-54	Formal settlement	22.4	2.4	18.1	27.5	1.026
	Informal settlement	77.6	2.4	72.5	81.9	1.026
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
55-59	Formal settlement	31.5	3.9	24.3	39.8	1.638
	Informal settlement	68.5	3.9	60.2	75.7	1.638
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
60-64	Formal settlement	26.1	3.1	20.5	32.7	1.036
	Informal settlement	73.9	3.1	67.3	79.5	1.036
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
65-69	Formal settlement	30.6	5.1	21.5	41.4	1.537
	Informal settlement	69.4	5.1	58.6	78.5	1.537
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
70-74	Formal settlement	38.9	5.6	28.5	50.5	1.424
	Informal settlement	61.1	5.6	49.5	71.5	1.424
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
75-79	Formal settlement	29.8	6.7	18.3	44.6	1.209
	Informal settlement	70.2	6.7	55.4	81.7	1.209
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
80-84	Formal settlement	36.0	7.1	23.4	50.9	.933
	Informal settlement	64.0	7.1	49.1	76.6	.933
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
85+	Formal settlement	30.7	10.5	14.2	54.1	2.733
	Informal settlement	69.3	10.5	45.9	85.8	2.733
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 3.12: Urban Households Living in Informal Settlements by Religion of Household Head

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Islam	Formal settlement	20.6	1.4	18.0	23.5	2.105
	Informal settlement	79.4	1.4	76.5	82.0	2.105
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Christianity	Formal settlement	25.8	6.2	15.4	39.9	1.982
	Informal settlement	74.2	6.2	60.1	84.6	1.982
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 3.13: Proportion of Urban Households Living in Informal Settlements by Functional Difficulties

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Has No functional difficulties	Formal settlement	24.3	1.7	21.1	27.8	17.362
	Informal settlement	75.7	1.7	72.2	78.9	17.362
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Has functional difficulties	Formal settlement	19.1	3.4	13.2	26.9	2.419
	Informal settlement	80.9	3.4	73.1	86.8	2.419
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

3.2 INADEQUATE HOUSING

Table 3.14: Proportion of Urban Households with Inadequate Housing

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Urban	Housing adequate	1.6	0.3	1.1	2.3	7.591
	Housing inadequate	98.4	0.3	97.7	98.9	7.591
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 3.15: Proportion of Urban Households with Inadequate Housing by LGA

LGA		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Banjul	Housing adequate	0.2	0.2	0.0	1.8	.855
	Housing inadequate	99.8	0.2	98.2	100.0	.855
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Kanifing	Housing adequate	2.4	0.6	1.5	4.0	6.163
	Housing inadequate	97.6	0.6	96.0	98.5	6.163
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Brikama	Housing adequate	1.3	0.4	0.7	2.4	9.754
	Housing inadequate	98.7	0.4	97.6	99.3	9.754
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Mansakonko	Housing adequate	2.1	2.3	0.2	16.4	3.180
	Housing inadequate	97.9	2.3	83.6	99.8	3.180
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Kerewan	Housing adequate	0.7	0.3	0.3	1.8	.560
	Housing inadequate	99.3	0.3	98.2	99.7	.560
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Kuntaur	Housing inadequate	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Janjanbureh	Housing adequate	0.7	0.3	0.4	1.5	.177
	Housing inadequate	99.3	0.3	98.5	99.6	.177
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Basse	Housing adequate	1.7	1.1	0.5	5.8	6.573
	Housing inadequate	98.3	1.1	94.2	99.5	6.573
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 3.16: Proportion of Urban Households with Inadequate Housing by Sex

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Male	Housing adequate	0.8	0.3	0.4	1.5	1.023
	Housing inadequate	99.2	0.3	98.5	99.6	1.023
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Female	Housing adequate	0.8	0.4	0.3	2.0	1.017
	Housing inadequate	99.2	0.4	98.0	99.7	1.017
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 3.17: Proportion of Urban Households with Inadequate Housing by Ethnicity

Ethnicity		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Mandinka/Jahanka	Housing adequate	1.2	0.5	0.6	2.7	1.163
	Housing inadequate	98.8	0.5	97.3	99.4	1.163
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Fula/Tukolor/ Lorobo	Housing adequate	0.3	0.3	0.0	2.1	.943
	Housing inadequate	99.7	0.3	97.9	100.0	.943
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Wolof	Housing adequate	0.9	0.6	0.2	3.5	.948
	Housing inadequate	99.1	0.6	96.5	99.8	.948
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Jola/Karoninka	Housing adequate	0.7	0.7	0.1	4.6	1.296
	Housing inadequate	99.3	0.7	95.4	99.9	1.296
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Sarahule	Housing adequate	2.4	1.7	0.6	9.4	1.149
	Housing inadequate	97.6	1.7	90.6	99.4	1.149
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Serere	Housing inadequate	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Creole/Aku/Marabou Marabout	Housing inadequate	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Manjago	Housing adequate	2.2	2.2	0.3	14.8	.782
	Housing inadequate	97.8	2.2	85.2	99.7	.782
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Bambara	Housing inadequate	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Other (specify)____	Housing inadequate	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	.

Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
-------	-------	-----	-------	-------	---

Table 3.18: Proportion of Urban Households with Inadequate Housing by Religion

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Islam	Housing adequate	0.8	0.2	0.5	1.4	1.165
	Housing inadequate	99.2	0.2	98.6	99.5	1.165
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Christianity	Housing adequate	0.8	0.8	0.1	5.4	.746
	Housing inadequate	99.2	0.8	94.6	99.9	.746
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 3.19: Proportion of Urban Households with Inadequate Housing by Age of Household Members

Agegroup		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
0-4	Housing adequate	0.7	0.3	0.3	1.4	1.703
	Housing inadequate	99.3	0.3	98.6	99.7	1.703
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
5-9	Housing adequate	0.7	0.3	0.3	1.6	2.571
	Housing inadequate	99.3	0.3	98.4	99.7	2.571
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
10-14	Housing adequate	0.6	0.3	0.3	1.4	2.039
	Housing inadequate	99.4	0.3	98.6	99.7	2.039
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
15-19	Housing adequate	1.1	0.4	0.5	2.3	2.667
	Housing inadequate	98.9	0.4	97.7	99.5	2.667
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
20-24	Housing adequate	0.9	0.4	0.4	2.1	2.151
	Housing inadequate	99.1	0.4	97.9	99.6	2.151
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
25-29	Housing adequate	1.0	0.4	0.5	2.1	1.745
	Housing inadequate	99.0	0.4	97.9	99.5	1.745
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

30-34	Housing adequate	0.7	0.3	0.3	1.7	1.274
	Housing inadequate	99.3	0.3	98.3	99.7	1.274
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
35-39	Housing adequate	1.2	0.5	0.6	2.6	1.335
	Housing inadequate	98.8	0.5	97.4	99.4	1.335
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
40-44	Housing adequate	0.8	0.4	0.3	2.0	1.029
	Housing inadequate	99.2	0.4	98.0	99.7	1.029
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
45-49	Housing adequate	1.3	0.7	0.5	3.6	1.414
	Housing inadequate	98.7	0.7	96.4	99.5	1.414
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
50-54	Housing adequate	1.0	0.6	0.3	3.1	1.090
	Housing inadequate	99.0	0.6	96.9	99.7	1.090
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
55-59	Housing adequate	2.9	1.4	1.1	7.3	1.588
	Housing inadequate	97.1	1.4	92.7	98.9	1.588
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
60-64	Housing adequate	0.5	0.5	0.1	3.3	.971
	Housing inadequate	99.5	0.5	96.7	99.9	.971
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
65-69	Housing adequate	1.0	1.0	0.1	6.7	1.233
	Housing inadequate	99.0	1.0	93.3	99.9	1.233
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
70-74	Housing inadequate	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
75-79	Housing adequate	4.9	3.7	1.1	20.2	1.659
	Housing inadequate	95.1	3.7	79.8	98.9	1.659
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
80-84	Housing adequate	2.9	2.3	0.6	13.4	.827
	Housing inadequate	97.1	2.3	86.6	99.4	.827
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
85+	Housing adequate	1.7	1.8	0.2	12.3	.975
	Housing inadequate	98.3	1.8	87.7	99.8	.975
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 3.20: Proportion of Urban Households Living in Inadequate Housing by Functional Difficulties

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Has No functional difficulties	Housing adequate	0.9	0.3	0.5	1.7	9.331
	Housing inadequate	99.1	0.3	98.3	99.5	9.331
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Has functional difficulties	Housing adequate	0.8	0.5	0.3	2.7	.939
	Housing inadequate	99.2	0.5	97.3	99.7	.939
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 3.21: Housing Deprivations

Deprivations	Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Households with No deprivations	1.6	0.3	1.1	2.3	7.591
Households with one (1) housing deprivation	9.7	1.2	7.6	12.4	21.909
Households with multiple (2 or more) housing deprivations	88.7	1.2	86.0	90.9	19.782
Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

4 ACCESS TO FORMAL FINANCIAL SERVICES

Table 4.1: Proportion of adults (15 years and older) with an account at a bank or other financial institution or with a mobile-money-service provider

	Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
No bank account or No access to a formal financial service	79.5	0.9	77.7	81.1	5.623
Have a bank account or access to a formal financial service	17.4	0.7	16.1	18.8	4.045
Don't know	3.1	0.4	2.5	4.0	5.951
Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 4.2: Proportion of adults (15 years and older) with an account at a bank or other financial institution or with a mobile-money-service provider by Place of Residence

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Urban	No bank account or No access to a formal financial service	75.0	1.2	72.6	77.2	6.256
	Have a bank account or access to a formal financial service	21.1	0.9	19.4	23.0	4.350
	Don't know	3.9	0.5	3.0	5.1	6.477
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Rural	No bank account or No access to a formal financial service	89.9	0.9	88.0	91.5	3.323
	Have a bank account or access to a formal financial service	8.7	0.8	7.2	10.5	3.215
	Don't know	1.4	0.3	0.9	2.1	2.380
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 4.3: Proportion of adults (15 years and older) with an account at a bank or other financial institution or with a mobile-money-service provider by Age

Agegroup		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
15-19	No bank account or No access to a formal financial service	95.4	0.5	94.2	96.3	1.682
	Have a bank account or access to a formal financial service	3.7	0.4	2.9	4.6	1.381
	Don't know	1.0	0.3	0.5	1.7	2.109
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
20-24	No bank account or No access to a formal financial service	88.6	1.1	86.3	90.6	2.380
	Have a bank account or access to a formal financial service	8.7	0.8	7.2	10.5	1.786
	Don't know	2.7	0.6	1.8	4.2	2.617
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
25-29	No bank account or No access to a formal financial service	74.1	1.4	71.3	76.8	1.806
	Have a bank account or access to a formal financial service	21.5	1.1	19.4	23.9	1.364
	Don't know	4.3	0.8	3.0	6.2	2.690
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
30-34	No bank account or No access to a formal financial service	69.3	1.8	65.6	72.8	2.058
	Have a bank account or access to a formal financial service	26.5	1.6	23.4	29.8	1.795
	Don't know	4.2	0.7	3.0	5.8	1.616
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

35-39	No bank account or No access to a formal financial service	68.1	1.8	64.5	71.6	1.764
	Have a bank account or access to a formal financial service	27.7	1.7	24.5	31.3	1.753
	Don't know	4.1	0.7	2.9	5.8	1.495
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
40-44	No bank account or No access to a formal financial service	69.0	2.1	64.6	73.0	1.855
	Have a bank account or access to a formal financial service	27.0	2.0	23.1	31.2	1.881
	Don't know	4.1	0.8	2.8	5.9	1.392
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
45-49	No bank account or No access to a formal financial service	68.3	2.3	63.7	72.6	1.518
	Have a bank account or access to a formal financial service	28.0	2.1	24.0	32.4	1.447
	Don't know	3.7	0.8	2.3	5.7	1.231
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
50-54	No bank account or No access to a formal financial service	76.6	2.3	71.7	80.8	1.588
	Have a bank account or access to a formal financial service	19.7	2.2	15.7	24.4	1.645
	Don't know	3.8	0.9	2.3	6.1	1.241
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
55-59	No bank account or No access to a formal financial service	71.8	2.5	66.7	76.4	1.205
	Have a bank account or access to a formal financial service	25.8	2.2	21.7	30.4	1.023
	Don't know	2.4	0.8	1.2	4.5	1.086

	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
60-64	No bank account or No access to a formal financial service	79.5	2.2	74.7	83.6	1.106
	Have a bank account or access to a formal financial service	18.4	2.0	14.7	22.8	1.007
	Don't know	2.1	0.9	0.9	4.8	1.440
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
65-69	No bank account or No access to a formal financial service	79.9	2.6	74.2	84.6	.935
	Have a bank account or access to a formal financial service	18.1	2.6	13.6	23.7	.950
	Don't know	2.0	1.0	0.7	5.5	1.171
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
70-74	No bank account or No access to a formal financial service	75.3	4.3	65.7	82.9	1.855
	Have a bank account or access to a formal financial service	20.7	3.7	14.4	28.9	1.498
	Don't know	4.0	1.7	1.7	9.1	1.398
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
75-79	No bank account or No access to a formal financial service	74.9	4.9	64.0	83.4	1.162
	Have a bank account or access to a formal financial service	22.5	5.0	14.2	33.8	1.274
	Don't know	2.6	1.8	0.6	9.9	1.179
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
80-84	No bank account or No access to a formal financial service	91.6	3.3	82.4	96.2	1.117
	Have a bank account or access to a formal financial service	6.8	2.9	2.9	15.4	1.073

	Don't know	1.6	1.6	0.2	10.5	1.248
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
85+	No bank account or No access to a formal financial service	81.0	3.9	72.1	87.6	.989
	Have a bank account or access to a formal financial service	7.9	3.1	3.6	16.5	1.291
	Don't know	11.1	3.9	5.4	21.2	1.511
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 4.4: Proportion of adults (15 years and older) with an account at a bank or other financial institution or with a mobile-money-service provider by Level of Education

Education		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Early childhood (1-4)	No bank account or No access to a formal financial service	78.6	5.2	66.6	87.1	1.842
	Have a bank account or access to a formal financial service	14.0	4.1	7.7	24.2	1.612
	Don't know	7.5	3.8	2.6	19.3	2.403
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Primary (1-6)	No bank account or No access to a formal financial service	87.2	1.2	84.6	89.4	1.719
	Have a bank account or access to a formal financial service	10.8	1.0	9.1	12.9	1.305
	Don't know	1.9	0.6	1.1	3.5	2.357
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Lower Sec (7-9)	No bank account or No access to a formal financial service	84.3	1.1	82.0	86.3	1.820
	Have a bank account or access to a formal financial service	13.4	1.0	11.5	15.5	1.814
	Don't know	2.4	0.5	1.6	3.5	2.164
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Upper Sec (10-12)	No bank account or No access to a formal financial service	72.4	1.5	69.3	75.3	2.863
	Have a bank account or access to a formal financial service	23.7	1.4	21.1	26.5	2.490
	Don't know	3.9	0.6	2.8	5.3	2.559
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Diploma	No bank account or No access to a formal financial service	37.3	2.3	32.8	42.1	1.285
	Have a bank account or access to a formal financial service	56.4	2.4	51.7	61.0	1.246
	Don't know	6.3	1.6	3.8	10.2	2.297
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Vocational	No bank account or No access to a formal financial service	46.0	4.7	37.0	55.4	1.434
	Have a bank account or access to a formal financial service	48.6	4.2	40.5	56.8	1.114
	Don't know	5.3	1.8	2.7	10.3	1.039

	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Higher	No bank account or No access to a formal financial service	30.9	3.9	23.8	39.0	1.677
	Have a bank account or access to a formal financial service	63.8	4.4	54.8	71.9	1.974
	Don't know	5.4	1.7	2.8	10.0	1.382
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
None	No bank account or No access to a formal financial service	87.1	0.8	85.5	88.5	2.745
	Have a bank account or access to a formal financial service	10.7	0.6	9.5	12.0	2.076
	Don't know	2.2	0.4	1.6	3.1	3.256
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Don't know	No bank account or No access to a formal financial service	67.8	4.3	58.7	75.7	1.545
	Have a bank account or access to a formal financial service	14.1	2.7	9.6	20.3	1.078
	Don't know	18.1	3.5	12.2	26.0	1.466
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 4.5: Proportion of adults (15 years and older) with an account at a bank or other financial institution or with a mobile-money-service provider by Sex

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Male	No bank account or No access to a formal financial service	74.2	1.2	71.9	76.4	3.865
	Have a bank account or access to a formal financial service	21.1	0.9	19.4	22.9	2.742
	Don't know	4.7	0.6	3.6	6.0	4.455
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Female	No bank account or No access to a formal financial service	83.8	0.8	82.2	85.4	3.216
	Have a bank account or access to a formal financial service	14.3	0.7	13.0	15.8	2.671
	Don't know	1.8	0.3	1.4	2.5	2.959
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

5 WASTE DISPOSAL

Table 5.1: The proportion of the population with Access to Basic MSW Collection Services

	Per cent	Standard error
Without basic waste collection services	74.3	1.6
With basic waste collection services	25.7	1.6
Total	100.0	0.0

Table 5.2: The proportion of the population with Access to Basic MSW Collection Services by Place of Residence

		Per cent	Standard error
Urban	Without basic waste collection services	64.1	2.2
	With basic waste collection services	35.9	2.2
	Total	100.0	0.0
Rural	Without basic waste collection services	99.5	0.3
	With basic waste collection services	0.5	0.3
	Total	100.0	0.0

Table 5.3: The proportion of the population with Access to Basic MSW Collection Services by Local Government Area

LGA		Per cent	Standard error
Banjul	Without basic waste collection services	17.3	3.3
	With basic waste collection services	82.7	3.3
	Total	100.0	0.0
KMC	Without basic waste collection services	25.8	4.0
	With basic waste collection services	74.2	4.0
	Total	100.0	0.0
Brikama	Without basic waste collection services	86.7	2.5
	With basic waste collection services	13.3	2.5
	Total	100.0	0.0
Mansakonko	Without basic waste collection services	93.7	4.0
	With basic waste collection services	6.3	4.0
	Total	100.0	0.0
Kerewan	Without basic waste collection services	91.1	3.8
	With basic waste collection services	8.9	3.8
	Total	100.0	0.0
Kuntaur	Without basic waste collection services	100.0	0.0

	Total	100.0	0.0
Janjanbureh	Without basic waste collection services	97.5	1.4
	With basic waste collection services	2.5	1.4
	Total	100.0	0.0
Basse	Without basic waste collection services	98.2	1.0
	With basic waste collection services	1.8	1.0
	Total	100.0	0.0

Table 5.4: Households Waste (rubbish/garbage) Disposal Modes

	Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Burning	32.9	1.8	29.5	36.5	4.211
Use as compost	2.2	0.4	1.5	3.3	2.603
Recycle	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.5	1.014
Collected by Municipality/Council (HH provides bin)	14.5	1.3	12.1	17.4	4.141
Collected by Municipality/Council (Municipality provides bin)	5.6	0.6	4.5	6.8	1.859
Collected by private body	3.1	0.5	2.2	4.4	2.819
Use donkey/horse cart	8.9	1.4	6.5	12.1	6.943
Public dump	9.8	1.3	7.5	12.8	5.720
In bush/open space	18.1	1.1	16.0	20.4	2.462
Other (specify)	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.6	.983
Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 5.5: Households Waste (rubbish/garbage) Disposal Modes by LGA

	Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect	
Urban	Landfill/bury	2.9	0.6	1.9	4.4	2.846
	Burning	31.3	2.3	26.8	36.0	5.221
	Use as compost	1.2	0.4	0.6	2.4	3.346
	Recycle	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.6	1.342
	Collected by Municipality/Council (HH provides bin)	20.4	1.9	17.0	24.3	4.398

	Collected by Municipality/Council (Municipality provides bin)	7.8	0.8	6.3	9.6	1.904
	Collected by private body	4.4	0.8	3.1	6.2	2.946
	Use donkey/horse cart	12.3	2.0	8.9	16.8	7.514
	Public dump	8.8	1.6	6.1	12.6	6.776
	In bush/open space	10.5	1.3	8.1	13.4	3.817
	Other (specify)	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.7	1.051
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Rural	Landfill/bury	7.5	1.3	5.3	10.6	2.152
	Burning	36.9	2.3	32.4	41.7	1.982
	Use as compost	4.9	1.1	3.2	7.6	2.184
	Recycle	0.4	0.2	0.2	1.0	.663
	Collected by private body	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.8	.887
	Use donkey/horse cart	0.7	0.3	0.3	1.6	1.096
	Public dump	12.3	2.3	8.5	17.5	3.943
	In bush/open space	36.8	2.0	32.9	40.9	1.466
	Other (specify)	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.8	.769
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 5.6: Mode of Waste Collection by Frequency

Frequency	Rubbish disposal Mode	Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Daily	Collected by Municipality/Council (HH provides bin)	18.0	8.2	6.7	40.0	1.657
	Collected by Municipality/Council (Municipality provides bin)	2.6	2.6	0.3	17.5	.982
	Use donkey/horse cart	79.4	8.7	57.3	91.7	1.650
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Weekly	Collected by Municipality/Council (HH provides bin)	49.5	3.7	42.3	56.8	3.636
	Collected by Municipality/Council (Municipality provides bin)	20.1	2.1	16.2	24.6	1.835
	Collected by private body	9.0	1.7	6.1	13.1	2.490
	Use donkey/horse cart	21.4	3.3	15.5	28.8	4.429
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Forth nightly	Collected by Municipality/Council (HH provides bin)	36.6	15.2	13.5	68.0	1.225
	Use donkey/horse cart	63.4	15.2	32.0	86.5	1.225
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Monthly	Collected by Municipality/Council (HH provides bin)	25.0	8.8	11.6	45.8	2.012
	Collected by Municipality/Council (Municipality provides bin)	15.9	5.0	8.3	28.5	.912
	Collected by private body	24.7	7.2	13.2	41.5	1.362
	Use donkey/horse cart	34.4	8.6	19.7	52.9	1.613
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Bi-weekly	Collected by Municipality/Council (HH provides bin)	28.3	8.5	14.5	47.7	2.081
	Collected by Municipality/Council (Municipality provides bin)	5.1	3.7	1.2	19.8	1.640
	Collected by private body	16.0	4.3	9.1	26.6	.807
	Use donkey/horse cart	50.6	8.3	34.5	66.6	1.616
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Others (specify)	Collected by Municipality/Council (HH provides bin)	49.5	11.3	28.5	70.7	1.151
	Collected by private body	6.8	4.9	1.5	25.6	.864
	Use donkey/horse cart	43.7	11.2	23.8	65.8	1.146
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 5.7: The most recent expenditure (GMD) on rubbish/garbage disposal

	Mean	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval	Design Effect
The most recent expenditure (GMD) on rubbish/garbage disposal	48.5245	4.54121	39.4696 57.5794	2.204

Table 5.8: Modes of Liquid Waste Disposal

Liquid disposal mode	Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Discharge into sewer system (ONLY FOR BANJUL)	2.4	0.1	2.1	2.7	.251
Discharge into drainage system/gutter	1.6	0.4	1.0	2.5	2.381
Discharge into drainage/pit ("soak away")	34.9	1.7	31.7	38.3	3.596
Discharge in the public street	8.2	1.1	6.3	10.6	4.500
Discharge at the compound	48.9	1.5	45.9	51.9	2.740
Discharge into the private property	1.0	0.2	0.6	1.6	1.649
Other (specify)	3.0	0.4	2.4	3.8	1.229
Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 5.9: Modes of Liquid Waste Disposal by Place of Residence

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Urban	Discharge into sewer system (ONLY FOR BANJUL)	3.3	0.2	3.0	3.8	.265
	Discharge into drainage system/gutter	2.2	0.5	1.4	3.4	2.407
	Discharge into drainage/pit ("soak away")	44.8	2.4	40.2	49.5	4.688
	Discharge in the public street	5.9	1.4	3.6	9.4	7.419
	Discharge at the compound	42.0	2.0	38.1	45.9	3.340
	Discharge into the private property	1.0	0.3	0.6	1.8	1.873
	Other (specify)	0.8	0.3	0.4	1.5	1.728
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Rural	Discharge into drainage system/gutter	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.6	.738

Discharge into drainage/pit ("soak away")	10.6	1.6	7.8	14.3	2.311
Discharge in the public street	13.8	1.5	11.0	17.2	1.667
Discharge at the compound	66.0	2.1	61.6	70.1	1.722
Discharge into the private property	0.9	0.3	0.4	1.9	1.019
Other (specify)	8.6	1.1	6.7	10.9	1.201
Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

6 SAFETY

Table 6.1: Proportion of Population That Feel Safe Walking Alone Around the Area they Live

	Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Unsafe	39.2	1.5	36.3	42.2	2.424
Safe	58.6	1.4	55.8	61.4	2.181
Don't know/prefer Not to say	2.1	0.3	1.6	2.8	1.182
Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 6.2: Proportion of population that feel safe walking alone around the area they live by Place of Residence

Area		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Urban	Unsafe	39.1	1.5	36.2	42.1	1.516
	Safe	58.4	1.4	55.6	61.1	1.301
	Don't know/prefer Not to say	2.5	0.4	1.8	3.4	1.081
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Rural	Unsafe	39.2	2.9	33.7	45.0	3.566
	Safe	59.4	2.8	53.8	64.7	3.238
	Don't know/prefer Not to say	1.4	0.5	0.8	2.7	1.533
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 6.3: Proportion of population that feel safe walking alone around the area they live by Local Government Area

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Banjul	Unsafe	23.0	2.9	17.8	29.2	1.459
	Safe	70.0	1.8	66.4	73.4	.458
	Don't know/prefer Not to say	7.0	1.5	4.5	10.7	1.087
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Kanifing	Unsafe	34.4	2.8	29.2	40.1	1.982
	Safe	63.7	2.8	58.0	69.0	1.959
	Don't know/prefer Not to say	1.8	0.5	1.0	3.3	.944
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Brikama	Unsafe	51.5	2.4	46.8	56.2	1.142
	Safe	47.9	2.4	43.2	52.6	1.106
	Don't know/prefer Not to say	0.6	0.3	0.3	1.4	.561
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Mansakonko	Unsafe	54.1	7.2	40.0	67.5	6.351
	Safe	44.2	6.4	32.2	56.9	5.085
	Don't know/prefer Not to say	1.7	1.2	0.4	7.0	2.806
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Kerewan	Unsafe	28.6	2.5	23.9	33.8	.692
	Safe	66.1	2.2	61.7	70.3	.471
	Don't know/prefer Not to say	5.2	1.2	3.3	8.1	.632
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Kuntaur	Unsafe	22.2	4.8	14.2	33.0	1.626
	Safe	77.8	4.8	67.0	85.8	1.626
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Janjanbureh	Unsafe	46.3	5.2	36.3	56.6	3.127
	Safe	53.7	5.2	43.4	63.7	3.127
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Basse	Unsafe	37.3	5.7	26.9	49.1	4.490
	Safe	61.7	5.6	50.2	72.1	4.368

Don't know/prefer Not to say	0.9	0.6	0.3	3.0	1.069
Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 6.4: Proportion of Population That Feel Safe Walking Alone Around the Area they Live

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Male	Unsafe	30.6	1.8	27.1	34.4	1.813
	Safe	68.4	1.9	64.6	72.0	1.803
	Don't know/prefer Not to say	1.0	0.5	0.4	2.5	2.546
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Female	Unsafe	45.9	1.8	42.4	49.3	1.819
	Safe	51.1	1.7	47.8	54.4	1.649
	Don't know/prefer Not to say	3.0	0.4	2.3	3.9	.792
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 6.5: Proportion of Population That Feel Safe Walking Alone Around the Area they Live

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
15-19	Unsafe	49.9	3.3	43.4	56.4	1.776
	Safe	49.5	3.3	43.1	56.0	1.775
	Don't know/prefer Not to say	0.6	0.3	0.2	1.8	.821
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
20-24	Unsafe	44.9	3.5	38.1	51.9	1.771
	Safe	54.0	3.5	47.1	60.9	1.760
	Don't know/prefer Not to say	1.1	0.5	0.4	2.7	.826
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
25-29	Unsafe	35.4	2.9	29.8	41.4	1.687
	Safe	62.6	3.1	56.2	68.6	1.883
	Don't know/prefer Not to say	2.0	1.1	0.6	6.1	3.006
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
30-34	Unsafe	37.5	3.8	30.4	45.2	1.921
	Safe	60.9	3.7	53.5	67.9	1.787

	Don't know/prefer Not to say	1.6	1.3	0.3	7.8	3.441
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
35-39	Unsafe	42.9	3.3	36.6	49.4	1.323
	Safe	55.5	3.3	49.0	61.9	1.340
	Don't know/prefer Not to say	1.6	0.7	0.7	3.8	.970
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
40-44	Unsafe	33.5	3.8	26.5	41.3	1.487
	Safe	63.9	4.8	54.1	72.7	2.271
	Don't know/prefer Not to say	2.6	1.8	0.6	9.8	2.974
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
45-49	Unsafe	33.0	4.5	24.9	42.3	1.438
	Safe	65.3	4.4	56.1	73.5	1.399
	Don't know/prefer Not to say	1.7	1.0	0.5	5.4	.970
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
50-54	Unsafe	40.0	6.6	27.8	53.4	2.052
	Safe	55.3	7.0	41.4	68.4	2.212
	Don't know/prefer Not to say	4.8	3.7	1.0	19.8	3.323
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
55-59	Unsafe	25.9	6.2	15.6	39.8	1.832
	Safe	72.0	6.3	58.2	82.6	1.783
	Don't know/prefer Not to say	2.1	1.5	0.5	8.6	1.049
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
60-64	Unsafe	22.7	8.4	10.2	43.1	2.853
	Safe	69.2	8.1	51.3	82.7	2.205
	Don't know/prefer Not to say	8.1	6.1	1.7	30.9	3.555
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
65-69	Unsafe	39.0	7.8	25.1	54.9	1.528
	Safe	58.8	7.7	43.2	72.8	1.473
	Don't know/prefer Not to say	2.2	2.1	0.3	13.8	1.275
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

70-74	Unsafe	23.0	6.7	12.4	38.7	.862
	Safe	75.2	6.8	59.6	86.1	.833
	Don't know/prefer Not to say	1.8	1.8	0.3	11.8	.604
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
75-79	Unsafe	40.4	14.1	17.6	68.4	2.106
	Safe	55.5	13.4	29.9	78.4	1.844
	Don't know/prefer Not to say	4.1	3.9	0.6	23.1	.975
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
80-84	Unsafe	30.5	18.7	7.2	71.5	2.003
	Safe	63.9	18.7	26.2	89.8	1.854
	Don't know/prefer Not to say	5.5	5.6	0.7	33.0	.739
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
85+	Safe	90.5	10.0	49.1	98.9	.742
	Don't know/prefer Not to say	9.5	10.0	1.1	50.9	.742
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 6.6: Safety at Home during the Night

	Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Unsafe	12.8	0.9	11.2	14.6	1.698
Safe	86.9	0.9	85.1	88.5	1.660
Don't know/prefer Not to say	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.9	2.777
Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 6.7: Safety at Home during the Night by Sex

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Male	Unsafe	10.3	1.1	8.2	12.8	1.582
	Safe	89.6	1.1	87.1	91.6	1.557
	Don't know/prefer Not to say	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.8	1.261
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Female	Unsafe	14.8	1.2	12.6	17.2	1.573
	Safe	84.8	1.2	82.3	87.0	1.598
	Don't know/prefer Not to say	0.4	0.3	0.1	1.7	3.060
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 6.8: Proportion of the Population Who were Worried About being Physically Attacked by Strangers, Including being Mugged or Robbed

	Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Not worried	37.0	1.3	34.6	39.6	1.822
Worried	62.8	1.2	60.3	65.2	1.715
Don't know/prefer Not to say	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.6	1.911
Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 6.9: Proportion of the Population Who were Worried About being Physically Attacked by Strangers, Including being Mugged or Robbed

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Male	Not worried	41.7	1.9	38.0	45.6	1.726
	Worried	58.0	1.8	54.3	61.6	1.581
	Don't know/prefer Not to say	0.2	0.2	0.0	1.5	2.361
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Female	Not worried	33.4	1.6	30.4	36.7	1.683
	Worried	66.5	1.6	63.3	69.5	1.661
	Don't know/prefer Not to say	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.7	1.324
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 6.10: Proportion of the Population Who were Worried About Having their Home Broken into and Something Stolen

	Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Not worried	33.3	1.3	30.8	35.8	1.860
Worried	66.7	1.3	64.2	69.2	1.860
Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 6.11: Proportion of the Population Who were Worried About Having their Home Broken into and Something Stolen by Sex

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Male	Not worried	35.7	1.7	32.3	39.2	1.492
	Worried	64.3	1.7	60.8	67.7	1.492
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Female	Not worried	31.4	1.6	28.3	34.7	1.803
	Worried	68.6	1.6	65.3	71.7	1.803
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 6.12: Proportion of the Population Who Are Worried About Having their Valuables Stolen or Vandalised

	Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Not worried	32.5	1.3	30.0	35.1	1.969
Worried	67.5	1.3	64.9	70.0	1.969
Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 6.13: Proportion of the Population Who were Worried About Having their Valuables Stolen or Vandalised by Sex

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Male	Not worried	35.0	1.8	31.5	38.7	1.651
	Worried	65.0	1.8	61.3	68.5	1.651
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Female	Not worried	30.5	1.6	27.5	33.7	1.661
	Worried	69.5	1.6	66.3	72.5	1.661
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

7 DISCRIMINATION AND HARASSMENT

Table 7.1: Experience of Any Form of Discrimination or Harassment during the Last 5 Years

	Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
YES	29.6	1.6	26.6	32.8	3.118
NO	70.4	1.6	67.2	73.4	3.118
Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 7.2: Experience of Any Form of Discrimination or Harassment during the Past 12 Months

	Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Yes	23.6	1.3	21.0	26.3	2.628
No	76.4	1.3	73.7	79.0	2.628
Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 7.3: Experience of any form of discrimination or harassment during the last 5 years by Place of Residence

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Urban	Yes	36.5	2.2	32.3	40.9	3.338
	No	63.5	2.2	59.1	67.7	3.338
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Rural	Yes	18.6	1.8	15.3	22.4	2.174
	No	81.4	1.8	77.6	84.7	2.174
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 7.4: Experience of Any Form of Discrimination or Harassment during the Past 12 Months by Place of Residence

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Urban	Yes	29.1	1.6	26.0	32.5	2.138
	No	70.9	1.6	67.5	74.0	2.138
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Rural	Yes	14.7	1.9	11.4	18.9	2.923
	No	85.3	1.9	81.1	88.6	2.923
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 7.5: Experience of Any Form of Discrimination or Harassment during the Last 5 Years by Local Government Area

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Banjul	Yes	58.4	7.5	43.3	72.1	7.033
	No	41.6	7.5	27.9	56.7	7.033
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Kanifing	Yes	46.5	4.5	37.8	55.4	4.690
	No	53.5	4.5	44.6	62.2	4.690
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Brikama	Yes	18.3	1.7	15.2	21.8	.926
	No	81.7	1.7	78.2	84.8	.926
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Mansakonko	Yes	14.4	5.5	6.5	28.9	7.454
	No	85.6	5.5	71.1	93.5	7.454
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Kerewan	Yes	29.3	2.2	25.0	33.9	.542
	No	70.7	2.2	66.1	75.0	.542
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Kuntaur	Yes	24.5	2.4	20.0	29.5	.388
	No	75.5	2.4	70.5	80.0	.388
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Janjanbureh	Yes	19.6	2.6	14.9	25.4	1.280
	No	80.4	2.6	74.6	85.1	1.280
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Basse	Yes	14.9	1.8	11.7	19.0	.873
	No	85.1	1.8	81.0	88.3	.873
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 7.6: Experience of Any Form of Discrimination or Harassment during the Past 12 Months by LGA

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Banjul	Yes	42.8	1.9	39.2	46.5	.426
	No	57.2	1.9	53.5	60.8	.426
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Kanifing	Yes	38.6	4.1	30.8	47.0	4.129
	No	61.4	4.1	53.0	69.2	4.129
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Brikama	Yes	14.6	1.4	12.1	17.7	.789
	No	85.4	1.4	82.3	87.9	.789
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Mansakonko	Yes	12.7	5.3	5.4	27.1	7.584
	No	87.3	5.3	72.9	94.6	7.584
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Kerewan	Yes	21.9	1.6	18.9	25.2	.335
	No	78.1	1.6	74.8	81.1	.335
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Kuntaur	Yes	23.6	2.3	19.4	28.4	.360
	No	76.4	2.3	71.6	80.6	.360
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Janjanbureh	Yes	13.1	4.3	6.7	24.1	4.616
	No	86.9	4.3	75.9	93.3	4.616
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Basse	Yes	13.0	2.2	9.2	18.1	1.427
	No	87.0	2.2	81.9	90.8	1.427
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 7.7: Experience of Any Form of Discrimination or Harassment during the Last 5 Years by Sex

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Male	Yes	34.1	1.9	30.4	38.0	1.862
	No	65.9	1.9	62.0	69.6	1.862
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Female	Yes	26.6	1.8	23.1	30.3	2.505
	No	73.4	1.8	69.7	76.9	2.505
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 7.8 : Experience of Any Form of Discrimination or Harassment during the past 12 Months by Sex

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Male	Yes	26.5	1.7	23.2	30.0	1.677
	No	73.5	1.7	70.0	76.8	1.677
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Female	Yes	21.7	1.6	18.7	25.0	2.196
	No	78.3	1.6	75.0	81.3	2.196
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 7.9: Experience of Any Form of Discrimination or Harassment during the Last 5 Years by Functional Difficulties

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Has No functional difficulties	Yes	30.2	1.6	27.2	33.4	2.959
	No	69.8	1.6	66.6	72.8	2.959
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Has functional difficulties	Yes	21.1	6.2	11.4	35.7	1.633
	No	78.9	6.2	64.3	88.6	1.633
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 7.10: Experience of Any Form of Discrimination or Harassment during the Past 12 Months by Functional Difficulties

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Has No functional difficulties	Yes	23.9	1.4	21.3	26.7	2.492
	No	76.1	1.4	73.3	78.7	2.492
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Has functional difficulties	Yes	20.8	6.1	11.2	35.4	1.642
	No	79.2	6.1	64.6	88.8	1.642
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 7.11: Experience of Any Form of Discrimination or Harassment during the Last 5 Years by Ethnicity

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Mandinka/Jahanka	Yes	25.3	1.9	21.8	29.3	1.413
	No	74.7	1.9	70.7	78.2	1.413
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Fula/Tukulor/ Lorobo	Yes	27.5	2.6	22.6	32.9	2.334
	No	72.5	2.6	67.1	77.4	2.334
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Wolof	Yes	33.6	4.7	25.0	43.3	3.103
	No	66.4	4.7	56.7	75.0	3.103
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Jola/Karoninka	Yes	27.9	5.9	17.8	40.9	3.662
	No	72.1	5.9	59.1	82.2	3.662
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Sarahule	Yes	19.2	5.5	10.6	32.2	1.949
	No	80.8	5.5	67.8	89.4	1.949
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Serere	Yes	41.5	7.5	27.9	56.6	1.897
	No	58.5	7.5	43.4	72.1	1.897
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Creole/Aku/Marabou Marabout	Yes	20.9	12.6	5.5	54.5	2.482
	No	79.1	12.6	45.5	94.5	2.482
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Manjago	Yes	38.0	14.3	15.6	67.0	2.102
	No	62.0	14.3	33.0	84.4	2.102
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Bambara	Yes	25.2	8.3	12.4	44.7	.756
	No	74.8	8.3	55.3	87.6	.756
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Other (specify)____	Yes	39.5	7.5	26.0	54.8	.904
	No	60.5	7.5	45.2	74.0	.904
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 7.12: Experience of Any Form of Discrimination or Harassment during the Past 12 Months by Ethnicity

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Mandinka/Jahanka	Yes	22.6	1.7	19.4	26.0	1.183
	No	77.4	1.7	74.0	80.6	1.183
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Fula/Tukulor/ Lorobo	Yes	22.7	2.5	18.2	28.0	2.399
	No	77.3	2.5	72.0	81.8	2.399
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Wolof	Yes	23.4	5.0	15.0	34.7	4.459
	No	76.6	5.0	65.3	85.0	4.459
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Jola/Karoninka	Yes	20.8	5.0	12.6	32.3	3.146
	No	79.2	5.0	67.7	87.4	3.146
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Sarahule	Yes	12.0	4.9	5.2	25.4	2.284
	No	88.0	4.9	74.6	94.8	2.284
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Serere	Yes	26.8	7.7	14.4	44.3	2.505
	No	73.2	7.7	55.7	85.6	2.505
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Creole/Aku/Marabou Marabout	Yes	16.4	11.9	3.4	52.1	2.638
	No	83.6	11.9	47.9	96.6	2.638
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Manjago	Yes	21.3	9.2	8.4	44.5	1.223
	No	78.7	9.2	55.5	91.6	1.223
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Bambara	Yes	24.5	8.7	11.3	45.2	.844
	No	75.5	8.7	54.8	88.7	.844
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Other (specify)____	Yes	19.6	7.6	8.6	38.7	1.411
	No	80.4	7.6	61.3	91.4	1.411
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 7.13: Experience of Any Form of Discrimination or Harassment during the Last 5 Years by Income

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Less than 500 GMD	Yes	22.8	4.7	14.7	33.4	2.735
	No	77.2	4.7	66.6	85.3	2.735
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
500 GMD - 999 GMD	Yes	21.9	2.8	16.8	28.0	1.163
	No	78.1	2.8	72.0	83.2	1.163
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
1,000 GMD - 1,999 GMD	Yes	20.2	3.0	15.0	26.7	1.876
	No	79.8	3.0	73.3	85.0	1.876
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
2,000 GMD - 2,999 GMD	Yes	30.1	3.0	24.6	36.3	1.318
	No	69.9	3.0	63.7	75.4	1.318
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
3,000 GMD -4,999 GMD	Yes	34.6	4.1	26.9	43.2	2.772
	No	65.4	4.1	56.8	73.1	2.772
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
5,000 GMD-7,499 GMD	Yes	33.2	4.6	24.9	42.8	1.879
	No	66.8	4.6	57.2	75.1	1.879
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
7,500 GMD - 9,999 GMD	Yes	33.8	6.7	22.0	48.0	1.334
	No	66.2	6.7	52.0	78.0	1.334
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
10,000 GMD - 14,999 GMD	Yes	35.7	8.5	21.0	53.7	1.581
	No	64.3	8.5	46.3	79.0	1.581
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
15,000 GMD - 19,999 GMD	Yes	46.7	12.5	24.5	70.3	1.267
	No	53.3	12.5	29.7	75.5	1.267
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
20,000 GMD- 29,999 GMD	Yes	59.2	25.2	15.5	92.0	3.962
	No	40.8	25.2	8.0	84.5	3.962
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
30,000 GMD - 49,999 GMD	Yes	10.7	10.2	1.4	49.6	.698
	No	89.3	10.2	50.4	98.6	.698
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
	Yes	55.5	29.5	10.5	93.0	2.655

50,000 GMD - 74,999 GMD	No	44.5	29.5	7.0	89.5	2.655
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
75,000 GMD and over	Yes	18.0	18.3	1.8	71.9	.623
	No	82.0	18.3	28.1	98.2	.623
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Can't disclose	Yes	34.1	6.3	22.9	47.4	1.397
	No	65.9	6.3	52.6	77.1	1.397
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 7.14: Experience of Any Form of Discrimination or Harassment during the past 12 by Income

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Less than 500 GMD	Yes	21.2	3.2	15.6	28.2	1.307
	No	78.8	3.2	71.8	84.4	1.307
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
500 GMD - 999 GMD	Yes	13.9	2.6	9.6	19.9	1.372
	No	86.1	2.6	80.1	90.4	1.372
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
1,000 GMD - 1,999 GMD	Yes	17.8	2.8	12.9	24.0	1.873
	No	82.2	2.8	76.0	87.1	1.873
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
2,000 GMD - 2,999 GMD	Yes	18.3	2.8	13.3	24.6	1.702
	No	81.7	2.8	75.4	86.7	1.702
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
3,000 GMD -4,999 GMD	Yes	28.7	3.2	22.8	35.4	1.824
	No	71.3	3.2	64.6	77.2	1.824
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
5,000 GMD-7,499 GMD	Yes	25.5	3.2	19.7	32.3	1.086
	No	74.5	3.2	67.7	80.3	1.086
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
7,500 GMD - 9,999 GMD	Yes	26.8	7.4	14.8	43.7	1.865
	No	73.2	7.4	56.3	85.2	1.865
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
10,000 GMD - 14,999 GMD	Yes	34.2	8.4	19.9	52.0	1.551
	No	65.8	8.4	48.0	80.1	1.551
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

15,000 GMD - 19,999 GMD	Yes	33.0	11.4	15.1	57.8	1.186
	No	67.0	11.4	42.2	84.9	1.186
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
20,000 GMD- 29,999 GMD	Yes	25.6	14.0	7.5	59.5	1.537
	No	74.4	14.0	40.5	92.5	1.537
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
30,000 GMD - 49,999 GMD	Yes	7.5	7.4	1.0	40.2	.511
	No	92.5	7.4	59.8	99.0	.511
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
50,000 GMD - 74,999 GMD	Yes	55.5	29.5	10.5	93.0	2.655
	No	44.5	29.5	7.0	89.5	2.655
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
75,000 GMD and over	No	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Can't disclose	Yes	26.7	4.6	18.7	36.6	.839
	No	73.3	4.6	63.4	81.3	.839
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 7.15: Experience of Any Form of Discrimination or Harassment during the past 12 Months by Age

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
15-19	Yes	30.0	3.2	24.1	36.7	2.021
	No	70.0	3.2	63.3	75.9	2.021
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
20-24	Yes	32.1	3.2	26.2	38.7	1.640
	No	67.9	3.2	61.3	73.8	1.640
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
25-29	Yes	33.9	3.2	27.9	40.5	2.046
	No	66.1	3.2	59.5	72.1	2.046
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
30-34	Yes	32.5	2.7	27.4	38.0	1.045
	No	67.5	2.7	62.0	72.6	1.045
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
35-39	Yes	30.7	5.2	21.4	41.9	3.943
	No	69.3	5.2	58.1	78.6	3.943
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
40-44	Yes	32.9	6.0	22.3	45.6	3.754
	No	67.1	6.0	54.4	77.7	3.754
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
45-49	Yes	28.6	5.1	19.6	39.8	2.074
	No	71.4	5.1	60.2	80.4	2.074
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
50-54	Yes	18.1	4.2	11.2	28.0	1.357
	No	81.9	4.2	72.0	88.8	1.357
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
55-59	Yes	28.0	5.5	18.4	40.1	1.393
	No	72.0	5.5	59.9	81.6	1.393
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
60-64	Yes	14.5	5.8	6.3	29.9	1.910
	No	85.5	5.8	70.1	93.7	1.910
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
65-69	Yes	15.1	4.9	7.7	27.4	1.115
	No	84.9	4.9	72.6	92.3	1.115
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
70-74	Yes	10.8	5.3	4.0	26.5	.984
	No	89.2	5.3	73.5	96.0	.984

	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
75-79	Yes	15.1	8.8	4.4	40.9	1.539
	No	84.9	8.8	59.1	95.6	1.539
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
80-84	No	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
85+	No	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 7.16: Experience of Any Form of Discrimination or Harassment during the Last 5 Years by Age

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
15-19	Yes	25.1	2.8	20.0	31.0	1.719
	No	74.9	2.8	69.0	80.0	1.719
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
20-24	Yes	30.8	3.1	25.0	37.3	1.617
	No	69.2	3.1	62.7	75.0	1.617
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
25-29	Yes	25.4	3.4	19.3	32.6	2.707
	No	74.6	3.4	67.4	80.7	2.707
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
30-34	Yes	22.9	2.9	17.6	29.2	1.551
	No	77.1	2.9	70.8	82.4	1.551
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
35-39	Yes	26.6	5.2	17.7	38.0	4.216
	No	73.4	5.2	62.0	82.3	4.216
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
40-44	Yes	26.4	4.2	19.0	35.5	2.087
	No	73.6	4.2	64.5	81.0	2.087
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
45-49	Yes	20.6	4.3	13.4	30.4	1.806
	No	79.4	4.3	69.6	86.6	1.806
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
50-54	Yes	12.8	3.4	7.4	21.2	1.196
	No	87.2	3.4	78.8	92.6	1.196
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
55-59	Yes	17.5	4.1	10.7	27.2	1.088

	No	82.5	4.1	72.8	89.3	1.088
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
60-64	Yes	10.8	5.3	3.9	26.6	2.104
	No	89.2	5.3	73.4	96.1	2.104
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
65-69	Yes	10.4	4.7	4.0	24.1	1.459
	No	89.6	4.7	75.9	96.0	1.459
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
70-74	Yes	4.6	2.9	1.3	14.9	.634
	No	95.4	2.9	85.1	98.7	.634
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
75-79	Yes	11.1	6.0	3.6	29.5	.941
	No	88.9	6.0	70.5	96.4	.941
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
80-84	No	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
85+	No	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

8 EXPERIENCE WITH PUBLIC SERVICES (BRIBERY)

Table 8.1: Proportion of persons who had at least one contact with a public official and who paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked for a bribe by those public officials, during the previous 12 months

	Estimate	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Yes	7.2%	0.9%	5.7%	9.2%	3.191
No	92.8%	0.9%	90.8%	94.3%	3.191
Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.

Table 8.2: Proportion of persons who had at least one contact with a public official and who paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked for a bribe by those public officials, during the previous 12 months by type of official

TYPE OF OFFICIAL		Per cent	Standard Error
Public Utilities officers (electricity, water, sanitation, etc.)	Yes	6.5	2.0
	No	93.5	2.0
	Total	100.0	0.0
Doctors, Nurses or Midwives (from public sector)	Yes	3.0	0.7
	No	97.0	0.7
	Total	100.0	0.0
officials in courts like judges, magistrates and prosecutors	Yes	7.2	4.0
	No	92.8	4.0
	Total	100.0	0.0
Teacher/Lecturers (from public schools)	Yes	2.7	0.8
	No	97.3	0.8
	Total	100.0	0.0
Vehicle Inspection officer including traffic officers	Yes	31.6	4.6
	No	68.4	4.6
	Total	100.0	0.0
Police officers	Yes	25.3	4.1
	No	74.7	4.1
	Total	100.0	0.0
Elected representatives (Local/state) Governor, Chairman, Councillor	Yes	2.2	2.2
	No	97.8	2.2
	Total	100.0	0.0
Member of Parliament/Legislature	No	100.0	0.0
	Total	100.0	0.0
Tax/Revenue officers/tax officers	Yes	6.6	2.7
	No	93.4	2.7

	Total	100.0	0.0
Public officials from other government agencies	Yes	3.2	1.8
	No	96.8	1.8
	Total	100.0	0.0
Other (specify)	Yes	3.8	2.3
	No	96.2	2.3
	Total	100.0	0.0

Table 8.3: During the last 12 months, were there any occasion directly or indirectly where a public official asked you to give extra money or a gift for a particular issue or procedure related to his/her function but you did not give anything in relation to that

	Estimate	Error	Standard
Yes	1.7%		0.4%
No	96.7%		0.6%
DK	1.6%		0.3%
Total	100.0%		0.0%

Table 8.4: Sex of the Official Who Received the Last Payment/Gift/Bribe

	Estimate	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Male	91.9%	2.2%	86.2%	95.4%	1.080
Female	7.7%	2.2%	4.3%	13.4%	1.102
DK	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	2.5%	.569
Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.

Table 8.5: Sex of the Bribe-givers

		Male	Female	Total
Yes	Estimate	65.7%	34.3%	100.0%
	Standard Error	6.2%	6.2%	0.0%
No	Estimate	48.4%	51.6%	100.0%
	Standard Error	1.6%	1.6%	0.0%
Total	Estimate	49.6%	50.4%	100.0%
	Standard Error	1.7%	1.7%	0.0%

Table 8.6: Age of the Bribe-givers

		Estimate	Error	Standard
15-19	No	100.0%		0.0%
	Total	100.0%		0.0%
20-24	Yes	21.4%		11.1%
	No	78.6%		11.1%
	Total	100.0%		0.0%
25-29	Yes	6.2%		2.6%
	No	93.8%		2.6%
	Total	100.0%		0.0%
30-34	No	100.0%		0.0%
	Total	100.0%		0.0%
35-39	Yes	5.0%		2.6%
	No	95.0%		2.6%
	Total	100.0%		0.0%
40-44	Yes	7.9%		5.6%
	No	92.1%		5.6%
	Total	100.0%		0.0%
45-49	Yes	5.8%		5.7%
	No	94.2%		5.7%
	Total	100.0%		0.0%
50-54	Yes	4.4%		4.5%
	No	95.6%		4.5%
	Total	100.0%		0.0%
55-59	Yes	8.6%		6.2%
	No	91.4%		6.2%
	Total	100.0%		0.0%
60-64	Yes	17.7%		13.5%
	No	82.3%		13.5%
	Total	100.0%		0.0%
65-69	No	100.0%		0.0%
	Total	100.0%		0.0%
70-74	No	100.0%		0.0%
	Total	100.0%		0.0%
75-79	No	100.0%		0.0%
	Total	100.0%		0.0%

80-84	No	100.0%	0.0%
	Total	100.0%	0.0%
85+	Total	.	.

Table 8.7: Income Level of Bribe-Givers

		Estimate	Standard Error
Less than 500 GMD	Yes	11.7%	11.4%
	No	88.3%	11.4%
	Total	100.0%	0.0%
500 GMD - 999 GMD	Yes	11.1%	10.5%
	No	88.9%	10.5%
	Total	100.0%	0.0%
1,000 GMD - 1,999 GMD	Yes	14.0%	12.0%
	No	86.0%	12.0%
	Total	100.0%	0.0%
2,000 GMD - 2,999 GMD	Yes	9.5%	4.4%
	No	90.5%	4.4%
	Total	100.0%	0.0%
3,000 GMD -4,999 GMD	Yes	7.4%	2.9%
	No	92.6%	2.9%
	Total	100.0%	0.0%
5,000 GMD-7,499 GMD	Yes	2.4%	1.7%
	No	97.6%	1.7%
	Total	100.0%	0.0%
7,500 GMD - 9,999 GMD	Yes	11.6%	7.4%
	No	88.4%	7.4%
	Total	100.0%	0.0%
10,000 GMD - 14,999 GMD	No	100.0%	0.0%
	Total	100.0%	0.0%
15,000 GMD - 19,999 GMD	No	100.0%	0.0%
	Total	100.0%	0.0%
20,000 GMD- 29,999 GMD	No	100.0%	0.0%
	Total	100.0%	0.0%
30,000 GMD - 49,999 GMD	Yes	100.0%	0.0%
	Total	100.0%	0.0%

50,000 GMD - 74,999 GMD	Yes	5.7%	6.6%
	No	94.3%	6.6%
	Total	100.0%	0.0%
75,000 GMD and over	No	100.0%	0.0%
	Total	100.0%	0.0%
Can't disclose	No	100.0%	0.0%
	Total	100.0%	0.0%

9 BRIBERY (BUSINESSES)

Table 9.1: Proportion of businesses that had at least one contact with a public official and that paid a bribe to a public official

		Per cent
The Gambia	Yes	5.7
	No	90.1
	Prefer Not to say	4.3
	Total	100.0

Table 9.2: Proportion of businesses that had at least one contact with a public official and that paid a bribe to a public official by LGA

LGA	Yes	No	Prefer Not to say
Banjul	7.4	88.9	3.7
Kanifing	5.0	90.0	5.0
Brikama	6.1	90.9	3.0
Mansakonko	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kuntaur	0.0	0.0	0.0
Janjanbureh	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kerewan	0.0	100.0	0.0
Basse	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 9.3: Proportion of businesses that had at least one contact with a public official and that paid a bribe to a public official by gender of top manager

Gender of top manager	Yes	No	Prefer Not to say
Male	5.3	89.4	5.3
Female	7.1	92.9	0.0

Table 9.4: Proportion of businesses that had at least one contact with a public official and that paid a bribe to a public official by business current legal status

Business current legal status	Yes	No	Prefer Not to say
Shareholding Company	4.1	93.9	2.0
Sole Proprietorship	8.0	86.0	6.0
Partnership	0.0	83.3	16.7
Limited Partnership	4.8	95.2	0.0
Other	11.1	88.9	0.0

Table 9.5: Proportion of businesses that had at least one contact with a public official and that paid a bribe to a public official by primary activity

Primary Activity of business	Yes	No	Prefer Not to say
Manufacturing (Food, Textiles, Garments, Chemicals, Plastics & rubber, Non-metallic mineral products, Basic metals, F	0.0	92.9	7.1
Construction (Building ,Civil engineering (roads, infrastructures))	0.0	100.0	0.0
Retail trade	9.1	90.9	0.0
Wholesale trade	7.1	92.9	0.0
Transportation and storage	0.0	100.0	0.0
Accommodation and Food service activities	0.00	100.0	0.0
Information and communication	12.5	75.0	12.5
Financial and insurance activities	8.3	91.7	0.0
Real estate activities	16.7	50.0	33.3
Professional, scientific and technical activities	0.0	100.0	0.0
Education	0.0	100.0	0.0
Other service activities	5.1	89.7	5.1

Table 9.6: Proportion of businesses that had at least one contact with a public official and that paid a bribe to a public official by business exporting status

Business exporting status	Yes	No	Prefer Not to say
Exporter (Small businesses that currently export)	5.7	88.6	5.7
Lapser (Small businesses that have exported in the past and would consider exporting again)	0.0	100.0	0.0
Considerer (Small businesses that have never exported before but would consider exporting)	9.8	85.4	4.9
Non-considerer (Small businesses that would Not consider exporting)	3.8	92.3	3.8

10 PARTICIPATION IN FORMAL AND NON-FORMAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Table 10.1: Participation rate of youth (15-24) in formal and Non-formal education and training in the previous 12 months

	Estimate	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Design Effect
No	65.7%	2.2%	61.3%	69.8%	1.595
Yes	34.3%	2.2%	30.2%	38.7%	1.595
Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.

Table 10.2: Participation rate of youth (15-24) in formal and Non-formal education and training in the previous 12 months by Sex

		Estimate	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Male	No	63.3%	3.4%	56.3%	69.8%	1.680
	Yes	36.7%	3.4%	30.2%	43.7%	1.680
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
Female	No	67.5%	3.3%	60.8%	73.6%	2.104
	Yes	32.5%	3.3%	26.4%	39.2%	2.104
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.

Table 10.3: Participation rate of youth (15-24) in formal and Non-formal education and training in the previous 12 months by Area

		Estimate	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Urban	No	60.3%	2.8%	54.7%	65.6%	1.579
	Yes	39.7%	2.8%	34.4%	45.3%	1.579
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
Rural	No	75.1%	3.4%	67.9%	81.1%	1.750
	Yes	24.9%	3.4%	18.9%	32.1%	1.750
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.

Table 10.4: Participation rate of youth (15-24) in formal and Non-formal education and training in the previous 12 months by Local Government

		Estimate	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Banjul	No	62.3%	7.8%	46.1%	76.2%	2.370
	Yes	37.7%	7.8%	23.8%	53.9%	2.370
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
Kanifing	No	59.9%	4.9%	50.0%	69.1%	1.706
	Yes	40.1%	4.9%	30.9%	50.0%	1.706
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
Brikama	No	60.3%	3.5%	53.3%	67.0%	.767
	Yes	39.7%	3.5%	33.0%	46.7%	.767
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
Mansakonko	No	53.3%	8.0%	37.7%	68.3%	1.997
	Yes	46.7%	8.0%	31.7%	62.3%	1.997
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
Kerewan	No	62.2%	5.5%	50.9%	72.4%	.965
	Yes	37.8%	5.5%	27.6%	49.1%	.965
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
Kuntaur	No	92.4%	4.5%	77.2%	97.8%	.978
	Yes	7.6%	4.5%	2.2%	22.8%	.978
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
Janjanbureh	No	79.0%	7.7%	60.1%	90.4%	3.184
	Yes	21.0%	7.7%	9.6%	39.9%	3.184
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
Basse	No	79.2%	4.5%	69.0%	86.7%	1.149
	Yes	20.8%	4.5%	13.3%	31.0%	1.149
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.

Table 10.5: Participation rate of youth (15-24) in formal and Non-formal education and training in the previous 12 months by Age

		Estimate	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Design Effect
15-19	No	56.1%	3.3%	49.5%	62.4%	1.833
	Yes	43.9%	3.3%	37.6%	50.5%	1.833
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
20-24	No	77.0%	2.4%	71.8%	81.5%	1.221
	Yes	23.0%	2.4%	18.5%	28.2%	1.221
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.

Table 10.6: Participation rate of youth (15-24) in formal and Non-formal education and training in the previous 12 months by Income

		Estimate	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Less than 500 GMD	No	70.3%	8.1%	52.3%	83.7%	1.830
	Yes	29.7%	8.1%	16.3%	47.7%	1.830
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
500 GMD - 999 GMD	No	66.6%	7.6%	50.4%	79.6%	1.378
	Yes	33.4%	7.6%	20.4%	49.6%	1.378
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
1,000 GMD - 1,999 GMD	No	74.0%	6.1%	60.4%	84.2%	1.687
	Yes	26.0%	6.1%	15.8%	39.6%	1.687
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
2,000 GMD - 2,999 GMD	No	92.8%	3.0%	84.1%	96.9%	.780
	Yes	7.2%	3.0%	3.1%	15.9%	.780
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
3,000 GMD -4,999 GMD	No	61.9%	9.0%	43.3%	77.6%	1.090
	Yes	38.1%	9.0%	22.4%	56.7%	1.090
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
5,000 GMD-7,499 GMD	No	80.9%	9.8%	54.7%	93.7%	1.819
	Yes	19.1%	9.8%	6.3%	45.3%	1.819
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
7,500 GMD - 9,999 GMD	No	42.8%	19.9%	13.0%	78.9%	1.099
	Yes	57.2%	19.9%	21.1%	87.0%	1.099
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
10,000 GMD - 14,999 GMD	No	59.9%	34.0%	8.3%	96.1%	.980
	Yes	40.1%	34.0%	3.9%	91.7%	.980
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.

15,000 GMD - 19,999 GMD	No	93.7%	6.9%	59.3%	99.4%	.239
	Yes	6.3%	6.9%	0.6%	40.7%	.239
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
20,000 GMD- 29,999 GMD	No	53.1%	35.2%	6.4%	94.9%	1.240
	Yes	46.9%	35.2%	5.1%	93.6%	1.240
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
Can't disclose	No	78.7%	13.3%	43.4%	94.7%	1.187
	Yes	21.3%	13.3%	5.3%	56.6%	1.187
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.

Participation Rate Of Adult (25-64) In Formal and Non-Formal Education and Training in the Previous 12 Months

Table 10.7: Participation Rate Of Adult (25-64) In Formal and Non-Formal Education and Training in the Previous 12 Months

	Estimate	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Design Effect
No	90.2%	0.9%	88.2%	91.9%	1.679
Yes	9.8%	0.9%	8.1%	11.8%	1.679
Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.

Table 10.8: Participation Rate Of Adult (25-64) In Formal and Non-Formal Education and Training in the Previous 12 Months

		Estimate	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Male	No	85.9%	1.6%	82.4%	88.7%	1.550
	Yes	14.1%	1.6%	11.3%	17.6%	1.550
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
Female	No	93.5%	1.2%	90.6%	95.6%	2.394
	Yes	6.5%	1.2%	4.4%	9.4%	2.394
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.

Table 10.9: Participation rate of Adult (25-64) in formal and Non-formal education and training in the previous 12 months by Area

		Estimate	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Urban	No	88.1%	1.3%	85.4%	90.4%	1.641
	Yes	11.9%	1.3%	9.6%	14.6%	1.641
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
Rural	No	93.7%	1.2%	91.0%	95.7%	1.521
	Yes	6.3%	1.2%	4.3%	9.0%	1.521
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.

Table 10.10: Participation rate of Adult (25-64) in formal and Non-formal education and training in the previous 12 months by Local Government Area

		Estimate	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Banjul	No	84.0%	4.7%	72.5%	91.3%	3.440
	Yes	16.0%	4.7%	8.7%	27.5%	3.440
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
KANIFING	No	89.4%	1.5%	86.0%	92.1%	.959
	Yes	10.6%	1.5%	7.9%	14.0%	.959
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
Brikama	No	89.7%	1.5%	86.4%	92.3%	.763
	Yes	10.3%	1.5%	7.7%	13.6%	.763
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
Mansakonko	No	89.4%	3.9%	78.8%	95.0%	3.118
	Yes	10.6%	3.9%	5.0%	21.2%	3.118
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
Kerewan	No	92.4%	2.0%	87.3%	95.6%	.797
	Yes	7.6%	2.0%	4.4%	12.7%	.797
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
Kuntaur	No	98.4%	1.5%	89.9%	99.8%	1.216
	Yes	1.6%	1.5%	0.2%	10.1%	1.216
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
Janjanbureh	No	92.2%	1.9%	87.6%	95.2%	.895
	Yes	7.8%	1.9%	4.8%	12.4%	.895
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
Basse	No	93.1%	1.8%	88.6%	96.0%	1.146
	Yes	6.9%	1.8%	4.0%	11.4%	1.146
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.

Table 10.11: Participation rate of Adult (25-64) in formal and Non-formal education and training in the previous 12 months by Age

		Estimate	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Design Effect
25-29	No	86.2%	1.6%	82.6%	89.1%	.990
	Yes	13.8%	1.6%	10.9%	17.4%	.990
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
30-34	No	88.5%	2.3%	83.0%	92.3%	1.671
	Yes	11.5%	2.3%	7.7%	17.0%	1.671
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
35-39	No	94.2%	1.6%	90.1%	96.7%	1.412
	Yes	5.8%	1.6%	3.3%	9.9%	1.412
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
40-44	No	84.5%	3.0%	77.6%	89.6%	1.580
	Yes	15.5%	3.0%	10.4%	22.4%	1.580
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
45-49	No	95.4%	1.7%	90.5%	97.9%	1.099
	Yes	4.6%	1.7%	2.1%	9.5%	1.099
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
50-54	No	97.0%	1.5%	92.3%	98.8%	.821
	Yes	3.0%	1.5%	1.2%	7.7%	.821
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
55-59	No	93.7%	2.4%	86.8%	97.1%	.919
	Yes	6.3%	2.4%	2.9%	13.2%	.919
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
60-64	No	98.8%	1.2%	91.7%	99.8%	.858
	Yes	1.2%	1.2%	0.2%	8.3%	.858
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.

Table 10.12: Participation rate of Adult (25-64) in formal and Non-formal education and training in the previous 12 months by Income

		Estimate	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Less than 500 GMD	No	94.6%	1.9%	89.3%	97.4%	1.078
	Yes	5.4%	1.9%	2.6%	10.7%	1.078
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
500 GMD - 999 GMD	No	94.8%	2.0%	89.1%	97.6%	1.433
	Yes	5.2%	2.0%	2.4%	10.9%	1.433
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
1,000 GMD - 1,999 GMD	No	92.2%	2.5%	85.7%	95.9%	2.046
	Yes	7.8%	2.5%	4.1%	14.3%	2.046
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
2,000 GMD - 2,999 GMD	No	94.5%	1.5%	90.6%	96.8%	1.035
	Yes	5.5%	1.5%	3.2%	9.4%	1.035
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
3,000 GMD -4,999 GMD	No	89.4%	2.2%	84.1%	93.0%	1.647
	Yes	10.6%	2.2%	7.0%	15.9%	1.647
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
5,000 GMD-7,499 GMD	No	82.7%	4.5%	71.9%	89.9%	2.340
	Yes	17.3%	4.5%	10.1%	28.1%	2.340
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
7,500 GMD - 9,999 GMD	No	74.2%	5.6%	61.9%	83.7%	.948
	Yes	25.8%	5.6%	16.3%	38.1%	.948
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
10,000 GMD - 14,999 GMD	No	80.2%	6.4%	64.5%	90.0%	1.218
	Yes	19.8%	6.4%	10.0%	35.5%	1.218
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
15,000 GMD - 19,999 GMD	No	93.6%	6.3%	64.7%	99.2%	1.143
	Yes	6.4%	6.3%	0.8%	35.3%	1.143
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
20,000 GMD- 29,999 GMD	No	88.8%	12.4%	40.4%	98.9%	1.939
	Yes	11.2%	12.4%	1.1%	59.6%	1.939
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
30,000 GMD - 49,999 GMD	No	90.2%	9.4%	52.7%	98.7%	.654
	Yes	9.8%	9.4%	1.3%	47.3%	.654
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
	No	5.7%	6.6%	0.5%	40.5%	.535

50,000 GMD - 74,999 GMD	Yes	94.3%	6.6%	59.5%	99.5%	.535
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
75,000 GMD and over	No	93.1%	7.7%	55.4%	99.3%	.258
	Yes	6.9%	7.7%	0.7%	44.6%	.258
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.
Can't disclose	No	88.0%	7.3%	65.0%	96.6%	2.958
	Yes	12.0%	7.3%	3.4%	35.0%	2.958
	Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.

Table 10.13: (SDG Indicator 4.3.3) Participation Rate of Youth (15-24) In Education or Training Activities to Improve Your Literacy Skills

	Estimate	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Design Effect
No, Not to improve literacy skills	17.3%	2.7%	12.6%	23.3%	1.435
Yes, to improve literacy skills	82.7%	2.7%	76.7%	87.4%	1.435
Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.

Table 10.14: (SDG Indicator 4.6.3) Participation Rate of Youth (15-24) In Technical or Vocational Programmes

	Estimate	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Design Effect
No, Not technical or vocational	45.7%	4.1%	37.7%	53.9%	1.926
Yes, technical or vocational	54.3%	4.1%	46.1%	62.3%	1.926
Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.

Table 10.15: (SDG Indicator 4.6.3) Participation of Adults (25-64) In Vocational or Technical Programmes

	Per cent	Standard Error
No, Not technical or vocational	32.8	5.6
Yes, technical or vocational	67.2	5.6
Total	100.0	0.0

Table 10.16: (SDG Indicator 4.3.3 Participation of Adults (25-64) In Education or Training Activities to Improve Literacy Skills

	Per cent	Standard Error
No, Not to improve literacy skills	26.1	5.7
Yes, to improve literacy skills	73.9	5.7
Total	100.0	0.0

11 RESPONDENTS PERCEPTION OF PUBLIC SERVICES

Table 11.1: Proportion of the Population Who Responded Positively for the Five Attributes Of Healthcare, Education and Government Services

The Gambia							
Attributes of healthcare services	Positive responses	Attributes of primary education services	Positive responses	Attributes of secondary education services	Positive responses	Attributes of government services	Positive responses
	Per cent		Per cent		Per cent		Per cent
Accessibility	56.1	Accessibility	67.9	Accessibility	52.4	Accessibility	21.5
Affordability	50.8	Affordability	40.2	Affordability	40.4	Affordability	41.1
Quality of facilities	90.0	Quality of facilities	89.8	Quality of facilities	89.8	Effective service delivery process	49.1
Equal treatment for everyone	68.3	Equal treatment for everyone	92.3	Equal treatment for everyone	85.5	Equal treatment for everyone	45.5
Courtesy and treatment (Attitude of healthcare staff)	80.5	Effective delivery of service (Quality of teaching)	87.7	Effective delivery of service (Quality of teaching)	90.6	Timeliness	38.1
NA/DK/RA (Average)	1.6	NA/DK/RA (Average)	3.0	NA/DK/RA (Average)	3.4	NA/DK/RA (Average)	8.4
Average share of positive responses on attributes of healthcare services	69.12	Average share of positive responses on attributes of primary education services	75.92	Average share of positive responses on attributes of secondary education services	72.4	Average share of positive responses on attributes of government services	39.04

Table 11.2: Share of Respondents Who Said Overall They are Satisfied with Each Service Area

	Per cent		Per cent		Per cent		Per cent
Share of respondents satisfied with healthcare services overall	73.7	Share of respondents satisfied with primary education services overall	89.2	Share of respondents satisfied with secondary education services overall	89.5	Share of respondents satisfied with government services overall	49.4
NA/DK/RA	-	NA/DK/RA	2.4	NA/DK/RA	1.4	NA/DK/RA	0.9

Table 11.3: Proportion of the Population Who Responded Positively for the Five Attributes Of Healthcare, Education and Government Services, Urban

Urban							
Attributes of healthcare services	Positive responses	Attributes of primary education services	Positive responses	Attributes of secondary education services	Positive responses	Attributes of government services	Positive responses
	Per cent		Per cent		Per cent		Per cent
Accessibility	66.3	Accessibility	65.6	Accessibility	60.7	Accessibility	26.0
Affordability	61.3	Affordability	47.3	Affordability	47.4	Affordability	48.3
Quality of facilities	90.7	Quality of facilities	91.9	Quality of facilities	91.9	Effective service delivery process	52.4
Equal treatment for everyone	63.7	Equal treatment for everyone	92.0	Equal treatment for everyone	86.8	Equal treatment for everyone	42.1
Courtesy and treatment (Attitude of healthcare staff)	82.3	Effective delivery of service (Quality of teaching)	88.4	Effective delivery of service (Quality of teaching)	91.4	Timeliness	43.2
NA/DK/RA(Average)	1.5	NA/DK/RA(Average)	3.4	NA/DK/RA(Average)	3.6	NA/DK/RA(Average)	9.0
Average share of positive responses on attributes of healthcare services	72.88	Average share of positive responses on attributes of primary education services	77.2	Average share of positive responses on attributes of secondary education services	75.94	Average share of positive responses on attributes of government services	42.66

Table 11.4: Proportion of the Population Who Responded Positively for the Five Attributes Of Healthcare, Education and Government Services, Rural

Rural							
Attributes of healthcare services	Positive responses	Attributes of primary education services	Positive responses	Attributes of secondary education services	Positive responses	Attributes of government services	Positive responses
	Per cent		Per cent		Per cent		Per cent
Accessibility	40.1	Accessibility	70.7	Accessibility	37.1	Accessibility	15.2
Affordability	34.6	Affordability	31.1	Affordability	27.4	Affordability	30.9
Quality of facilities	89.0	Quality of facilities	85.9	Quality of facilities	85.9	Effective service delivery process	44.4
Equal treatment for everyone	75.2	Equal treatment for everyone	92.8	Equal treatment for everyone	82.9	Equal treatment for everyone	50.5
Courtesy and treatment (Attitude of healthcare staff)	77.1	Effective delivery of service (Quality of teaching)	86.7	Effective delivery of service (Quality of teaching)	89.2	Timeliness	30.9
NA/DK/RA (Average)	1.6	NA/DK/RA (Average)	2.4	NA/DK/RA (Average)	3.0	NA/DK/RA (Average)	7.5
Average share of positive responses on attributes of healthcare services	63.2	Average share of positive responses on attributes of primary education services	73.94	Average share of positive responses on attributes of secondary education services	65.7	Average share of positive responses on attributes of government services	33.82

Table 11.5: Proportion of the Population Who Responded Positively for the Five Attributes Of Healthcare, Education and Government Services by Sex (Male)

Male							
Attributes of healthcare services	Positive responses	Attributes of primary education services	Positive responses	Attributes of secondary education services	Positive responses	Attributes of government services	Positive responses
	Per cent		Per cent		Per cent		Per cent
Accessibility	54.8	Accessibility	70.1	Accessibility	59.6	Accessibility	21.7
Affordability	51.4	Affordability	40.0	Affordability	37.6	Affordability	43.6
Quality of facilities	90.3	Quality of facilities	88.8	Quality of facilities	88.8	Effective service delivery process	51.5
Equal treatment for everyone	67.3	Equal treatment for everyone	91.6	Equal treatment for everyone	84.5	Equal treatment for everyone	44.7
Courtesy and treatment (Attitude of healthcare staff)	78.9	Effective delivery of service (Quality of teaching)	83.4	Effective delivery of service (Quality of teaching)	88.8	Timeliness	35.6
NA/DK/RA(Average)	1.9	NA/DK/RA(Average)	3.8	NA/DK/RA(Average)	4.7		7.5
Average share of positive responses on attributes of healthcare services	68.64	Average share of positive responses on attributes of primary education services	75.16	Average share of positive responses on attributes of secondary education services	72.78	Average share of positive responses on attributes of government services	39.44

Table 11.6: Proportion of the Population Who Responded Positively for the Five Attributes Of Healthcare, Education and Government Services by Sex (Female)

Female							
Attributes of healthcare services	Positive responses	Attributes of primary education services	Positive responses	Attributes of secondary education services	Positive responses	Attributes of government services	Positive responses
	Per cent		Per cent		Per cent		Per cent
Accessibility	57.0	Accessibility	66.6	Accessibility	48.0	Accessibility	21.4
Affordability	50.3	Affordability	40.2	Affordability	42.1	Affordability	38.9
Quality of facilities	89.9	Quality of facilities	90.4	Quality of facilities	90.4	Effective service delivery process	46.9
Equal treatment for everyone	69.0	Equal treatment for everyone	92.8	Equal treatment for everyone	86.0	Equal treatment for everyone	46.3
Courtesy and treatment (Attitude of healthcare staff)	81.7	Effective delivery of service (Quality of teaching)	90.2	Effective delivery of service (Quality of teaching)	91.8	Timeliness	40.4
NA/DK/RA(Average)	1.3	NA/DK/RA(Average)	2.5	NA/DK/RA(Average)	2.6		9.2
Average share of positive responses on attributes of healthcare services	69.48	Average share of positive responses on attributes of primary education services	76.34	Average share of positive responses on attributes of secondary education services	72.18	Average share of positive responses on attributes of government services	38.62

Table 11.7: Proportion of the Population with Functional Difficulties Who Responded Positively for the Five Attributes Of Healthcare, Education and Government Services

With Functional Disabilities							
Attributes of healthcare services	Positive responses	Attributes of primary education services	Positive responses	Attributes of secondary education services	Positive responses	Attributes of government services	Positive responses
	Per cent		Per cent		Per cent		Per cent
Accessibility	45.9	Accessibility	42.4	Accessibility	28.9	Accessibility	7.1
Affordability	39.5	Affordability	32.5	Affordability	31.4	Affordability	34.3
Quality of facilities	92.5	Quality of facilities	97.7	Quality of facilities	97.7	Effective service delivery process	24.1
Equal treatment for everyone	70.6	Equal treatment for everyone	94.6	Equal treatment for everyone	86.5	Equal treatment for everyone	37.1
Courtesy and treatment (Attitude of healthcare staff)	91.4	Effective delivery of service (Quality of teaching)	81.1	Effective delivery of service (Quality of teaching)	100	Timeliness	28.9
NA/DK/RA(Average)	3.1	NA/DK/RA(Average)	4.0	NA/DK/RA(Average)	2.2		13.8
Average share of positive responses on attributes of healthcare services	67.98	Average share of positive responses on attributes of primary education services	69.66	Average share of positive responses on attributes of secondary education services	68.9	Average share of positive responses on attributes of government services	26.3

Table 11.8: Share of Respondents Who Said Overall They are Satisfied with Each Service by Area

Urban							
	Per cent		Per cent		Per cent		Per cent
Share of respondents satisfied with healthcare services overall	73.7	Share of respondents satisfied with primary education services overall	90.9	Share of respondents satisfied with secondary education services overall	92.6	Share of respondents satisfied with government services overall	51.5
NA/DK/RA	-	NA/DK/RA	2.8	NA/DK/RA	1.4	NA/DK/RA	1.5
Rural							
Share of respondents satisfied with healthcare services overall	73.6	Share of respondents satisfied with primary education services overall	86.4	Share of respondents satisfied with secondary education services overall	83.8	Share of respondents satisfied with government services overall	46.4
NA/DK/RA	-	NA/DK/RA	1.6	NA/DK/RA	1.4	NA/DK/RA	-

Table 11.9: Share of Respondents Who Said Overall They are Satisfied with Each Service by Sex

Male							
	Per cent		Per cent		Per cent		Per cent
Share of respondents satisfied with healthcare services overall	70.0	Share of respondents satisfied with primary education services overall	86.8	Share of respondents satisfied with secondary education services overall	87.3	Share of respondents satisfied with government services overall	48.6
NA/DK/RA	-	NA/DK/RA	3.4	NA/DK/RA	3.2	NA/DK/RA	0.3
Female							
Share of respondents satisfied with healthcare services overall	76.4	Share of respondents satisfied with primary education services overall	90.6	Share of respondents satisfied with secondary education services overall	90.8	Share of respondents satisfied with government services overall	50.0
NA/DK/RA	-	NA/DK/RA	1.9	NA/DK/RA	0.3	NA/DK/RA	1.4

Table 11.10: Share of Respondents with Functional Difficulties Who Said Overall They are Satisfied with Each Service

With Functional Difficulties							
	Per cent		Per cent		Per cent		Per cent
Share of respondents satisfied with healthcare services overall	88.9	Share of respondents satisfied with primary education services overall	100	Share of respondents satisfied with secondary education services overall	97.7	Share of respondents satisfied with government services overall	38.7
NA/DK/RA	-	NA/DK/RA	-	NA/DK/RA	-	NA/DK/RA	5.6

Table 11.11: Documents Sought from Civil Registration Services or Other Relevant Agencies

Document	Responses		Per cent of
	N	Per cent	Cases
National ID Card	720	69.8%	81.1%
Voter's Card	7	0.7%	0.8%
Passport	52	5.0%	5.9%
Driver's License	81	7.8%	9.1%
Birth Certificate	135	13.1%	15.2%
Marriage Certificate	2	0.2%	0.2%
Death Certificate	4	0.4%	0.5%
Other reasons	31	3.0%	3.5%
Total	1032	100.0%	116.2%

Table 11.12: Reasons for Not Trying to Obtain Documents from Civil Registration or Other Relevant Agencies

Reason	Per cent
Cannot afford to (administrative fees are too expensive)	33.1
Too difficult to access the ?point-of-service? (office, phone number, website)	5.8
The staff do Not treat people with respect	2.5
The process for applying and obtaining such documents is too complicated	20.7
It takes too long to get what you need	17.0
Other reasons (specify)	21.0
Total	100.0

12 PHYSICAL AND SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Table 12.1: Proportion of Persons Victim of Physical or Sexual Harassment in the Past 12 Months

	Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
No	85.7	0.9	83.9	87.4	1.614
Yes	14.3	0.9	12.6	16.1	1.614
Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 12.2: Proportion of Persons Victim of Physical Harassment

	Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
YES	4.5	0.6	3.4	5.8	2.126
NO	95.5	0.6	94.2	96.6	2.126
Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 12.3: Proportion of Persons Victim of Physical Harassment

	Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
YES	11.5	0.8	10.0	13.2	1.607
NO	88.5	0.8	86.8	90.0	1.607
Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 12.4: Reporting of Physical Harassment Experienced in the Past 12 Months to the Police or Other Competent Authorities

	Responses		Percent of
	N	Percent	Cases
Yes, to the police	40	4.3%	4.4%
Yes, to Chief	1	0.1%	0.1%
Yes, to Religious Leader	4	0.4%	0.4%
Yes, to Elders in the community	7	0.8%	0.8%
Reported elsewhere	88	9.6%	9.8%
Not reported to any authority	763	82.9%	84.7%
Don't know	5	0.5%	0.6%
Prefer Not to say	12	1.3%	1.3%
Total	920	100.0%	102.1%

Table 12.5: Reporting of Sexual Harassment Experienced in the Past 12 Months to the Police or Other Competent Authorities

	Responses		Percent of
	N	Percent	N
Yes, to the police	16	1.0%	1.0%
Yes, to Chief	1	0.1%	0.1%
Yes, to Religious Leader	6	0.4%	0.4%
Yes, to Elders in the community	30	1.8%	1.9%
Reported elsewhere	98	5.9%	6.1%
Not reported to any authority	1444	87.1%	89.5%
Don't know	4	0.2%	0.2%
Prefer Not to say	58	3.5%	3.6%
Total	1657	100.0%	102.7%

Table 12.6: Reasons for Not Reporting Physical Harassment to the Police or Other Competent Authorities

	Responses		Percent of
	N	Percent	Cases
Somebody else reported it	1	0.1%	0.1%
It came to the attention of the authorities in another way	2	0.2%	0.3%
Not serious enough, I did Not consider it a crime	202	24.3%	26.8%
I solved it myself	395	47.5%	52.4%
I knew the offender and did Not want to report them	76	9.1%	10.1%
I believed the police/competent authority could do Nothing	4	0.5%	0.5%
I believed the police/competent authority would do Nothing	3	0.4%	0.4%
I did Not want to deal with the police/authorities // Dislike or fear of police/authorities	31	3.7%	4.1%
The cost associated with the procedure is expensive	5	0.6%	0.7%
Fear of reprisal by the offender or by others	9	1.1%	1.2%
I did Not know where to report	44	5.3%	5.8%
Other reason	41	4.9%	5.4%
Don't know	1	0.1%	0.1%
Prefer Not to say	17	2.0%	2.3%
Total	831	100.0%	110.2%

Table 12.7: Reasons for Not Reporting Sexual Harassment to the Police or Other Competent Authorities

	Responses		Percent of
	N	Percent	Cases
Somebody else reported it	1	0.1%	0.1%
It came to the attention of the authorities in another way	1	0.1%	0.1%
Not serious enough, I did not consider it a crime	383	23.5%	26.5%
I solved it myself	871	53.4%	60.3%
I knew the offender and did not want to report them	95	5.8%	6.6%
I believed the police/competent authority could do nothing	9	0.6%	0.6%
I believed the police/competent authority would do nothing	5	0.3%	0.3%
I did not want to deal with the police/authorities / Dislike or fear of police/authorities	37	2.3%	2.6%
I did not know the procedure for reporting	12	0.7%	0.8%
The cost associated with the procedure is expensive	14	0.9%	1.0%
Fear of reprisal by the offender or by others	18	1.1%	1.2%
I did not know where to report	89	5.5%	6.2%
Other reason	68	4.2%	4.7%
Don't know	5	0.3%	0.3%
Prefer not to say	23	1.4%	1.6%
Total	1631	100.0%	113.0%

Table 12.8: Most Recent Physical Harassment

	Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Somebody sent unwanted messages, e-mails or made calls of Non-sexual nature that were offensive or threatening?	10.1	2.3	6.4	15.6	2.951
Somebody personally made offensive, threatening or humiliating comments to you such as insulting you or calling you name	42.9	3.0	37.0	49.0	1.991
Somebody made offensive or threatening gestures to belittle, insult or humiliate you	23.2	2.0	19.4	27.4	1.199
Somebody posted offensive or embarrassing comments, photos or videos of you on the internet	3.5	1.6	1.4	8.5	3.968
Either somebody followed you against your will, physically or online that made you feel uncomfortable?	20.3	2.4	15.9	25.4	1.864
Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 12.9: Most Recent Sexual Harassment

	Estimate	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Inappropriate sexual staring or leering that made you feel intimidated	21.3%	2.3%	17.0%	26.2%	2.113
Sexually suggestive comments or jokes that made you feel offended	14.6%	2.0%	11.2%	19.0%	2.027
Somebody sending or showing you sexually explicit pictures, videos or gifts that made you feel offended or embarrassed	8.3%	1.2%	6.3%	11.0%	1.188
Unwanted sexual proposition or pressure for a date	13.9%	1.7%	10.9%	17.5%	1.534
Sexually Intrusive questions about your private life that made you feel offended	4.2%	0.9%	2.7%	6.5%	1.438
Intrusive sexual comments about your physical appearance that made you feel offended	11.4%	1.8%	8.3%	15.4%	2.061
Unwanted sexually explicit emails or SMS messages or calls that offended you?	7.7%	1.2%	5.7%	10.4%	1.252
Inappropriate sexual advances that offended you on social networking websites such as Facebook, or in internet chat room	8.5%	1.6%	5.9%	12.3%	2.162
Somebody indecently exposing himself or herself to you?	10.0%	1.4%	7.6%	13.2%	1.437
Total	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.

Table 12.10: Time Period of Recent Physical Harassment

	Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
During the last 12 months	91.1	1.6	87.5	93.7	1.565
Before then	8.4	1.4	6.0	11.7	1.397
Don't know	0.5	0.5	0.1	3.2	2.410
Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 12.11: Time Period of Recent Sexual Harassment

	Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
During the last 12 months	92.2	1.4	89.0	94.5	1.744
Before then	7.8	1.4	5.5	11.0	1.744
Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 12.12: Place of Occurrence of Last Physical Harassment

	Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Home	27.8	2.4	23.3	32.8	1.522
School	6.2	1.3	4.1	9.5	1.594
Workplace	9.1	1.8	6.1	13.3	2.034
Public Transport	0.9	0.3	0.4	1.8	.603
Street	26.6	2.1	22.7	30.9	1.168
Shopping Center	1.2	0.4	0.6	2.5	.854
Public Space/Park	3.8	0.9	2.3	6.2	1.303
Own Neighborhood	10.2	1.6	7.5	13.9	1.472
Social media/Email/Via SMS	12.8	2.0	9.3	17.3	1.891
Other (specify)	1.3	0.6	0.5	3.4	1.657
Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 12.13: Place of Occurrence Last Sexual Harassment

	Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Home	23.7	1.7	20.4	27.3	1.086
School	4.7	1.1	3.0	7.4	1.699
Workplace	11.4	1.4	9.0	14.4	1.214
Public Transport	1.5	0.7	0.6	3.6	2.050
Street	28.2	2.1	24.2	32.5	1.434
Shopping Center	1.2	0.6	0.4	3.4	2.208
Public Space/Park	1.3	0.4	0.6	2.5	.978
Water & Food Distribution Sites	0.2	0.2	0.0	1.4	1.238
Own Neighborhood	10.5	1.4	8.0	13.6	1.358
Social media/Email/Via SMS	15.1	1.5	12.4	18.2	1.129
Other (specify)	2.2	0.8	1.1	4.4	1.778
Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 12.14: Experience of Physical or Sexual Harassment in the Past 12 Months by Functional Difficulties

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Has No functional difficulties	No	85.6	0.9	83.7	87.4	1.734
	Yes	14.4	0.9	12.6	16.3	1.734
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Has functional difficulties	No	88.3	4.1	77.5	94.3	1.158
	Yes	11.7	4.1	5.7	22.5	1.158
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 12.15: Most Recent Physical Harassment by Sex

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Male	Somebody sent unwanted messages, e-mails or made calls of Non-sexual nature that were offensive or threatening?	11.6	3.6	6.2	20.7	3.146
	Somebody personally made offensive, threatening or humiliating comments to you such as insulting you or calling you name	43.9	5.2	34.1	54.2	2.738
	Somebody made offensive or threatening gestures to belittle, insult or humiliate you	22.6	5.0	14.1	34.0	3.688
	Somebody posted offensive or embarrassing comments, photos or videos of you on the internet	2.8	1.7	0.8	9.3	2.812
	Somebody followed you against your will, either physically or online that made you feel uncomfortable	19.1	3.6	13.0	27.3	2.116
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
	Female	Somebody sent unwanted messages, e-mails or made calls of Non-sexual nature that were offensive or threatening?	8.8	2.1	5.4	13.9

Somebody personally made offensive, threatening or humiliating comments to you such as insulting you or calling you name	41.9	4.2	34.0	50.3	1.922
Somebody made offensive or threatening gestures to belittle, insult or humiliate you	23.8	3.8	17.1	32.0	2.119
Somebody posted offensive or embarrassing comments, photos or videos of you on the internet	4.2	1.8	1.8	9.5	2.132
Somebody followed you against your will, either physically or online that made you feel uncomfortable	21.3	3.8	14.8	29.7	2.283
Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

13 PHYSICAL AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE

Table 13.1: Proportion of the Population Subjected to Physical Violence

	Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
YES	4.0	0.4	3.2	4.9	1.217
NO	96.0	0.4	95.1	96.8	1.217
Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 13.2: Proportion of the Population Subjected to Sexual Violence

	Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
YES	1.0	0.2	0.6	1.5	1.327
NO	99.0	0.2	98.5	99.4	1.327
Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 13.3: Proportion of the Population Subjected to Physical or Sexual Violence in the Past 12 Months

	Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
No	95.2	0.4	94.3	96.0	1.081
Yes	4.8	0.4	4.0	5.7	1.081
Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 13.4: Proportion of the Population Subjected to Physical Violence by a Partner or Ex-partner

	Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
YES	12.2	3.9	6.3	22.4	1.524
NO	80.8	4.4	70.5	88.1	1.338
DK	0.6	0.6	0.1	4.1	.609
Prefer Not to say	6.4	2.3	3.2	12.7	.905
Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 13.5: Proportion of the Population Subjected to Sexual Violence by a Partner or Ex-partner

	Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
YES	62.2	11.2	39.0	80.9	1.411
NO	37.8	11.2	19.1	61.0	1.411
Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 13.6: (SDG Indicator 16.3.1) Reporting Last Incident of Physical Violence to the Police or Other Competent Authorities

	Responses		Percent of
	N	Percent	Cases
Yes, to the police	96	8.2%	8.5%
Yes, to Chief	1	0.1%	0.1%
Yes, to Alkalo	9	0.8%	0.8%
Yes, to Religious Leader	4	0.3%	0.4%
Yes, to Elders in the community	33	2.8%	2.9%
Reported elsewhere	83	7.1%	7.4%
Not reported to any authority	902	76.9%	79.9%
Don't know	13	1.1%	1.2%
Prefer Not to say	32	2.7%	2.8%
Total	1173	100.0%	103.9%

Table 13.7: (SDG Indicator 16.3.1) Reporting Last Incident of Sexual Violence to the Police or Other Competent Authorities

	Responses		Percent of
	N	Percent	N
Yes, to the police	3	1.4%	1.5%
Yes, to Alkalo	1	0.5%	0.5%
Yes, to Religious Leader	2	1.0%	1.0%
Yes, to Elders in the community	2	1.0%	1.0%
Reported elsewhere, specify	12	5.7%	5.9%
Not reported to any authority	181	86.6%	88.3%
Don't know	1	0.5%	0.5%
Prefer Not to say	7	3.3%	3.4%
Total	209	100.0%	102.0%

Table 13.8: Reason for Not Reporting Last Incident of Sexual Violence

	Responses		Percent of
	N	Percent	Cases
It came to the attention of the authorities in another way	1	0.5%	0.6%
Not serious enough, I did Not consider it a crime	30	14.2%	16.6%
I solved it myself	77	36.5%	42.5%
I knew the offender and did Not want to report them	23	10.9%	12.7%
I did Not want to deal with the police/authorities // Dislike or fear of police/authorities	4	1.9%	2.2%
I did Not know the procedure for reporting	2	0.9%	1.1%
The cost associated with the procedure is expensive	4	1.9%	2.2%
Fear of reprisal by the offender or by others	24	11.4%	13.3%
I did not know where to report	19	9.0%	10.5%
Other reason (specify)	20	9.5%	11.0%
Don't know	1	0.5%	0.6%
Prefer not to say	6	2.8%	3.3%
Total	211	100.0%	116.6%

Table 13.9: Reason for Not Reporting Last Incident of Physical Violence

	Responses		Percent of
	N	Percent	Cases
Somebody else reported it	11	1.0%	1.2%
It came to the attention of the authorities in another way	2	0.2%	0.2%
Not serious enough, I did Not consider it a crime	218	20.8%	24.2%
I solved it myself	397	37.8%	44.0%
I knew the offender and did Not want to report them	180	17.2%	20.0%
I believed the police/competent authority could do Nothing	2	0.2%	0.2%
I believed the police/competent authority would do Nothing	3	0.3%	0.3%
I did Not want to deal with the police/authorities // Dislike or fear of police/authorities	30	2.9%	3.3%
I did Not know the procedure for reporting	5	0.5%	0.6%
The cost associated with the procedure is expensive	3	0.3%	0.3%
Fear of reprisal by the offender or by others	19	1.8%	2.1%
I did Not know where to report	97	9.2%	10.8%
Other reason	68	6.5%	7.5%
Don't know	4	0.4%	0.4%
Prefer Not to say	10	1.0%	1.1%
Total	1049	100.0%	116.3%

Table 13.10: Proportion of the Population Subjected to Physical Violence by Sex

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Male	YES	4.8	0.6	3.6	6.2	1.012
	NO	95.2	0.6	93.8	96.4	1.012
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Female	YES	3.4	0.6	2.3	4.9	1.818
	NO	96.6	0.6	95.1	97.7	1.818
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 13.11: Proportion of the Population Subjected to Sexual Violence by Sex

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Male	YES	0.4	0.1	0.2	0.8	.529
	NO	99.6	0.1	99.2	99.8	.529
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Female	YES	1.4	0.4	0.8	2.4	1.479
	NO	98.6	0.4	97.6	99.2	1.479
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 13.12: Proportion of the Population Subjected to Physical or Sexual Violence by Sex

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Male	No	94.9	0.6	93.5	96.1	.961
	Yes	5.1	0.6	3.9	6.5	.961
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Female	No	95.4	0.7	93.8	96.6	1.576
	Yes	4.6	0.7	3.4	6.2	1.576
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 13.13: Proportion of the Population Subjected to Physical Violence by Age

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
15-19	Yes	7.6	1.4	5.3	10.9	1.112
	No	92.4	1.4	89.1	94.7	1.112
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
20-24	Yes	5.1	1.8	2.5	10.1	2.234
	No	94.9	1.8	89.9	97.5	2.234
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
25-29	Yes	3.5	1.0	2.0	6.1	1.240
	No	96.5	1.0	93.9	98.0	1.240
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
30-34	Yes	5.5	1.6	3.0	9.7	1.586
	No	94.5	1.6	90.3	97.0	1.586
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
35-39	Yes	3.6	1.2	1.9	6.8	1.187
	No	96.4	1.2	93.2	98.1	1.187
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

40-44	Yes	1.6	0.8	0.5	4.4	.979
	No	98.4	0.8	95.6	99.5	.979
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
45-49	Yes	1.5	1.1	0.4	6.2	1.227
	No	98.5	1.1	93.8	99.6	1.227
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
50-54	Yes	2.0	1.2	0.6	6.4	.795
	No	98.0	1.2	93.6	99.4	.795
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
55-59	Yes	2.0	1.4	0.5	8.1	.952
	No	98.0	1.4	91.9	99.5	.952
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
60-64	Yes	0.8	0.8	0.1	5.8	.577
	No	99.2	0.8	94.2	99.9	.577
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
65-69	No	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
70-74	No	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
75-79	No	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
80-84	No	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
85+	No	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 13.14: Proportion of the Population Subjected to Sexual Violence by Age

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
15-19	Yes	1.9	1.1	0.6	5.9	2.675
	No	98.1	1.1	94.1	99.4	2.675
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
20-24	Yes	2.3	0.9	1.0	4.8	1.173
	No	97.7	0.9	95.2	99.0	1.173
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
25-29	Yes	1.0	0.4	0.5	2.3	.741
	No	99.0	0.4	97.7	99.5	.741
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
30-34	Yes	0.7	0.5	0.2	2.6	.960
	No	99.3	0.5	97.4	99.8	.960
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
35-39	Yes	0.8	0.5	0.2	2.9	.983
	No	99.2	0.5	97.1	99.8	.983
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
40-44	Yes	0.2	0.2	0.0	1.3	.385
	No	99.8	0.2	98.7	100.0	.385
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
45-49	No	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
50-54	No	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
55-59	No	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
60-64	No	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
65-69	No	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
70-74	No	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
75-79	No	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
80-84	No	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
85+	No	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
-------	-------	-----	-------	-------	---

Table 13.15: Proportion of the Population Subjected to Physical or Sexual Violence by Age

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
15-19	No	90.6	1.6	87.0	93.3	1.205
	Yes	9.4	1.6	6.7	13.0	1.205
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
20-24	No	93.3	1.9	88.6	96.2	1.883
	Yes	6.7	1.9	3.8	11.4	1.883
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
25-29	No	95.6	1.1	92.8	97.4	1.297
	Yes	4.4	1.1	2.6	7.2	1.297
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
30-34	No	93.8	1.7	89.6	96.4	1.496
	Yes	6.2	1.7	3.6	10.4	1.496
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
35-39	No	95.6	1.3	92.3	97.5	1.110
	Yes	4.4	1.3	2.5	7.7	1.110
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
40-44	No	98.3	0.8	95.5	99.3	.922
	Yes	1.7	0.8	0.7	4.5	.922
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
45-49	No	98.5	1.1	93.8	99.6	1.227
	Yes	1.5	1.1	0.4	6.2	1.227
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
50-54	No	98.0	1.2	93.6	99.4	.795
	Yes	2.0	1.2	0.6	6.4	.795
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
55-59	No	98.0	1.4	91.9	99.5	.952
	Yes	2.0	1.4	0.5	8.1	.952
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
60-64	No	99.2	0.8	94.2	99.9	.577
	Yes	0.8	0.8	0.1	5.8	.577
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
65-69	No	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
70-74	No	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	.

	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
75-79	No	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
80-84	No	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
85+	No	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

14 OWNERSHIP OR SECURE RIGHTS OVER AGRICULTURAL LAND

Table 14.1: **(Indicator 5.a.1)** Proportion of total agricultural population with ownership or secure rights over agricultural land

	Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
No	36.0	3.0	30.2	42.1	4.628
Yes	64.0	3.0	57.9	69.8	4.628
Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

Table 14.2: **(Indicator 5.b.1)** Proportion of women in the agricultural population with ownership or tenure rights over agricultural land

		Per cent	Standard Error	95 Confidence Interval		Design Effect
Male	No	37.5	3.4	31.1	44.4	2.422
	Yes	62.5	3.4	55.6	68.9	2.422
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.
Female	No	34.8	3.4	28.4	41.9	3.536
	Yes	65.2	3.4	58.1	71.6	3.536
	Total	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	.

15 ACCESS TO PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Table 15.1: Percentage Share of Population That Uses Transport Modes for Major Movements (e.g. home to work, home to shopping, home to recreation areas, etc.)

	Walking	Cycling	Public Transport	Private Car	Donkey/Horse/Horse or donkey Cart	others	Total
The Gambia	46.6	8.5	37.0	4.6	1.9	1.4	100.0
Urban	32.4	7.2	52.1	7.1	0.0	1.1	100.0
Rural	69.3	10.6	12.8	0.7	4.9	1.8	100.0
Male	38.6	15.8	34.8	6.7	1.9	2.1	100.0
Female	53.0	3.1	38.2	3.1	1.7	0.9	100.0
Persons with Functional Difficulties	43.2	7.4	30.0	8.9	9.7	0.8	100.0

Table 15.2: Proportion of Population That Has Access to Public Transport by Sex, Place of Residence and Persons with Functional Difficulties

	Buses (formally managed and regulated)	Buses (informally managed Not regulated)	Informal publicly shared taxis (including minivans)	Ferries	Others
The Gambia	15.9	26.3	90.8	32.7	7.4
Urban	11.2	24.9	97.0	35.0	8.3
Rural	35.9	32.0	64.1	23.0	13.2
Male	20.2	27.8	90.9	37.0	8.2
Female	12.8	25.4	90.9	30.3	7.2
Persons with Functional Difficulties	21.4	21.0	71.2	24.2	8.3

16 EXPERIENCE OF DISPUTE IN THE PAST TWO YEARS

Table 16.1: Proportion of the population who have experienced a dispute in the past two years and who accessed a formal or informal dispute resolution mechanism

	Numerator: Number of respondents who experienced a dispute during the past two years who accessed a formal or informal dispute resolution mechanism (b)	Denominator: Number of respondents who experienced a dispute in the past two years, minus those who are voluntarily self-excluded (e)	[Numerator / Denominator] * 100
The Gambia	331	714	46.4
Area			
Urban	247	520	47.5
Rural	84	194	43.3
Sex			
Male	167	321	52.0
Female	153	365	41.9
Functional Difficulties			
With functional difficulties	13	1109	0.01
Without functional difficulties	305	654	46.6

Table 16.2: Dispute experienced by Type of Dispute

	Responses		Percent of
	N	Percent	Cases
Problems with land	124	4.7	10.4
Issues with housing	179	6.9	14.9
Tried to resolve family issues	271	10.4	22.6
Issues with compensation for injuries	112	4.3	9.3
Problems with employment or labor	156	6.0	13.0
Problems with government payments	66	2.5	5.5
Problems with government and public services	312	11.9	26.0
Problems with other goods and services	225	8.6	18.8
Issues with money, debt or financial services	464	17.8	38.7
Environmental issues affecting you	434	16.6	36.2
Neighborhood disputes	270	10.3	22.5
Total	2613	100.0	218.1

Table 16.3: Access to Dispute Resolution Mechanisms

	Responses		Percent of
	N	Percent	Cases
Court or tribunal	37	8.1	11.2
Police (or other law enforcement)	87	19.0	26.3
Government or municipal office	41	9.0	12.4
Religious leader or authority	37	8.1	11.2
Community leader or authority	128	28.0	38.7
lawyer, solicitor, or paralegal	13	2.8	3.9
Other formal complaints	11	2.4	3.3
Sought other external help	9	2.0	2.7
Other person	94	20.6	28.4
Total	457	100.0	138.1

Table 16.4: Most Recent Dispute Experienced

	Per cent	Standard Error
Problems with land, or buying and selling property (for example, dispute over a property title, the right to pass through property, or illegally occupying land)	4.0	0.7
Issues with housing (for example, problems with a landlord or tenant over rent; damage or repairs; or eviction)	6.3	1.0
Trying to resolve family issues (for example, divorce, child support, child custody, or a will)	7.8	0.9
Seeking compensation for injuries or illness caused by an accident, poor workplace conditions, or wrong medical treatment	1.7	0.5
Problems with employment or Labour (for example, being dismissed unfairly, problems obtaining wages or benefits, or harassment)	2.8	0.5
Problems with government payments (including cash transfers, pensions, education grants, or disability benefits)	1.0	0.3
Government and public services other than payments (including problems accessing healthcare and education, problems obtaining ID or other personal government documents, lack of access to water or electricity)	11.5	1.4
Problems with other goods and services (for example, problems related to poor professional services, faulty goods)	6.4	0.8
Issues with money, debt or financial services (such as being unable to pay bills or debts, or problems collecting money)	20.5	1.6
Environmental issues affecting you, your property or your community (for example land or water pollution, waste dumping)	20.6	2.0
Neighbourhood disputes, including problems with neighbours over noise, vandalism	17.3	1.8
Total	100.0	0.0

Table 16.5: Problem or Dispute Ongoing or Done with

	Per cent	Standard Error
Ongoing	49.3	2.1
Done with, but problem persists	9.5	1.1
Done with, problem resolved	39.7	2.1
Don't know	0.3	0.1
Prefer not to say	1.2	0.6
Total	100.0	0.0

Table 16.6: Reasons for Not Trying to Resolve a Dispute/Problem

	Per cent	Standard Error
I think/thought the problem is/was not important enough	19.1	1.7
I was/am confident that I could/can easily resolve it by myself	34.4	2.2
I caused the problem / Up to the other party	3.5	0.8
I did not know where to go to	11.0	1.3
I could not obtain legal assistance	0.3	0.1
It was too far away or hard to get to	0.1	0.1
It was too expensive or inconvenient	0.8	0.3
I did not trust the authorities	3.1	0.9
I did not think they could help	7.7	1.2
I was afraid of the consequences for my family or me	8.5	1.5
Other reason	6.5	1.1
Don't know	3.6	0.9
Prefer not to say	1.5	0.4
Total	100.0	0.0

Table 16.7: Institution That Took the Final Decision in the Dispute

	Per cent	Standard Error
No decision was taken: the dispute was dropped, or was resolved otherwise	66.7	2.5
No decision was taken, because the case still ongoing	4.2	0.9
Court or tribunal	1.5	0.5
Police (or other law enforcement)	4.7	1.1
A government or municipal office or other formal designated authority or agency	1.3	0.5
Religious leader or authority	1.8	1.3
Community leader or authority (such as village elder, or local leader)	8.1	1.3
Lawyer, solicitor, paralegal	0.2	0.2
Other formal complaints or appeal process	0.1	0.1
Other external help, such as mediation, conciliation, arbitration	0.6	0.3
Other person or organisation	7.3	1.4
98 - Don't know	3.3	0.9
99 - Prefer not to say	0.2	0.1
Total	100.0	0.0