

# 2017 Population and Housing Census <br> Release 1 <br> Age, Sex, Geography and Economic Activity 

A total of 884,887 persons were enumerated in the 2017 Population and Housing Census, These Fiji residents were living in 191,910 Private Households and 1,224 Institutions on Census night, the $17^{\text {th }}$ of September, 2017. The count was $5.7 \%(47,616)$ higher than the 837,271 persons enumerated in 2007. Other data sources indicate coverage of around $99.5 \%$, hence the findings will more or less provide a complete picture of Fiji's population and housing situation at the time of the Census. Information on economic activity reflects the situation in the week before September 17.

The average annual rate of population growth over the decade up to September 2017 was $0.6 \%$. The annual rate of population growth has been decreasing that is from $2 \%$ in 1986, $0.8 \%$ in 1996 and $0.6 \%$ in 2017. The decline is mainly due to lower birth rates and out migration.

The Median Age of the Population is 27.5 years, which means that half of Fiji's population is below that age. The Median Age was 17.8 in 1976, 20.6 in 1986, 21.2 in 1996 and 25.1 in 2007.

The proportion of Fiji's urban population continued to increase. The proportion of Fiji's population living in urban areas was $37.2 \%$ in $1976,38.7 \%$ in $1986,46.4 \%$ in $1996,50.7 \%$ in 2007 and $55.9 \%$ in 2017. The significant growth between 1986 and 1996 was partly due to the extension of Urban Boundaries which is the case for 2017 as well.

When compared to 2007, the Urban Population increased by 69,406 ( $16.3 \%$ ) while the Rural Population decreased by 21,790 ( $5.3 \%$ ). Further details are presented in Table 1 that follows;

Table 1. Total Population by Urban and Rural, 1976-2017

| Census <br> Year | Population | Annual <br> Growth <br> Rate (\%) | Median <br> Age <br> (years) | Urban | \% | Rural | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1976 | 588,068 | 2.1 | 17.8 | 218,495 | 37.2 | 369,573 | 62.8 |
| 1986 | 715,375 | 2.0 | 20.6 | 277,025 | 38.7 | 438,350 | 61.3 |
| 1996 | 775,077 | 0.8 | 21.2 | 359,495 | 46.4 | 415,582 | 53.6 |
| 2007 | 837,271 | 0.7 | 25.1 | 424,846 | 50.7 | 412,425 | 49.3 |
| 2017 | 884,887 | 0.6 | 27.5 | 494,252 | 55.9 | 390,635 | 44.1 |

## Age and Sex Distribution by Urban and Rural Residence

The Median Age for Males is 27.2 compared to 27.8 for Females. Males accounted for slightly over a half ( $50.7 \%$ ) of the population with the sex ratio of 102 , that is 102 Males for every 100 Females. The proportion of Males is higher in the age groups $0-4$ up to 55-59. Females accounted for $51.4 \%$ of the population in the age group $60-64$ and close to $60 \%$ in the age group 75+ indicating greater Female longevity.

The delineation of Urban Boundaries uses the following set of criteria;

1) Urban Attributes
2) Economic Activity
3) Population Size
4) Association and Contiguity with a Town or City
5) Population Density

In the Urban Areas;

- The Median Age was 27.9 with the Male and Female Ages being 27.5 and 28.3 respectively.
- The proportion of Males is higher in the age-groups; $0-4,5-9,10-14,25-29$ and up to 45-49.
- The proportion of Females is higher in the age groups 15-19, 20-24, 50-54 and higher.
- The proportion of Females in the age-group 75+ was $62.5 \%$

In the Rural Areas;

- The Median Age was 27.0 with the Male and Female Ages being 26.9 and 27.1 respectively.
- The proportion of Males is higher in the age groups 0-4 up to 65-69.
- The proportion of Females in the age group $75+$ was $57.0 \%$.

Further details are presented in Table 2 that follows;

Table 2. Population by 5-year Age Group, Urban and Rural by Sex and Median Age, 2017

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{AgeGroup} \& \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Total} \& \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Urban} \& \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Rural} \\
\hline \& Total \& Male \& \% \& Female \& \% \& Total \& \% \& Male \& \% \& Female \& \% \& Total \& \% \& Male \& \% \& Female \& \% \\
\hline Total \& 884,887 \& 448,595 \& 50.7\% \& 436,292 \& 49.3\% \& 494,252 \& 55.9\% \& 245,928 \& 49.8\% \& 248,324 \& 50.2\% \& 390,635 \& 44.1\% \& 202,667 \& 51.9\% \& 187,968 \& 48.1\% \\
\hline 0-4 \& 91,897 \& 47,195 \& 51.4\% \& 44,702 \& 48.6\% \& 47,904 \& 52.1\% \& 24,614 \& 51.4\% \& 23,290 \& 48.6\% \& 43,993 \& 47.9\% \& 22,581 \& 51.3\% \& 21,412 \& 48.7\% \\
\hline 5-9 \& 88,295 \& 45,243 \& 51.2\% \& 43,052 \& 48.8\% \& 45, 436 \& 51.5\% \& 23,231 \& 51.1\% \& 22,205 \& 48.9\% \& 42,859 \& 48.5\% \& 22,012 \& 51.4\% \& 20,847 \& 48.6\% \\
\hline 10-14 \& 79,596 \& 40,715 \& 51.2\% \& 38,881 \& 48.8\% \& 40,784 \& 51.2\% \& 20,676 \& 50.7\% \& 20,108 \& 49.3\% \& 38,812 \& 48.8\% \& 20,039 \& 51.6\% \& 18,773 \& 48.4\% \\
\hline 15-19 \& 74,088 \& 38,032 \& 51.3\% \& 36,056 \& 48.7\% \& 42,045 \& 56.8\% \& 20,713 \& 49.3\% \& 21,332 \& 50.7\% \& 32,043 \& 43.2\% \& 17,319 \& 54.0\% \& 14,724 \& 46.0\% \\
\hline 20-24 \& 73,616 \& 37,464 \& 50.9\% \& 36,152 \& 49.1\% \& 46,942 \& 63.8\% \& 23,397 \& 49.8\% \& 23,545 \& 50.2\% \& 26,674 \& 36.2\% \& 14,067 \& 52.7\% \& 12,607 \& 47.3\% \\
\hline 25-29 \& 69,308 \& 35,253 \& 50.9\% \& 34,055 \& 49.1\% \& 41,756 \& 60.2\% \& 21,030 \& 50.4\% \& 20,726 \& 49.6\% \& 27,552 \& 39.8\% \& 14,223 \& 51.6\% \& 13,329 \& 48.4\% \\
\hline 30-34 \& 68,818 \& 35,266 \& 51.2\% \& 33,552 \& 48.8\% \& 40,741 \& 59.2\% \& 20,609 \& 50.6\% \& 20,132 \& 49.4\% \& 28,077 \& 40.8\% \& 14,657 \& 52.2\% \& 13,420 \& 47.8\% \\
\hline 35-39 \& 65,150 \& 33,382 \& 51.2\% \& 31,768 \& 48.8\% \& 37,684 \& 57.8\% \& 18,904 \& 50.2\% \& 18,780 \& 49.8\% \& 27,466 \& 42.2\% \& 14,478 \& 52.7\% \& 12,988 \& 47.3\% \\
\hline 40-44 \& 53,514 \& 27,697 \& 51.8\% \& 25,817 \& 48.2\% \& 30,590 \& 57.2\% \& 15,476 \& 50.6\% \& 15,114 \& 49.4\% \& 22,924 \& 42.8\% \& 12,221 \& 53.3\% \& 10,703 \& 46.7\% \\
\hline 45-49 \& 49,504 \& 25,314 \& 51.1\% \& 24,190 \& 48.9\% \& 27,872 \& 56.3\% \& 13,998 \& 50.2\% \& 13,874 \& 49.8\% \& 21,632 \& 43.7\% \& 11,316 \& 52.3\% \& 10,316 \& 47.7\% \\
\hline 50-54 \& 48,610 \& 24,649 \& 50.7\% \& 23,961 \& 49.3\% \& 26,585 \& 54.7\% \& 13,241 \& 49.8\% \& 13,344 \& 50.2\% \& 22,025 \& 45.3\% \& 11,408 \& 51.8\% \& 10,617 \& 48.2\% \\
\hline 55-59 \& 42,008 \& 21,263 \& 50.6\% \& 20,745 \& 49.4\% \& 23,113 \& 55.0\% \& 11,249 \& 48.7\% \& 11,864 \& 51.3\% \& 18,895 \& 45.0\% \& 10,014 \& 53.0\% \& 8,881 \& 47.0\% \\
\hline 60-64 \& 30,615 \& 14,891 \& 48.6\% \& 15,724 \& 51.4\% \& 16,744 \& 54.7\% \& 7,805 \& 46.6\% \& 8,939 \& 53.4\% \& 13,871 \& 45.3\% \& 7,086 \& 51.1\% \& 6,785 \& 48.9\% \\
\hline 65-69 \& 21,328 \& 10,076 \& 47.2\% \& 11,252 \& 52.8\% \& 11,469 \& 53.8\% \& 5,138 \& 44.8\% \& 6,331 \& 55.2\% \& 9,859 \& 46.2\% \& 4,938 \& 50.1\% \& 4,921 \& 49.9\% \\
\hline 70-74 \& 14,148 \& 6,367 \& 45.0\% \& 7,781 \& 55.0\% \& 7,342 \& 51.9\% \& 3,131 \& 42.6\% \& 4,211 \& 57.4\% \& 6,806 \& 48.1\% \& 3,236 \& 47.5\% \& 3,570 \& 52.5\% \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
75+ \\
Median \\
Age
\end{tabular} \& 14,392
27.5 \& 5,788
27.2 \& 40.2\% \& 8,604
27.8 \& 59.8\% \& 7,245

27.9 \& 50.3\% \& 2,716
27.5 \& 37.5\% \& 4,529
28.3 \& 62.5\% \& 7,147
27.0 \& 49.7\% \& 3,072
26.9 \& 43.0\% \& 4,075
27.1 \& 57.0\% <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

## Age and Sex Structure

Figure 1. that follows is a Population Pyramid showing Fiji's age-sex structure as at Census Night 2017. The broad base of the structure indicates a population that is young with 10.4 percent of the population under five years of age while $16.7 \%$ are in the youth age group of 15-24.

Figure 1. Age-Sex Structure of Population, Fiji 2017


Figure 2. that follows shows the age-sex composition of rural and urban dwellers in 2017. There are marked differences with the Rural population having a higher proportion in the young age groups 0-4, 5-9 and 10-14. On the other hand, a higher proportion of Urban dwellers are in the age groups 20-24, 25-29, 30-34 and 35-39.

The Urban and Rural age structures show some differences for Males and Females. For instance a higher proportion of Urban Females compared to Rural Females are in the age groups 15-19, 55-59 and 60-64, unlike their Male counterparts who make up a lower proportion of these age groups in comparison to Rural dwellers.

Figure 2. Age-Sex Structure of Urban and Rural Population, Fiji, 2017


## Population by Province

Table 3 below presents the 2007 and 2017 population numbers by province. Ba was the most populous province with its 247,708 residents accounting for $28.0 \%$ of Fiji's population. The second largest province, Naitasiri recorded the highest inter-censal population increase of $16,918(10.5 \%)$ with 177,678 persons counted.

The provinces of Tailevu and Rewa also recorded significant population increases of 8,860 ( $15.9 \%$ ) and 7,021 ( $7.0 \%$ ) respectively.

The Northern Division provinces of Bua and Cakaudrove recorded population increases of $9.1 \%$ and $2.3 \%$ respectively while the population of Macuata continued to decrease. Macuata's census count of 65,983 was $6,458(8.9 \%)$ lower than a decade ago continuing the trend that was first observed during the inter-censal period of 1996 and 2007.

The population of Lau and Lomaiviti also recorded declines of $10.1 \%$ and $3.7 \%$ respectively.
Further details are presented in Table 3 that follows;

Table 3. Population by Province 2007 and 2017

| Province | Census Year |  | Absolute <br> Change | Percentage <br> Change |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ |  | 247,708 |
| Bua | 14,176 | 15,466 | 1,290 | $6.9 \%$ |
| Cakaudrove | 49,344 | 50,469 | 1,125 | $9.1 \%$ |
| Kadavu | 10,167 | 10,897 | 730 | $2.3 \%$ |
| Lau | 10,683 | 9,602 | $-1,081$ | $-10.1 \%$ |
| Lomaiviti | 16,253 | 15,657 | -596 | $-3.7 \%$ |
| Macuata | 72,441 | 65,983 | $-6,458$ | $-8.9 \%$ |
| Nadroga/Navosa | 58,387 | 58,931 | 544 | $0.9 \%$ |
| Naitasiri | 160,760 | 177,678 | 16,918 | $10.5 \%$ |
| Namosi | 6,898 | 7,871 | 973 | $14.1 \%$ |
| Ra | 29,464 | 30,432 | 968 | $3.3 \%$ |
| Rewa | 100,995 | 108,016 | 7,021 | $7.0 \%$ |
| Serua | 18,249 | 20,031 | 1,782 | $9.8 \%$ |
| Tailevu | 55,692 | 64,552 | 8,860 | $15.9 \%$ |
| Rotuma | 2,002 | 1,594 | -408 | $-20.4 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{8 3 7 , 2 7 1}$ | $\mathbf{8 8 4 , 8 8 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 3 , 2 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 7 \%}$ |

## Urban Population

Fiji's urban population reached 494,252 in 2017, an increase of 69,406 (16.3\%) compared to 2007. The count shows that $55.9 \%$ of Fiji's population live in the Urban Areas, an increase of 5.1 percentage points compared to 2007 . Much of the growth was due to the extension of the urban boundaries to cover growth in Nadi, Lautoka and parts of Taveuni in Cakaudrove.

There were significant increases in the urban population of the following provinces;

1) Ba by 44,413 or $36.7 \%$ with the Urban proportion of Ba's population increasing from $52.2 \%$ in 2007 to $66.8 \%$ in 2017.
2) Naitasiri by 13,664 or $10.1 \%$ with the Urban proportion of Naitasiri's population sitting at a very high $83.7 \%$.
3) Cakaudrove by 3,965 or $56.4 \%$ with the Urban proportion of Cakaudrove's population increasing from $14.3 \%$ in in 2007 to $21.8 \%$ in 2017.
4) Rewa by 4,720 or $5.3 \%$ with the Urban proportion of Rewa's population now at $86.5 \%$.
5) Tailevu by 2,497 or $14.0 \%$ with the Urban proportion of Tailevu's population now at 31.5\%.

Further details are provided in Table 4 that follows;

Table 4. Urban Population by Province 2007 and 2017

| Province | Urban |  |  |  | Absolute Change | \% Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Census Year |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2007 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \\ \text { Urban } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2017 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \\ \text { Urban } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Ba | 120,998 | 52.2 | 165,411 | 66.8 | 44,413 | 36.7\% |
| Bua | 592 | 4.2 | 625 | 4.0 | 33 | 5.6\% |
| Cakaudrove | 7,034 | 14.3 | 10,999 | 21.8 | 3,965 | 56.4\% |
| Kadavu | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Lau | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Lomaiviti | 4,397 | 26.7 | 4,250 | 27.1 | -147 | -3.3\% |
| Macuata | 28,765 | 39.7 | 27,182 | 41.2 | -1,583 | -5.5\% |
| Nadroga/Navosa | 9,622 | 16.5 | 10,293 | 17.5 | 671 | 7.0\% |
| Naitasiri | 135,033 | 84.0 | 148,697 | 83.7 | 13,664 | 10.1\% |
| Namosi | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ra | 4,952 | 16.8 | 5,987 | 19.7 | 1,035 | 20.9\% |
| Rewa | 88,763 | 88.1 | 93,483 | 86.5 | 4,720 | 5.3\% |
| Serua | 6,867 | 37.6 | 7,005 | 35.0 | 138 | 2.0\% |
| Tailevu | 17,823 | 32.0 | 20,320 | 31.5 | 2,497 | 14.0\% |
| Rotuma | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total | 424,846 |  | 494,252 |  | 69,406 | 16.3\% |

## Rural Population

Fiji's rural population was 390,635 at the time of the 2017 Population Census, a decrease of $21,790(5.3 \%)$ compared to 2007. The count shows that $44.1 \%$ of Fiji's population live in the Rural Areas which is a decrease of 5.1 percentage points compared to 2007.

A combination of Out-Migration and the extension of the Urban Boundaries were the main causes of decline in the number of rural dwellers in the following provinces;

- Ba by 28,465 with the Rural proportion of Ba's population decreasing from $47.8 \%$ in 2007 to $31.2 \%$ in 2017.
- Cakaudrove by 2,840 with the Rural proportion of Cakaudrove's population decreasing from $85.7 \%$ in 2007 to $78.2 \%$ in 2017

The population of Rural Macuata decreased by 4,875 and this was due mainly to the movement of people out of the rural areas. The Rural proportion of Macuata's population decreased from $60.3 \%$ in 2007 to $58.8 \%$ in 2017.

Further details are provided in Table 5 that follows;

Table 5. Rural Population by Province 2007 and 2017

| Province | Rural |  |  |  | Absolute Change | \% Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Census Year |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2007 | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { Rural } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2017 | $\%$ Rural |  |  |
| Ba | 110,762 | 47.8 | 82,297 | 31.2 | -28,465 | -25.7\% |
| Bua | 13,584 | 95.8 | 14,841 | 96.0 | 1,257 | 9.3\% |
| Cakaudrove | 42,310 | 85.7 | 39,470 | 78.2 | -2,840 | -6.7\% |
| Kadavu | 10,167 | 100.0 | 10,897 | 100.0 | 730 | 7.2\% |
| Lau | 10,683 | 100.0 | 9,602 | 100.0 | -1,081 | -10.1\% |
| Lomaiviti | 12,064 | 73.3 | 11,407 | 72.9 | -657 | -5.4\% |
| Macuata | 43,676 | 60.3 | 38,801 | 58.8 | -4,875 | -11.2\% |
| Nadroga/Navosa | 48,765 | 83.5 | 48,638 | 82.5 | -127 | -0.3\% |
| Naitasiri | 25,727 | 16.0 | 28,981 | 16.3 | 3,254 | 12.6\% |
| Namosi | 6,898 | 100.0 | 7,871 | 100.0 | 973 | 14.1\% |
| Ra | 24,512 | 83.2 | 24,445 | 80.3 | -67 | -0.3\% |
| Rewa | 12,024 | 11.9 | 14,533 | 13.5 | 2,509 | 20.9\% |
| Serua | 11,382 | 62.4 | 13,026 | 65.0 | 1,644 | 14.4\% |
| Tailevu | 37,869 | 68.0 | 44,232 | 68.5 | 6,363 | 16.8\% |
| Rotuma | 2,002 | 100.0 | 1,594 | 100.0 | -408 | -20.4\% |
| Total | 412,425 |  | 390,635 |  | -21,790 | -5.3\% |

## Gender Perspective of Urban Population

Female numbers showed a higher level of increase in the urban areas of the following provinces over the decade up to September 2017;

1) Naitasiri with $7,750(11.47 \%)$ compared to 5,914 ( $8.77 \%$ ) for Males.
2) Tailevu with $1,425(16.32 \%)$ compared to $1,072(11.79 \%)$ for Males.
3) Rewa with 2,522 ( $5.67 \%$ ) compared to 2,198 ( $4.96 \%$ ) for Males.

Comparisons for other provinces for the urban population by gender is illustrated in Table 6 .

Table 6. Urban Population by Province and Sex 2007 and 2017

| Province | Urban |  |  |  | Absolute Change |  | \% Change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2007 |  | 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Males | Females | Males | Females | Males | Females | Males | Females |
| Ba | 60,744 | 60,256 | 82,841 | 82,570 | 22,097 | 22,314 | 36.38\% | 37.03\% |
| Bua | 311 | 281 | 305 | 320 | -6 | 39 | -1.93\% | 13.88\% |
| Cakaudrove | 3,585 | 3,449 | 5,612 | 5,387 | 2,027 | 1,938 | 56.54\% | 56.19\% |
| Kadavu | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Lau | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Lomaiviti | 2,217 | 2,180 | 2,119 | 2,131 | -98 | -49 | -4.42\% | -2.25\% |
| Macuata | 14,086 | 14,679 | 13,376 | 13,806 | -710 | -873 | -5.04\% | -5.95\% |
| Nadroga/Navosa | 4,730 | 4,892 | 5,097 | 5,196 | 367 | 304 | 7.76\% | 6.21\% |
| Naitasiri | 67,463 | 67,570 | 73,377 | 75,320 | 5,914 | 7,750 | 8.77\% | 11.47\% |
| Namosi | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ra | 2,510 | 2,455 | 3,030 | 2,957 | 520 | 502 | 20.72\% | 20.45\% |
| Rewa | 44,301 | 44,462 | 46,499 | 46,984 | 2,198 | 2,522 | 4.96\% | 5.67\% |
| Serua | 3,417 | 3,450 | 3,509 | 3,496 | 92 | 46 | 2.69\% | 1.33\% |
| Tailevu | 9,091 | 8,732 | 10,163 | 10,157 | 1,072 | 1,425 | 11.79\% | 16.32\% |
| Rotuma | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total | 212,455 | 212,406 | 245,928 | 248,324 | 33,473 | 35,918 | 15.76\% | 16.91\% |

## Gender Perspective of Rural Population

Male numbers showed a higher level of increase in the Rural areas of the following provinces over the decade up to September 2017;

1) Kadavu with 606 (11.28\%) compared to 124 (2.59\%) for Females.
2) Rewa with $1,342(21.09 \%)$ compared to 959 ( $16.34 \%$ ) for Females.
3) Tailevu with $3,275(16.30 \%)$ compared to 3,088 ( $17.38 \%$ ) for Females.

Comparisons for other provinces for the rural population by gender is illustrated in Table 7.

Table 7. Rural Population by Province and Sex 2007 and 2017

| Province | Rural |  |  |  | Absolute Change |  | \% Change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2007 |  | 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Males | Females | Males | Females | Males | Females | Males | Females |
| Ba | 57,332 | 53,428 | 42,413 | 39,884 | -14,919 | -13,544 | -26.02\% | -25.35\% |
| Bua | 7,098 | 6,486 | 7,710 | 7,131 | 612 | 645 | 8.62\% | 9.94\% |
| Cakaudrove | 22,286 | 20,024 | 20,702 | 18,768 | -1,584 | -1,256 | -7.11\% | -6.27\% |
| Kadavu | 5,374 | 4,793 | 5,980 | 4,917 | 606 | 124 | 11.28\% | 2.59\% |
| Lau | 5,763 | 4,920 | 5,173 | 4,429 | -590 | -491 | -10.24\% | -9.98\% |
| Lomaiviti | 6,328 | 5,528 | 5,983 | 5,424 | -345 | -104 | -5.45\% | -1.88\% |
| Macuata | 22,472 | 21,204 | 19,808 | 18,993 | -2,664 | -2,211 | -11.85\% | -10.43\% |
| Nadroga/Navosa | 25,464 | 23,301 | 25,191 | 23,447 | -273 | 146 | -1.07\% | 0.63\% |
| Naitasiri | 13,100 | 12,627 | 14,681 | 14,300 | 1,581 | 1,673 | 12.07\% | 13.25\% |
| Namosi | 3,557 | 3,341 | 4,063 | 3,808 | 506 | 467 | 14.23\% | 13.98\% |
| Ra | 12,566 | 11,933 | 12,494 | 11,951 | -72 | 18 | -0.57\% | 0.15\% |
| Rewa | 6,363 | 5,869 | 7,705 | 6,828 | 1342 | 959 | 21.09\% | 16.34\% |
| Serua | 5,858 | 5,524 | 6,574 | 6,452 | 716 | 928 | 12.22\% | 16.80\% |
| Tailevu | 20,098 | 17,771 | 23,373 | 20,859 | 3,275 | 3,088 | 16.30\% | 17.38\% |
| Rotuma | 1,046 | 956 | 817 | 777 | -229 | -179 | -21.89\% | -18.72\% |
| Total | 214,705 | 197,705 | 202,667 | 187,968 | -12,038 | -9,737 | -5.61\% | -4.93\% |

## Working Age Population and Economic Activity

All persons aged 15 and over who furnish or are available to furnish the supply of labour for the production of economic goods and services are Economically Active or are in the Labour Force. So basically the Labour Force is made up of those engaged in Paid or Unpaid Work or are Unemployed. The Unemployed are those who are available or looking for work.

Some features of Fiji's Population Aged 15 and above;

- There are more Females in the Central Division.
- There are more Females in the Urban Areas and this is consistent throughout the four administrative divisions.
- The Labour Force Participation rate is highest in the Eastern Division.
- There is a significant Gender differential in the Labour Force Participation Rates i.e. $76.4 \%$ for Males and $37.4 \%$ for Females.
- There is a significant Gender differential in the Unemployment Rates i.e. $2.9 \%$ for Males and 7.8\% for Females.
- There is a significant Gender Differential in the number of persons engaged in Paid and Unpaid Work i.e. 234,059 for Males and 106,680 for Females.

Further details are presented in Table 8 that follows;

Table 8. Population Aged 15 and Over by Labour Force Status by Division and Sex.

|  | Total |  |  | Urban |  |  | Rural |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
|  | Population Aged 15 and Over |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 625,099 | 315,442 | 309,657 | 360,128 | 177,407 | 182,721 | 264,971 | 138,035 | 126,936 |
| Central | 268,772 | 133,686 | 135,086 | 197,082 | 96,555 | 100,527 | 71,690 | 37,131 | 34,559 |
| Eastern | 24,237 | 13,112 | 11,125 | 2,883 | 1,428 | 1,455 | 21,354 | 11,684 | 9,670 |
| Western | 242,146 | 122,501 | 119,645 | 132,477 | 65,763 | 66,714 | 109,669 | 56,738 | 52,931 |
| Northern | 89,944 | 46,143 | 43,801 | 27,686 | 13,661 | 14,025 | 62,258 | 32,482 | 29,776 |
| Labour Force |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 356,789 | 241,091 | 115,698 | 198,903 | 128,326 | 70,577 | 157,886 | 112,765 | 45,121 |
| LFPR | 57.1\% | 76.4\% | 37.4\% | $55.2 \%$ | 72.3\% | 38.6\% | 59.6\% | 81.7\% | 35.5\% |
| Central | 151,987 | 97,920 | 54,067 | 107,536 | 67,618 | 39,918 | 44,451 | 30,302 | 14,149 |
| LFPR | 56.5\% | $73.2 \%$ | 40.0\% | 54.6\% | 70.0\% | 39.7\% | 62.0\% | 81.6\% | 40.9\% |
| Eastern | 15,836 | 10,923 | 4,913 | 1,730 | 1,075 | 655 | 14,106 | 9,848 | 4,258 |
| LFPR | 65.3\% | 83.3\% | $44.2 \%$ | 60.0\% | 75.3\% | 45.0\% | 66.1\% | 84.3\% | 44.0\% |
| Western | 136,449 | 94,892 | 41,557 | 73,956 | 49,213 | 24,743 | 62,493 | 45,679 | 16,814 |
| LFPR | 56.3\% | $77.5 \%$ | 34.7\% | 55.8\% | 74.8\% | 37.1\% | 57.0\% | 80.5\% | $31.8 \%$ |
| Northern | 52,517 | 37,356 | 15,161 | 15,681 | 10,420 | 5,261 | 36,836 | 26,936 | 9,900 |
| LFPR | 58.4\% | 81.0\% | $34.6 \%$ | 56.6\% | 76.3\% | 37.5\% | 59.2\% | 82.9\% | $33.2 \%$ |
| Paid and Unpaid Work |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 340,739 | 234,059 | 106,680 | 187,498 | 122,780 | 64,718 | 153,241 | 111,279 | 41,962 |
| Central | 144,118 | 94,289 | 49,829 | 100,876 | 64,329 | 36,547 | 43,242 | 29,960 | 13,282 |
| Eastern | 15,595 | 10,863 | 4,732 | 1,682 | 1,056 | 626 | 13,913 | 9,807 | 4,106 |
| Western | 129,548 | 91,919 | 37,629 | 69,517 | 47,081 | 22,436 | 60,031 | 44,838 | 15,193 |
| Northern | 51,478 | 36,988 | 14,490 | 15,423 | 10,314 | 5,109 | 36,055 | 26,674 | 9,381 |
| Unemployed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 16,050 | 7,032 | 9,018 | 11,405 | 5,545 | 5,859 | 4,645 | 1,486 | 3,159 |
| Unemployment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rate | 4.5\% | 2.9\% | 7.8\% | 5.7\% | 4.3\% | 8.3\% | 2.9\% | 1.3\% | 7.0\% |
| Central | 7,869 | 3,631 | 4,238 | 6,660 | 3,289 | 3,371 | 1,209 | 342 | 867 |
| Unemployment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rate | 5.2\% | 3.7\% | 7.8\% | 6.2\% | 4.9\% | 8.4\% | 2.7\% | 1.1\% | 6.1\% |
| Eastern | 241 | 60 | 181 | 48 | 19 | 29 | 193 | 41 | 152 |
| Unemployment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rate | 1.5\% | 0.5\% | 3.7\% | 2.8\% | 1.8\% | 4.4\% | 1.4\% | 0.4\% | 3.5\% |
| Western | 6,901 | 2,973 | 3,928 | 4,439 | 2,132 | 2,307 | 2,462 | 841 | 1,621 |
| Unemployment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rate | 5.1\% | 3.1\% | 9.5\% | 6.0\% | 4.3\% | 9.3\% | 3.9\% | 1.8\% | 9.6\% |
| Northern | 1,039 | 368 | 671 | 258 | 106 | 152 | 781 | 262 | 519 |
| Unemployment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outside of the Labour Force |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 268,310 | 74,351 | 193,959 | 161,225 | 49,081 | 112,144 | 107,085 | 25,270 | 81,815 |
| Central | 116,785 | 35,766 | 81,019 | 89,546 | 28,937 | 60,609 | 27,239 | 6,829 | 20,410 |
| Eastern | 8,401 | 2,189 | 6,212 | 1,153 | 353 | 800 | 7,248 | 1,836 | 5,412 |
| Western | 105,697 | 27,609 | 78,088 | 58,521 | 16,550 | 41,971 | 47,176 | 11,059 | 36,117 |
| Northern | 37,427 | 8,787 | 28,640 | 12,005 | 3,241 | 8,764 | 25,422 | 5,546 | 19,876 |

Note: $L F P R$ - Labour Force Participation Rate

## Population Aged 15 and Above With Bank Account

A total of 392,148 persons aged 15 and above were reported to have a Bank Account. The number equates to a rate of $62.7 \%$ with Males at $68.5 \%$ while Females had a rate of $56.8 \%$.

The Urban rate was $71.1 \%$ with Males at $76.9 \%$ and Females at $65.5 \%$. On the other hand the Rural rate was $51.3 \%$ with Males at $57.8 \%$ and Females at $44.3 \%$.

Further details are presented in Table 9 that follows;

Table 9. Population Aged 15 and above With a Bank Account By Division, Urban and Rural, 2017

|  | Total |  |  | Urban |  |  | Rural |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female |
| Total | 625,099 | 315,442 | 309,657 | 360,128 | 177,407 | 182,721 | 264,971 | 138,035 | 126,936 |
| Central | 268,772 | 133,686 | 135,086 | 197,082 | 96,555 | 100,527 | 71,690 | 37,131 | 34,559 |
| Eastern | 24,237 | 13,112 | 11,125 | 2,883 | 1,428 | 1,455 | 21,354 | 11,684 | 9,670 |
| Western | 242,146 | 122,501 | 119,645 | 132,477 | 65,763 | 66,714 | 109,669 | 56,738 | 52,931 |
| Northern | 89,944 | 46,143 | 43,801 | 27,686 | 13,661 | 14,025 | 62,258 | 32,482 | 29,776 |
| With Bank Account |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 392,148 | 216,207 | 175,941 | 256,094 | 136,444 | 119,650 | 136,054 | 79,763 | 56,291 |
| Central | 173,733 | 93,225 | 80,508 | 138,920 | 73,317 | 65,603 | 34,813 | 19,908 | 14,905 |
| Eastern | 7,914 | 4,697 | 3,217 | 1,508 | 812 | 696 | 6,406 | 3,885 | 2,521 |
| Western | 161,155 | 89,769 | 71,386 | 96,980 | 52,147 | 44,833 | 64,175 | 37,622 | 26,553 |
| Northern | 49,346 | 28,516 | 20,830 | 18,686 | 10,168 | 8,518 | 30,660 | 18,348 | 12,312 |
| \% With Bank Account |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 62.7\% | 68.5\% | 56.8\% | 71.1\% | 76.9\% | 65.5\% | 51.3\% | 57.8\% | 44.3\% |
| Central | 64.6\% | 69.7\% | 59.6\% | 70.5\% | 75.9\% | 65.3\% | 48.6\% | 53.6\% | 43.1\% |
| Eastern | 32.7\% | 35.8\% | 28.9\% | 52.3\% | 56.9\% | 47.8\% | 30.0\% | 33.3\% | 26.1\% |
| Western | 66.6\% | 73.3\% | 59.7\% | 73.2\% | 79.3\% | 67.2\% | 58.5\% | 66.3\% | 50.2\% |
| Northern | 54.9\% | 61.8\% | 47.6\% | 67.5\% | 74.4\% | 60.7\% | 49.2\% | 56.5\% | 41.3\% |

## Functioning Challenge (Disability)

A total of 113,595 persons aged 3 and above were reported to have at least one functioning challenge. The number equates to a rate of $13.7 \%$ which is close to the International benchmark of $15 \%$. The percentage was highest in Rotuma with $21.7 \%$ followed by Lau at $18.2 \%$ with the province of Nadroga/Navosa recording the lowest rate of $10.4 \%$. Further details are presented in Table 10 that follows;

Table 10. Population Aged 3 and Above with at Least One Disability

| Province | Age 3 and <br> above | At Least One <br> Disability | \%/ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Total | $\mathbf{8 2 9 9 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 3 5 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 . 7}$ |
| Ba | 233284 | 30242 | 13.0 |
| Bua | 14301 | 2411 | 16.9 |
| Cakaudrove | 46633 | 5099 | 10.9 |
| Kadavu | 10058 | 1532 | 15.2 |
| Lau | 9002 | 1635 | 18.2 |
| Lomaiviti | 14670 | 2352 | 16.0 |
| Macuata | 62289 | 9187 | 14.7 |
| Nadroga/Navosa | 55267 | 5771 | 10.4 |
| Naitasiri | 166545 | 23768 | 14.3 |
| Namosi | 7306 | 943 | 12.9 |
| Ra | 28393 | 4360 | 15.4 |
| Rewa | 101773 | 13925 | 13.7 |
| Serua | 18678 | 3375 | 18.1 |
| Tailevu | 60190 | 8665 | 14.4 |
| Rotuma | 1518 | 330 | 21.7 |

Other information from the 2017 Population and Housing Census will be released progressively in the coming months.


Mr. Epeli Waqavonovono
Census Commissioner

