Erratum - 22.11.2021

Since the publication of Census 2016 Summary Results - Part 2 the CSO has discovered that an incorrect number was printed on Chapter 9, Page 67.

"While people in social class 7 accounted for 18.0 per cent of the total population they accounted for 68.1 per cent of those with bad or very bad general health. The correction is they accounted for 45.4 per cent of those with bad or very bad health". Page 67 has been amended to reflect this change.
9. Health, disability and caring

General health

Disability

Carers
Self-assessed health

A question on general health was first introduced in Census 2011 and asked respondents to select one of five categories ranging from very good to very bad. Self-perceived health provides a well validated and widely used measure of actual health, despite its subjective nature. The naturally observed phenomenon of failing health with age is clearly reflected in the census results.

Feeling (Very) Good

Figure 9.1 presents the distribution of health by age group, for both 2011 and 2016. While the pattern of younger people having good or very good health persists, the percentage of 0 – 19 year olds in these categories has fallen slightly from 96.6 per cent in 2011 to 94.5 per cent in 2016. The percentage with fair, bad or very bad health meanwhile has increased from 1.4 per cent in 2011 to 1.6 per cent in 2016. This shift, albeit marginal, from good to less good health can also be seen in those aged 20 to 39.

Among the older age group on the other hand, namely those aged 60 to 79, there has been a small increase in the percentage with good or very good health (up from 72.5% to 73.8%), and a corresponding fall in those with fair, bad or very bad health which was down to 23.5 per cent (from 25.6% in 2011).

While only 12.7 per cent of those aged 80 and over reported their health as very good this is up on the 2011 figure of 11.4 per cent.

The total number of people with bad health increased by 5,454 persons (from 57,243 to 62,697) while those with very bad health increased by 1,320 persons (from 12,418 to 13,738).

See web table EZ050

It’s a fact!

59.4%  The percentage of the population who identified themselves as having very good health

7.8%  The percentage of males aged 80 and over who identified themselves as having bad or very bad health
Social class and health

Figure 9.2 presents general health and social class and illustrates the relationship between those with very good health by descending social class category code.

While 75.4 per cent of respondents in social class 1 identified their health as very good, this fell to 55.9 per cent within social class 4, while only 40.3 per cent in social class 7 selected this category.

Bad or very bad health

While people in social class 7 accounted for 18.0 per cent of the total population they accounted for 45.4 per cent of those with bad or very bad general health.

Health by county

The people in Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown rated themselves the healthiest in Ireland with 65.6 per cent indicating they had ‘very good’ health, followed closely by Meath, Kildare and Cork County (all at 63.1%).

The administrative areas with the lowest proportion of respondents indicating ‘very good’ health were Cork City, Dublin City and Longford (at 54.1%, 55.6% and 55.9% respectively).

It’s a fact!

75.4% The percentage of respondents in social class 1 with ‘very good’ health

55.9% The percentage of respondents in social class 4 with ‘very good’ health

40.3% The percentage of respondents in social class 7 with ‘very good’ health

89.9% The percentage of respondents in Dún Laoghaire-Rathdown who identified themselves with ‘very good’ or ‘good’ health
Health, disability and caring

Increase in those with a disability

There was a total of 643,131 people with a disability in April 2016 accounting for 13.5 per cent of the population; this represented an increase of 47,796 persons on the 2011 figure of 595,335 when it accounted for 13.0 per cent of the population.

Among those aged 0 to 14 there were an additional 6,028 persons with a disability, bringing the rate of disability to 5.9 per cent (up from 5.4% in 2011), while for those aged 15 to 24 the numbers increased by 8,952 to 53,465 resulting in a disability rate of 9.3 per cent (up from 7.7% in 2011).

As illustrated in Figure 9.3, the rate of disability fell for all groups aged 45 and over. The age group 75-84 shows the largest drop, falling from 46.3 per cent in 2011 to 42.4 per cent in 2016.

While disability rates have fallen, the increase in the number of older people generally means the actual number of people aged 65 and over with a disability has increased from 204,069 to 224,388 over the five years, a rise of 20,319.

Workers and disability

Of the total 643,131 persons with a disability 130,067 were at work, accounting for 6.5 per cent of the workforce.

Among those aged 25-34, almost half (47.8%) were at work whereas by age 55 to 64 only 25 per cent of those with a disability were at work.

It’s a fact!

13.5% The percentage of the population in 2016 with a disability

See web table EZ042
Map 9.1 Percentage of persons with a disability by electoral division, 2016
Increase in carers in older age groups

The number of people who identified themselves as unpaid carers increased by 8,151, from 187,112 in 2011 to 195,263 in 2016, accounting for 4.1 per cent of the population.

While female carers continued to outnumber male carers (118,151 and 77,112 respectively) the increase in carers was almost evenly distributed among males and females over the five years. The number of male carers increased by 4,113 between 2011 and 2016, while female carers increased by 4,038.

Since 2011, the number of carers aged 44 or younger has fallen by 4,561 while the number of carers aged 45 and over increased by 12,712.

Figure 9.5 shows the percentage of men and women who were carers by five year age group. Just under 1 in 10 people aged 50-54 were providing unpaid care in 2016.

See web table EZ044

Figure 9.5 Carers as a percentage of the total population by age group and gender, 2011 and 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours spent caring per week</th>
<th>Number of Carers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-14 (up to 2 hours a day)</td>
<td>80,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-28 (between 2 and 4 hours a day)</td>
<td>29,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-42 (between 4 and 6 hours a day)</td>
<td>14,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 hours or more (6 hours a day or more)</td>
<td>39,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-84 (between 6 and 12 hours a day)</td>
<td>15,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-167 (between 12 and 24 hours a day)</td>
<td>9,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168 (24 hours a day)</td>
<td>15,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>22,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>187,112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.1 Number of carers by hours spent caring per week, 2011 and 2016

Hours spent caring increases

Table 9.1 shows that the number of people providing up to 2 hours caring a day increased from 80,891 to 83,754 between 2011 and 2016.

In the same period those providing between 2 and 6 hours of caring a day increased from 29,255 to 31,129.

The number of people providing more than 6 hours of caring a day grew from 39,982 persons to 41,185 persons in 2016.

It’s a fact!

195,263 The number of people who identified themselves as unpaid carers in 2016
Children

The data presented in Table 9.2 shows that 3,800 children provided unpaid care in 2016, down from 4,228 in 2011. Of these, 1,635 were under the age of 10, compared to 1,838 five years earlier.

Child carers typically provided up to 2 hours caring a day (i.e. 1-14 hours per week). However, 554 child carers, up from 530 in 2011, reported providing in excess of this.

See web table EZ044

**It’s a fact!**

3,800

The number of children aged 14 and younger providing unpaid care in April 2016

29,311

The number of people aged 65 and over providing unpaid care in April 2016

Table 9.2 Carers aged under 15 by number of hours per week spent caring, 2011 and 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>1 - 14</th>
<th>15 - 28</th>
<th>29 - 42</th>
<th>43 or more</th>
<th>Not stated</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1 - 14</th>
<th>15 - 28</th>
<th>29 - 42</th>
<th>43 or more</th>
<th>Not stated</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 9</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>1,838</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>1,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14</td>
<td>1,494</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>2,390</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>2,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,422</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td>4,228</td>
<td>2,075</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>