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Methodology

The Lladewey/Ramble CDRRF Community Engagement Survey (CES) was conducted in collaboration with the Llandewey/Ramble Community Development Committee Benevolent Society and Social Development Commission in Jamaica. This research was executed across the Llandewey and Ramble communities over the period May 5 – 13, 2018 as a part of the Llandewey/Ramble Environment and Disaster Mitigation Initiative Communities Project funded by the CDRRF. The CES was a precursor to the design and implementation of engagement strategies to secure community-wide participation and involvement project activities. Data were collected in the two target communities by a team of ten community-based data collectors using the convenience sampling method. The questionnaires were administered to 250 community members and data collectors sought to maintain an even spread across sex and age groups.
• The parish of St. Thomas is exposed to multiple environmental hazards. Poverty levels in the parish, especially in the rural communities such as Llandewey and Ramble, are amongst the highest in the country.

• Llandewey is approximately six miles (mi.) from Yallahs, one of St. Thomas’ main commercial centres and 19 miles from the parish capital Morant Bay and it comprises, the districts of Mount Sinai, Village Hall, Cambridge Hill, and Gordon Castle.

• Llandewey is a central point for the residents in the surrounding districts in terms of the provision of community services such as: Post Office, Health Centre, Police Station, People’s Cooperative Bank, and RADA Branch Office.

• The estimated population of the community from the 2009 SDC Community Profile is 696 persons and they reside in 183 dwellings, with the average household size of four persons which is slightly above the national average of 3.3 persons per household.

• Agriculture is the main economic activity and the main crops are ackee, banana, coffee, yam, and ground provisions which are grown by small farmers. The community’s natural resources include springs, sand, and large acreages of arable land. The two rivers that traverse the community are Yallahs River and the Norris River.

• Ramble is located 2.8 kilometres north of Llandewey, has a similar socio-demographic profile. The SDC Community Profile estimated the population of Ramble at March 2011 at 564 persons occupying 166 dwellings, with the average household size of three persons.
Historical pattern of floods in Llandewey and St. Thomas
Socio-demographic profile
Socio-demographic profile

Sex

- Llandewey: 50% Males, 50% Females
- Ramble: 40% Males, 60% Females

Age

- Highest proportion: 56 and over
- Lowest proportion: 46 to 55

Occupation

- Farmland respondents
- Unemployed
- Self-employed
- Housewife

250 respondents

60% Llandewey

40% Ramble

Farmer: 37%

Unemployed: 15%

Self-employed: 8%

Housewife: 7%
Perceptions of community issues
Perceptions of community issues

Respondents’ prioritization of community issues

Priority issues by sex

Differences among top priority issue:

**Unemployment**
- Females
- Males

**Bad roads**
- Males

While the top three priority issues remained, variations were observed among the 4th priority issue:

Unemployment

- 33%

Bad roads
- 29%

Water shortage
- 8%

Lack of community development
- 3%

Praedial Larceny
- 2%

Overview

Top 5 issues mentioned:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad roads</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water shortage</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of community development</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praedial Larceny</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Role in community development

Respondents’ perceptions of their own role in community development

Believed they had a role in community development:
- Males: 87%
- Females: 77%

Highest affirmations of their role in community development: 90%

36-45 age group

Did not perceive themselves as having a role in community development:
- ≤50%
  - Artist (50%), Bartender (50%), Block maker (50%), Mechanic (50%), Retiree (50%), Vendor (50%), Housekeeper (40%), Dressmaker (33%), and Assistant Chef (0%)
Community-Based Organisation (CBO) engagement

Respondents' rate of invitation to group activities

Gender differences

- **61%** Males
- **45%** Females

Age group differences

- **18-25 age group**: recorded the lowest levels of community activity
- **46-55 age group**: recorded the highest levels of community activity

Occupational differences

- **<50%**
  - Housewife (42%), Self-employed (40%), Bartender (33%), Factory Worker (33%), Retiree (25%), Student (22%), Shopkeeper (20%), Assistant Chef (0%), Music Production (0%), Dressmaker (0%), Block Maker (0%), Hairdresser (0%), Security (0%), Salesman (0%) and Justice of the Peace (0%)
Community group membership

Respondents’ level of community group membership

- **Gender differences**
  - Males: 28%
  - Females: 26%

- **Age group differences**
  - 56 and over: 34%
  - 18-25: 20%

- **Occupational differences**
  - Top 3 occupations who reported being group members:
    - 45% Farmers
    - 13% Self-employed
    - 9% Unemployed

Overview

- 73% non-membership
- 27% membership
Community group perceptions

Respondents' feelings about community groups

Top 5 reasons for non-membership:

- **Unawareness**: 29%
- **Unavailability**: 15%
- **No reason**: 8%
- **Not interested**: 8%
- **Never been invited**: 5%

62% believed that groups were good for the community or doing a good/fair job.
Community participation and inclusion

Community participation opportunities

Respondents’ opportunities to participate in community development activities

Overview

Age group differences

Occupational differences

Had an opportunity to participate in community activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Llandewey</th>
<th>Ramble</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parish total</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 age groups recorded having less than 50% participation opportunities (18-25, 26-35, 46-55)

18-25: 57%

18-25 lowest levels of receiving community participation opportunities:

<50%

Had an opportunity to participate in community activities:

Housewife (47.4%), Unemployed (40%), Factory Worker (33.3%), Self-Employed (25%), and Shopkeeper (20%)
Community activities

Highest ranked activities by overall participation rate

**Top 2 most popular activities:**
- **Sports:** 15% participation
- **Religious events:** 9% participation

**Gender differences:**
- **Sports:**
  - Males: 27% participation
  - Females: 4% participation
- **Religious events:**
  - Males: 1% participation
  - Females: 13% participation

**Occupational differences:**
- **Sports**:
  - Students, Carpenters, Retirees, Masons, Security, Mechanics, Driver, Labourer, Cashier and Justice of the Peace
- **Religious events**:
  - Housewives, Retirees, Hairdressers, Salesmen and Horticulturalists

**Above average participation in:**
- **Sports**
- **Religious events**
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Community development involvement

Respondents' desire for community development involvement

Gender differences
- Males: 96%
- Females: 94%

Age group differences
- All age groups up to 55 years old recorded over 90% interest
- 56 and over age group: only age group with 90%

Occupational differences
- All occupations expressed a desire for community involvement at 90% and over, except:
- Shopkeepers: lowest level of desire for community involvement at 80%

95% desired to be involved in community activities
Engagement preferences

Communication setting

Respondents’ preferred location for receiving communication

- **Overview**
  - 40% Community Meetings
  - 36% Church

- **Gender differences**
  - 52% Males preferred Community meeting
  - 47% Females preferred Church

- **Age group differences**
  - All age groups named community meetings and church as their top 2, except:
    - 18-25 age group: 2nd preferred setting: on the street

**COMMUNITY DISASTER RISK REDUCTION FUND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT SURVEY**
**ST.THOMAS, JAMAICA**
Day and time to be informed

Respondents’ preferred day and time to be informed about community activities

Gender differences

- 32% Males preferred mornings
- 30% Females preferred afternoons

Age group differences

- 26 and older had a higher preference for Sundays

Preferred time

- Most preferred days:
  - Saturday 78%
  - Sunday 35%
  - Monday 14%

- Top preferred time of day expressed:
  - 41% Evenings
  - 28% Afternoons
  - 26% Mornings

Engagement preferences
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Electronic device access

Respondents’ level of access to electronic devices

Access to cellphones:
- Parish total: 73%
- Ramble: 82%
- Llandewey: 67%

Highest access to all devices:
- Nurse (100%)
- Hairdresser (50%)
- Teachers (33.3%)
- Students (22.2%)

Lowest access to cell phones:
- Students (44.4%)
- Masons (25%)

The relative proportions with access to all devices decreased dramatically across older age groups.

18-25 age group had the most access to all devices at 10%.
Communication channels

Internet service availability

Respondents’ level of access to internet service

Community differences

Gender differences

Age group differences

79% indicated they had internet access

Each age group reported over 80% access except:

- 67% of the 56 and over age group only recorded access.
Internet service quality

Respondents’ most prevalent ratings of internet quality

- “very good”: 6%
- “good”: 26%
- “poor”: 24%
- “very poor”: 8%
Preferred information sharing method

Respondents’ preferred methods of information sharing

Top 4 methods:

- Audio-visual: 32%
- Whatsapp: 22%
- Print: 14%
- Audio: 12%
Emergency alert preference

Respondents' most preferred means for receiving emergency alerts

Top 4 preferred means:
- **43%** Phone call
- **13%** Word of mouth
- **17%** Local radio station
- **13%** Town crier

The largest margins of difference was found in phone call preference:
- **38%** Llandewey
- **50%** Ramble

18-25 age group
- **Phone calls** less popular than older age groups
- **Town criers** most preferred in contrast to older groups
Community development information preference

Respondents’ most preferred means for receiving community development information

Top 4 preferred means:
- **30%** Television
- **23%** Text messages
- **21%** Word of mouth
- **15%** Radio

Top 3 preferences:
- **18-25**: Television and Word of mouth
- **26-35**: Text messages and Word of Mouth
- **36-45**: Television and Text Messages
- **46-55**: Television, Radio and Text messages
- **56 and over**: Television, Word of mouth

Gender differences:
- **Males**: Television, radio, word of mouth
- **Females**: Television, text messages, word of mouth
Trusted information sources

Respondents’ most trusted sources for reliable community development and disaster risk management information

Top 4 most trusted sources:

- Government agencies: 35%
- Pastors: 12%
- Parents: 13%
- Community Leaders: 11%

Although government agencies was the most trusted source, there were differences among the 2nd and 3rd most trusted:

- Llandewey: Community leaders, Parents, Social media (11%)
- Ramble: Neighbour, Pastor, Parents (12%)

Age group differences:

- 18-25: Government agencies, community leaders, and parents
- 26-35: Government agencies and parents
- 36-45: Government agencies and parents
- 46-55: Government agencies and neighbours
- 56 and over: Government agencies and pastors
Feedback frequency

Frequency of feedback received on community development and disaster risk management issues from existing community-based organizations (CBOs) and NGOs in respondents' districts

67% did not receive frequent feedback on community development/DRM issues
Preferred method of feedback from government agencies

Preferred method of feedback from government agencies such as the Social Development Department, Fire Department, and the Office of Disaster Preparedness and Emergency Management.

Communication channels

Top 3 most favourable:

- **Community meetings**: 31%
- **Radio**: 17%
- **Telephone calls**: 14%

**Phone call**: Justice of the Peace, Security and Block Maker

**Text message**: Nurse, Block Maker, Chef

**Community meetings**: Unemployed, Shopkeeper, Housewife, Music Production, Vendor, Hairdresser, Horticulturalist, Driver, Administrative Assistant, Cashier, Salesman

**Town Crier**: Vendor, Attendant, Labourer

**Television**: Assistant Chef, Artist, Hairdresser, Security

**Social media**: Artist

**Flyer**: Gardener
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Community Emergency Shelters

Respondents’ awareness of community emergency shelters

- **56%** no emergency shelter
- **43%** uncertain existence of shelter
- **50%** highest awareness of shelters: Farmers, Shopkeepers, Assistant Chef, Music Producers, Vendors, Artists, Gardeners, Attendants, Police Officers, Administrative Assistants and Salesmen
- **<50%** lowest awareness of shelters: unemployed, students, housewives/housekeepers, bartenders, self-employed, taxi drivers, retirees, nurses, dressmakers, block makers, mason, hairdressers, security, mechanics, horticulturalists, drivers, labourers, teachers, chefs, cashiers and Justice of the Peace
Community disaster plan awareness

Respondents’ awareness of community disaster plan

Awareness of community disaster plan:

- Llandewey: 16%
- Ramble: 8%

13% aware of a plan
43% unaware
44% uncertainty
Presence of a family disaster plan

Respondents having a family disaster plan

Had a family disaster plan:

- Llandewey: 40%
- Ramble: 27%

66% did not have a family disaster plan