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Methodology

The Westmoreland CDRRF Community Engagement Survey (CES) was conducted in collaboration with the Westmoreland Municipal Corporation (WMC) and the Social Development Commission in Jamaica. This research was executed across the Russia, New Market Oval and Llandilo Phase 1 communities over the period June 22 – July 2, 2018 as a part of the WMC’s Climate Change Adaptation and Risk Reduction Technology and Strategies to Improve Community Resilience (CARTS) 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 in project activities. Data were collected in the three target communities by a team of 20 community-based data collectors using the convenience sampling method. The questionnaires were administered to 860 community members and data collectors sought to maintain an even spread across sex and age groups.
Overview

- Savanna-la-mar is the capital of Westmoreland Parish and is located 27 km from Negril, the parish’s renowned tourist resort, and 54 km from the city of Montego Bay in St. James. The town has an estimated population of 22,633 residing in 5,658 households, with the average household size being four persons. Females head around 51% of the households. Approximately 30% of household heads in the town are unemployed.

- Savanna-la-mar was built on ‘a strip of land with mangrove swamps on either side with significant sections of the town being below sea level and prone to flooding. The town’s coastal ecosystems have been facing numerous natural and human-induced stressors related to the hazards as well as adverse effects from formal and informal coastal development and pollution. The mangroves support various livelihood activities, especially like fishing, and other related activities.

- The town is considered a sub-regional centre as it is the focal point for the parish’s administrative, commercial, marketing, retail activities and services which are provided to the adjacent agricultural communities and Negril. Social services available to the town’s residents include a public hospital and health centre, a combined total of 15 infant, primary and secondary schools, a market, police station, fire station, three community centres and four playing fields.

- Russia is a coastal inner-city community which for the most part consists of unplanned residential settlements with poor road networks and drainage (most of the roads are unpaved with earthen drains), poor sanitation (all the households in the unplanned sections of both communities use pit latrines), limited access to potable water supply, and unregulated arrangements for access to electricity. Some sections of the community were originally swamp land and the mangroves were destroyed to facilitate the construction of houses.
Historical pattern of floods in Savanna-la-mar and Westmoreland
Socio-demographic profile
## Socio-demographic profile

### Sex
- 52% Males
- 48% Females

### Age
- 18-24 age group had the largest share of the sample at 25%.

### Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Employed</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisherman</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Owner</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired, Labourer, Student</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor, Mason</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairdresser, Chef</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

700 respondents

- 85% in Savanna-la-mar in Russia
- 15% in Russia
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Perceptions of community issues
Perceptions of community issues

Respondents' prioritization of community issues

Although crime/violence was the top priority in both communities, some of the major differences were:

**Poverty in Russia**

**Flooding in Savanna-la-mar**

Differences among third priority issue:

**Unemployment**

- aged 45 and below
- over 45

**Improper drainage**

- over 45

**Bad roads**

- Student and Retirees

Top 5 issues mentioned:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime/Violence</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad road conditions</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper drainage</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No water</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only group which perceived an issue being of higher priority than crime/violence
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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**: 84%
- **Females**: 75%

18-24 age group

- Highest level of uncertainty at 20%
- Lowest level of affirmation about having a role at 80%

Highest level of affirmations among:

- **Chefs (93%)**, **Masons, and Fishermen (89%)**
- **Students (69%)**

Gender differences

Age group differences

Occupational differences
Community participation and inclusion

Community-Based Organisation (CBO) engagement

Respondents’ rate of invitation to group activities

Overview

Gender differences

41% participated in group activities

47% Males

35% Females

59% never been invited

Invited to participate in community-based activities

Less than half invited:
- Unemployed (38%), Self-employed (48%), Fishermen (47%), Small business owner (37%), Student (24%), Retired (22.6%)

More than half invited:
- Mason (61.1%), Hairdresser (53.3%), Chef (60%) and Labourer (51.6%)

Occupational differences
Community participation and inclusion

Community group membership

Respondents' level of community group membership

Overview

Community differences

Community group membership rates

81% non-membership
19% membership

27% in Russia
18% in Savanna-la-mar
Overview

Community group perceptions

Respondents’ feelings about community groups

18-24 age group

The only group which recorded the highest relative proportion indicating “no group exists”

Most common description of groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>“good”</th>
<th>“Unaware” of the existence of groups</th>
<th>“No opinion”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Savanna-la-mar</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age group differences

Community differences

not aware of any existing community group

needs to be more proactive

no opinion

good

7%

42%

34%
Non-participation in community groups

Reasons given for non-participation in community groups

Two most prevalent responses given for non-participation in community groups:
- 35% “No group exists”
- 17% “not available”

“Unawareness” was the most common reason given, however:
- 56 and over age group
  - The age group with the highest proportion expressing: “disinterest”

Highest relative proportion citing:
- “Unavailability”:
  - Fishermen (26%), Small business owner (29%), Chef (27%)
- Unaware of group existence:
  - Unemployed (40%), Self-employed (31%), Small business owner (34%), Mason (33%), Student (38%)
Community participation and inclusion

Community participation opportunities

Respondents' opportunities to participate in community development activities

Overview

Gender differences

Occupational differences

Had an opportunity to participate in community activities:

Males: 51%

Females: 41%

Had an opportunity:

46%

No opportunity:

54%

>50% Mason (72%), Labourer (71%), Self-employed (51%) and Chef (53%)

<50% Small business owner (31%), Unemployed (45%), Fishermen (45%), Dressmaker (38%), Student (31%), Hairdresser (47%), Retired (45%)
Community participation and inclusion

Community activities

Highest ranked activities by overall participation rate

Overview
Sports
Religious activities
Parties
Disaster preparedness activities

84% participated in at least one activity in their community

15% Total
22% Males
21% 18-25, 26-35
22% Students, Masons

9% Females
8% 56 and over
7% Retired

4% Total
3% Males
9% 46-55
5% Females
4% 56 and over

12% Total
6% Males
35% 56 and over
18% Females
10% less than 55

6% 18-25
7% Unemployed, hairdresser, chef, labourer

1% 56 and over
Small business owners (3%), self-employed (2%)

5% Total
5% 18-25
13% Labourers

2% other age groups
Fishermen, mason, student, hairdresser, chef

0% Total
7% 18-25
3% Dressmakers, and retired

7% Students, Masons
5% 18-25
3% Masons, fishermen

Parents Teacher Association meetings

Westmoreland, Jamaica
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Engagement preferences
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Community development involvement

Respondents’ desire for community development involvement

Gender differences

- **90%** Males
- **82%** Females

Age group differences

- All age groups up to 55 years old recorded over 87% interest
- **56 and over age group**
  - only age group with **72%**

Occupational differences

- **Highest proportions expressing interest (90% and over):**
  - Mason (100%), Dressmaker (100%), Labourer (97%), Fishermen (94%), Hairdresser (93%), Chef (93%)
- **Lowest proportions expressing interest (<90%):**
  - Retired (45%), Student (69%), Small business owner (71%), Unemployed (85%), Self-employed (89%).

86% desire to be involved in community activities
Communication setting

Respondents’ preferred location for receiving communication

Gender differences

49% of Males preferred Community meeting

40% of Females preferred Church

Age group differences

26-35 age group recorded on average twice higher proportional preference for:
shops/bars

56 and over age group only age group which recorded the highest proportional preference for:
church

Occupational differences

Community meetings
Unemployed (46%), Self-employed (45%), Small business owner (46%), Mason (50%), Student (59%), Chef (27%) and Labourer (32%)

Church
Retired (52%), Hairdresser (40%), Fishermen (34% - equal proportion with community meetings)

The top two preferred settings were:

43% Community Meetings
31% Church
Day and time to be informed

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

Gender differences:
- **Males**: 49%
- **Females**: 40%

Age group differences:
- 46-55 age group: only age group with second highest preference for Thursday

Preferred time:
- Top preferred time of day expressed:
  - **Evenings**: 45%
  - **Afternoons**: 31%

Most preferred days:
- **Monday**: 43%
- **Sunday**: 19%
Communication Channels
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Electronic device access

Respondents’ level of access to electronic devices

Cell phone access:
- 56% Access to cell phones
- 61% in Russia
- 55% in Savanna-la-mar

Cell phone access interestingly increased with age
- 18-25 age group: 44%
- 56 and over age group: 70%
Internet service availability

Respondents’ level of access to internet service

Community differences

Gender differences

Age group differences

73% indicated they had internet access

54% in Russia

77% in Savanna-la-mar

76% Males

70% Females

All age groups recorded around 75% or more having internet access except:

56 and over age group

only recorded 55%
Communication channels

Internet service quality

Respondents’ most prevalent ratings of internet quality

Overview

Community differences

Age group differences

Top three responses:

Russia
- good, 29%
- fair, 14%
- very good, 19%

Savanna-la-mar
- good, 29%
- fair, 14%
- very good, 19%

56 and over age group

Only age group which did not have ‘good’ as the most prevalent rating
Preferred information sharing method

Respondents’ preferred methods of information sharing

Top 3 methods:
- 24% Audio-visual
- 22% Whatsapp
- 18% Print

18-25 age group
- Whatsapp
- Audio-visual

46 and over
- Print
- Savanna-la-mar
- Russia
Emergency alert preference

Respondents’ most preferred means for receiving emergency alerts

Both communities preferred phone call and local radio stations, however their 3rd preferred means differed:

- **Russia**: Town crier
- **Savanna-la-mar**: Whatsapp

**Top 3 preferred means:**
- **42%** Phone call
- **19%** Local radio station
- **15%** Word of mouth

**Top 2 preferred media:**
- **Phone calls and local radio stations**: Self-employed, fishermen, chefs, retirees, and small business owners
- **Phone calls and town criers**: Masons and labourers
- **Phone calls and word of mouth**: Students

**Community differences**

**Age group differences**

- **18-25**: Phone call (42%), Word of mouth (19%), local radio station (17%)
- **26-35**: Phone call (40%), local radio station (20%) and word of mouth (13%)
- **36-45**: Phone call (38%), local radio station (21%) and word of mouth (12%)
- **46-55**: Phone call (47%), local radio station (16%) and word of mouth (13%)
- **56 and over**: Phone call (45%), local radio station (22%) and word of mouth (17%)
Community development information preference

Respondents' most preferred means for receiving community development information

Top 4 preferred media:
- 30% Television
- 23% Text messages
- 20% Radio
- 17% Word of mouth

Both communities preferred television and text messages, however their 3rd preferred media differed:
- Russia: Word of mouth
- Savanna-la-mar: Radio

Top 3 preferences:
- **Males**: Television, radio, text messages
- **Females**: Television, text messages, word of mouth
Trusted information sources

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

Community differences

Gender differences

Age group differences

Top 3 most trusted sources:

- Pastors: 22%
- Community leaders: 21%
- Government agencies: 19%

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

- Pastors (22%), community leaders (21%), government agencies (20%)
- Parents (21%), pastors (20%) and community leaders (20%)
- Pastor (22%), community leaders (21%) and government agencies (20%)
- Pastor (27%), community leaders (19%), government agencies (18%)
- Pastor (33%), community leaders (23%), government agencies (16%)

Russia

Savanna-la-mar

Males

Females

Community leaders

Pastors

Parents (26%) and government agencies (23%) and community leaders (21%)

Parents (21%), pastors (20%) and community leaders (20%)

Pastor (22%), community leaders (21%) and government agencies (20%)

Pastor (27%), community leaders (19%), government agencies (18%)

Pastor (33%), community leaders (23%), government agencies (16%)
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.

Overview

56% received frequent feedback on community development/DRM issues

36-45, 56 and over age groups

67% Reliable feedback

18-25, 46-55 age groups

<50% Reliable feedback

Age group differences
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

**Top 5 most favourable:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face meeting</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Top 3 most favourable:**

- **Russia**: Face-to-face meetings (27%), television (18%) and telephone (17%)
- **Savanna-la-mar**: Telephone (21%), face-to-face meetings (15%) and radio (14%)
Hazard Management Practices
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Disaster preparedness activities

Respondents’ participation in disaster preparedness activities

Age group differences

18-24 age group recorded around twice the proportional attendance to disaster preparedness activities of all age groups

Occupational differences

5 out of the top 10 most prevalent occupations did not mention having attended disaster preparedness activities (fishermen, mason, student, hairdresser and chef)

highest group recorded at 13% labourers
Community Emergency Shelters

Respondents’ awareness of community emergency shelters

- **Overview**
  - Existence of shelter: 19% uncertain, 79% no emergency shelter

- **Community differences**
  - Awareness of shelters:
    - **Russia**: 26%
    - **Savanna-la-mar**: 18%

- **Occupational differences**
  - Highest awareness of shelters: Labourers (25.8%), masons (22.2%) and small business owners (22.9%)
  - Lowest awareness of shelters: Hairdressers (6.7%) and students (6.9%).
Hazard Management Practices

Community disaster plan awareness

Respondents’ awareness of community disaster plan

Overview

Community differences

Age group differences

Awareness of community disaster plan:

- **Russia**: 53% aware of a plan, 36% uncertain, 11% not aware
- **Savanna-la-mar**: 22% aware of a plan, 9% uncertain, 6% not aware

Highest awareness of community disaster plan:
- 56 and over age group: 15%

Lowest awareness of community disaster plan:
- 18-25 age group: 6%
Hazard Management Practices

Presence of a family disaster plan

Respondents having a family disaster plan

56% did not have a family disaster plan

Had a family disaster plan:

Russia 40%
Savanna-la-mar 44%