



June 2013



STATISTICAL  
INSTITUTE  
OF  
JAMAICA

JAMAICA NATIONAL CRIME VICTIMIZATION  
SURVEY 2013 – ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT



Special Projects Unit | Surveys Division

# Contents

1	Background.....	2
1.1	Introduction .....	2
1.2	Objectives of the Survey .....	2
2	Sample Design and Selection.....	2
2.1	Sampling Frame .....	3
2.2	Stratification.....	3
2.3	Selection of Dwellings.....	4
2.4	Selection of Respondents.....	4
3	JNCVS Questionnaires .....	4
4	Training and Fieldwork .....	5
4.1	Training of trainers .....	5
5	Data Collection.....	6
5.1	Field Supervision.....	7
5.2	Field Verification .....	7
6	Data Processing.....	8
6.1	Socio-economic Index.....	8
6.2	Response Rates .....	8
6.3	Weighting.....	9

# 1 BACKGROUND

## 1.1 Introduction

The Ministry of National Security in collaboration with the Statistical Institute of Jamaica (STATIN) conducted *The Jamaica National Crime Victimization Survey* (JNCVS) during October 12, 2012 to April 10, 2013. This was the third national crime victimization survey that was conducted in Jamaica; the first being in 2006 and the second in 2009. STATIN served as the implementing agency for the conduct of the survey. As the implementing agency, STATIN was responsible for all operational matters including the planning of the fieldwork, and the processing of the collected data.

The crime victimization survey provides valuable information concerning the extent of crime in Jamaica, given that a large percentage of the crimes that occur are not reported to the police. The reporting of crime to the police is an option available to every citizen in a country. However, some persons do not believe that the reporting of crime to the police is important since they believe the police cannot provide the necessary assistance, while others believe that some crime is not important enough to merit reporting. The information received from the survey included not only incidents that were reported to the police, but also those that were not brought to the attention of the police. The crime victimization survey allows for a better understanding of the level and nature of both personal and household crime, people's perception of safety in their communities, their confidence in law enforcement agencies, and the socio-demographic details of the victims.

## 1.2 Objectives of the Survey

The main objectives of the survey as outlined in the Terms of Reference were to assess:

- The nature of property and person (violent) crime in Jamaica;
- Victims' satisfaction with the criminal justice system following a victimization incident; and
- The perception Jamaican residents have of safety within their neighbourhood and overall community.

# 2 SAMPLE DESIGN AND SELECTION

The sample design for the JNCVS was a multi-stage probability sampling design, with the first stage being a selection of geographical areas called Enumeration

Districts (EDs) and the second stage a selection of dwellings within the selected EDs. The third and final stage was a selection of eligible respondents in each of the selected dwellings in each ED. The main focus of this design was to select a nationally representative sample that would provide estimates on the state of crime victimization at both the national and the regional (urban/rural) levels.

The target population for the sample comprised usual residents, aged 16 years and older, who were living in private dwelling units at the time of the survey. Excluded from the survey were non-private dwellings including group dwellings, for example, military camps, mental institutions, hospitals and prisons.

## 2.1 Sampling Frame

The sampling frame for the Survey was developed by STATIN using information from the 2001 Population and Housing Census<sup>1</sup> A master sampling frame is developed after every Census and is updated every 4 to 5 years to include the most recent changes in the population using a listing of dwellings in the selected enumerated districts (EDs).

## 2.2 Stratification

All the EDs were first stratified by parish and into urban and rural domains. The stratification placed each Primary Sampling Unit (PSU) into either an urban or a rural classification. This ensures that the data collected can be analysed at the urban<sup>2</sup>/rural or at the national level. The category urban was further disaggregated into Kingston Metropolitan Area (KMA) and Other Urban Centres. The KMA comprised of PSUs in Kingston and the urban areas of St. Andrew. The survey domains can therefore be classified as:

- Kingston Metropolitan Area (KMA)<sup>3</sup>
- Other Urban Centres (OUC)<sup>4</sup>
- Rural Areas
- Parish
- National

Included among the sample of EDs, was a sub-sample of twenty-five “**Crime Hot Spots,**” which were geographic areas/communities with relatively high reported incidents of criminal activities.

---

<sup>1</sup> Data from the 2011 Population and Housing Census were not available at the time of this survey.

<sup>2</sup>Urban Areas include both Kingston Metropolitan Area and the Urban Centres of other parishes

<sup>3</sup>This includes Kingston and the urban areas of St. Andrew

<sup>4</sup> This includes Parish capitals and other urban areas not located in St. Andrew

Below is a summary table of the number of EDs and dwellings selected per parish.

**Table 1: Number of EDs and Dwellings Selected by Region and Parish**

Parish	No. EDs in Master Sample			No. EDs Selected			No. Dwelling Selected Per Parish		
	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural	Total
Kingston	34	0	<b>34</b>	16	0	<b>16</b>	288	0	<b>288</b>
St. Andrew	159	20	<b>179</b>	40	9	<b>49</b>	720	162	<b>882</b>
St. Thomas	9	25	<b>34</b>	4	12	<b>16</b>	72	216	<b>288</b>
Portland	3	23	<b>26</b>	4	7	<b>11</b>	72	126	<b>198</b>
St. Mary	10	34	<b>44</b>	3	9	<b>12</b>	54	162	<b>216</b>
St. Ann	14	37	<b>51</b>	4	10	<b>14</b>	72	180	<b>252</b>
Trelawny	4	19	<b>23</b>	3	8	<b>11</b>	54	144	<b>198</b>
St. James	34	26	<b>60</b>	10	7	<b>17</b>	180	126	<b>306</b>
Hanover	4	20	<b>24</b>	3	8	<b>11</b>	54	144	<b>198</b>
Westmoreland	10	38	<b>48</b>	3	11	<b>14</b>	54	198	<b>252</b>
St. Elizabeth	6	40	<b>46</b>	2	11	<b>13</b>	36	198	<b>234</b>
Manchester	23	39	<b>62</b>	6	11	<b>17</b>	108	198	<b>306</b>
Clarendon	25	44	<b>69</b>	7	12	<b>19</b>	126	216	<b>342</b>
St. Catherine	106	46	<b>152</b>	30	13	<b>43</b>	540	234	<b>774</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>441</b>	<b>411</b>	<b>852</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>2,430</b>	<b>2,304</b>	<b>4,734</b>

## 2.3 Selection of Dwellings

In the second stage, eighteen dwellings were selected from each ED using systematic sampling. One household from each selected dwelling was assigned to be visited by an interviewer.

## 2.4 Selection of Respondents

One eligible household member from each of the selected households was selected for interview. Eligible household members were those satisfying the criteria for the target population.

In instances where there were more than one eligible household member, the selection was done using the **next birthday selection method**. With this method, the eligible member with the next birthday was selected for interviewing.

## 3 JNCVS QUESTIONNAIRES

STATIN conducted the *Jamaica National Crime Victimization Survey* using the following four data collection *instruments*:

1. *Individual Questionnaire* – This instrument collected information on the respondent's perceptions and experience with crime and victimization and addressed the following topics:
  - Part D: Demographic Information
  - Part N: Neighbourhood Disorder
  - Part V: Criminal Victimization Screener
  - Part F: Indirect Experience with Crime
  - Part G: Fear of Crime
  - Part H: Opinions about the Criminal Justice System
  - Part J: Crime Prevention
  - Part K: Police Complaints, Corruption and Police Brutality
  - Part L: Citizen Security and Justice Programme
  - Part M: Self-Reported Criminal Activity and Substance Abuse
2. *Household Questionnaire* – The purpose of the household questionnaire was to provide information on the household composition and to help to identify respondents who were eligible to be interviewed with the individual questionnaire. This questionnaire also included the respondent selection procedure and collected information on the socio-economic status of the respondent.
3. *Crime Victimization Inventory* – This instrument provided a one page summary of the respondent's victimization experiences in the past twelve (12) months.
4. *Crime Incident Report* – This instrument collected detailed information on victimizations that took place in the past twelve (12) months. One Crime Incident Report was completed for each type of victimization that took place in the past twelve month.

## 4 TRAINING AND FIELDWORK

### 4.1 Training of trainers

The training of trainers for the survey took place over the period October 22-23, 2012 in STATIN's Board room and was conducted by Mr. Douglas Forbes the Project Manager and Miss Leesha Delatie-Budair the Project Coordinator. A total of thirteen (13) persons participated in this training which included eight (8) trainers, two (2) resource persons and a programmer. Also in attendance was Miss Monique Campbell, a representative from the Ministry of National Security (MNS). During

this training, participants were exposed to the key concepts of the survey, and were instructed on every aspect of the survey that should be emphasised.

## **4.2 Training of Interviewers**

A total of eighty-nine (89) persons were invited to be trained as interviewers and interviewer supervisors for the survey. The training of Interviewers took place from Tuesday October 30 to Friday November 2, 2012, at four locations, namely Kingston, Linstead, Mandeville and Montego Bay.

With the aid of the questionnaires and manuals, the training included class exercises, practice interviews, and a final test. The Project Manager visited all the classes and gave a brief overview of the survey and its relevance to Jamaica for policy making. The trainers communicated with each other by telephone and email to ensure that all problems that were encountered were solved in the same way so as to avoid any measurement error.

Based on the final test results and the trainers assessment, 18 persons were chosen to be supervisors and 64 selected to be interviewers.

## **5 DATA COLLECTION**

The data collection for the survey was scheduled to last for six (6) weeks, beginning in mid-October and concluding at the end of November 2012. However, due to a delay in the finalisation and the printing of the questionnaire, the survey was not able to start until November 21, 2012 in all the parishes.

Commencing the data collection for the survey so late in the year meant that the data collection period included the Christmas break and was extended into the following year. As a consequence, the response rate was adversely affected. A large per cent of the respondents were actively preparing for the festive season and were reluctant to spend time with the Interviewers.

During the data collection period, STATIN realised that the response rate especially for the smaller parishes such as Hanover, Trelawny and Kingston, were lower than what was expected. Therefore, in order to increase the response rate and to ensure that the sample was representative, the sample size was increased in these parishes, and the data collection period extended to March 8, 2013.

Table 2 below gives a breakdown of the revised sample by parish. The data collected based on the original sample was completed February 8, 2013 in all the EDs, and the preliminary count was 3,300 completed interviews.

**Table 2: Sample Distribution by Parish**

Parish	Total No. of EDs			No. EDs Selected			No. Dwellings Selected Per Parish		
	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural	Total
<b>Kingston</b>	26	0	<b>26</b>	16	0	<b>16</b>	288	0	<b>288</b>
<b>St. Andrew</b>	86	18	<b>104</b>	40	9	<b>49</b>	720	162	<b>882</b>
<b>St. Thomas</b>	7	19	<b>26</b>	4	12	<b>16</b>	72	216	<b>288</b>
<b>Portland</b>	6	12	<b>18</b>	4	7	<b>11</b>	72	126	<b>198</b>
<b>St. Mary</b>	6	18	<b>24</b>	3	9	<b>12</b>	54	162	<b>216</b>
<b>St. Ann</b>	8	20	<b>28</b>	4	10	<b>14</b>	72	180	<b>252</b>
<b>Trelawny</b>	5	13	<b>18</b>	3	8	<b>11</b>	54	144	<b>198</b>
<b>St. James</b>	20	14	<b>34</b>	10	7	<b>17</b>	180	126	<b>306</b>
<b>Hanover</b>	5	13	<b>18</b>	3	8	<b>11</b>	54	144	<b>198</b>
<b>Westmoreland</b>	6	22	<b>28</b>	3	11	<b>14</b>	54	198	<b>252</b>
<b>St. Elizabeth</b>	4	22	<b>26</b>	2	11	<b>13</b>	36	198	<b>234</b>
<b>Manchester</b>	12	22	<b>34</b>	6	11	<b>17</b>	108	198	<b>306</b>
<b>Clarendon</b>	14	24	<b>38</b>	7	12	<b>19</b>	126	216	<b>342</b>
<b>St. Catherine</b>	60	26	<b>86</b>	30	13	<b>43</b>	540	234	<b>774</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>508</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>2,430</b>	<b>2,304</b>	<b>4,734</b>

## 5.1 Field Supervision

The logistics of the survey was the responsibility of STATIN's Special Projects and the Field Administration Division, which distributed all the required material and administered the flow of the documents between its Head Office and the parishes. The supervisory task consisted of verifying that the fieldwork of the survey was executed with the established norms and guidelines laid down by STATIN. The field supervision activity was implemented immediately following the commencement of fieldwork. A mechanism was established to closely monitor the data collection activities under which supervisors and senior staff members of the survey team made frequent spot-checks to ensure that the data collection process took place according to instructions.

## 5.2 Field Verification

Three statisticians from STATIN Surveys Division undertook field verification in eight (8) parishes. The findings from the spot checks and the field verification were compared to the original questionnaires and where discrepancies were found, the field supervisors were instructed to revisit the dwelling. Each Field Supervisor was



assigned to randomly check two dwellings per interviewer. Additional dwellings based on their findings of missing or incomplete data were also assigned to be checked based on the findings of the Editor/Coders.

## **6 DATA PROCESSING**

Data processing began on December 12, 2013 and was completed on March 28, 2013. The tables and validated dataset were finalized and delivered to the Ministry of National Security on April 10, 2013. The survey data entry and edit programmes were written using *CSPro 2.5* software. The programmes were straightforward and user friendly. The programmes were also interactive and included several verification checks such as range, skips and consistency checks. Error messages were displayed on the screen, as well as instructions of how to proceed. At the end of data entry, an edit programme was executed to generate an error report.

### **6.1 Socio-economic Index**

A wealth index was developed to measure the socioeconomic status of the survey respondents. The methodology used was adapted from the procedure used by the Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) to measure and compare the socioeconomic status of populations in developing countries.

The index was constructed using household assets that were collected from each household. Household assets can be placed into the categories household durables and household characteristics. Household durables consisted of possessions of items such as radios, television, washing machines etc. and household characteristics comprised of the type of toilet facilities, the type of cooking fuel used and the type of material used to construct the dwelling.

The principal component analysis (PCA) was used to generate a weight for each of the household durable and the household characteristic found in each dwelling. Using this weight a score was produced for each household which was used to rank the respondents into quintiles. Based on this ranking individuals having the highest score were placed in quintile five (5) while those with the lowest were placed in quintile one (1).

### **6.2 Response Rate**

The overall response rate of the survey is based on the interviewer's success in introducing the survey to a household and randomly selecting an eligible person to be interviewed. Given the nature of the survey, proxy interviews were not accepted for respondents who were unavailable. As a result, as many as four (4) attempts

were made to contact every sampled individual. The interviewers were therefore instructed to stagger their visits over different times of day in the week in order to maximise the chances of making contact with the respondents.

During the fieldwork phase of the survey, a total of 4,734 households were visited. Of the households that were selected, approximately 76 per cent were successfully interviewed. Of the 3,610 eligible respondents who were selected, approximately 3,555 or 98.5 per cent were successfully interviewed. The detail regarding the level of responses are shown in Table 3

**Table 3: Results of the Household and Interview Responses**

<b>Result of Interviews</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Per cent</b>
<b>Households Selected</b>	4,734	100.00
<b>Completed Household Interview</b>	3,610	76.26
<b>Household Refusal</b>	156	3.30
<b>Vacant Dwellings</b>	316	6.68
<b>Closed Dwellings</b>	472	9.97
<b>Dwellings not Located/ Demolished</b>	79	1.67
<b>Other</b>	101	2.13
<b>Household Response Rate</b>		<b>76.26</b>
<b>Individuals Selected</b>	3,610	100.00
<b>Completed Individual Interview</b>	3,555	98.48
<b>Partially Completed Individual Interview</b>	1	0.03
<b>No Contact</b>	19	0.53
<b>Individual Refusal</b>	31	0.86
<b>Other</b>	4	0.11
<b>Individual Response Rate</b>		<b>98.50</b>

### 6.3 Weighting

To produce population estimates from the survey, weights were applied to the sample data to compensate for the probability of selection. The sample is weighted to represent the non-institutionalised population for each parish. The weighting procedure used for the survey accomplished the following objectives:

- Compensate for differential probabilities of selection for households and persons;
- Reduce biases occurring because non-respondents may have different characteristics from respondents; and
- Adjust for under-coverage in the sample frame and in the conduct of the main survey.

As part of this process, a weight was created for all the EDs to compensate for the changes in the number of dwellings that occurred between the time of the census and the time of the listing of dwellings. Another weight was also created to control the population totals for each parish. This is an iterative procedure that forced the weights to sum to a known population total. The weight is then normalized to the sample population totals using the demographic variables age and sex at the parish level from the 2011 Population Census.