TABLE C-2
USE OF PUBLIC/PRIVATE HEALTH SECTOR BY ILL/INJURED PERSONS PURCHASE OF MEDICATIONS AND HOSPITALIZATION DURING THE MEDICAL CARE, FOUR WEEK REFERENCE PERIOD, BY AREA, QUINTILE, SEX AND AGE

Classification those injured	Source of Care (Of Those Seeking Medical Care)							
	Percentage of Those Seeking Medical Care			Percentage Purchasing Medication			Percentage Hospitalization	
Area	Pub.	Priv.	Both	Pub	Priv.	Both	Pub.	Priv.
KMA (N=205)	28.9	63.0	8.1	19.0	79.6	1.5	7.7	0.8
Other Town (N=122)	26.3	68.2	5.5	9.8	88.8	1.4	7.2	0.0
Rural Are (N=416)	26.8	67.5	5.7	16.9	81.1	2.0	4.9	0
Quintile								
Poorest (N=157)	47.1	49.4	3.5	20.7	78.2	1.2	6.9	1.2
2 (N=158)	25.3	66.3	8.4	17.2	81.7	1.1	3.2	0.0
3 (N=113)	22.7	69.7	7.6	17.6	81.1	1.4	6.1	0.0
4 (N=153)	21.7	68.0	10.3	14.8	81.8	3.4	8.3	0.0
5 (N=162)	16.8	80.0	3.2	11.1	87.2	1.7	4.3	0.0
Sex								
Male (N=306)	26.5	65.3	8.2	15.4	83.6	1.0	4.9	0.5
Female (N=437)	27.8	67.2	5.0	17.2	80.6	2.3	6.7	0.0
Age(Years)								
0-4 (N=147)	33.8	60.2	6.1	12.7	87.3	0.0	6.1	1.0
5-9(N=77)	20.2	72.5	7.3	22.1	77.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
10-19 (N=79)	35.2	62.2	2.6	26.7	73.3	0.0	7.1	0.0
20-29 (N=69)	20.9	72.9	6.2	12.7	85.2	2.1	6.6	0.0
30-39 (N=63)	19.2	74.2	6.5	11.2	86.2	2.6	7.8	0.0
40-49 (N=53)	26.8	67.8	5.4	20.6	76.8	2.7	11.7	0.0
50-59 (N=66)	41.1	54.5	4.4	19.3	78.2	2.5	6.5	0.0
60-64 (N=31)	26.4	67.7	5.9	16.2	83.8	0.0	16.0	0.0
65+ (N=158)	21.0	70.2	8.8	14.7	81.2	4.2	2.9	0.0
Jamaica (N=743)	27.2	66.4	6.3	16.4	81.9	1.7	6.0	0.2

TABLE C-3
LEVEL OF CARE BY AREA, QUINTILE, SEX AND AGE

Those seeking medical care	LEVELS OF CARE			
	Primary	Outpatient	Both Primary and Outpatient	Hospitalization (inpatient)
Area				
KMA (N=108)	68.3	24.5	7.2	8.5
Other Town(N=93)	74.0	20.5	5.5	7.2
Rural Areas(N=262)	81.1	14.2	4.7	4.9
Quintile				
Poorest (N85)	72.4	26.4	1.2	8.1
2 (N=95)	80.0	13.7	6.3	3.2
3 (N=66)	81.8	13.6	4.6	6.1
4 (N=97)	73.2	16.5	10.3	8.3
5 (N=94)	80.9	14.9	4.3	4.3
Sex				
Male (N=179)	74.0	19.3	6.7	5.4
Female (N=260)	78.4	16.9	4.7	6.7
Age(Years)				
0-4 (N=91)	78.8	16.1	5.1	7.1
5-9 (N=39)	77.2	20.6	2.1	0.0
10-19 (N=37)	73.5	23.9	2.6	7.1
20-29 (N=41)	75.3	18.5	6.2	6.6
30-39 (N=40)	79.3	12.5	8.2	7.8
40-49 (N=33)	69.9	24.6	5.4	11.7
50-59 (N=41)	67.5	27.8	4.7	6.5
60-64 (N=18)	71.1	22.8	6.2	16.0
65+'(N=99)	82.1	10.8	7.1	2.9
Jamaica (N=472)	76.6	17.9	5.5	6.2

TABLE C-4
EXPENDITURE ON MEDICAL CARE, IN PUBLIC/ PRIVATE SECTOR BY THOSE ILL/INJURED,BY AREA, QUINTILE, SEX AND AGE

Classification	Mean No. of Visits	Mean Total Cost Incurred for All Visits in Last 4 Weeks Excluding Drugs and Costs Reimbursed by Insurance ($)		Mean Cost ($) of Drugs by Source	
		Public	Private	Public	Private
Area					
KMA (N=205)	1.5	162.4	462.9	293.4	358.2
Other Towns (N=122)	1.7	128.8	715.8	242.6	693.5
Rural Areas (N=416	1.5	114.2	449.7	194.4	537.0
Quintile					
Poorest (N=157)	1.5	140.2	342.1	146.6	354.2
2 (N=158)	1.4	81.0	494.2	164.7	412.9
3 (N=113)	1.5	114.2	433.3	173.1	442.7
4 (N=153)	1.6	161.6	547.5	397.0	683.3
5 (N=162)	1.6	186.6	591.1	381.0	628.4
Sex					
Male (N=306)	1.6	122.8	492.1	251.0	500.1
Female (N=437)	1.5	135.9	498.5	222.6	516.9
Age (years)					
0-4 (N=147)	1.4	104.3	310.8	199.8	340.7
5-9 (N=77)	1.3	74.8	287.6	430.9	369.1
10-19 (N=79)	1.2	54.5	395.3	242.9	293.0
20-29 (N=69)	1.4	326.4	395.9	156.6	556.9
30-39 (N=63)	1.9	326.9	557.3	139.5	729.6
40-49 (N=53)	1.5	46.2	578.0	445.7	418.4
50-59 (N=66)	1.7	153.3	447.0	241.7	396.3
60-64 (N=31)	1.7	39.9	1078.2	95.9	810.2
65+(N=158)	1.7	106.7	658.7	135.6	744.1
Jamaica (N=743)	1.5	130.4	495.9	233.6	509.3

TABLE C-5
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITH HEALTH INSURANCE BY AREA, QUINTILE, SEX AND AGE

Classification	Percentage of Total Sample with Health Insurance	Percentage of Those Seeking Medical Care with Health Insurance
Area		
KMA (N=2,291)	14.8	14.7
Other Towns (N=1,492)	8.7	6.0
Rural Areas (N=3,747)	6.6	10.1
Quintile		
Poorest (N=1,508)	1.7	2.3
2 (N=1505)	4.1	9.5
3 (N=1,503)	3.6	7.6
4 (N=1,506)	13.0	14.4
5 (N=1,508)	25.7	19.2
Sex		
Male (N=3,666)	9.8	9.2
Female (N=3,861)	9.6	11.6
Age (years)		
0-4 (N=851)	6.2	11.7
5-9 (N=917)	8.0	20.5
10-19 (N=1,647)	8.3	13.0
20-29 (N=1,272)	10.5	16.7
30-39 (N=991)	14.4	18.1
40-49 (N=649)	17.1	11.4
50-59 (N=439)	10.7	7.7
60-64 (N=191)	8.0	0.0
65+(N=573)	3.1	2.1
Jamaica (N=7,530)	9.7	10.6

TABLE C-6
IMMUNIZATION COVERAGE OF CHILDREN (0-59 MONTHS OLD) BY AREA, QUINTILE, SEX AND AGE

Group	Percentage 6-59 Months Receiving 3 or More Doses of OPV	Percentage 6-59 Months Receiving 3 or More Doses of DPT (%)	Percentage Receiving BCG (%)	Percentage 12-59 Month Vaccinated Against Measles (%)
Area				
KMA (N=257)	97.9	99.2	90.6	90.6
Other Towns (N=153)	99.3	96.5	97.7	92.8
Rural Areas (N=410)	97.0	97.8	96.9	92.5
Quintile				
Poorest (N=242)	97.8	97.8	93.3	92.4
2 (N=186)	99.3	99.3	96.4	91.7
3 (N=172)	95.0	95.7	94.3	90.0
4 (N=110)	96.5	98.8	97.9	94.2
5 (N=96)	96.2	98.7	97.8	97.5
Sex				
Male (N=421)	96.6	97.3	95.3	93.5
Female (N=399)	97.9	98.9	94.6	90.3
Jamaica (N=834)	97.3	98.1	95.4	92.6

TABLE C-7
PERCENTAGE OF BIRTHS REGISTERED (CHILDREN 0-59 MONTHS), BY AREA QUINTILE, SEX

Classification	Percentage of Births Registered
Area	
KMA (N=257)	96.2
Other Towns (N=153)	94.8
Rural Areas (N=410)	94.6
Quintile	
Poorest (N=242)	94.6
2 (N=200)	93.0
3 (N=172)	95.9
4 (N=110)	95.5
5 (N=96)	97.9
Sex	
Male (N=421)	94.9
Female (N=399)	95.5
Jamaica (N=820)	95.2

SECTION D

NUTRITION

TABLE D-1
PREVALENCE OF UNDERNUTRITION AMONG CHILDREN 0-59 MONTH BY AREA

Area	n	Low Weight for Age (Z-score <-2 Per cent
KMA (n=238)	22	9.2
Other Towns (n=149)	3	2.1
Rural Areas (n=388)	14	3.6
JAMAICA (n=769)	39	5.1

Area	n	Low Height for Age (Z-Score <-2) Per cent
KMA (n=235)	21	8.9
Other Towns (n=140)	7	5.0
Rural Areas (n=377)	23	6.1
JAMAICA (n=752)	51	6.8

Area	n	Low Weight for Height (Z-Score <-2) Per cent
KMA (n=238)	11	4.6
Other Towns (n=149)	4	2.8
Rural Areas (n=388)	16	4.1
JAMAICA (n=769)	31	4.0

TABLE D-2 *
PREVALENCE OF UNDERNUTRITION AMONG CHILDREN 0-59 MONTHS, BY QUINTILE

Quintile	n	Low Weight for Age (Z-score2) Per cent
Poorest (n=229)	13	5.7
2 (n=181)	3	1.6
3 (n=171)	11	6.4
4 (n=97)	11	11.3
5 (n=86)	1	1.2
JAMAICA (n=769)	39	5.1

Quintile	n	Low Height for Age (Z-score <-2 Per cent
Poorest (n=226)	23	10.2
2 (n=184)	8	4.3
3 (n=166)	13	7.8
4 (n=93)	7	7.5
5 (n=83)	0	0
JAMAICA (n=752)	51	6.8

Quintile	n	Low Weight for Height (Z-Score<-2) Per cent
Poorest (n=229)	12	5.2
2 (n=181)	6	3.2
3 (n=171)	5	2.9
4 (n=97)	7	7.2
5 (n=86)	1	1.2
JAMAICA (n=769)	31	4.0

* -Table generated from the disaggregation of a small sample into five population group

TABLE D-3
PREVALENCE OF UNDERNUTRITION AMONG CHILDREN 0-59 MONTH,

		Low Weight for Age (Z-score <-2)
Sex	n	Per cent
Male (n=397)	19	4.8
Female (n=372)	20	5.4
JAMAICA (n=769)	39	5.1

		Low Height for Age (Z-Score <-2)
Sex	n	Per cent
Male (n=389)	31	8.0
Female (n=363)	20	5.5
JAMAICA (n=769)	51	6.8

		Low Weight for Height (Z-Score <-2)
Sex	n	Per cent
Male (n=397)	16	4.0
Female (n=372)	15	4.0
JAMAICA (n=769)	31	4.0

TABLE D-4*
PREVALENCE OF UNDERNUTRITION AMONG CHILDREN 0-59 MONTHS BYAGE

		Low Weight for Age (Z-score <-2)
Age (months)	n	Per cent
0-11 (n=158)	5	3.2
12-23(n=164)	10	6.1
24-35 (n=163)	10	6.1
36-47(n=150)	10	6.7
48-59 (n=134)	4	3.0
JAMAICA(n=769)	39	5.1

		Low Height for Age (Z-score <-2)
Age (months)	n	Per cent
0-11 (n=155)	11	7.1
12-23(n=156)	15	9.6
24-35 (n=158)	7	4.4
36-47(n=148)	10	6.8
48-59 (n=133)	8	6
JAMAICA(n=752)	51	6.8

		Low Weight for Height (Z-Score <-2)
Age (months)	n	Per cent
0-11 (n=158)	5	3.2
12-23(n=164)	10	6.1
24-35 (n=163)	5	3.1
36-47(n=150)	5	3.3
48-59 (n=134)	6	4.5
JAMAICA(n=769)	31	4.0

* - Table generated from the disaggregation of a small sample into five population groups

TABLE D-5
SEVERITY AND PREVALENCE OF UNDERNUTRITION AMONG CHILDREN 0-59 MONTH, BY AREA

Low Weight for Age

Area	Moderate n	Moderate Percent	Severe n	Severe Per cent	Total n	Total Per cent
KMA (n=238)	25	10.5	2	0.8	27	11.3
Other Towns (n=149	4	2.8	0	0.0	4	2.8
Rural Areas (n=388	15	3.9	1	0.3	16	4.2
JAMAICA (n=769)	44	5.7	3	0.4	47	6.1

STUNTING

Area	Moderate n	Moderate Percent	Severe n	Severe Per cent	Total n	Total Per cent
KMA (n=238)	5	2.1	5	2.1	10	4.2
Other Towns (n=149	3	2.1	0	0.0	3	4.1
Rural Areas (n=388	13	3.4	4	1.4	17	4.8
JAMAICA (n=769)	21	2.7	9	1.2	30	3.9

WASTING

Area	Moderate n	Moderate Percent	Severe n	Severe Per cent	Total n	Total Per cent
KMA (n=238)	3	1.3	1	0.4	4	1.7
Other Towns (n=149	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Rural Areas (n=388	5	1.3	1	0.3	6	1.6
JAMAICA (n=769)	8	1	2	0.3	10	1.3

TABLE D-6*
SEVERITY AND PREVALENCE OF UNDERNUTRITION AMONG CHILDREN 0-59 MONTHS, BY QUINTILE

Low Weight for Age

Quintile	Moderate n	Moderate Per cent	Severe n	Severe Per cent	Total n	Total Per cent
Poorest (n=229)	14	6.1	2	0.9	16	7.0
2 (n=181)	3	1.6	0	0.0	3	1.6
3 (n=171)	14	8.2	1	0.6	15	8.8
4 (n=97)	11	11.3	0	0.0	11	11.3
5 (n=86)	2	2.3	0	0.0	2	2.3
JAMAICA (n=769)	44	5.7	3	0.4	47	6.1

STUNTING

Quintile	Moderate n	Moderate Per cent	Severe n	Severe Per cent	Total n	Total Per cent
Poorest (n=229)	8	3.5	6	2.6	13	6.1
2 (n=181)	5	2.7	0	0.0	5	2.7
3 (n=171)	6	3.5	2	1.2	8	4.7
4 (n=97)	2	2.1	1	1.0	3	3.1
5 (n=86)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
JAMAICA (n=769)	21	2.7	9	1.2	30	3.9

WASTING

Quintile	Moderate n	Moderate Per cent	Severe n	Severe Per cent	Total n	Total Percent
Poorest (n=229)	4	1.7	0	0.0	4	1.7
2 (n=181)	2	1.1	0	0.0	2	1.1
3 (n=171)	2	1.2	1	0.6	3	1.8
4 (n=97)	0	0.0	1	1.0	1	1.0
5 (n=86)	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
JAMAICA (N=769)	8	1.0	2	0.3	10	1.3

* Data generated from the disaggregation of a small sample into five groups

TABLE D-7
SEVERITY AND PREVALENCE OF UNDERNUTRITION AMONG CHILDREN 0-59 MONTHS

Low Weight for Age

Sex	Moderate n	Moderate Per cent	Severe n	Severe Per cent	Total n	Total Per cent
Male (n=397)	21	5.3	1	0.3	22	5.6
Female (n=372)	23	6.2	2	0.5	25	6.7
JAMAICA (n=769)	44	5.7	3	0.4	47	6.1

STUNTING

Sex	Moderate n	Moderate Per cent	Severe n	Severe Per cent	Total n	Total Per cent
Male (n=397)	13	3.3	5	1.3	18	4.6
Female (n=372)	8	2.1	4	1.1	12	3.2
JAMAICA (n=769)	21	2.7	9	1.2	30	3.9

WASTING

Sex	Moderate n	Moderate Per cent	Severe n	Severe Per cent	Total n	Total Per cent
Male (n=397)	4	1.0	0	0.0	4	1.0
Female (n=372)	4	2.1	2	0.5	6	1.6
JAMAICA (n=769)	8	2.7	2	0.3	10	1.3

TABLE D-8*
SEVERITY AND PREVALENCE OF UUDERNUTRITION AMONG CHILDREN 0-59 MONTHS, BY AGE

	Low Weight for Age					
	Moderate		Severe		Total	
Age (months)	n	Per cent	n	Per cent	n	Per cent
0-11 (n=158)	7	4.4	1	0.6	8	5.0
12-23(n=164)	11	6.7	0	0.0	11	6.7
24-35 (n=163)	8	4.9	1	0.6	9	5.5
36-47(n=150)	12	8.0	0	0.0	12	8.0
48-59 (n=134)	6	4.5	1	0.7	7	5.2
JAMAICA (n=769)	44	5.7	3	0.4	47	6.1

	STUNTING					
	Moderate		Severe		Total	
Age(months)	n	Percent	n	Percent	n	Percent
0-11 (n=158)	4	2.5	1	0.6	5	3.1
12-23(n=164)	7	4.3	3	1.8	10	6.1
24-35 (n=163)	1	0.6	2	1.2	3	1.8
36-47(n=150)	6	4.0	1	0.7	6	4.7
48-59 (n=134)	3	2.2	2	1.5	5	3.7
JAMAICA (n=769)	21	2.7	9	1.2	30	3.9

	WASTING					
	Moderate		Several		Total	
Age (months)	n	Per cent	n	Per cent	n	Per cent
0-11 (n=158)	1	0.6	0	0.0	1	0.6
12-23(n=164)	1	0.6	0	0.0	1	0.6
24-35 (n=163)	2	1.2	1	0.6	3	1.8
36-47(n=150)	2	1.3	1	0.7	3	2.0
48-59 (n=134)	2	1.5	0	0.0	2	1.5
JAMAICA (n=769)	8	1.0	2	0.3	10	1.3

* - Data generated from the disaggregation of a small sample into five population groups

APPENDIX D1

REGRESSION MODEL TO IDENTIFY THE CONSUMPTION GROUPS WITH THE HIGHEST

Level of Low Weight for Age

Low Weight for Age	Coef.	t (p<|t|)	Coef	t (p<|t|)
Quantile 1			-0.008	-0.323
			(0.747)	
2	-0.04	-2.276	-0.048	-2.311
	(0.023)		(0.021)	
3	0.008	0.323		
	(0.747)			
4	0.057	1.597	0.049	1.317
	(0.111)		(0.188)	
5	-0.045	-2.348	-0.053	-2.391
	(0.019)		(-0.017)	
Cons.	0.057	3.712	0.064	3.429
	(0.000)		(0.001)	

APPENDIX D2

REGRESSION MODEL TO IDENTIFY THE CONSUMPTION GROUPS WITH THE HIGHEST

'Level of Low Height for Age'

Low Height for Age	Coef		t (p<|t)
Quantile 1			
2	-0.057		-2.316
		(0.021)	
3	-0.024		-0.847
		(0.397)	
4	-0.028		-0.846
		(0.398)	
5	-0.1		-5.055
		(0.000)	
Cons.	0.1		5.055
		(0.000)	

APPENDIX D3

REGRESSION MODEL TO IDENTIFY THE CONSUMPTION GROUPS WITH THE HIGHEST 'Levels of Low Weight for Height

Low Weight for Height	Coef	t (p<\t\)	Coef	t (p<\t\)	Coef	t (p<\t\)
Quantile 1			0.023	1.175	0.020	1.030
			(0.240)			(0.304)
2	-0.020	-1.029	0.003	0.156		
		(0.304)		(0.876)		
3	0.023	-1.175			-0.003	-0.160
		(0.240)				(0.876)
4	0.020	0.664	0.043	1.467	0.040	1.370
		(0.507)		(0.148)		(0.171)
5	-0.041	-2.171	0.176	-1.017	-0.020	-1.180
		(0.030)		(0.309)		(0.238)
Cons	0.052	3.558	0.029	2.269	0.032	2.490
		(0..000)		(0.024)		(0.013)

SECTION E

EDUCATION

TABLE E-1
PERCENTAGE ENROLMENT BY AGE, EDUCATION LEVEL, AREA AND SEX

Age and Education Level	Jamaica	Area			Sex	
		KMA	Other Towns	Rural Areas	Male	Female
3-5 Years	(N=529)	(N=154)	(N=102)	(N=273)	(N=272)	(N=257)
Early Childhood	80.8	87.5	81.2	76.3	79.3	82.3
Primary	4.3	2.9	1.1	6.4	3.9	4.7
None	14.9	9.6	17.7	17.3	16.8	13.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
6-11 Years	(N=1068)	N=283)	(N=215)	(N=570)	(N=517)	(N=551)
Early Childhood	0.8	0.4	0.0	1.4	0.4	1.3
Primary	96.8	96.7	98.7	96.2	96.9	96.8
Secondary	1.5	2.4	0.9	1.3	1.6	1.5
None	0.8	0.6	0.4	1.0	1.1	0.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
12-14 Years	(N=526)	(N=140)	(N=102)	(N=284)	(N=267)	(N=259)
Primary	25.4	24.6	17.1	28.8	25.5	25.4
Secondary	72.8	74.5	80.7	69.2	71.6	74.1
None	1.7	0.9	2.2	2.0	2.9	0.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
15-16 Years	(N=334)	(N=106)	(N=72)	(N=156)	(N=176)	(N=158)
Primary	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0
Secondary	76.9	81.2	77.2	73.8	75.0	79.2
Tertiary	0.9	1.9	1.2	0.0	1.2	0.5
None	22.2	16.9	21.6	26.2	23.8	20.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
17-19 Years	(N=418)	(N=125)	(N=79)	(N=214)	(N=203)	(N=215)
Secondary	22.0	25.3	20.6	20.6	20.0	24.0
Tertiary	6.3	7.3	12.8	3.3	4.1	8.4
None	71.7	67.4	66.6	76.1	75.9	67.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
20-24 Years	(N=644)	(N=231)	(N=120)	(N=293)	(N=317)	(N=327)
Secondary	0.5	0.5	1.7	0.0	0.6	0.4
Tertiary	2.5	5.0	1.8	0.6	2.1	2.9
None	97.0	94.5	96.5	99.4	97.3	96.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

NOTE: Figures adjusted for non-response

TABLE E-2
PERCENTAGE ENROLMENT BY EDUCATION LEVEL

Education Level	Percentage Enrolment
Total Early Childhood	17.9
- Basic/Infant/Kindergarten	
Total Primary	49.3
- Primary	
- All Age (1-6)	
Total Secondary	31.0
- All Age (7-9)	
- New Secondary	
- Comprehensive High	
- Secondary High	
- Technical High	
- Vocational	
Total Tertiary	1.8
- University	
- Post-Secondary	
- Adult/Night School	
- Community College	
Total	100.0

NOTE: Figures adjusted for non-response

TABLE E-3
PERCENTAGE ENROLLED IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS BY AREA, QUINTILE, SEX AND AGE

	School Sector		
Category	Public	Private	Total
Area			
KMA (N=538)	96.3	3.7	100.0
Other Towns (N=380	96.6	3.4	100.0
Rural Areas (N=100	97.5	2.5	100.0
Quintile			
Poorest (N=464)	98.5	1.5	100.0
2 (N=437)	98.6	1.4	100.0
3 (N=402)	98.3	1.7	100.0
4 (N=370)	97.0	3.0	100.0
5 (N=253)	90.1	9.9	100.0
Sex			
Male (N=945)	96.8	3.2	100.0
Female (N=981)	97.1	2.9	100.0
Age (Years)			
3-5 (N=23)	91.5	8.5	100.0
6-11 (N=1050)	96.2	3.8	100.0
12-14 (N=514)	99.0	1.0	100.0
15-16 (N=254)	97.2	2.8	100.0
17-19 (N=85)	95.4	4.6	100.0
20-24 (N=0)	0.0	0.0	0.0
Jamaica (N=1926)	96.9	3.1	100.0

NOTE: Figures adjusted for non-response

TABLE E-4
PERCENTAGE ENROLMENT BY AGE, EDUCATION LEVEL AND QUINTILE

Age and Education Level	Quintile				
	Poorest	2	3	4	5
3-5 Years	(N=150)	(N=110)	(N124)	(N=79)	(N=66)
Early Childhood	72.0	81.8	82.3	86.1	86.4
Primary	6.0	3.6	4.0	2.5	4.6
None	22.0	14.6	13.7	11.4	9.1
Sub-total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
6-11 Years	(N=273)	(N=272)	(N=208)	(N=182)	(N=133)
Early Childhood	0.7	1.8	0.5	0.0	0.8
Primary	98.2	96.0	96.6	97.3	96.2
Secondary	0.4	1.1	2.4	1.7	2.3
None	0.7	1.1	0.0	1.1	0.7
Sub-total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
12-14 Years	(N=134)	(N=111)	(N=118)	(N=107)	(N=56)
Primary	33.6	29.7	20.3	23.4	10.7
Secondary	64.2	68.5	77.1	75.7	87.5
None	2.2	1.8	2.5	0.9	1.8
Sub-total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
15-16 Years	(N=79)	(N=64)	(N=72)	(N=67)	(N=52)
Primary	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Secondary	56.9	78.1	81.9	82.1	92.3
Tertiary	1.3	0.0	1.4	1.5	0.0
None	41.8	21.9	16.7	16.4	7.7
Sub-total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
17-19 Years	(N=91)	(N=80)	(N=85)	(N=97)	(N=65)
Secondary	11.0	16.3	22.3	32.0	29.2
Tertiary	1.0	5.0	5.9	7.2	13.9
None	87.9	78.7	71.8	60.8	56.9
Sub-total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
20-24 Years	(N=103)	(N=124)	(N=140)	(N=137)	(N=140)
Secondary	0.0	0.8	0.0	1.5	0.0
Tertiary	0.0	0.0	0.7	1.5	7.1
None	100.0	99.2	99.3	97.0	92.9
Sub-total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

NOTE: Figures adjusted for non-response

TABLE E-5
PERCENTAGE ENROLMENT IN SECONDARY AND TERTIARY EDUCATION, + BY AREA, QUINTILE AND SEX

Category	School Type							
	All Age (7-9)	New Secondary	Compr High	Secondary High	Technical High	Vocational/ Agricultural	University/ Post Sec.	Adult/ Night	Total
Area									
KMA (N=252)	18.6	17.8	6.5	42.3	3.7	1.6	6.2	3.3	100.0
Other Towns (N=170)	15.9	26.3	7.3	33.8	4.9	4.0	7.3	0.6	100.0
Rural Areas (N=371)	26.1	26.1	16.7	24.9	3.1	0.8	1.9	0.4	100.0
Quintile									
Poorest (N=144)	43.1	27.8	9.0	15.3	3.5	0.0	0.7	0.7	100.0
2 (N=147)	29.3	24.5	15.0	23.8	2.0	2.7	2.0	0.7	100.0
3 (N=181)	19.3	26.0	14.4	32.6	2.8	1.1	3.3	0.6	100.0
4 (N=183)	14.2	23.5	13.1	33.3	7.1	2.7	4.9	1.1	100.0
5 (N=138)	4.4	14.5	7.3	55.1	2.9	2.2	10.1	3.6	100.0
Sex									
Male (N=386)	22.4	27.7	11.3	28.9	3.8	1.4	3.4	1.0	100.0
Female (N=407)	20.6	19.3	11.3	36.0	3.5	2.0	5.5	1.8	100.0
Jamaica (N=793)	21.5	23.4	11.3	32.6	3.7	1.7	4.5	1.4	100.0

Note: Figures adjusted for non-response

TABLE E-6
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF HIGHEST GRADE ACHIEVED BY 12-19YEAR OLDS OUT-OF-SCHOOL, BY AREA, QUINTILE, SEX AND AGE

Category	GRADE 1-6	7-9	10-11	12-13	Total
Area					
KMA (N=95)	0.0	30.3	67.5	2.2	100.0
Other Towns (N=67)	1.4	37.2	61.4	0.0	100.0
Rural Areas (N=200	3.7	46.2	49.1	1.0	100.0
Quintile					
Poorest(N=111)	3.6	56.8	37.8	1.8	100.0
2 (N=73)	2.7	42.5	54.8	0.0	100.0
3 (N=74)	2.7	25.7	71.6	0.0	100.0
4 (N=65)	1.5	26.2	72.3	0.0	100.0
5 (N=39)	0.0	33.3	61.5	5.1	100.0
Sex					
Male (N=197)	4.2	43.4	51.9	0.5	100.0
Female (N=165)	0.0	36.3	61.9	1.8	100.0
Age (years)					
12-14 (N=8)	30.9	69.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
15-16 (N=69)	2.7	76.0	21.3	0.0	100.0
17-19 (N=285)	1.3	30.6	66.6	1.4	100.0
Jamaica (N=362)	2.2	40.1	56.5	1.1	100.0

NOTE: Figures adjusted for non-response

TABLE E-7
PERCENTAGE ATTENDANCE IN PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS BY SEX, SCHOOOL TYPE, QUINTILE AND AREA

Group	NUMBER OF DAYS ATENDED IN REFERENCE WEEK						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Sex							
Male (N=928)	5.4	0.4	2.2	4.3	8.3	79.4	100.0
Female (N=974)	5.4	0.7	2.5	3.9	6.4	81.1	100.0
School Type							
Primary (N=619)	5.0	0.8	3.3	5.2	6.9	78.8	100.0
All Age (1-6) (N=552)	5.5	0.2	1.0	3.3	7.2	82.8	100.0
All Age (7-9) (N=170)	4.4	1.0	1.7	1.2	13.2	78.6	100.0
New Sec. (N=186)	4.0	0.5	4.0	6.1	6.9	78.5	100.0
Compreh. High (N=95)	3.4	0.0	0.0	7.1	4.6	84.9	100.0
Technical High (N=30)	4.4	0.0	0.0	4.0	19.8	71.8	100.0
Second. High (N=250)	8.7	0.7	3.0	2.3	4.8	80.5	100.0
Quintile							
Poorest (N=455)	6.8	0.7	4.4	4.2	10.5	73.4	100.0
2 (N=433)	3.9	0.9	1.9	3.7	9.0	80.6	100.0
3 (N=394)	6.6	1.0	0.8	5.3	6.6	79.7	100.0
4 (N=370)	3.5	0.3	1.6	3.8	6.8	84.0	100.0
5 (N=250)	4.4	0.0	2.4	2.4	2.8	88.0	100.0
Area							
KMA (N=536)	4.1	0.6	1.8	3.6	5.2	84.7	100.0
Other Towns (N=378)	4.3	0.5	2.3	3.0	5.5	84.4	100.0
Rural Are (N=919)	6.6	0.5	2.6	4.8	9.3	76.2	100.0
Jamaica (N=1902)	5.4	0.6	2.3	4.1	7.3	80.3	100.0

NOTE: Figures adjusted for non-response

TABLE E-8
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPATION IN THE SCHOOL FEEDING PROGRAMME, BY TYPE OF MEAL, SCHOOL TYPE, AREA AND QUINTILE

Category	Type of Meal: Milk/ Nutribun	Cooked Meal	Both	Non-participation	Total
School Type					
Primary (N=442)	27.6	13.4	14.5	44.5	100.0
All Age (1-6) (N=398)	29.1	13.5	11.2	46.2	100.0
All Age (7-9) (N=123)	18.5	12.0	10.0	59.5	100.0
New Secondary (N=141)	2.1	17.7	4.9	75.3	100.0
Comprehensive (N=71)	1.5	8.8	11.1	78.7	100.0
Secondary High (N=194)	1.6	15.8	8.4	74.2	100.0
Technical High (N=24)	4.6	16.1	12.7	66.6	100.0
Area					
KMA (N=392)	17.6	10.1	14.4	57.9	100.0
Other Towns (N=238)	8.0	11.8	15.9	64.2	100.0
Rural Areas (N=763)	23.8	16.7	7.8	51.8	100.0
Quintile					
Poorest (N=359)	34.5	13.1	9.8	42.6	100.0
2 (N=313)	23.9	18.2	9.3	48.6	100.0
3 (N=282)	11.7	9.9	15.6	62.8	100.0
4 (N=273)	13.2	13.2	12.4	61.2	100.0
5 (N=166)	2.4	17.5	13.2	66.9	100.0
Jamaica (N=1393)	19.3	13.9	11.1	55.7	100.0

NOTE: Figures adjusted for non-response

TABLE E-9
MEAN ANNUAL EXPENDITURE ON SCHOOL AND SCHOOL RELATED ITEMS, BY AREA, QUINTILE, AND SCHOOL TYPE ($)

Area	Tuition & Fees	Extra Lessons	Transport	Lunch & Snacks	Uniforms	Books	Other Supplies
KMA (N=624)	$2, 467.00	$2,406.00	$1,530.00	$3,977.00	$1,131.00	$1,173.00	$416.00
Other Towns (N=446)	$1,932.00	$1,730.00	$1,744.00	$3,479.00	$1,027.00	$960.00	$345.00
Rural Areas (N=1161)	$1,603.00	$1,170.00	$1,981.00	$2,988.00	$942.00	$822.00	$394.00
Quintile							$234.00
Poorest (N=522)	$909.00	$1,660.00	$1,456.00	$2,013.00	$693.00	$525.00	$416.00
2 (N=505)	$1,369.00	$1,430.00	$1,658.00	$2,985.00	$990.00	$718.00	$402.00
3 (N=482)	$1,748.00	$1,290.00	$1,500.00	$3,598.00	$953.00	$831.00	$419.00
4 (N=426)	$1,915.00	$2,432.00	$1,867.00	$4,408.00	$1,101.00	$1,326.00	$534.00
5 (N=296)	$4,108.00	$1,877.00	$2,440.00	$5,168.00	$1,577.00	$1,607.00	$534.00
School Type							
Early Child. (N=355)	$1,827.00	$1,382.00	$2,327.00	$2,348.00	$711.00	$249.00	$224.00
Primary (N=607)	$1,660.00	$1,907.00	$1,372.00	$3,031.00	$933.00	$800.00	$318.00
All Age (1-6) (N=546)	$732.00	$1,247.00	$1,137.00	$2,661.00	$816.00	$539.00	$324.00
All Age (7-9) (N=169)	$186.00	$2,045.00	$1,333.00	$2,858.00	$977.00	$713.00	$354.00
New Second. (N=181)	$1,585.00	$1,565.00	$1,798.00	$4,605.00	$1,290.00	$1,189.00	$453.00
Comprehensive (N=95)	$1,899.00	$1,565.00	$2,237.00	$5,579.00	$1,332.00	$1,844.00	$504.00
Secondary High (N=249)	$3,946.00	$2,030.00	$2,232.00	$5,249.00	$1,686.00	$2,447.00	$793.0
Technical High (N=29)	$3,140.00	$2,414.00	$3,233.00	$7,163.00	$1,741.00	$1,886.00	$517.00
Jamaica (N=2231)	$1,971.00	$1,768.00	$1,771.00	$3,387.00	$1,014.00	$961.00	$390.00

TABLE E-10
SCHOOL FEES, AND ASSISTANCE GIVEN THROUGH THE GOVERNMENT'S STUDENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMME (SAP) AND OTHER SOURCES, BY AREA, QUINTILE, AND SCHOOL TYPE (Mean dollar ($) Values)

Category Area	Secondary School Fees	Assistance from SAP	Assistance from Other Sources
KMA	(N=158) 2973	(N=3) 1346	(N=14) 3839
Other Towns	(N=112) 2256	(N=6) 707	(N=14) 2500
Rural Areas	(N=219) 2499	(N=11) 976	(N=30) 1641
Quintile			
Poorest	(N=75) 2164	(N=4) 1400	(N=10) 1445
2	(N=83) 2259	(N=5) 569	(N=13) 1568
3	(N=110) 2498	(N=6) 1148	(N=16) 1906
4	(N=123) 2681	(N=5) 621	(N=10) 3944
5	(N=98) 3145	(N=0) 0	(N=9) 3767
School Type			
New Secondary	(N=150) 1678	(N=8) 670	(N=21) 1448
Comprehensive	(N=82) 1650	(N=6) 1195	(N=7) 1184
Secondary High	(N=222) 3543	(N=5) 1057	(N=27) 3509
Technical High	(N=28) 3122	(N=1) 1000	(N=3) 1693

NOTE:Figures not in brackets are the mean dollar values

SECTION F

HOUSING

TABLE F-1
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF DWELLINGS BY TYPE OF HOUSING UNIT, AREA AND QUINTILE

Type of Housing Unit	Area			
	Jamaica (N=1976)	KMA (N=629)	Other Towns (N=399)	Rural Areasl (N=948)
Separate House Detached	76.1	5.0	74.6	92.4
Semi-detached House	5.7	11.6	4.6	1.6
Part of a House	14.1	24.9	18.3	4.4
Apartment Building	2.2	5.0	2.2	0.1
Town House	1.4	3.3	0.0	0.6
Improvised Housing Unit	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.1
Part of Commercial Building	0.4	0.2	0.0	0.6
Other	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.2
All Types	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Type of Housing Unit	Quintile				
	Poorest (N=257)	2 (N=313)	3 (N=338)	4 (N=427)	5 (N=641)
Separate House Detached	87.6	83.9	80.4	76.3	71.3
Semi-detached House	3.1	4.2	4.8	6.7	7.3
Part of a House	8.1	10.7	12.5	14.0	15.2
Apartment Building	0.4	0.7	1.5	1.9	2.9
Town House	0.0	0.0	0.3	1.0	2.8
Improvised Housing Unit	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.2
Part of Commercial Building	0.8	0.7	0.0	0.2	0.3
Other	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.2
All Types	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

NOTE: Estimates for Area and Jamaica adjusted for non-response

TABLE F-2
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF DWELLINGS BY MATERIAL OF OUTER WALL, BY AREA AND QUINTILE

Classification	Material of Outer Wall							
	Wood	Stone	Brick	Concrete Nog	Block & Steel	Wattle & Daub	Other	All Types
Area								
KMA	18.4	0.6	1.5	16.1	56.1	0.0	7.3	100.0
Other Towns	37.8	2.6	0.0	16.8	41.1	0.0	1.7	100.0
Rural Areas	33.2	0.4	0.8	17.0	46.8	0.6	1.3	100.0
Quintile								
Poorest	45.9	0.8	0.0	17.1	33.9	0.8	1.6	100.0
2	33.9	1.6	0.6	21.4	39.3	0.6	2.6	100.0
3	35.4	0.6	0.9	19.1	41.4	0.0	2.7	100.0
4	26.5	1.4	1.2	13.8	53.2	0.0	4.0	100.0
5	19.1	0.3	1.1	15.0	59.7	0.2	4.7	100.0
Jamaica	29.0	0.9	0.9	16.6	48.9	0.3	3.5	100.0

NOTE: Estimates for Area and Jamaica adjusted for non-response

TABLE F-3
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY TYPE OF TOILET FACILITY, BY AREA

Type of Toilet Facility	JAMAICA		AREA KMA		Other Towns		Rural Areas	
	Households With Facility	Households Having Exclusive Use	Households With Facility	Households Having Exclusive Use	Households With Facility	Households Having Exclusive Use	Households With Facility	Households Having Exclusive Use
WC Linked To Sewer	21.0	17.4	49.2	41.0	8.5	6.2	5.2	4.5
WC Not Linked To Sewer	31.3	24.9	35.1	21.7	41.0	35.1	24.3	22.9
Pit	47.5	35.6	15.7	8.3	49.8	31.4	70.3	57.8
Other	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.5	0.2	0.2
None	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
All Types	100.0	78.1	100.0	71.0	100.0	73.2	100.0	85.4

NOTE: Estimates adjusted for non-response

TABLE F - 4
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY TYPE OF TOILET FACILITY, BY QUINTILE

Type of Toilet Facility	Poorest		Quintile 2		Quintile 3		Quintile 4		Quintile 5	
	Households With Facility	Households Having Exclusive Use	Households With Facility	Households Having Exclusive Use	Households With Facility	Households Having Exclusive Use	Households With Facility	Households Having Exclusive Use	Households With Facility	Households Having Exclusive Use
WC Linked To Sewer	7.5	6.7	9.8	6.2	13.8	12.9	23.1	20.4	32.4	27.2
WC Not Linked To Sewer	10.2	8.2	20.0	15.4	29.7	22.2	33.7	27.9	41.3	34.4
Pit	82.0	66.6	69.8	56.7	56.2	42.3	42.8	30.3	26.3	16.7
Other	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.2	0.0	0.0
None	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
All Types	100.0	81.9	100.0	78.7	100.0	77.8	100.0	78.8	100.0	78.4

TABLE F- 5
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF DWELLINGS BY SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER, BY AREA AND QUINTILE

Classification	Source of Drinking Water: Indoor Tap/ Pipe	Outside Private Tap/Pipe	Public Standpipe	Well	River/Lake/ Spring/Pond	Rianwater (Tank)	Other	All Types
Area								
KMA	75.1	21.8	1.6	0.0	0.1	0.5	0.9	100.0
Other Towns	44.2	26.0	16.6	0.0	1.1	8.7	3.4	100.0
Rural Areas	17.2	18.5	27.5	0.1	8.0	24.5	4.2	100.0
Quintile								
Poorest	12.3	20.0	30.8	0.0	7.7	21.9	7.3	100.0
2	21.4	19.4	29.8	0.3	5.8	19.1	4.2	100.0
3	36.6	26.5	15.8	0.0	6.3	12.5	2.4	100.0
4	46.0	24.4	13.3	0.0	3.1	10.9	2.4	100.0
5	60.8	17.7	8.9	0.0	1.6	9.8	1.2	100.0
Jamaica	42.3	21.1	16.5	0.1	4.0	13.2	2.9	100.0

NOTE: Estimates for Area and Jamaica adjusted for non-response

TABLE F - 6
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY DISTANCE FROM PUBLIC WATER SOURCE, BY AREA AND QUINTILE

Classification	Households Analysed (N)	Distance from Source (yards): 0-49	50-199	200-499	500-999	1000+	Total
Area/Source							
KMA							
Public Standpipe	8	65.9	22.7	11.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
River/Lake/ Spring/Pond	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other Towns							
Public Standpipe	65	56.9	34.3	8.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
River/Lake/ Spring/Pond	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Rural Areas							
Public Standpipe	262	57.0	22.2	13.6	2.2	5.0	100.0
River/Lake/ Spring/Pond	75	43.9	18.3	18.3	3.5	16.1	100.0
Quintile/Source							
Poorest							
Public Standpipe	80	61.3	17.5	11.3	2.5	7.5	100.0
River/Lake/ Spring/Pond	20	30.0	20.0	20.0	10.0	20.0	100.0
2							
Public Standpipe	91	47.3	33.0	17.6	1.1	1.1	100.0
River/Lake/ Spring/Pond	18	50.0	11.1	27.8	0.0	11.1	100.0
3							
Public Standpipe	53	58.5	28.3	3.8	0.0	9.4	100.0
River/Lake/ Spring/Pond	18	44.4	22.2	11.1	5.6	16.7	100.0
4							
Public Standpipe	56	62.5	19.6	16.1	0.0	1.8	100.0
River/Lake/ Spring/Pond	12	41.7	25.0	16.7	0.0	16.7	100.0
5							
Public Standpipe	55	63.6	21.8	9.1	3.6	1.8	100.0
River/Lake/ Spring/Pond	8	62.5	12.5	12.5	0.0	12.5	100.0
Jamaica							
Public Standpipe	335	57.3	24.6	12.6	1.7	3.9	100.0
River/Lake/ Spring/Pond	76	44.8	18.0	18.0	3.4	15.8	100.0

NOTE: Estimates for Area and Jamaica adjusted for non-response.

TABLE F-7
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY SOURCE OF LIGHTING BY AREA AND QUINTILE

Classification	Source of Lighting				
	Electricity	Kerosene	Other	None	All Types
Area					
KMA	86.8	7.7	0.5	5.0	100.0
Other Towns	75.0	23.7	0.5	0.8	100.0
Rural Areas	58.8	39.8	0.6	0.9	100.0
Quintile					
Poorest	43.5	54.6	0.4	1.5	100.0
2	57.3	41.1	0.7	1.0	100.0
3	69.4	28.2	0.6	1.8	100.0
4	77.4	20.2	0.2	2.1	100.1
5	85.6	11.6	0.8	2.0	100.0
5					
Jamaica	71.5	25.7	0.5	2.3	100.0

NOTE: Estimates for Area and Jamaica adjusted for non-response

TABLE F- 8
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS HAVING KITCHEN FACILITIES AND EXCLUSIVE USE OF KITCHEN FACILITIES BY AREA AND QUINTILE

Classification	Households With Facility	Households Having Exclusive Use of Facility
Area		
KMA	92.7	75.1
Other Towns	94.3	80.1
Rural Areas	95.8	88.8
Quintile		
Poorest	93.8	86.9
2	93.2	83.9
3	94.1	82.8
4	96.9	84.8
5	94.8	80.2
Jamaica	94.4	82.4

NOTE: Estimates for Area and Jamaica adjusted for non-response

TABLE F-9
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY TENURE STATUS, BY AREA AND QUINTILE

Tenure Status	Jamaica	KMA	Other Towns	Rural Areas
		Area		
Owned By Household Member	59.1	43.8	59.4	70.2
Rent-Free	14.4	15.4	11.4	15.0
Rented				
Leased	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.4
Private Rented	21.8	34.2	25.5	11.1
Government Rented	1.9	3.0	1.8	1.2
Squatter	0.7	1.4	0.3	0.4
Other	0.7	1.0	0.3	0.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Owned By	Poorest	2	3	4	5
			Quintile		
Rent-Free	16.5	14.5	15.1	15.4	12.1
Rented					
Leased	2.3	1.9	0.3	1.4	0.8
Private Rented	8.5	12.3	16.0	21.1	31.9
Government Rented	1.2	3.2	1.2	1.7	1.9
Squatter	0.4	1.6	0.3	1.0	0.5
Other	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.2	1.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

NOTE: Estimates for Area and Jamaica adjusted for non-reponse

TABLE F-10
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF TENANT HOUSEHOLDS BY LANDLORD TYPE, BY AREA AND QUINTILE

Classification	Households Analysed (N)	From Whom Rented				
		Relative	Private Employer	Public Agency	Private Individual/ Agency	Total
Area						
KMA	213	3.2	0.8	1.8	94.2	100.0
Other Towns	102	7.1	4.8	1.1	87.0	100.0
Rural Areas	119	7.5	1.7	2.7	88.2	100.0
Quintile						
Poorest	28	3.6	3.6	0.0	92.9	100.0
2	44	6.8	0.0	0.0	93.2	100.0
3	56	7.1	0.0	3.6	89.3	100.0
4	96	10.4	3.1	1.0	85.4	100.0
5	210	3.3	2.4	2.4	91.9	100.0
Jamaica	434	5.1	1.9	1.9	91.1	100.0

NOTE: Estimates for Area and Jamaica adjusted for non-response

TABLE F-11
MEAN MONTHLY RENTAL PAYMENT AND RENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL HOUSEHOLD CONSUMPTION, BY AREA AND QUINTILE

Classification	Households Analysed (N)	Mean Monthly Rent ($)	Rent as % of Total Household Consumption
Area			
KMA	203	1,709	11.8
Other Towns	99	766	8.3
Rural Areas	119	608	6.3
Quintile			
Poorest	27	229	4.3
2	42	379	5.5
3	52	703	7.1
4	92	879	8.6
5	208	1,707	11.2
Jamaica	421	1,210	10.1

NOTE: Estimates for Area and Jamaica adjusted for non-response

TABLE F-12
MEAN MONTHLY WATER PAYMENT AND WATER PAYMENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL HOUSEHOLD, CONSUMPTION, BY AREA AND QUINTILE

Classification	Households Analysed (N)	Mean Monthly Water Payment ($)	Water as % of Total Household Consumption
Area			
KMA	454	320	2.0
Other Towns	235	286	2.3
Rural Areas	254	250	2.2
Quintile			
Poorest	50	214	2.9
2	85	229	2.6
3	156	262	2.4
4	230	292	2.3
5	422	326	1.9
Jamaica	943	294	2.1

NOTE: Estimates for Area and Jamaica adjusted for non-response

TABLE F-13
MEAN MONTHLY ELECTRICITY PAYMENT AND ELECTRICITY PAYMENT AS PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL HOUSEHOLD CONSUMPTION, BY AREA AND QUINTILE

Classification	Households Analysed (N)	Mean Monthly Electricity Payment ($)	Electricity as % of Total Household Consumption
Area			
KMA	467	704	4.5
Other Towns	280	618	4.8
Rural Areas	540	483	4.3
Quintile			
Poorest	101	432	5.8
2	161	461	5.1
3	218	622	5.5
4	292	604	4.8
5	515	644	3.8
Jamaica	1,287	595	4.5

NOTE: Estimates for Area and Jamaica adjusted for non-response

TABLE F- 14
MEAN MONTHLY TELEPHONE PAYMENT AND TELEPHONE EXPENSES AS PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL HOUSEHOLD CONSUMPTION, BY AREA AND QUINTILE

Classification	Households Analysed (N)	Mean Monthly Telephone Payment ($)	Telephone as % of Total Household Consumption
Area			
KMA	214	634	3.2
Other Towns	118	488	3.3
Rural Areas	82	585	3.9
Quintile			
Poorest	18	467	4.7
2	27	297	3.1
3	45	345	2.8
4	80	568	3.8
5	244	646	3.1
Jamaica	414	585	3.3

NOTE: Estimates for Area and Jamaica adjusted for non-response

TABLE F-15
MEAN MONTHLY MORTGAGE PAYMENT AND MORTGAGE PAYMENT AS PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL HOUSEHOLD CONSUMPTION, BY AREA AND QUINTILE

Classification	Households Analysed (N)	Mean Monthly Mortgage Payment ($)	Mortgage as % of Total Household Consumption
Area			
KMA	60	2,507	12.7
Other Towns	5	737	5.7
Rural Areas	7	1,077	5.4
Quintile			
Poorest	4	1,000	13.0
2	2	265	3.2
3	12	565	3.7
4	20	873	6.0
5	34	3,112	13.3
Jamaica	72	2,227	11.5

NOTE: Estimates for Area and Jamaica adjusted for non-response

TABLE F-16
MEAN MONTHLY PROPERTY TAX PAYMENT AND PROPERTY TAX PAYMENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL HOUSEHOLD CONSUMPTION, BY AREA AND QUINTILE

Classification	Households Analysed (N)	Mean Monthly Property Tax Payment ($)	Property Tax as % of Total Household Consumption
Area			
KMA	129	61	0.3
Other Towns	108	27	0.2
Rural Areas	468	16	0.2
Quintile			
Poorest	107	14	0.2
2	126	13	0.2
3	128	18	0.2
4	134	22	0.2
5	210	46	0.3
Jamaica	705	26	0.2

NOTE: Estimates for Area and Jamaica adjusted for non-response

TABLE F-17
PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS OWNING SELECTED DURABLE GOODS, BY AREA

Durable Good	Code	Area			
		Jamaica (N=1976)	KMA (N=605)	Other Towns (N=389)	Rural (N=946)
Sewing Machines	601	13.5	17.6	14.2	10.2
Gas Stoves	602	64.0	79.9	71.0	49.3
Electric Stoves	603	1.0	2.0	0.5	0.5
Refrigerators/Freezers	604	49.4	64.8	53.4	36.2
Air Conditioners	605	0.7	1.4	0.7	0.2
Fans	606	40.1	66.1	32.9	23.7
Radio/Cassette Players	607	72.0	71.1	70.5	73.3
Phonographs	608	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Stereo Equipment	609	11.1	16.6	14.1	5.7
Video Equipment	610	18.9	26.0	24.3	11.5
Washing Machines	611	3.4	6.3	3.4	1.3
TV Sets	612	58.7	74.1	62.0	45.9
Bicycles	613	11.1	12.4	13.2	9.2
Motor Bikes	614	1.0	0.4	0.5	1.6
Cars/Other Vehicles	615	9.0	11.3	10.4	6.6
None	13.1	9.0	13.2	16.0	

Note: Estimates adjusted for non-response

TABLE F-18
PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS OWNING SELECTED DURABLE GOODS, BY QUINTILE

Durable Good	Code	Quintile				
		Poorest (N=260)	2 (N310)	3 (N=337)	4 (N=422)	5 (N=647)
Sewing Machines	601	8.8	11.9	10.4	14.0	16.5
Gas Stoves	602	33.5	52.6	64.7	68.5	76.4
Electric Stoves	603	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3
Refrigerators/Freezers	604	18.1	33.5	49.0	53.3	64.9
Air Conditioners	605	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	1.5
Fans	606	14.6	23.9	36.5	39.8	56.3
Radio/Çassette Players	607	61.2	75.5	74.8	72.0	73.1
Phonographs	608	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Stereo Equipment	609	2.7	4.8	7.4	10.4	19.2
Video Equipment	610	5.0	7.7	13.6	22.0	30.3
Washing Machines	611	1.2	0.3	0.6	1.9	7.7
TV Sets	612	36.5	46.1	58.2	63.5	69.2
Bicycles	613	5.0	8.4	9.2	13.0	14.5
Motor Bikes	614	0.8	0.3	0.6	0.7	1.7
Cars/Other Vehicles	615	1.2	1.6	2.1	6.9	19.8
None		28.1	14.5	11.6	11.4	8.8

SECTION G

FOOD STAMP PROGRAMME

TABLE G-1
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF INDIVIDUALS IN TERMS OF APPLICATION FO AND RECEIPT OF FOOD STAMPS, BY AREA AND QUINTILE

Classification	NOT RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS			
	Food Stamps	Applied	Never Applied	Total
Area				
KMA (N=2,040)	2.6	1.5	95.9	100.0
Other Towns (N=1,198)	4.7	3.5	91.8	100.0
Rural Areas (N=2,418)	12.3	5.6	82.1	100.0
Quintile				
Poorest (N=791)	16.8	8.2	75	100.0
2 (N=944)	13	5.1	81.9	100.0
3 (N=1205)	6.6	4.0	89.4	100.0
4 (N=1,300)	3.3	2.8	93.9	100.0
5 (N=1,416)	2	1.1	96.9	100.0
Jamaica (N=5,656)	7.2	3.7	89.1	100.0

Note:Regional and Jamaica percentages adjusted for non-response.

TABLE G-2
DISTRIBUTION OF INDIVIDUALS RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS, BY AREA AND QUINTILE

Classification	Number of Individuals Receiving Food Stamps	Percentage of Total Recipients
Area		
KMA	54	14.3
Other Towns	54	13.4
Rural Areas	299	72.4
Quintile		
Poorest	133	32.7
2	123	30.2
3	80	19.7
4	43	10.6
5	28	6.9
Jamaica	407	100.0

Note: Percentages adjusted for non-response.

TABLE G-3
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS, BY BENEFICIARY CATEGORY, AREA AND QUINTILE, 1994-1995

Classification	Beneficiary Categories											
	Children Aged Less Than Six Years				Pregnant/ Lactating Women				Elderly/Poor/Disabled			
	1994		1995		1994		1995		1994		1995	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Area												
KMA	153	15.1	244	6.9	32	5	31	0	73	32.9	74	27.3
Other Towns	145	19.1	144	10.8	27	13.4	13	0	80	31.2	46	31.5
Rural Areas	381	31.7	406	26.5	65	11.3	64	8	338	45.2	197	39.8
Quintile												
Poorest	181	36.5	226	23	33	18.2	35	2.9	140	57.1	78	48.7
2	167	22.2	178	21.4	31	6.5	30	10	136	38.2	78	35.9
3	131	25.2	178	16.3	24	12.5	19	5.3	105	40.9	54	33.3
4	126	13.5	124	12.1	18	16.7	15	0	67	32.9	43	32.6
5	74	10.8	88	9.1	18	0	9	0	43	9.3	64	21.9
Jamaica	679	23.7	794	17.9	124	11.3	108	4.6	491	40.9	317	35.3

Note: (i)N' means number of eligible individuals in sample.

TABLE G-4
SELF-REPORTED REASONS FOR NON-RECEIPT OF FOOD STAMPS
AMONG APPLICATIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED MORE THAN 12 MONTHS EARLIER

CLASSIFICATION	Reason						
Classification	Never Checked Back	Put on File	Turned Down	Did not Receive In Mail	Other	Don't Know	Total
Area							
KMA (N=39)	0.0	28.2	2.4	11.9	3.4	54.2	100
Other Towns N=39)	0.0	4.7	20.7	7.9	2.4	64.3	100
Rural Areas (N=124)	3.7	13.0	6.0	2.4	8.4	66.5	100
Quintile							
Poorest (N=68)	4.4	19.1	8.8	2.9	10.3	54.4	100
2 (N=36)	28.8	25.0	5.6	2.8	2.8	61.1	100
3 (N=41)	0.0	4.9	4.9	2.4	7.3	80.5	100
4 (N=38)	0.0	5.3	13.2	18.4	2.6	60.5	100
5 (N=19)	5.3	15.8	5.3	0.0	0.0	73.7	100
Jamaica (N=202)	2.2	14.4	8.2	5.4	6.2	63.6	100

Note:Regional and Jamaica percentages adjusted for non-response

TABLE G-5
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS, BY AREA AND QUINTILE

Classification	Households Receiving Food Stamps (N)	Percentage of Total Recipients (%)
Area		
KMA	46	14.8
Other Towns	42	12.7
Rural Areas	243	72.5
Quintile		
Poorest	103	31.1
2	104	31.4
3	60	18.1
4	39	11.8
5	25	7.6
Jamaica	331	100

TABLE G-6
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF NUMBER OF RECIPIENTS IN HOUSEHOLDS RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS, BY AREA AND QUINTILE

Classification	Number of Recipients in Household			
	One	Two	Three or more	Total
Area				
KMA (N=46)	83.5	14.5	2.0	100.0
Other Towns (N=42)	70.5	29.5	0.0	100.0
Rural Areas (N=243)	81.8	14.5	3.7	100.0
Quintile				
Poorest (N=103)	76.7	18.5	4.9	100.0
2 (N=104)	83.7	14.4	1.9	100.0
3 (N=60)	73.3	21.7	5.0	100.0
4 (N=39)	89.7	10.3	0.0	100.0
5 (N=25)	88.0	12.0	0.0	100.0
Jamaica (N=331)	80.6	16.4	3.0	100.0

Note: Regional and Jamaica percentages adjusted for non/resonse

TABLE G-7
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF ELIGIBLE HOUSEHOLDS RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS, BY BENEFICIARY CATEGORY, AREA AND QUINTILE

Classification	Children Aged Less Than Six Years		Pregnant\ Lactating Women		Elderly\Poor\ Disabled	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Area						
KMA	158	9.4	30	0.00	58	32.9
Other Towns	109	12.2	12	0	40	33.1
Rural Areas	259	36.1	59	8.7	152	51.0
Quintile						
Poorest	124	31.5	35	2.9	58	62.1
2	120	33.3	28	10.7	61	47.5
3	110	23.6	17	5.9	42	40.5
4	100	13.0	13	0.0	38	36.8
5	72	8.3	8	0.0	51	25.5
Jamaica	526	23.6	101	5.0	250	43.6

Notes: (i) 'N' means number of elibible households in sample '%' means percentage of eligible household receiving food stamps.

ii) Regional and Jamaica percentages adjusted for non-response.

(iii) Eligibility for single member families with income below $7,000 and families with income less than $18,000 cannot be determined with sufficient accuracy since consumption measures are used as a proxy for income.

TABLE G-8
SELF-REPORTED REASONS FOR HOUSEHOLDS NOT APPLYING FOR FOOD STAMPS, BY AREA AND QUINTILE

Classification	Reason					
	Did not Consider Household Eligible	Did not Know How to Apply	Not Worth the Trouble	Did not Want Stigma	Other	Total
Area						
KMA (N=553)	44.1	18.9	17.8	8.4	10.8	100.0
Other Towns N=320)	50.2	19.8	21.3	5.3	3.4	100.0
Rural Areas (N=586)	49.1	24.2	16.9	6.7	3.1	100.0
Quintile						
Poorest (N=102)	26.5	38.2	23.5	4.0	7.8	100.0
2 (N=165)	32.7	30.9	26.7	3.0	6.7	100.0
3 (N=240)	41.7	26.7	20.4	6.7	4.5	100.0
4 (N=352)	44.6	22.4	21.6	8.0	3.4	100.0
5 (N=600)	59.2	12.3	13.8	8.3	6.3	100.0
Jamaica (N=1459)	47.3	21.1	18.2	7.1	6.3	100.0

Note: Regional and Jamaica percentages adjusted for non-response.

TABLE G-9
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF AREAS IN WHICH SELF-REPORTED PROBLEMS IN OBTAINING FOOD STAMPS OCCURRED, BY AREA AND RELATIVE FREQUENCY OF PROBLEMS IN JAMAICA

	Problem							
	Lateness\ Absence of Officer	Rudeness of Officer	Disorder-liness of crowd	Transpor-tation Difficulties	Longl Lines	Not in Mail	Other	Total
KMA	15.9	53.8	39.1		40.4	0.0	0.0	-
Other Towns	14.8	46.2	0.0		0.0	42.0	25.4	-
Rural Areas	69.3	0.0	60.9	100.0	59.6	58.0	74.6	-
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-
Jamaica	19.6	6.3	14.3	15.1	15.4	14.8	14.5	100.0

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

SURVEY DESIGN

1 Since SLC 92, detailed documentation on the survey design and relevant technical aspects have been included in the SLC reports in the form of two Appendices. Appendix I provides the details on how the survey was conducted, and Appendix II gives the basic information on the methodology adopted for annualising the expenditure data collected in the survey and the description of the relevant variables and their sources. In the Report on SLC 94, however, one more Appendix (Appendix III), which presented a brief report on the results of the two experimental consumption modules canvassed in that round was included. The 1995 Report covers Appendices I and II.

I. Household questionnaire

2 The survey instrument for the Survey of Living Conditions (SLC) is a household questionnaire, the core of which is basically the same from round to round for ensuring continuity and comparability. However, from the third round, emphasis was placed in each round, on obtaining a wide spectrum of data on one particular social sector to provide the basic data used in policy formulation, as shown below.

3 The questionnaire for SLC 95 was divided into the following 13 parts, apart from the Cover:

Part A:	General health of all household members
Part B:	Education of all household members of age three years and older
Part C:	Anthropometric measurements and immunization data for all children 0-59 months old
Part D:	Aged (Persons 60+ years)
Part E:	Daily expenses (past 7 days)
Part F:	Food expenses including home production and food received as gift (past 7 days and past 30 days)
Part G:	Non-food consumption expenditures (past 30 days and in most cases past 12 months)
Part H:	Non-consumption expenditures such as insurance, gifts, and donations (past 30 days and past 12 months)
Part I:	Receipt of food stamps and reasons for not receiving
Part J:	Housing conditions and related expenses
Part K:	Inventory of durable goods owned by the household
Part L:	Miscellaneous income received by the household
Part R:	Household roster of all members

4 The periods given in brackets against parts E to H are the reference periods adopted for collecting the expenditure data. All of the above modules, with the exception of Parts A and D, were the same as in SLC 94. In Part A- Health, the seven questions on the annual hospitalisation expenses (questions 21 to 27 in Part A of SLC 94) were omitted in SLC 95. In SLC 95, the focus module on the Aged was given as Part D, replacing the Social Mobility module which was the focus module in SLC 94. The two experimental consumption modules canvassed in SLC 94 were also omitted in SLC 95.

II. Pre-Test

5 Since the standard modules in SLC 95 were the same as in SLC 94, except for Part A on Health, the pre-test was confined to testing only the following modules:

Cover Page;
Part A-Health;
Part D-Aged;
Part I-Food Stamps; and Roster.

TABLE AP-II.1
FOCUS IN SLC ROUNDS, 1989 to 1995

SLC ROUND	Focus Topics	Associated Questionnaires
SLC 88	Pilot	
SLC 89-1	Core Modules	
SLC 89-2	Expanded Health	Public Primary, Secondary & Tertiary Health Services
	Fertility	Private Primary, Secondary & Tertiary Health Services
	Last Pregancy	
SLC 90	Expanded Educations	Primary & Secondary School Teachers, Administrators
	Expanded Housing	
SLC 91	Expanded Housing	
SLC92	Poverty	
SLC 93	Employment & Time Use	
	Social Mobility	
SLC 94	Experiment Consumption Modules	
SLC 95	Persons aged 60 + years	

6 The pre-test was conducted in one ED each in 18 supervisor Zones. The supervisor selected one Interviewer in his/her Zone for the pre-test; and from the EDs entrusted to that interviewer for LFS, selected one ED for the pre-test.

7 Since the emphasis in the pre-test was on testing the Module on the Aged (i.e. Part D), the pre-test was carried out on households having at least one household member of age 60 years or over. The supervisor selected from the households in the chosen ED in the January 1995 LFS, five distinct households having at least one aged person. Only in two supervisor zones, it was not found possible to find 5 distinct households each; in these two EDs, two members of age 60 years were covered from one of the households. Distinct households were prescribed to have a wider dispersal of the pre-test.

8 The training for the pre-test was conducted on 15th March in Kingston; on 16th March at May Pen and on 17th March at Black River, for the relevant group of supervisors and interviewers. The field work was taken up immediately after the training and completed before 23rd March. The debriefing session was held for one day on 28th March 1995.

9 86 completed questionnaires were received by the 27th March. These were analysed and some crucial statements were prepared and used at the debriefing session. Since the sample households were drawn from the January LFS and as there was a geographic distribution of the EDs, the results from the pre-test were fairly representative of the country.

III. Sampling design

10 The sampling design adopted in the LFS is as follows. In 1993, a Master Sample of 32 dwellings was selected from each chosen ED for the quarterly LFS, which was arranged in eight panels of four sample dwellings each. Each of the eight panels was a systematic sample of the Master Sample. In each round of the quarterly LFS, four panels are canvassed, two continued from the previous quarter and two of the succeeding panels. This type of rotation of panels results in the inclusion of completely different dwellings in every alternate quarterly LFS. Thus, the October and April LFS will cover different dwellings from the Master sample. This scheme of rotation was introduced to reduce respondent fatigue.

11 The design adopted for the LFS (all surveys of STATIN follow the same design) was a two-stage stratified random sampling design, with the first stage being a selection of areas and the second stage being a selection of dwellings. For the selection of the first stage units, that is, the Enumeration Districts, all the Enumeration Districts in the country were grouped into sampling regions (strata) of equal size, in terms of dwellings. Two Enumeration Districts were selected from each sampling region with probability proportionate to size (measured in terms of dwellings). In each selected ED, a list of all dwellings, which formed the frame for selection of the Master sample of dwellings for LFS, was prepared.

12 The sample dwellings for the LFS are revised once every 4-5 years by selecting a new sample of two EDs from each sampling region and preparing up dated lists of dwellings in each. The sampling regions are updated on the basis of available information on new dwellings. Updated and comprehensive data on dwellings is generally available only after the results of a population census and therefore, in between the censuses, whatever revisions are made to the LFS sample are mostly through the selection of a new sample of EDs and the preparation of updated lists of dwellings in the selected EDs.

13 The sample dwellings for the Labour Force Surveys in 1988 and the SLC 88 were those selected in 1983 with sampling regions formed on the basis of 1982 population census. The sample was revised in 1989 and was adopted for all quarterly labour force surveys and the Surveys on Living Conditions conducted during 1989 to 1992. In 1993, the sample dwellings for the LFS were again revised after revising the sampling regions based on the dwellings data collected in the population census 1991. This sample was adopted for the LFS and SLC surveys in 1993 onwards.

14 For the revision of the LFS sample in 1989, the country was divided into 217 sampling regions (or strata) of equal size (the prescribed size was 2,400 dwellings per sampling region); and for the revision in 1993, the country was divided into 234 sampling regions each containing about 2,500 dwellings. In the 1989 revision, a Master Sample of dwellings was formed by selecting 36 dwellings from each selected ED while in 1993, this number was reduced to 32 dwellings, to keep the overall sample of dwellings at a manageable level. The sample dwellings from an ED were selected as a systematic sample with a random start. The 36 dwellings selected from an ED in 1989 were grouped into 12 panels of three each and six of these panels were covered in each round of LFS, with replacement of three panels from round to round; while in the revision of 1993, the 32 dwellings selected from each selected ED were grouped into eight panels of four each and four of these panels were covered in each round of LFS. Thus, the LFS surveys conducted during 1989 to 1992 covered in each round 7,812 dwellings selected from 434 EDs which themselves were selected at the rate of two each from 217 sampling regions. On the

other hand, the quarterly LFS surveys of 1993 to 1995 covered 7,488 dwellings drawn from 468 EDs, which were selected from 234 sampling regions.

IV. Panels:

15 The eight panels in the Master Sample of 1993 revision were formed in such a manner that each panel was a systematic sub-sample of the Master Sample. The coverage of the panels in each quarterly LFS is given below.

16 If the eight panels are labelled as A, B, C, D, E, F, G and H, then the panels covered in each quarterly LFS are -

Quarter	Panels
April	A, B, C, D
July	C, D, E, F
October	E, F, G, H
January	G, H, A, B
April	A, B, C, D

17 It will be observed that the panels are repeated after one year; and the panels covered in alternate quarterly LFS comprise different dwellings. Thus, the April and October LFS cover different dwellings. The EDs in all the quarterly LFS will, however, be the same.

V. Implications of samples with different dwellings

18 The sample dwellings for the SLC 95 was a subset of the April 1995 Labour Force Survey (LFS). Unlike SLC 94 (a subset of the October 1994 LFS sample) in which the sample dwellings were identical to those in SLC 93 (a subset of the October 1993 LFS sample), the sample dwellings in SLC 95 were all different from those in the two earlier rounds, because of the change in timing of the survey within the year. The change was made so that field work and data processing would not be interrupted by the Christmas/New Year's season.

19 Thus, the advantage of identical dwellings in SLC 93 and SLC 94 did not exist between SLC 95 and SLC 94. The estimates derived from SLC 95 in the case of demographic characteristics differed, though marginally, from those of SLC 94; but these differences will not only reflect the natural changes within each household but also changes in the sample households. The differences, however, were not statistically significant (vide Appendix II).

VI. SLC Sample

20 The sample dwellings for the Survey of Living Conditions (SLC) are being selected as a random sub-set of the sample for the immediately preceding Labour Force Survey (LFS), to facilitate the linkage of an integrated analysis of the data collected in both surveys. Thus, one-third of the LFS sample dwellings were covered in SLC 88, SLC 89-1, SLC 90 and SLC 91, SLC 93, SLC 94 and SLC 95; and two-thirds of the LFS sample dwellings in SLC 89-2. In SLC 92, all LFS samples in ten parishes and two-thirds of the samples in Kingston, St. Andrew, Clarendon and St. Catherine were covered, to provide parish estimates.

21 In the Labour Force Survey conducted in April 1995, the sample comprised 468 Enumeration Districts (EDs), drawn from 234 sampling regions, with 16 dwellings selected from each ED, a total of 7,488. For the SLC 95, conducted in May 1995, 78 sampling regions (selected from the 234 sampling regions using circular systematic sampling with equal probability), along with the two EDs and 32 dwellings from each sampling region covered in the April LFS were included in the SLC sample. Thus, the sample for SLC 95 covered 2,496 dwellings.

22 It may be noted that the sample of 78 sampling regions were selected from all the 234 sampling regions in the country for SLC 93 to SLC 95, unlike some of the previous rounds in which the sampling regions were selected separately from each parish giving rise to rounding off errors in the parish proportions. Thus, no weighting at the parish level to take account of the differences in sampling fractions have been necessary since SLC 93 to the current SLC 95.

VII. Training

23 The training for the interviewers and supervisors on the concepts, definitions and procedures was organized at four places as follows:

Centre	Dates
Kingston	May 3-4, 1995
Highgate	May 4-5, 1995
May Pen	May 8-9, 1995
Black River	May 9-10 1995

24 At each centre, the first day of training was confined to the new and weak interviewers. The focus was on the general procedures for the preparation and submission of completed questionnaires. On the second day all the interviewers and supervisors were given detailed instructions on the concepts, definition and procedures in completing the different modules. Each trainee was supplied with a detailed interviewer's instruction manual.

VIII. Investigations

25 The Interview method was followed in conducting the SLC, that is, the Interviewers of STATIN visit the households in the selected dwellings and record the information which was elicited by oral enquiry.

All surveys conducted by STATIN follow the same method of investigation. There are several advantages to the interview method. In this method, the interviewer can be trained intensively in the concepts, definitions and details of classifications so that a high degree of consistency in the replies can be obtained. Since the interviewers make personal visits and contact the households, non-response can be reduced to a minimum. The use of interviewers also makes it possible to employ a variety of techniques to maintain the interest of the respondent and increase the reliability and completeness of the data collected.

26 The main disadvantage of the interview method however, is that the data collected, especially on topics such as consumption expenditures, are largely based on the recollection of the respondent; but experience has shown that the alternative which is to ask the respondent to complete the questionnaire has disadvantages as well. Many of the households are neither capable of nor willing to keep accounts, or to follow adequately the concepts, definitions and instructions.

IX. Incentive Scheme

27 There was a delay of about 2 1/2 months in completing the field work under SLC 93. In order to reduce this delay, an incentive scheme was introduced in SLC 94, which was effective in eliminating the delays. Hence, this scheme was continued in SLC 95. The investigations commenced by the middle of May and the cut off date was prescribed as July 10. All the questionnaires received in STATIN on or before the cut off date were paid at the following rates (same as in SLC 94):

Completed Questionnaire

	Jam $
Senior Supervisor	10
Supervisor	25
Interviewer	75

Anthropometric Measurements

Supervisor	75
Interviewer (who assisted)	25
Child (payment in kind)	25

28 It was made clear that only those questionnaires which were received on or before the cut-off date and which were accepted for analysis would be eligible for the incentive. This had a salutary effect and almost all the completed questionnaires and anthropometric data were received by the cut off date.

X. Supervision

29 Apart from the intensive training for two days given to the interviewers and supervisors before the start of the investigations, the SLC statistician and consultant visited all the supervisors' zones during the early part of the field work. A few questionnaires of each interviewer were scrutinised and on-the-job training was provided, where necessary.

XI. Non-response

30 In SLC 95, it was observed that the non-completion of questionnaires was about 20.6 per cent compared with 22.0 per cent in SLC 94, 20.5 per cent in SLC 93, 28.1 per cent in SLC 92 and 29.8 per cent in SLC 91. Another 0.2 per cent of the questionnaires were rejected for analysis at the time of data cleaning, because of inconsistent data, compared with 0.3 per cent in SLC 94, 1.1 per cent in SLC 93, 1.6 per cent in SLC 92 and 1.3 percent in SLC 91. The following table shows the non-interview rates in SLC 90 to SLC 95.

TABLE AP-I.2
PLANNED AND FINAL SAMPLE SIZES,SLC 90 to SLC 95

Year	Sample Sized		Non-Responsive Rates (%)			
	Planned	Analysed	Non-Interview Dwelling vacant/ closed*	Refusals	Rejected in data cleaning	Total
90	2,592	1,828	18.0	9.7	2.0	29.7
91	2,592	1,786	19.4	10.4	1.3	31.1
92	6,237	4,485	19.3	8.8	1.6	29.7
93	2,496	1,963	12.1	8.4	1.1	21.6
94	2,496	1,940	15.1	6.9	0.3	22.3
95	2,496	1,976	14.9	5.7	0.2	20.8

31 The total number of questionnaires accepted for analysis in SLC 95 was 1,976 against 1,940 in SLC 94 and 1963 in SLC 93. The non-completion of questionnaires due to the households' refusal to furnish information was 5.7 per cent in SLC 95 compared with 6.9 per cent in SLC 94, 8.4 per cent in SLC 93, 8.8 per cent in SLC 92 and 10.4 per cent in SLC 91. Thus, there was a decrease in refusals in SLC 95.

32 In one ED (W 58/59) in the parish of Kingston however, none of the 16 dwellings could be contacted by the interviewer because of violent activities in that area during the period of investigations.

XII. Adjustment for non-response

33 The sample assigned to the LFS (also SLC) is designed in such a manner that it is self-weighting and each dwelling in the sampling universe is given an equal probability of being represented in the sample. For such a sample, the estimates can be built up by pooling the results of all households straightaway without assigning weights at any stage. But, since there were some non-interviews, and they were found to be uneven across geographic areas, unless adjustment factors are applied for non-interviews the self-weighting nature of the sample would be affected. These adjustment factors (also called raising factors) have been applied at the Enumeration District level since SLC 90 to correct for non-response at that level. The raising factor for an ED is the total number of dwellings assigned under the self-weighting design divided by the number of dwellings for which data are finally accepted for analysis. The assumption is that the non-responding dwellings/households will have similar features as the responding. Since an ED is a small geographic area, this assumption is not unreasonable.

34 The application of the non-response adjustment factors at the ED level is equivalent to the application of the same factor to all household observations within the ED. Hence, the non-response adjustment factor (also called the raising factor), relevant to each household, is included in the SAS data set, for use by those involved in data processing.

35 The non-response adjustment factors were applied in generating all the aggregates involving the pooling of information from all households of an ED or group of EDs, such as estimates for parishes, regions, and Jamaica.

XIII. Data entry/cleaning

36 Before data entry, all the questionnaires were edited and coded by three assistants appointed for the purpose. All clerical errors were removed at this stage. All questionnaires which were partly completed or not filled out at all were removed from data entry operations. After the questionnaires were screened by the assistants, they were once more scrutinised by the SLC statisticians.

37 The data entry was done on personal computers and adequate computer checks for ensuring consistency in such areas as totals and codes, which are feasible at this stage, were introduced in the programme. The computer print-outs of the data in respect of all households were compared with the questionnaires to spot data entry errors, first by the assistants and then by the SLC statisticians.

38 Immediately after the data were entered and the data sets formed, checks for area classification, that is, Kingston Metropolitan Area, Other Towns and Rural Areas were undertaken through a computer programme.

39 Then the consumption expenditure data collected in Parts E to H were annualised. The method followed is described in Appendix II. At this stage, four indicators were adopted for cleaning the data, namely, (i) per capita annual household consumption expenditure; (ii) the percentage expenditure on Food group; (iii) the percentage expenditure on Meals taken away from home; and (iv) the percentage expenditure on Housing. These indicator values were calculated for all households along with the corresponding mean and standard deviation. This operation was done for households falling into each of the five per capita consumption expenditure quintiles formed on the basis of indicator (i), for ensuring adequate dispersal of the cleaning process.

40 In each quintile, the questionnaires of households which fell beyond the range "mean plus or minus two standard deviations" for any of the four indicators were taken for detailed scrutiny. Out of 1,982 household questionnaires included in the data set, 140 questionnaires were thus taken for detailed examination. Out of these, 6 questionnaires with abnormal or inconsistent data which could not be removed at the editing stage were rejected; 22 questionnaires with clerical errors were corrected; and the remaining 112 questionnaires were accepted.

41 Thus, against 1,982 questionnaires included in the data set, 1,976 household questionnaires were considered in the final processing- 629 from the Kingston Metropolitan Area (KMA); 399 from the Other Towns; and 948 from the Rural Areas.

XIV. Distribution of Households with Females as Head

42 Two tables (Table A-9 and Table A-10) present the distribution of households with females as head according to the categories of "no man, no child"; "no man, with children"; "with man, no child" and "with man, with children". In these tables, man is taken to mean the spouse of the female head who is

a member of the household. This concept also was used in SLC 92 to SLC 94.

XV. Measurement of Malnutrition

43 Standards set by the World Health Organisation were used to measure malnutrition. Normal weight for height is defined as more than 80 per cent of the median weight for height. Severe wasting is defined as weight for height less than 70 per cent of the median. Moderate wasting is weight for height between 70 and 80 per cent of the median. Normal height for age is 90 per cent of the median or above. Moderate stunting is height for age from 85 per cent to 90 per cent of the median.

Extremely low weight for age is less than 60 per cent of the median. Moderate low weight for age is 60 to 80 per cent of the median. Normal weight for age is 80 per cent of the median or greater.

44 The median weight for height, height for age and weight for age referred to above relate to a reference population accepted by WHO for international comparisons. The criteria adopted for this purpose are described in Annex 3 of the publication "Measuring Change in Nutritional Status" issued by the WHO.

45 The field supervisors of STATIN measured the standing height of children aged over two years, and length (lying down) in younger children using a measuring board. The anthropometric measurements on about 90 per cent of the children of age 0-59 months in the sample households were accepted for analysis in SLC 95.

APPENDIX II

SOME TECHNICAL ASPECTS

I. Construction of an annualised consumption data set.

1 The household expenditures were collected in Parts E to H and J, of which Part H relates to specified non-consumption expenditures and Part J housing and utilities. Parts E, F and G relate to food and non-food commodity consumption and services. The expenditures were collected for the various items with different reference periods depending on their frequency of purchase.

2 To arrive at a total consumption expenditure figure, the consumption data in each part were annualised and a sum made of the different parts. However, since several parts ask about consumption expenditures for two different periods of time, one of the two time periods, or an average of the two, must be selected.

3 Different time periods are affected by different problems. The short reference period may be affected by netting expenditures of the previous period; it may be that the item was not purchased in that period. On the other hand, the long period may be affected by the respondent's "recall lapse", that is, the respondent not being able to recall all the purchases in that period.

4 The method followed so far in all the rounds of SLC for annualising the consumption expenditure is to take an average of both the short and long reference periods. This tends to smooth out possible distortions by choosing a middle ground between the two time periods. Technically, the portion of the long term expenditure that does not include the short term expenditure (e.g. the 11 months previous to the last month if the long period is one year and the short period is one month) was calculated and then annualised, and an equal weighted average of this annualisation and the short period annualisation was taken. For all items for which only one time period is used, the consumption figure is annualised by straight forward multiplication (i.e. 7 days figures multiplied by 365/7, and 30 days figures multiplied by 365/30).

5 The following paragraphs describe the procedures followed in annualising the expenditures and grouping the data by commodity groups and subgroups.

Single quotation

6 For all items for which only one reference period is prescribed or for which the expenditure was reported for one of the two reference periods, the annualisation of expenditure on that item is simple - the reported figure was multiplied by 365/p, where 'p' stands for the period for which the expenditure was reported. In the case of two reference periods, the following procedure was followed:

Notation

s_t- short period expenditure; s_p- short period (days);
l_t- long period expenditure; l_p- long period (days);
'.'- data missing.

Formulae

if s_t=. and l_t=. then value= 0;
else if s_t=. then value=l_t*365/l_p;
else if l_t=. then value=s_t*365/s_p;
else if l_t = st then value =s_t*365/l_p;
else value=[0.5*s_t+0.5*(l_t-s_t)/(l_p-s_p)/s_p]*365/s_p.

Missing values

7 When the household had not consumed any specified item in parts E to G, the interviewer will answer the relevant lead question on whether the household purchased or received as gift or consumed homegrown (in case of food) with a "no"; and skipped the relevant space provided for the amount. Hence, all blank spaces in Parts E to G should not be treated as missing values. When the household was unable to provide the amount for an item, then an "N.S" (not stated) was written in that space. Such cases where the respondent was unable to provide amount for some items were found to be rare. STATIN does not, therefore, impute values in such cases.

Monetary values

8 Unlike SLC 91-93, in the SAS data sets in SLC 94 and 95, the dollars and cents in consumption and non-consumption expenditure modules were treated as one numeric variable.

Deflators

9 The expenditure aggregates compiled from the survey were at current prices; hence, quite often the estimates had to be deflated to the price levels in one of the previous years, to make valid com-

Table AP II.1
NATIONAL AND REGIONAL MONTHLY PRICE INDICES
JANUARY TO SEPTEMBER 1995
(BASE: JANUARY 1988 = 100)

Year/Month	Jamaica	KMA	Other Towns	Rural Areas
		(All Commodity index)		
1995				
January	701.1	690.8	695.8	717.9
February	709.2	696.6	703.2	729.4
March	715.8	701.8	709.6	737.8
April	723.5	710.9	717.1	743.9
May	733.7	722.1	725.7	753.7
June	740.9	729.6	733.7	760.0
July	753.5	741.9	748.8	771.6
August	766.4	753.2	760.8	787.0
September	789.2	775.5	786.2	808.8
		(Food and Drink Group Index)		
1995				
January	767.9	765.6	758	775.6
February	777.9	773.9	765.0	789.4
March	786.2	782.2	771.9	798.5
April	794.8	794.1	779.8	803.9
May	807.5	809.8	791.1	813.9
June	816.1	818.5	800.8	821.8
July	831.1	833.5	818.2	835.6
August	848.9	849.6	834.9	855.8
September	878.3	881.3	866.2	881.7

parisons on the basis of constant price series. In the reports on SLC, STATIN/PIOJ also present the consumption aggregates at constant prices for the regional and Jamaica estimates of mean per capita consumption and for the mean per capita consumption by commodity groups, to assess the real trends in consumption. The monthly consumer price indices compiled by STATIN are used as deflators for this purpose. These indices are compiled for Jamaica and the three major area divisions, namely, KMA, Other Towns and Rural Areas, which are identical to the regions adopted for SLC consumption aggregates. The consumer price indices are also compiled for the commodity groups. Except for Personal Care and Health Care which are grouped together and the Education and Recreation group which is combined with the Miscellaneous group, all the other groups for which estimates are calculated in SLC are identical to those adopted in the compilation of the CPI. These commodity group CPI indices are used for deflating the commodity group estimates of current consumption. For both the Personal Care and Health Care groups, the combined CPI is used as deflator; and in the case of Education, Recreation and Miscellaneous consumption groups, the Miscellaneous group CPI is used. The STATIN publications show the indices for all major groups of commodities, together with an all-group index.

TABLE AP II.2
ITEMS INCLUDED IN COMMODITY GROUPS AND SUB-GROUPS, SLC 95

Group/SUB-Group	Item Codes
Commodity groups	
1 Food and Beverages	(Given below)
2 Fuel and Household Supplies	102 to 105; 304 to 308, 312
3 Housing and Household Operational Expenses	309 to 311 + (rent+utilities+ mortgage+p.tax)
4 Household Durable goods	313 to 321
5 Personal Care	301 to 303
6 Health Care	322 to 324
7 Clothing and Footwear	325 to 332
8 Transportation	338 to 344
9 Education	333, 335
10 Recreation	336, 337, 345, 346
11 Miscellaneous Consumption	106; 334, 347 to 349
Sub-groups (under food)	
1 Meat, Poultry and Fish	201 to 213
2 Dairy Products	214 to 221
3 Oils and Fats	222
4 Cereals and Cereal Products	223 to 225, 27 to 231
5 Starchy Roots and Tubers	232 to 235, 226
6 Vegetables	236 to 238
7 Fruits	239 to 241
8 Sugar/Sweets	242, 243
9 Miscellaneous Food	244 to 252
10 Beverages	253 to 255
11 Meals Away From Home	101

10 In the chapter on Consumption in this report, STATIN/PIOJ used a simple arithmetic average of the April to June 1995 indices for deflation of SLC 95 expenditure aggregates. The indices for the Food and Drink group and the All-Group indices for January to September 1995 are given in the Table AP II.1, for ready reference.

11

TABLE AP II.3
CONTENTS OF STATIN'S DATA SET
"ANNUAL" SLC 95
(List of Variables and Description)

Variable	Description
1 SERIAL	Household Identification Number
2 PARISH	Parish Number
3 CONST	Constituency Number
4 DISTRICT	Enumeration District Number
5 EDWGHT	Non-Response Weight for ED
6 DWELLING	Dwelling Number
7 HH	Household number in Dwelling
8 HHSIZE1	Household Size - All Individuals
9 HHSIZE2	Household Size - Members only
10 T_Meal	Annual Purchased Meal Expenditure
11 TOT_TAX	Annual Property Tax Payment
12 TOT-WAT	Annual Water Bill
13 ELECTRIC	Annual Telephone Bill
14 TOT-TELE	Annual Telephone Bill
15 TOT-MORT	Annual Mortgage Bill
16 RENT	Annual Rent Expenditure
17 TCGIFT	Annual value of gifts of Food and Non-Food Consump.
18 HOMEGIFT	Annual Value of Home Produced and Gift Food
19 TOTGIFT	Annul Value of gifts of Food and Non-food Consump.
20 UTILITY	Annual Utility bill (TOT_WAT+ELECTRIC+TOT_TEL)
21 HOUSING	Annual Housing Expenditure (RENT+TOT_MORT+ TOT-TAX+UTILITY+HOUSEHOLD OPERATIONAL EXPENSES
22 NON_FOOD	Annual Non-Food Expenditure (Purchased+TCGIFT=HOUSING)
23 TOT_FOOD	Annual Food Expenditure (Purchased+HOMEGIFT)
24 CONS	Annual Consumption Expenditure (TOT_FOOD+NON_FOOD)
25 PERCAP1	Per Capita Annual Consumption (All Individuals)
26 PERCAP2	Per Capita Annual Consumption (Members Only)
27 T_NONCON	Annual Non-Consumption Expenditure
28 TOT_EXP	(Annuall Expenditure (CONS+T_NONCON)
29 POPDEC	Per Capita Polulation Decile
30 POPQUINT	Per Capita Polulation Quintile
31 AREA	Area codes for KMA, Othe Towns and Rural

Consider the deflation of the current price estimate of mean Food & Drink group consumption in Jamaica in SLC 95.

The average price index of the Food & Drink group for Jamaica in 1995 (April - June) was 806.1 and that for 1990 (Oct.-Dec.) was 168.7. The deflator is, therefore, 4.7783 (i.e. 806.1/168.7). The current price mean consumption of the Food & Drink group in SLC 95 was $19,439. At constant October - December 1990 prices, this becomes $4,068 (i.e. 19,439/4.7783) compared with $4,046 in SLC 90. The difference in constant price estimate of mean Food & Drink consumption in SLC 95, compared with that in SLC 90 is, therefore, 0.5 per cent [i.e.{(4068-4046)/4046}x100].

Commodity Groups and Sub-Groups

12 The annual household consumption was grouped under 11 Commodity Groups and 11 subgroups under Food. Both the groups and the subgroups, broadly correspond to the grouping in the Consumer Price Indices. The codes of items included in each commodity group and sub-group in SLC 95 are shown in Table AP II.2. As mentioned in Appendix I, there was a change in the order of canvassing the expenditure modules in SLC 94 with the Food expenses module coming immediately after the daily expenses module followed by non-food consumption expenditures module and last the non-consumption expenditures module. The order followed in SLC 95 was the same as in SLC 94; there was also no change in the items. Hence the code numbers of items included in each group and sub-group shown below are the same as in SLC 94.

II. Annualised Expenditure Data Set

13 The annualised expenditure data from SLC 95 was given in SAS data set **ANNUAL,** as in previous rounds. Table AP II.3 gives the list of variables with a brief description of each variable.

III. Identification Variables

14 The identification variables, namely, PARISH, CONSTITUENCY, ENUMERATION DISTRICT NUMBER, AREA (i.e KMA, Other Towns and Rural Areas), DWELLING NUMBER, HOUSEHOLD # IN DWELLING, EDWGHT (weight for non-response at ED level), were given both in the SAS dataset ANNUAL and Data set REC001. These identification variables will be used to link SLC and LFS.

IV. SAS Data Sets

15 SAS data sets were created, generally one for each page of the questionnaire, except in the case of Food expenditure (Part F) and Consumption expenditure (Part G) in which one data set was created for the entire part, because of the similarity of the questions for all items. In the case of Food Stamps Programme, though it was covered in one page in the questionnaire, three data sets were created - first for household questions; second for the persons receiving food stamps and the third for persons who applied for food stamps. The way to link data sets within the SLC is through the four digit serial number of the household, whose variable name is SERIAL. The following table shows the list of data sets prepared in SLC 95 for the standard modules.

V. Tabulation Programme

16 A standard tabulation programme was developed for the basic modules on the different sectors. This programme was improved by the SLC Steering Committee while generating tables from the fourth round of SLC, that is, the one conducted in November 1990. The tabulations from the fifth round SLC conducted in November 1991 follow this improved programme. Some of these tables

are generated at STATIN; some in PIOJ; and a few at the Ministries. The tabulation programme was further improved in SLC 92; and included a number of parish tables. The Parish tables, however, were not generated in SLC 93 to SLC 95, as the sample size was relatively small.

VI. Estimation

18 The estimation of aggregates from SLC 95 is straightforward, as in SLC 94 and SLC 93.

Deciles/quintiles

18 The deciles and quintiles are formed of sample household members after arranging them in ascending order of their per capita household consumption. The per capita household consumption is arrived at by dividing the total household consumption by the number of household members. All members of the household are assumed to have the same per capita consumption. The decile classification of households is shown in the SAS data set with label **ANNUAL**. Quintile 1 comprises Deciles 1 & 2; quintile 2 comprises Deciles 3 & 4 and so on.

19 It should be noted that no household was ignored in the analysis of variables according to deciles or quintiles. It should also be understood that the deciles and quintiles comprise equal numbers of household members and not of households.

TABLE AP 11.4
LIST OF DATA SETS IN SLC 95

RECORD NAME	DESCRIPTION
REC01.SSD	Cover
REC002.SSD	Part A - Health (Page A!)
REC003.SSD	Part A - Health (Page A2)
REC004.SSD	Part A - Health (Page A3)
REC005.SSD	Part B - Education (Page B1)
REC006.SSD	Part B - Education (Page B2)
REC007.SSD	Part C - Anthropometric Measurements
REC008.SSD	Part D - Aged Mental Status (Page D1)
REC009.SSD	Part D - AgedEmployment (Page D2-1)
REC010.SSD	Part D - Aged Employment (Page D2-2)
REC011.SSD	Part D - Aged Employment (Page D2-3)
REC012.SSD	Part D - Financial Support (Page D2-4)
REC013.SSD	Part D - Financial Support (Page D3-1)
REC014.SSD	Part D Financial Support (Page D3-2)
REC015.SSD	Part D Aged Health Status (Page D4-1)
REC016.SSD	Part D Aged Health Status (Page D4-2)
REC017.SSD	Part E - Daily Expenses
REC018.SSD	Part F -Respondent
REC019.SSD	Part F - Food Expenses - Purchased
REC020.SSd	Part F - Food Expenses - Home Production/Gifts
REC021.SSd	Part G Respondent
REC022.SSD	Part G - Consumption Expenditure
REC023.SSD	Part H - Non-Consumption Expenditure
REC024.SSD	Part I - Food Stamps
REC025.SSD	Part I - Food Stamps - Recipients
REC026.SSD	Part I - Food Stamps - Applied
REC027.SSD	Part J - Housing Expenses
REC028.SSD	Part K - Durable Goods-Inventory
REC029.SSD	Part K - Durable goods-Acquisition Value
REC030.SSD	Part L -Miscellaneous Income
REC031.SSD	Roster - Principal Earner
REC032.SSD	Roster - Age, Sex and other details of members
THOMFOOD.SSD	Total Annual Home Produced Food
THOUSEXP.SSD	Total Household Operational Expenses
TOTMEALS.SSD	Total Annual Expenditure on Meals away from Home
ANNUAL.SSD	Total Annual Consumption Expenditure

VII. Sampling Errors

20 The sampling design adopted for the Labour Force Surveys and the Surveys of Living Conditions is a self weighting design, that is, the probability of selection of a second stage unit is the same for all units in the population, which in effect means a uniform sampling fraction for all strata (which are of equal size in terms of dwellings) with an equal number of second stage units being selected from the two first stage units. The sampling regions being of equal size coupled with the fact that the probability of selection of the second stage units being equal in all strata has simplified the estimation formulae. Only in SLC 92, the sampling fractions being different for four parishes, compared with the other 10 parishes necessitated the introduction of appropriate weights at the parish level. In SLC 93 to SLC 95, the sampling fraction being the same in all parishes, presented no necessity of any weighting except the weights (or raising factors) for non-response.

21 The formulae for estimation of sample mean

Strata (Sampling Regions) from parish "t" included in the survey	
Sub-Units (dwellings) in Sampling Region	M (same for all regions)
Number of first stage units (EDs)	2 (same for all regions)
Number of second stage units (dwellings) selected from one selected ED	m (same for all EDs)
Number of dwellings analysed from "i"th selected ED in the "s"th sampling region.	
Non-response raising factor for the 'i'th ED in the "s"th sampling region	$f_{is}=m/m_{is}$
Unit Value for the 'j'th sub-unit in the 'i'th primary unit (ED)	Y_{ij}
Sample Mean for the 'i'th selected ED in the 's'th region	$\bar{Y}_{is}$

and its variance are as follows:

In the case of parish estimates, the Sample Mean and Variance of the Sample Mean for the "t" th parish are given by the following simple formulae-

$$\bar{Y} = \frac{1}{L_{t*2m}} \sum_{s=1}^{L_t} \sum_{i=1}^{2} \sum_{j=1}^{m_{is}} f_{is*} Y_{ij}$$

and the Variance of the Sample Mean (the square root of which is called the Standard Error) is given by the formula-

$$V(Y) = \frac{1}{4L_i^2} \sum_{s=1}^{L_i} (Y_{1_s} - Y_{2_s})^2$$

Where $\sum$ stands for summation.

22 The simple formulae above are also applicable in case of all regional aggregates, where the region is built up of sampling regions from parishes with the same sampling fraction.

23 These relatively simple formulae are due to the sampling design involving paired selection of first stage units (i.e. EDs) with probability proportionate to size, from each sampling region.

VIII. Standard Errors

Estimates of Mean Per Capita Consumption

24 Based on the above formulae, the mean per capita consumption expenditure and its standard error were compiled for the three area divisions, namely, KMA, Other Towns and Rural Areas from the SLC 95 and presented below, with comparative figures for SLC 94. In the case of a few sampling regions, one of the two EDs belonged to Other Towns and the other to Rural Areas; in such cases, the sampling region as a whole is treated as belonging to Rural Areas, for purposes of compiling the variance of the sample mean.

25 The standard errors were compiled for the Mean Per Capita consumption estimates at current prices. More often, what would be required is to test the difference in the estimates of mean per capita consumption at constant prices between surveys. Usually, the deflator, based on the consumer price indices, is applied to the aggregate estimate of mean per capita consumption, to arrive at the mean consumption estimate at constant prices. The above percentage standard errors, could, however, be applied to the constant price estimates, on the assumption that the same deflator could be applied to the household level consumption. In case the standard errors are dealt with in the measuring units (such as $), then the current price estimate of standard error has to be divided by the deflator.

Caution

26 When the sample size is small, the standard errors for the detailed breakdowns and the confidence intervals are likely to be relatively large. For instance, the standard errors of the regional estimates of Mean Per Capita consumption given above are large and the standard error of the difference in the estimates between two surveys would be even larger. The result would be that even large observed differences in estimates of mean consumption in two surveys would be within the confidence limits for accepting the null hypothesis that there is no real difference in the means in the population. In some cases, this conclusion itself may be useful. In the following paragraphs, only the standard errors of some estimates for the country as a whole are presented for a few more variables.

Mean Household Composition

27 The following table presents the standard errors of the estimates of Mean Household Size, Number of Adult Males, Adult Females and Children for the years 1990 to 1995.

IX. TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Difference in means of two samples

28 The broad principles in testing the means obtained from two samples are described below.

Hypothesis:

29 The hypothesis in testing for significance is that there is no difference in the means of the populations from which the two samples were selected. If it is known that the standard deviations of the two populations are equal, it will be a test of whether these two samples came from the same population.

Table AP II.5-(i)
NUMBER IN SAMPLE, MEAN AND STANDARD ERROR OF ESTIMATES OF PER CAPITA CONSUMPTION, BY REGIONS, SLC 94 AND SLC 95

	SLC94			SLC 95		
Area	Sample households	Mean Cons ($)	Standard Error %	Sample (households)	Mean Cons ($)	Standard Error %
KMA	605	46,127	4.5	629	47,801	5.3
Other Towns	391	32,406	6.4	399	35,632	5.3
Rural Areas	944	24,296	3.6	948	27,216	3.4
Jamaica	1,940	32,712	2.8	1,976	35,522	2.9

TABLE AP II.5 (iv)
RESULTS OF TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR JAMAICA
B. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Year	Sample Size (N=)	Mean Number		S.E.	Diff in Means	S.E	Z-Statistic
			% (No.) Household Size				
1995	1976	3.79	1.58	0.060			
1994	1940	3.69	1.57	0.058	-0.10	0.083	-1.20
		Number of Adult Males					
1995	1976	1.18	1.78	0.021			
1994	1940	1.16	1.81	0.021	-0.02	0.030	-0.67
		Number of Adult Females					
1995	1976	1.28	1.80	0.023			
1994	1940	1.26	1.75	0.022	-0.02	0.032	-0.63
		Total Adults					
1995	1976	2.46	1.34	0.033			
1994	1940	2.42	1.36	0.033	-0.04	0.047	-0.85
		Number of Children					
1995	1976	1.34	2.76	0.037			
1994	1940	1.27	2.83	0.036	-0.07	0.052	-1.35

TABLE II.5 (iv)
RESULTS OF TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR JAMAICA
B. HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Year	Sample Size (N=)	Mean (Number)		S.E.	Diff in Means	S.E.	Z-Statistic
			% (No.) Household Size				
1995	1976	3.79	1.58	0.060			
1994	1940	3.69	1.57	0.058	-0.10	0.083	-1.20
			Number of Adult Males				
1995	1976	1.18	1.78	0.021			
1994	1940	1.16	1.81	0.021	-0.02	0.030	-0.67
			Number of Adult Females				
1995	1976	1.28	1.80	0.023			
1994	1940	1.26	1.75	0.022	-0.02	0.032	-0.63
			Total Adults				
1995	1976	2.46	1.34	0.033			
1994	1940	2.42	1.36	0.033	-0.04	0.047	-0.85
			Number of Children				
1995	1976	1.34	2.76	0.037			
1994	1940	1.27	2.83	0.036	-0.07	0.052	-1.35

30 This hypothesis is also called the "null" hypothesis, that is the difference in the population means is zero, though there is some observed difference in the sample means.

Assumptions:

31 The assumptions involved in the test are that -
(i) The two samples are independent; and
(ii) The samples are large (i.e. more than 100 each)

Notation:

Item	Sample	Sample 2
Sample size	n_1	n_2
Sample mean	$\bar{x}_1$	$\bar{x}_2$
Sample standard deviation	S_1	S_2
Variance of the mean	$\frac{(S_1)^2}{n_1}$	$\frac{(S_2)^2}{n_2}$
Standard error of mean	$V\frac{(S_1)^2}{n_1} V\frac{(S_2)^2}{n_2}$	
Difference in sample means	$\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2$	
Standat error of difference	$V\frac{(S_1)^2}{n_1} + \frac{(S_2)^2}{n_1}$	
Z- Statistics	$Z = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{\text{(s. e. diff)}}$	

32 In large samples, the Z - statistic is distributed in the "normal distribution" with 0 mean and unit standard deviation. For this distribution, 95 per cent of the observations are within + or - 1.96 and 99 per cent between + or - 2.58. Any observed Z which is beyond these limits will make the hypothesis that there is no difference between the means suspect and, therefore, we reject the hypothesis. If the Z is between the limits specified, it only means that there is no evidence to justify the rejection of the hypothesis that there is no difference in the means in the two populations.

33 The standard error of the difference in means will be larger than either of the standard errors of the two sample means. Hence, if the sample sizes are small, the standard errors of the sample means will be relatively large and the Z- statistic will turn out to be proportionately smaller. For example, take the case of testing the difference in Mean Per Capita consumption in Other Towns at constant prices in 1994 compared with 1993. The difference was 11.4 per cent (see Table 2.3). Inspite of this large difference, the test does not show that it is statistically significant, as the Z- statistic was 1.23 which was less than the specified 1.96 at 95 per cent confidence limit. This is because the percentage standard errors of the sample means were 6.3 in 1993 and 6.4 in 1994 and the standard errors in measuring units were $ 478 and $ 422 respectively. The standard error of the difference was $ 638 while the observed difference in the sample means was $ 785 at constant 1990 prices. The samples from Other Towns were 384 households in 1993 and 391 in 1994, which gave rise to the above large standard errors for the estimates of mean consumption.

34 The following tables present some of the test results for Jamaica for some variables.

Linking with LFS

35 As mentioned earlier, the selection of SLC sample dwellings as a sub-set of the immediately preceding LFS facilitates a linkage of the data collected in both the surveys for an integrated analysis. However, it should be remembered that in the SLC a household questionnaire is canvassed while in the LFS, a questionnaire is canvassed for each household member. The SLC questionnaire however, provides for such a linkage.

36 Firstly, the identification codes of parish, constituency, enumeration district (ED), dwelling number, and household number for the SLC samples are identical to the corresponding LFS sample dwellings. In the case of LFS, all questionnaires completed for individuals in a household are given the same identification.

37 Secondly, the roster of household members in the SLC is filled with the data on household members collected in the identification section of LFS. These are: the name of the individual, relationship to the head of the household, sex and age and individual number. In the SLC surveys, these details of household members are arranged in the same order of individual numbers; and the details are updated so that members who left the household in the intervening period between LFS and SLC are given a code 2, those who are new members a code 3, and those continuing code 1. There will not be the LFS data for members with code 3 and no SLC data for members with code 2. The age and sex data will be helpful in cases where the individual numbers do not seem to correspond.

XI. Parish/Area codes

38 The Parish and Area codes are given below for ready reference:

XII. Industrial/Occupational Classifications

39 The detailed industrial and occupational classifications, which may be required in the analysis of some of the variables, are available in a printed form (for sale) from STATIN. The one digit level classifications are given in Table AP II.6, for ready reference.

Parish	Code	Area	Code
Kingston	01	KMA	01
St. Andrew	02	Other Towns	02
St. Thomas	03	Rural Areas	03
Portland	04		
St. Mary	05		
St. Ann	06		
Trelawny	07		
St. James	08		
Hanover	07		
Westmoreland	09		
St. Elizabeth	11		
Manchester	12		
Clarendon	13		
St. Catherine	14		

TABLE AP 11.6
INDUSTRIAL AND OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATIONS AT ONE DIGIT LEVEL
(ADOPTED FOR LABOUR FORCE SURVEYS 88 TO 95)

Industrial Classification

One digit code	Description
0	Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing
1	Mining, Quarrying and Refining
2/3	Manufacture
4	Electricity, Gas and Water
5	Construction and Installation
6	wholesale & Retail Trace, Hotels & Restaurants
7	Transport, Storage and Communications
8	Financing, Insurance, Real Estate & Business Services
9	Community, Social and Personal Services

Occupational Classification (88 to July 93):

One Digit code	Description
1	Professional, Technical, Administrative
2	Executive, Managerial and Independent Occupations
3	Clerical and Sales Occupations
4	Self Employed and Independent Occupations
5	Service Occupations
6/7/8	Craftsmen, Production Process and Operating Occupations
9	Unskilled Manual and General Occupations

Occupational Classification (July 93 to date):

1	Legislators, Senior Officials and Managers
2	Professionals
3	Technicians and Associate Professionals
4	Clerks
5	Service Workers and Shop and Market Sales Workers
6	Skilled Agricultural and Fishery Workers
7	Craft and related Trades Workers
8	Plant and Machine Operators and Assemblers
9	Elementary Occupations

Abbreviations/Acronyms

BCG	Bacillus Calmette-Guerin (vaccination against tuberculosis)
CFNI	Caribbean Food and Nutrition Institute
CPI	Consumer Price Index
DPT	Diphtheria, pertussis, tetanus
ED	Enumeration district
ESSJ	Economic and Social Survey, Jamaica
FSP	Food Stamp Programme
GCT	General Consumption Tax
HES	Household Expenditure Survey
HRDP	Human Resources Development Programme
KMA	Kingston Metropolitan Area
LFS	Labour Force Survey
MOE	Ministry of Education
N	Number of observations
NWC	National Water Commission
NPL	Nutrition Products Limited
OPV	Oral polio vaccine
PIOJ	Planning Institute of Jamaica
SAP	Structural Adjustment Programme
SAS	Statistical Analysis Software
SFP	School Feeding Programme
SLC	Survey of Living Conditions
STATIN	Statiscal Institute of Jamaica
WC	Water closet

Notes

Notes

A Joint Publication of
The Planning Institute of Jamaica
and The Statistical Institute of Jamaica