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IPA’s Research for Effective COVID-19 Responses (RECOVR)

- Rapid response surveys to answer critical policy questions (8+ countries)
- A global hub that centralizes research and policy lessons
- A portfolio of IPA studies to generate rigorous evidence (80+ studies)
- Advising 15+ governments on evidence-based approaches
- Research-on-Research to strengthen the quality of remote data collection
RECOVR Survey: Key Takeaways

78 percent of respondents report feeling at risk of contracting COVID-19, a slight increase from Round 1 (75 percent)

A smaller share of those who reported receiving government transfers in Round 1 reports reducing portions or skipping meals. Across rounds, the share of respondents that had to limit portions at mealtimes decreased from 50 percent to 44 percent

14 percent of respondents could not come up with Fr35,000 within 30 days. One fifth of female respondents could not come up with Fr35,000 within 30 days

There was a 7 percentage point increase in the share of respondents working since Round 1 and, of those working, 41 percent are working fewer hours

Parents’ most common concerns are children falling behind in their education (24 percent), children getting into trouble (21 percent), and affording school fees and materials (17 percent)
Rwanda Survey Information

**Dates of survey:** October 22-November 6

**Sampling method:** Random Digit Dialing of a nationally representative sample of phone numbers, limited to respondents age 18+ (panel survey- follow ups with original respondents)

**Sample size:** 1,357 respondents out of 1,484 call attempts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average respondent demographics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% that completed secondary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% working in informal sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Under national poverty line:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Estimated with the PPI)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Definitions

- **Poor vs. non-poor**
  - Is this household most likely below the national poverty line?
  - Estimated using the PPI, which uses a simple machine-learning algorithm to build a proxy means test estimating poverty rates using a set of household characteristics.
  - Based on NISR’s 2017 EICV5 dataset.

- **School-age children**
  - “How many children who had been enrolled in primary/secondary school before the national quarantine live in your household?”

- **Employment Sectors**
  - 20+ occupations across agriculture, manufacturing, services, transport, mining, retail, etc.

- **Error Bars** in each graph represent the 95% confidence interval.
  - If error bars do not overlap, the difference between groups is statistically significant (p<0.05).
Rwanda RECOVR Survey: Survey and Policy Timeline

- Nationwide Lockdown: 21 Mar - 4 May
- IPA RECOVR Survey Round 1: 4 Jun - 15 Jun
- Curfew (8pm-5am) established: 4 May
- Curfew (9pm-5am): 15 July
- Curfew (7pm-5am): 16 Aug
- Curfew (10pm-5am): 25 Sep
- Closure of schools and higher education institutions: 16 Mar
- Facemasks required in public: 19 Apr
- Launch of Drones for Health Information Dissemination: 12 Apr
- National Bank eliminates charges for mobile money transfers: 19 Mar
- Launch of in-kind food distribution program: 28 Mar
- IMF approves $109 million Rapid Credit Facility Disbursement: 02 Apr
- IMF approves additional $111 million: 11 Jun
- IPA RECOVR Survey Round 2: 22 Oct - 6 Nov

Legend:
- Public Health Measures
- Economic Measures
- IPA RECOVR
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Health & COVID-19 Mitigation
Health & COVID-19 Mitigation: Key Takeaways

- Nearly 90 percent of adults are keeping up with medical appointments.

- 94 percent of respondents report always using a facemask. For those who do not regularly use a facemask, 83 percent indicate it is not necessary.

- 85 percent of respondents indicate they would take a COVID-19 vaccine once it becomes available. The majority of these respondents would take the vaccine for self-protection, followed by family protection.
Nearly 90% of adults are keeping up with medical appointments
Across age groups, less than 10% of children have had delays in healthcare visits and in keeping up with medical appointments.

- Children less than 6 years old: 8%
- Children 6-18 years old: 7%
98% of respondents report having gone outside their homes or receiving visits in the past 7 days, more than half of which were for going to work.
50% of respondents report going outside their home every day during the past week.

- Every day (7): 50%
- Most days (4-6): 23%
- Some days (2-3): 20%
- Once (1): 5%
- Never (0): 3%

Total (N=1355)
57% of respondents indicate that over the past 7 days, they have not received visitors any days.
Poor and Non-poor respondents report similar rates of non-adherence to shelter-in-place regulations.
Poor and non-poor respondents report going out of their homes over the past 7 days in similar proportions.
94% of respondents report always using a facemask. For those who do not regularly use a facemask, 83% indicate it is not necessary.
Poor and non-poor respondents report the same rate of compliance with mask usage

- Always (4): 94% (Non-Poor N=607), 94% (Poor N=748)
- Usually (3): 3% (Non-Poor N=607), 3% (Poor N=748)
- Sometimes (7): 0% (Non-Poor N=607), 0% (Poor N=748)
- Never (1): 1% (Non-Poor N=607), 1% (Poor N=748)

- Not necessary: 83% (Non-Poor N=607), 83% (Poor N=748)
- Too expensive: 12% (Non-Poor N=607), 5% (Poor N=748)
- Employer does not provide: 18% (Non-Poor N=607), 10% (Poor N=748)
A slightly larger proportion of male respondents report always using masks, though the difference is not statistically significant.
78% of respondents report feeling at risk of contracting COVID-19, a slight increase from Round 1.
A larger share of rural respondents report feeling at risk for COVID-19, though the difference is not statistically significant.
85% of respondents indicate that they would take a COVID-19 vaccine once it becomes available.
The majority of respondents would take the vaccine because of self-protection, followed by family protection.
Of the 5% of respondents who would not take the vaccine, almost 40% cite worries about its side effects.
Of those who cited a conspiracy theory, over half believes that the vaccine contains a tracking device.
Less than 10% of respondents across urban and rural areas would not get the vaccine.

- Would NOT take the vaccine: 6% Urban, 3% Rural
- If not, why?
  - Side effects from the vaccine: 11% Urban, 21% Rural
  - Doesn't think vaccines work very well: 5% Urban, 13% Rural
  - Conspiracy theory: 8% Urban, 17% Rural
  - Not concerned about getting seriously ill: 6% Urban, 14% Rural
  - Concerned about getting coronavirus from the vaccine: 3% Urban, 6% Rural
  - Doesn't like needles: 13% Urban, 24% Rural
  - Do not have symptoms: 6% Urban, 12% Rural
  - Coronavirus outbreak is not as serious as people say: 3% Urban, 3% Rural
  - Allergic to vaccines: 6% Urban, 6% Rural
  - Already immuned/Had covid-19: 3% Urban, 6% Rural
  - Other reason: 2% Urban, 3% Rural
One third of respondents does not trust any other people or institutions for vaccine information

- I do not trust anybody: 34%
- Advice of the Ministry of Health: 25%
- Doctors or other health staff: 23%
- Family members: 14%
- Friends you see and talk to: 1%
- Religious leaders: 1%
- Famous person: 1%
- Traditional media: 1%
Social Protection & Financial Resilience
Social Protection & Financial Resilience: Key Takeaways

• Between Round 1 and Round 2, the proportion of respondents needing to deplete their savings to cover basic expenses since June 2020 decreased by 17 percentage points.

• Since schools closed, 45 percent of children’s diets have maintained their level of nutrition.

• While urban and rural respondents could access emergency funds at similar rates, urban respondents are more likely to rely on their savings and rural respondents are more likely to sell their assets.

• 3 percent of respondents report that their household received new government transfers in Round 2, down from 11 percent in Round 1.
3% of respondents report that their household received new government transfers in Round 2, down from 11% in Round 1. Reporting of in-kind provision of PPEs and food increased substantially between rounds.
Poor and non-poor respondents report that their households received new government transfers at similar rates.
Male and female respondents report that their households received new government transfers at similar rates.
While respondents from urban and rural areas report the same rate of receiving new government transfers since March, a higher share of urban respondents received in-kind food assistance (though not statistically significant).
Between rounds, there was a 4pp decrease in the share of respondents that received non-government transfers they did not receive before March.
There are not statistically significant differences between poor and non-poor households’ likelihood in receiving non-government transfers from individuals or institutions.
There are not statistically significant differences by gender in the likelihood of receiving non-government transfers from individuals or institutions.
Respondents in urban areas were more likely to receive assistance or transfers from churches or mosques than their rural counterparts.
Across rounds, there was a 6pp decrease in the share of respondents that had to limit portions at mealtimes.
A higher share of non-poor respondents either reduced portions or skipped 1+ meals for adults and children in the household.
A higher share of respondents from urban areas reports reducing portions for adults and children in their household.
A smaller share of those who reported receiving government transfers in Round 1 reports reducing portions or skipping meals.
Between rounds, a smaller share of respondents cite market shortages and household income drops as reasons for being unable to buy food.
Poor respondents are 10-12pp more likely to report that high food prices and reduced income prevent them from buying as much food as they usually do.
Respondents from rural areas are more likely to be unable to buy as much food as they usually do because of high food prices and reduced income.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Urban (N=978)</th>
<th>Rural (N=375)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shortages in markets</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High food prices</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced income</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
55% of poor respondents’ children received school meals before March, when schools closed.
57% of respondents’ from rural areas children received school meals before March
Since schools closed, 45% of children’s diets have maintained their level of nutrition

How have children's diets changed?

- More Healthy: 19%
- Same Healthy: 45%
- Less Healthy: 36%

Total (N=808)
Since schools closed, 38% of children of poor respondents have had less healthy diets.
There are not significant differences between children’s diets from urban areas vs. rural areas.
Among those who received government transfers, 25% of children’s diets are more healthy but this is not statistically significant.
3 Education
Education: Key Takeaways

- The majority of parents prefer in-person schooling next year.
- Parents’ most common concerns are children falling behind in their education, children getting into trouble, and affording school fees and materials.
- 76 percent of parents indicate receiving sufficient and timely information from children's schools.
- 42 percent of children spend at least two hours per day on education.
- Distance learning (March-October) was considered to be effective or very effective for 92 percent of children.
The majority of parents prefer in-person schooling next year.
There are no statistically significant differences between poor and non-poor parents' preferences for education modality for the upcoming school year.

![Bar chart showing preferences for education modality]

- **In-person**
  - Non-Poor: 73%
  - Poor: 69%

- **Remote**
  - Non-Poor: 3%
  - Poor: 2%

- **Combination**
  - Non-Poor: 24%
  - Poor: 30%
There are no statistically significant differences between urban and rural parents' preferences for education modality for the upcoming school year.
Nearly 100% of children were to be enrolled for in-person classes in November.
Poor children are slightly more likely to be enrolled for in-person schooling

- Will enroll:
  - Non-Poor (N=277): 97%
  - Poor (N=1122): 99%

- Will not enroll:
  - Non-Poor (N=277): 3%
  - Poor (N=1122): 1%
There are no differences between male and female children’s likelihood of enrolling in-person classes in November.
There are no differences between children from urban and rural areas’ likelihood of being enrolled in in-person classes in November.
Parents’ most common concerns are children falling behind in their education, children getting into trouble, and affording school fees and materials.

- Have not been concerned: 10%
- Children falling behind in their education: 24%
- Children getting into trouble: 21%
- School fees and materials: 17%
- Children loitering: 11%
- Children getting sick: 7%
- Children having not enough to eat: 6%
- Children not being able to take exams: 3%
- Children being disobedient: 1%
- Children being safe: 1%

Total (N=867)
Between rounds, parents’ concern of their children falling behind in their education decreased by 11pp
Non-poor respondents are 11pp more likely to not be concerned about their children’s education than poor respondents.
There are no statistical differences between urban and rural respondents’ concerns about their children’s education

- Have not been concerned: Urban 8% vs. Rural 11%
- Children falling behind in their education: Urban 24% vs. Rural 22%
- Children getting into trouble: Urban 31% vs. Rural 20%
- School fees and materials: Urban 17% vs. Rural 15%
- Children loitering: Urban 13% vs. Rural 11%
- Children getting sick: Urban 6% vs. Rural 7%
- Children having not enough to eat: Urban 6% vs. Rural 7%
- Children not being able to take exams: Urban 3% vs. Rural 3%
- Children being disobedient: Urban 1% vs. Rural 2%
- Children being safe: Urban 1% vs. Rural 2%
6% of respondents have at least one child with disabilities
Poor and non-poor respondents are similarly likely to have at least one child with disabilities.
10% of respondents from rural areas have at least one child with disabilities.
More than half of children with disabilities have been able to follow remote learning programs.
Among children with disabilities, more than half are able to follow remote learning programs regardless of their socioeconomic status.
Among children with disabilities, a larger share of those in rural areas are able to follow remote learning programs but the difference is not statistically significant.
76% of parents indicate receiving sufficient and timely information from children's schools
Poor and Non-poor respondents receive sufficient and timely information from their children's schools at similar rates
Respondents from urban and rural areas receive sufficient and timely information from their children's schools at similar rates.
42% of children spend at least two hours per day on education
There are no significant differences between poor and non-poor children’s study habits.
Male respondents are more likely to report that their children spend only a few minutes each day studying.
There are no significant differences between urban and rural respondents’ reporting of children’s study habits
Radio Rwanda and students’ own school books were reported to be the most popular distance learning tools.
Radio is a more popular distance learning tool for poor respondents, while Internet is more popular for non-poor respondents.
Distance learning (March-October) was considered to be effective or very effective for 92% of children.
Distance learning was reported as very effective for 25% of poor and non-poor children.
Participation in distance learning was reported to be important for 66% of children.
Parents report that the biggest challenge with continuing education for primary school students is the lack of support from teachers and schools.

- Lack of support from teachers and schools: 43%
- Lack of motivation: 36%
- Lack of access to educational programs: 29%
- Lack of access to television: 24%
- Lack of access to textbooks or learning materials: 24%
- Lack of access to internet: 21%
- Lack of supervision from adults in the household: 19%
- Lack of access to radio: 11%
Respondents report that the biggest challenge with continuing education for secondary school students is the lack of support from teachers and schools.
Non-poor respondents are more likely than poor respondents to report that there is no challenge for primary school students in continuing education.

- Lack of support from teachers and schools: Non-Poor 38%, Poor 44%
- Lack of motivation: Non-Poor 30%, Poor 37%
- Lack of access to educational programs: Non-Poor 24%, Poor 30%
- Lack of access to television: Non-Poor 17%, Poor 26%
- Lack of access to textbooks or learning materials: Non-Poor 23%, Poor 28%
- Lack of access to internet: Non-Poor 19%, Poor 22%
- Lack of supervision from adults in the household: Non-Poor 16%, Poor 20%
- Lack of access to radio: Non-Poor 8%, Poor 12%

Children need to spend their time doing other things: Non-Poor 12%, Poor 10%
- Children are doing housework: Non-Poor 2%, Poor 10%
- There is not a good/quiet place to study: Non-Poor 0%, Poor 10%
- Children are taking care of their siblings: Non-Poor 4%, Poor 3%
- Children are working to earn money: Non-Poor 2%, Poor 1%
- No children in primary school: Non-Poor 0%, Poor 8%
- Other (specify): Non-Poor 8%, Poor 9%
- No challenge: Non-Poor 24%, Poor 8%
Non-poor parents are more likely than poor parents that there is no challenge for secondary school students in continuing education.
Male and female parents similarly perceive the challenges for primary school students continuing their education.

- Lack of support from teachers and schools: Male (42%) vs Female (44%)
- Lack of motivation: Male (35%) vs Female (37%)
- Lack of access to educational programs: Male (24%) vs Female (22%)
- Lack of access to television: Male (26%) vs Female (22%)
- Lack of access to textbooks or learning materials: Male (21%) vs Female (22%)
- Lack of access to internet: Male (21%) vs Female (22%)
- Lack of supervision from adults in the household: Male (18%) vs Female (20%)
- Lack of access to radio: Male (11%) vs Female (12%)

Children need to spend their time doing other things: Male (11%) vs Female (9%)
- Children are doing housework: Male (10%) vs Female (8%)
- There is not a good/quiet place to study: Male (10%) vs Female (7%)
- Children are taking care of their siblings: Male (3%) vs Female (3%)
- Children are working to earn money: Male (3%) vs Female (2%)
- No children in primary school: Male (0%) vs Female (0%)
- Other (specify): Male (9%) vs Female (10%)
- No challenge: Male (14%) vs Female (10%)

In general, the challenges perceived by male and female parents are similar, with some slight differences in specific areas.
Male and female respondents similarly perceive the challenges for secondary school students continuing their education.
Parents from rural areas cite lack of access to educational programs as a main barrier for primary students to continue their education.
Parents from rural areas cite lack of access to television as a main barrier for secondary students to continue their education.

- Lack of support from teachers and schools: 99% (Urban) vs 46% (Rural)
- Lack of motivation: 33% (Urban) vs 25% (Rural)
- Lack of access to textbooks or learning materials: 25% (Urban) vs 33% (Rural)
- Lack of access to internet: 23% (Urban) vs 32% (Rural)
- Lack of access to educational programs: 23% (Urban) vs 30% (Rural)
- Lack of access to television: 16% (Urban) vs 31% (Rural)
- Lack of supervision from adults in the household: 15% (Urban) vs 10% (Rural)
- Children are doing housework: 11% (Urban) vs 16% (Rural)

Barriers by location:
- Lack of access to radio: 8% (Urban) vs 16% (Rural)
- Children need to spend their time doing other things: 9% (Urban) vs 7% (Rural)
- There is not a good/quiet place to study: 8% (Urban) vs 7% (Rural)
- Children are working to earn money: 5% (Urban) vs 4% (Rural)
- Children are taking care of their siblings: 2% (Urban) vs 5% (Rural)
- No children in secondary school: 0% (Urban) vs 0% (Rural)
- Other (specify): 7% (Urban) vs 11% (Rural)
- No challenge: 0% (Urban) vs 17% (Rural)
93% of parents have received communications about next school year's plans, mainly through radio.
Poor and non-poor respondents receive school year communications at similar rates, but more than three quarters of poor respondents rely on radio.
Urban and rural respondents receive school year communications at similar rates, but more than three quarters of rural respondents rely on radio.
More than half of households have access to school books for their children’s grade levels to continue remote learning.
More than half of respondents from poor households indicate that they rely on the radio to continue with distance learning, compared to one third from non-poor households.
Male and female respondents report at similar rates the tools that their households have access to for remote learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Male (N=509)</th>
<th>Female (N=362)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schoolbooks</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phone with internet</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desktop or laptop with internet</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tablet</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Radio was reported by rural respondents as the most prevalent tool they have access to for children to continue with their education.
Economic Activity & Employment
Economic Activity & Employment: Key Takeaways

● 69 percent of respondents’ place of work from February remained open in November.

● There was a 7 percentage point increase in the share of respondents working since Round 1 and, of those working, 41 percent are working fewer hours.

● Male and female respondents report similar rates for household employment and earnings in the last week.

● 71 percent of respondents’ earnings decreased, with nearly four in ten earning 75 percent less.
Among those currently employed, there has been a small decrease (7pp) in formal employment, between those holding permanent contracts in February 2020 and at the time of the survey.
Respondents categorized as Poor saw a larger drop in permanent employment contracts, with the poor/non-poor gap widening from 2pp to 7pp.
Households that rely on informal employment seem to be less likely to have a woman as the Head of Household.
69% of respondents’ place of work from February remained open in November only a slight (non-significant) decrease from 71% in June
71% of poor respondents’ place of work from February remained open in November
Agriculture remains the sector where the largest share of respondents’ work places are still open, though this rate decreased by 13pp across rounds.

[Bar chart showing percentages of open workplaces in June and this week by sector, with Agriculture having the highest percentage in June.]
Rural and urban respondents’ places of work from February remained open at similar rates across rounds.
There was a 7pp increase in the share of respondents working since Round 1 and, of those working, 41% are working fewer hours (a 22pp decrease since Round 1).
While respondents and household heads were largely able to maintain employment, of those working, 40% worked fewer hours.
A larger share of rural respondents and heads of household report working in the past week (88%), with over half of those working the same or more hours.
Poor respondents and heads of household are more likely to be self-employed or have worked on a family business or farm in the past 7 days.
Male and female respondents and heads of households have worked across different employment types at similar rates in the past 7 days.
Respondents and heads of household that work in the agriculture sector are more likely to be self-employed or work for a family business.
Respondents and heads of household from urban areas are more likely to be self-employed or work for a family business.
While there was a 7 percentage point increase across rounds between respondents reporting they worked in the past week, 71% of those working still experienced decreased earnings.
A larger share of poor households report working in the past week, but a larger share of these households report earning less compared to non-poor households.
While a larger share of urban household heads report working in the last week, there are no significant differences between earning changes between urban and rural household heads.
While a larger share of household heads that received government transfers report working in the last week, the difference is not statistically significant.
Male and female respondents report similar rates for household employment and earnings in the last week.
A larger share of respondents in the agriculture sector report working in the last week, though 84% earn less or much less.
Of respondents whose earnings increased (8%), more than half earned 25% more
71% of respondents’ earnings decreased, with nearly 40% earning 75% less
Among heads of household, the most prevalent employment sectors are agriculture, retail/wholesale, and construction/utilities.
Of the 47% of the sample involved in farming, 38% of these individuals had to alter their planning.
Among those involved in farming, a greater proportion of poor respondents (42%) had to alter their planning compared to non-poor respondents (29%).
10% of respondents started a business during quarantine
Urban and rural respondents started a business during quarantine at similar rates.
Among those who started a business, the majority think that it will remain in operation for the rest of 2020.
14% of respondents could not come up with Fr35,000 within 30 days

- Could not come up with the money: 14%
- Family, relatives, or friends: 29%
- Money from working: 17%
- Savings: 17%
- Selling assets: 13%
- Borrowing (bank/employer/private lender): 8%
- Some other source: 2%
One fifth of female respondents could not come up with Fr35,000 within 30 days
Among employed households, 39% of workers with no contract (informal workers) could not come up with Fr35,000 within 30 days.
While urban and rural respondents could access emergency funds at similar rates, urban respondents are more likely to rely on their savings and rural respondents are more likely to sell their assets.
Between Round 1 and Round 2, the proportion of respondents needing to deplete their savings to cover basic expenses since June 2020 decreased by 17pp.
A larger share of poor respondents than non-poor respondents reported selling their assets, seeking money from friends or family, or skipping payments to pay for basic expenses since June 2020.
Among employed households, informal workers are more likely than their counterparts with permanent and short-term contracts to take various measures to cover basic expenses since June 2020.

- Depleted savings: 69% (No Contract), 69% (Short-term Contract), 48% (Permanent Contract)
- Borrowed money: 43% (No Contract), 26% (Short-term Contract), 24% (Permanent Contract)
- Sold assets: 37% (No Contract), 27% (Short-term Contract), 13% (Permanent Contract)
- Seek food or money from friends/relatives: 25% (No Contract), 20% (Short-term Contract), 13% (Permanent Contract)
- Skipped payments: 27% (No Contract), 23% (Short-term Contract), 16% (Permanent Contract)
- None of the above: 14% (No Contract), 14% (Short-term Contract), 13% (Permanent Contract)
There are not statistically significant differences between male and female respondents’ reporting of actions taken to cover basic expenses since June 2020.
Respondents from rural areas are more likely to sell their assets or seek food/money from friends/family to cover basic expenses since June 2020.
Intrahousehold analysis: those receiving transfers in R1 and current financial behaviors