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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
Zambia Survey Information


Sampling method: Random Digit Dialing of a nationally representative sample of phone numbers; panel survey

Sample size: Round 1: 1,278 respondents out of 3,213 call attempts
Round 2: 752 respondents out of 4,073 call attempts

Average respondent demographics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Round 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Women:</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>31.9 years old</td>
<td>32.3 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% completed secondary school</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household size</td>
<td>5.2 people</td>
<td>5.4 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Under national poverty line*</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(baseline)(Estimated with the PPI)
Survey Demographic Composition

- Non-Poor: 60%
- Poor: 40%
- Male: 60%
- Female: 40%
Survey Demographic Composition

- No HH member >60yo: 80%
- HH has member >60yo: 20%

- No Children: 80%
- School-age Children: 20%
Survey Demographic Composition

- Rural
- Urban
- Small/Medium District
- Large District
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.

- **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).
Zambia RECOVR: Survey and Policy Timeline

Partial Lockdown
20 Mar-8 May

 Closure of Public Schools
20 Mar

 Closure of restaurants, bars, cinemas, and crossborder commercial travel
27 Mar

 Facemasks required in public
16 Apr

 Suspension of tourist visas
29 Apr

 Closure of border with Tanzania
11 May

 Enactment of fiscal measures
27 Mar

 Enactment of additional fiscal measures
20 Apr

 RECOVR R1
13 Jun-21 Jun

 RECOVR R2
Nov 28-Dec 21

Reopening of Public Schools
21 Sep

Legend
- Public Health Measures
- Economic Measures
- IPA RECOVR
Health & COVID-19 Mitigation
A greater proportion of households delayed healthcare appointments in Round 2 (20%) than in Round 1 (9%), though concerns about Covid-19 seemingly decreased.
Compared to June, respondents were far less likely to report staying inside in December.
In Round 1, men were more likely than women to never stay home, while women were more likely than men to stay home every day in the past week.
In Round 2, women are still less likely to go out every day, but seldom stay in entirely.
The proportion of respondents reporting usage of homemade facemasks decreased by 16pp, while the proportion using medical facemasks increased by 10pp.

However, the proportion of those NOT using facemasks also increased by 5pp, with more than half of those perceiving they are not necessary.
The proportion of respondents who say they feel their household is at risk of contracting COVID-19 increased by 10 percentage points.

For those who do NOT feel at risk, the majority of respondents maintain that it is because they are following preventive measures.
In June, almost 60% of respondents said their main concern related to the coronavirus was lack of money.

Poorer and wealthier households responded similarly to this question.
In Round 2, lack of money, health, and economic impact remained top concerns.
75% of respondents would take the vaccine if available, and 76% would vaccinate their children.
There are no significant differences by gender or geography in the likelihood of taking the vaccine.
65% of respondents indicate that doctors and healthcare professionals are the most trusted sources for vaccine information.
Less than half of respondents strongly agree that the vaccine is safe and effective.
Poor respondents are more likely to strongly agree that the vaccines are safe, though only half strongly agree. Less than half of poor respondents perceive that the vaccine will be effective.
Social Protection & Financial Resilience
The vast majority of respondents do not receive support from non-government sources.
More than one third of respondents indicate having family/friends that can help in times of need, though the majority report receiving less than usual since March 2020 compared to another typical 6 month period.
A larger proportion of non-poor respondents has family/friends that can help in times of need, though the difference is not statistically significant.
A larger proportion of rural respondents has family/friends that can help in times of need, though the difference is not statistically significant.
Among those who have received non-government support, the majority have received less assistance since March 2020 compared to another typical 6 month period.
Among those who have received non-government support, the majority have received less assistance since March 2020 compared to another typical 6 month period.
The proportions of households reducing food intake in the past 7 days increased slightly from Round 1 to Round 2.
A higher proportion of households reported skipping meals in the past 7 days, though the difference is not statistically significant.
Nearly half of poor children were reported as limiting meal portions in the past 7 days.
A higher proportion of respondents with school-age children report skipping meals and limiting portions, though the difference is not statistically significant.
Among the barriers respondents cite for lack of food access, affordability is far more prevalent than market closures, mobility, or food shortages.
Every barrier was more common among those who did skip meals, but those who did not still frequently reported food shortages.
Across rounds, there was a 12pp increase in parents’ concerns about school-age children.
Poor and non-poor parents have similar rates of concern and types of concerns about their school-age children.
Rural and urban parents have similar rates of concern and types of concerns about their school-age children.
More than half of poor students rely on their own school books to keep up with education.
The proportion of primary students who spent no time on education increased by 21pp across rounds.
In Round 2, more than one in five students spend no time on education.
A larger proportion of non-poor students spends no time on education (26%) compared to poor students (17%).
Boys in primary school are more likely to spend no time on education (25%) compared to girls (17%).
Poor students are more likely to use their own school books than non-poor students.
There are no systematic differences in learning methods by gender.
Access to television, lack of motivation, and competing priorities were the main reasons children did not spend time on education.
There are not statistically significant differences in the reasons that poor and non-poor students did not spend on education.

![Diagram showing reasons time not spent on education for non-poor and poor students]

- Access to television: Non-Poor 19%, Poor 21%
- Lack of motivation: Non-Poor 15%, Poor 18%
- Children need to do other things: Non-Poor 12%, Poor 14%
- Lack of supervision - household-adults: Non-Poor 11%, Poor 13%
- Children are doing housework: Non-Poor 9%, Poor 9%
- Lack of support from schools: Non-Poor 6%, Poor 5%
- Access to internet: Non-Poor 3%, Poor 4%
- Access to educational programs: Non-Poor 2%, Poor 3%
- Access to learning materials: Non-Poor 2%, Poor 3%
- No good place to study: Non-Poor 2%, Poor 1%
- Access to radio: Non-Poor 1%, Poor 1%
There are not statistically significant differences for reasons that boys and girls did not spend time on education.
There are not statistically significant differences between poor and non-poor respondents with respect to conflict between adults and children in the household.
Male and female respondents report similar rates of levels of conflict between adults and children in the household.
There are not statistically significant differences between poor and non-poor respondents with respect to conflict between minor children in the household.
Economic Activity & Employment
While respondents indicate largely maintaining employment *levels*, a majority experienced decreased earnings across both rounds.
Among those working in the last week in Round 2, there was a 9pp increase in the proportion of respondents that indicate working more hours, and a 28pp decrease in the proportion of respondents that indicate working fewer hours.
Poor and non-poor respondents report similar rates of working for pay and earnings/hours relative to February 2020.
Women were more likely to report no earnings relative to February 2020.
Rural and urban respondents report similar rates of working for pay and earnings/hours relative to February 2020.
72% of respondents indicate spending at least one hour working in the past 7 days, the majority of which were for their own business.
Men are more likely to have worked in the past 7 days, while women are more likely to be seeking paid employment.
Among those working*, a majority believe that their employer has taken necessary precautions against the virus and this does not differ by socioeconomic status.

*includes self-employed workers
Among those working*, a majority believe that their employer has taken necessary precautions against the virus and this does not differ by gender.

*includes self-employed workers
Among those working*, there are no systematic differences across sectors in the perception of an employer’s workplace precautions against COVID-19.

¹includes self-employed workers
Among those working*, 51% have a main job that offered benefits.

*includes self-employed workers
Among those working*, 55% of non-poor respondents and 46% of poor respondents have a main job that offered benefits.

*includes self-employed workers
Among those working*, 53% of male respondents and 47% of female respondents have a main job that offered benefits.

*includes self-employed workers
Compared to a typical week in February 2020, there are not statistically significant differences between poor and non-poor respondents’ relative hours worked.
Compared to a typical week in February 2020, there are not statistically significant differences respondents’ gender and relative hours worked.
Urban heads of household were more likely to work more hours in the last week compared to a typical week in Feb 2020 compared to their rural counterparts.
There are not statistically significant differences among poor and non-poor respondents’ comparative earning trends.
Compared to a typical week in February 2020, women were 19pp more likely than men to indicate “no earnings.”
Non-poor and poor respondents report still working for their same primary employer from February 2020 at similar rates.
Female respondents or heads of household are more likely to still be working for the same primary employer as they were in February 2020.
Before the pandemic, female respondents or heads of household were most likely to be working in the agriculture sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Male (N=93)</th>
<th>Female (N=173)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture sector</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other civil servant/government worker</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction or utilities sector</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail or Wholesale sector</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and storage sector</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial activities or real estate sector</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing or mining sector</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing sector</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services sector</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
53% of respondents or someone in their household owns or leases a farm...
Non-poor and poor respondents perceive their relative household incomes with respect to the previous year to have changed at similar rates.

- Less household income now than last yr: Non-Poor (41%), Poor (44%)
- Same household income now as last yr: Non-Poor (25%), Poor (22%)
- Much less income now than last yr: Non-Poor (19%), Poor (16%)
- Much household more income now than last yr: Non-Poor (10%), Poor (10%)
- More household income now than last yr: Non-Poor (5%), Poor (6%)
Male and female respondents perceive their relative household incomes with respect to the previous year to have mostly changed at similar rates.
Across rounds, respondents’ main source for emergency funds within 30 days have persisted at similar proportions.

![Diagram showing source of emergency funds across rounds]

- I could not come up with the money: 16% (Round 1), 18% (Round 2)
- Savings: 13% (Round 1), 15% (Round 2)
- Family, relatives, or friends: 22% (Round 1), 25% (Round 2)
- Money from working: 18% (Round 1), 17% (Round 2)
- Borrowing from a bank, employer, or private lender: 16% (Round 1), 15% (Round 2)
- Selling assets: 7% (Round 1), 8% (Round 2)
- Some other source: 3% (Round 1), 4% (Round 2)

Round 1 (N=717) vs Round 2 (N=722)
One in five poor respondents indicate that they have no source of income for raising emergency funds of K800 within 30 days.
For those who indicate difficulty in obtaining emergency funds within 30 days, the proportion indicating that it would be “Very Difficult” decreased by 7 pp.
More than one in five female respondents indicate that they have no source of income for raising emergency funds of K800 within 30 days.
For those who indicate difficulty in obtaining emergency funds within 30 days, there are not statistically significant differences between men and women’s difficulty in raising K800.
42% of poor respondents indicate it would be “very difficult” to raise K800 emergency funds in 30 days.
Across rounds, respondents report increased prevalence of selling assets (35%), skipping required loan payments (23%), and buying fewer inputs (39%) to cover basic household expenses.
Poor and non-poor respondents report similar rates of measures taken to cover basic expenses.
Male and female respondents report similar rates of measures taken to cover basic expenses.

- Sell off assets (including livestock): Male 36%, Female 33%
- Deplete your savings: Male 54%, Female 52%
- Borrow money with uncertainty about payback: Male 41%, Female 40%
- Skip making a required payment on a loan: Male 23%, Female 23%
- Buy fewer inputs for a farm/business: Male 38%, Female 39%
Thank you

https://www.poverty-action.org/recovr