Impacts of COVID-19 on Communities in the Philippines
Results from the Philippines COVID 19 Community Survey
Round 2: April 8 – 14, 2021
## Social Monitoring Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Context</th>
<th>Round 1 (R1)</th>
<th>Round 2 (R2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Size</strong></td>
<td>180 respondents</td>
<td>200 respondents (180 of which are repeaters from R1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coverage</strong></td>
<td>101 barangays across 29 provinces</td>
<td>136 barangays across 40 provinces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dates</strong></td>
<td>28 Aug – 01 Sep 2020</td>
<td>8 - 14 Apr 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quarantine Classification</strong></td>
<td>1 barangay in General Community Quarantine, the rest in Modified General Community Quarantine (MGCQ)</td>
<td>All barangays in Modified General Community Quarantine (MGCQ)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Parameters

- Respondents were community representatives and acted as key informants.
- Survey results represent key informants’ general observations and perceptions.
- Sample drawn from barangays within NCDDP rural municipalities.
- Gives insights into COVID-19 impacts in poor rural barangays, not representative for entire country.
- Complements the Philippines COVID-19 Firm and Households Surveys.
HIGHLIGHTS
How COVID-19 Affected Communities

COVID-19 Information
• Communities were markedly concerned about vaccine safety and effectiveness and looked to doctors and health practitioners for information about vaccination plans
• Though they knew vaccine could prevent COVID, communities were aware that health protocols were still needed
• Because of health reasons, getting vaccinated would likely be difficult for seniors, persons with comorbidities, and children

Social Safety Nets
• There is a slight drop in the share of people who received assistance, with the city government as the top source of assistance
• Communities preferred food, cash and livelihood assistance
• The negative effects of natural calamities on livelihood made the COVID-19 situation worse
How COVID-19 Affected Communities

**Economic Impact**
- Lack of income was the main problem for most people, with many of them citing loss of or limited employment opportunities
- Construction workers and public transport drivers were worst hit by job cuts, and job losses were experienced equally by both men and women
- The economic situation of IP barangays stayed the same

**Government Services**
- Local governments could do better in implementing health protocols
- Generally, there was no increase in the number of health workers and non-COVID patients
How COVID-19 Affected Communities

Social Cohesion

- There was an increase in COVID-related problems in peace and order, with the cause shifting from lack of medical supplies in R1 to loss of employment in R2
  - Cases of COVID-related discrimination similarly increased
  - Cases of sexual harassment, rape, and domestic violence did not increase

Education

- Distance learning was not effective due to lack of or limited access to learning gadgets and learning losses among children
  - Paper-based modules were the preferred learning modality
  - People believed that in-person classes should resume when the national government says so and when vaccines become available for most people
BARANGAY PROFILES
Sample Size

- **R1: 180 respondents across 9 regions**
  Luzon - 25%, Visayas - 64%, Mindanao - 11%

- **R2: 200 respondents across 13 regions**
  Luzon - 30%, Visayas - 50%, Mindanao - 20%
GIDA and IP Respondents

- GIDAs’ (geographically isolated and disadvantaged areas) share of survey respondents declined from 47% (R1) to 37% (R2).
- IPs’ (indigenous peoples) share of respondents declined from 24% (R1) to 10% (R2).

![Bar chart showing the share of respondents from GIDAs and IPs in two rounds of a survey.](chart.png)
Most respondents owned a business...

Classification of Respondents Based on Work Performed (R1, R2)

- Employer in own family-operated farm or business: 52% (Round 1), 38% (Round 2)
- Self-employed without any paid employee: 20% (Round 1), 33% (Round 2)
- Wage and Salary: 28% (Round 1), 30% (Round 2)
...And most wage earners worked in private establishments.

Classification of Wage and Salary Workers Based on Employer (R1, R2)

- Family-operated Farm or Business: 6% (Round 1), 10% (Round 2)
- Government: 4% (Round 1), 6% (Round 2)
- Private Establishments: 9% (Round 1), 16% (Round 2)
- Private Households: 2% (Round 1), 5% (Round 2)
INFORMATION ON COVID-19 VACCINES
Of the various sources of COVID information...

Sources of COVID-19 Information

- Health practitioners: 78%
- Media: 77%
- Government materials: 56%
- Social Media: 39%
- Community leaders: 14%
- Word of mouth: 11%
- Others: 8%
Doctors and health practitioners were expected to provide vaccine-related information.

Top Sources that Should Provide Information on COVID-19 Vaccine and Roll-out Plan

- Health practitioners: 89%
- Local government materials: 54%
- Media: 39%
- National government materials: 32%
- Community leaders: 17%
- NGOs and International Orgs: 15%
- Social Media: 10%
- Others: 10%
For most people, information about vaccine effectiveness and safety were most useful ...

Type of COVID-19 Information and its Usefulness

- Vaccine Effectiveness: 59%
- Vaccine Safety: 59%
- Side Effects and Process of Reporting: 22%
- Vaccine Options: 13%
- Availability/Timing of the Roll out: 8%
- Others: 25%

Delivery Mechanism – 5%
Priority Groups – 5%
Potential Cost of Vaccine – 5%
Frequency of Shots/Doses – 4%
Mixed others – 7%
...And much of people’s concerns were linked to vaccine safety and effectiveness

Concerns About Vaccination

- Vaccine Safety: 86%
- Vaccine Effectiveness: 60%
- Vaccine Access: 10%
- Vaccine Potential Cost: 5%
- Others: 7%
Though they believed vaccine could prevent COVID, people knew that health protocols were still needed.

Knowledge that COVID-19 can be prevented with a vaccine

- Yes - 83%
- No - 18%

Awareness that even with vaccine, the community should still practice social distancing, wear face mask, and hand wash

- Yes - 100%
Of the groups that should be vaccinated first...

Priority Groups for the Vaccine

- Health workers: 81%
- Senior citizens: 72%
- Government officials: 45%
- Young working adults: 17%
- Children/Students: 15%
- Patients with chronic/long-term diseases: 13%
- Military and police: 11%
- Teachers: 9%
- Poor: 9%
- Others: 21%

Other groups:
- Public transport workers: 7%
- Travelers: 3%
- Pregnant: 2%
- Janitors: 2%
- Mixed Others: 8%
...Seniors, persons with comorbidities, and children were likely to have difficulty getting the vaccine...

Groups that Might Have Difficulty Accessing the Vaccine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior citizens</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients with long-term/chronic diseases</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children/Students</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young working adults</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health workers &amp; medical professionals</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnant women</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWDs</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transport workers</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Government officials – 4%
- Teachers – 3%
- Travelers – 2%
- None of the above – 2%
- Mixed others – 24%
...Health was the main reason that access could be difficult for these people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health reasons</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport to health facilities</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Vaccine</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost related to transport, etc</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Won't be prioritized by government</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation/remote areas</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOCIAL SAFETY NETS
Lack of income was a major problem for most people...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of income opportunities and reduction of pay</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient food supply</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of access to financial services</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of access to markets, food and essentials</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of health facilities for COVID-19 cases</td>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government's response to the crisis*</td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*New Category in Round 2

Most Pressing Problems in the Community (R1, R2)
...And loss or limited employment opportunities was the most common grievance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Causes of Grievances and Complaints (R1, R2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment-Loss and limited opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of sufficient food/water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Access to Markets, Food, Water and Essentials*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of financial access*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory quarantine policy and lockdown implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government’s response to the crisis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*New Category in Round 2

Share of people who observed COVID-19 related grievances and complaints:

R1 - 83%
R2 - 64%
There is a slight drop in the share of people who received assistance, and the city government continued to be the top source of assistance.

Sources of Assistance (R1, R2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Assistance</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City/Municipal</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barangay</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private organizations</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R1 - 99%

R2 - 96%
People preferred food, cash and livelihood assistance

Preferred Type of Assistance for the Community

- Food: 59%
- Cash Transfer: 50%
- Livelihoods assistance: 50%
- Non-food items: 30%
- Health services assistance: 18%
- Assistance for Community COVID-19 preparedness: 10%

People preferred food, cash and livelihood assistance.
Among vulnerable groups—seniors, people affected by natural disasters, and IPs needed more assistance

Groups that Need More Assistance in Coping with COVID-19 (R1, R2)

- Senior citizens: 59% (R1), 46% (R2)
- Victims of disasters and calamities: 4% (R1), 36% (R2)
- Indigenous People: 17% (R1), 33% (R2)
- Pregnant women*: 21% (R1), 19% (R2)
- 4Ps beneficiaries: 14% (R1), 19% (R2)
- Farmers and landless rural workers: 27% (R1), 17% (R2)
- Women: 19% (R1), 15% (R2)
- Sectors prohibited from operating: 14% (R1), 11% (R2)
- Children: 21% (R1), 10% (R2)
- Fishermen: 15% (R1), 10% (R2)

*New Category in Round 2
Natural calamities aggravated the COVID-19 situation...

Affected by Natural Calamity since September 2020

- Yes, 65%
- No, 35%

Natural Calamity Aggravated COVID-19 Situation

- Yes, 74%
- No, 26%
...Because of the negative effects of calamities on people’s livelihood

Factors that Aggravated the COVID Situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative Effects on Livelihood</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Constraints</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Distancing Constraint</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Limitations</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPEs Limitations</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOCIAL COHESION
Communities experienced more peace and order problems related to COVID-19

Peace and Order Problems Related to COVID-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The main cause of peace and order problems shifted from lack of medical supplies to loss of employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causes of Peace and Order Problems (R1, R2)</th>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Round 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss of employment</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of sufficient food/water</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory quarantine policy and lockdown implementation</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting information on and interpretation of government/police rules/guidelines</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of access to information</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government’s response to the crisis (ex. provision of assistance, etc.)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of medical supplies in medical facilities (e.g., RHUs, Hospitals)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fake news, misinformation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools/ universities shutdown</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main cause of peace and order problems shifted from lack of medical supplies to loss of employment.
Discrimination related to COVID increased, with COVID patients as the most discriminated group

Increase in Cases of COVID-Related Discrimination

**R1 - 25%**

**R2 - 30%**
Cases of sexual harassment, rape, and domestic violence did not increase during the pandemic.

- 94% No
- 6% Yes
EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC IMPACT
Public transport drivers and construction workers were worst hit by job cuts

Incidence of Severe Job Losses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Round 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Formal agriculture</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal manufacturing</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal manufacturing</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal manufacturing</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal manufacturing</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public transport drivers</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial institutions</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal retail</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal retail</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal services</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal services</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal agriculture</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal agriculture</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Women and men were equally affected by job losses

Agreement Rating: Women in your community are affected by job losses more than men

- The same/both are equally affected: 51%
- Agree: 29%
- Strongly agree: 9%
- Disagree: 8%
- Strongly disagree: 5%
The economic situation of barangays with IP communities stayed the same while it worsened in barangays without IPs.

### Economic Situation by IP and Non-IP Barangays

- **Improved**
  - IP Brgy: 5%
  - Non-IP Brgy: 32%

- **Stayed the same**
  - IP Brgy: 34%
  - Non-IP Brgy: 68%

- **Worsened**
  - IP Brgy: 60%
  - Non-IP Brgy: 0%
Mobility restrictions affected population size

Population Changes due to Migration/Movement of People

- Cannot migrate to other place/country: 67%
- No changes: 44%
- Entry restrictions in the barangay: 33%
- Domestic work migrants have returned to their workstation in other areas of the Philippines: 25%
- Domestic work migrants have returned to the community: 21%
- OFW have returned to the community: 15%
- OFW have returned to their workstation abroad: 5%
Local governments could do better in implementing health and travel protocols

Areas of LGU Response that the Community Found Appropriate and Could be Strengthened

- Protocols (e.g. social distance etc): 64% appropriate and well-executed, 34% could be strengthened
- Restrictions on travel and mobility: 23% appropriate and well-executed, 75% could be strengthened
- Health facilities and health services: 19% appropriate and well-executed, 19% could be strengthened
- Assistance for households (e.g. cash grants): 11% appropriate and well-executed, 19% could be strengthened
- Assistance for communities (e.g. cash for work schemes, health facilities): 11% appropriate and well-executed, 18% could be strengthened
- Social services: 9% appropriate and well-executed, 13% could be strengthened
- Communication and information: 8% appropriate and well-executed, 15% could be strengthened
- COVID-19 testing and tracking: 7% appropriate and well-executed, 10% could be strengthened
The number of health workers and non-COVID patients remained the same

Change in Number of Barangay Health Workers (BHWs) during the COVID-19 Pandemic

- 6% Fewer
- 20% More
- 75% No Change

Why more?
- 74% - The community hired more BHWs because there was a higher volume of barangay patients.
- 26% - The community hired more BHWs because more people needed jobs

Why fewer?
- 55% - Fewer BHWs were willing to work because of COVID-19
- 45% - There were fewer patients who had to be attended to

Change in Volume of Non-COVID Patients in the Health Center

- 37% Fewer patients
- 59% More patients
- 5% No change

Why fewer?
- 29% - People were afraid to go out in general
- 9% - People were afraid of going to the health center
- 42%
EDUCATION
Distance learning was not considered effective

Perception of Effectiveness of Current Distance Learning Compared to Face-to-Face Schooling

- 20-50 percent effective: 30%
- Less than 20 percent effective: 29%
- 50-80 percent effective: 28%
- 80-100 percent effective: 14%
Lack or limited access to learning gadgets and learning losses made distance learning difficult for most children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No/ Limited access to gadgets/devices for learning (i.e., PC/Laptop/Tablet)</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning losses</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No/ Limited learning guidance from household members</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No/ Limited access to internet</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological stresses</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No/ Limited physical communications with friends</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to learning materials</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No school lunch</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paper-based modules were considered the most effective distance learning modality

Proven Effective Modalities for Distance Learning

- Paper-based modules: 92%
- Online: 23%
- "Gabay Aral Modality" (where a teacher does face to face or one on one sessions with a child of assigned households): 9%
- TV: 4%
- Radio: 4%
- SMS: 0.5%
In-person classes should resume when the national government says so and vaccines are available to most people.

When Should Schools Transition to Face-to-Face Learning?

- When the central government decides to reopen all schools in the country. 47%
- When vaccines are available for the majority of people in your community. 32%
- When the next school year starts. 8%
- As soon as possible with appropriate health measures even though there are some COVID cases. 8%
- As soon as possible because COVID cases are very limited locally/in our community. 6%
Next Steps

- Results of community, household and firm surveys to be published and shared widely
- The three survey results are complementary, with the community survey complementing the household survey results in particular
- Third round of community survey to be prepared – the timing TBD
THANK YOU!

worldbank.org/philippines/covidmonitor