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Timor-Leste COVID-19 Survey

**Who?**
423 Timor-Leste adults

**How?**
Phone surveys, 19-25 May 2020

**Future?**
Tracking results in July

**Biggest challenge**
- 61% COVID-19
- 18% Politics
- 10% Economy

**Biggest concerns**
- Money 73%
- Health 71%
- Food 68%

**Behaviors** (% applies)
- 86% Face mask
- 85% Wash hands
- 77% Work from home
- 74% 2m distance
- 74% Avoid public areas
- 71% Stay home
- 65% Avoid gatherings

**Would go to hospital if they had symptoms** 93%

**Have currently or previously self-quarantined**
68%

**Currently, 27%**

**Previously, 42%**

58% Right direction, 38% Don’t know

**Currently, 27%**
26.7%+41.5%=68.2%

20% Insufficient
52% Appropriate
27% Too extreme

**Current government response:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Eligible</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electricity subsidy</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbusiness loan</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker wage subsidy</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eskola ba Uma (School Goes Home)</td>
<td>66% (exposed)</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uma Kain ($100 payment)</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>(would use to purchase food)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55% Want the government to end the State of Emergency, and

35% Think the Government should provide more cash to households

In the past 30 days,
7 in 10 have cut meal size or skipped a meal

because there wasn’t enough money for food
70% think COVID-19 has brought their community closer together

Since the State of Emergency, Good relationships have improved

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>+33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>+26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>+21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But only...

58% Provide help

52% Receive help
to / from friends or neighbors

78% People are more suspicious or fearful of suspected / confirmed COVID-19 cases

64% Timor-Leste is LESS tolerant of those unknown to community

90% You are able to adapt to change

82% You will bounce back after illness or hardship

Positive COVID-19 impacts
- Spending time with family (53%), Feeling part of community (53%), Physical health (53%), Mental health (51%), How safe you feel (50%)

Negative COVID-19 impacts
- Job (52%), Household income (50%)

78% used Television or Radio as an information source on government subsidy programs

Radio

Most listened:
- 42% RTTL
- 29% Radio Maubere
- 20% GMN

Television

Most watched:
- 76% RTTL
- 67% GMN

Most trusted news and information source for...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Television</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Radio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COVID-19</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most respondents follow COVID-19 and other news at least somewhat closely

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very closely</th>
<th>Somewhat closely</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COVID-19</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National politics</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local politics</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World affairs</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business / financial</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

News followed more closely within Dili

Dili
- COVID-19 – 83%
- National politics – 75%

Outside Dili
- COVID-19 – 60%
- National politics – 50%

We would like to thank the 423 respondents for their time and the 14 interviewers in Dili who conducted the survey.
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Background

What is this research about?

The COVID-19, or coronavirus global pandemic has required huge responses from governments all over the world. Timor-Leste has its own unique requirements when addressing an event of this magnitude. The Government of Timor-Leste responded by declaring a state of emergency, which closed schools, suspended public transport and large gatherings, instituted border closures and established requirements for social distancing.

While these measures were put in place to prevent the spread of COVID-19, the Government of Timor-Leste also acknowledged the social and economic impact and introduced a number of financial support programs, to not only support citizens as they self-quarantine, but also to boost the economy.

One of these programs is a $100 per month household payment for low income households, known as Apoiu Monetáriu ba COVID-19, or Uma Kain $100. Other support programs include:

- An electricity subsidy of $15 per month;
- A 60% wage subsidy for certain workers including microlet and taxi drivers; and
- Micro loans for businesses.

In addition to other COVID-19 awareness and information campaigns, the government also launched the Eskola ba Uma program, a remote learning program for students who self-quarantine at home.

In the background to the above measures, Timor-Leste has experienced political shifts with the recent change of party alliances in Parliament and the appointment of 8 new Ministers. Fortunately, Timor-Leste has so far avoided the worst of the pandemic compared to many other countries, with a low number of cases. The next consideration is the long-lasting economic impact of the State of Emergency, and strategies for economic recovery.

This research aims to understand:

- The concerns of the people of Timor-Leste;
- How well they are adopting prevention measures and taking care of their health;
- The level of trust in government;
- The use and satisfaction of government programs;
- The social and economic impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic;
- The resilience of individuals and their communities; and
- The sources of news and information the people of Timor-Leste are relying on to stay informed about the pandemic.

Who is the research being conducted for?

The Asia Foundation has been working with the people of Timor-Leste for nearly 30 years on issues such as employment, women’s rights, and community policing, and commissioned this research. The results will be used for advocacy with the Timor-Leste Government and donors on issues relating to COVID-19. This research is supported by the Australian Government through the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT).

How was the research conducted?

A Dili-based call centre conducted 423 interviews with Timor-Leste adults, using a sample list of previous respondents to The Asia Foundation Tatoli surveys. The interviews were conducted between 19 and 25 May 2020. ORIMA Research (Australia) worked with The Asia Foundation on the questionnaire and data collection methodology, performed data quality checks, and conducted the analysis and reporting. More detail is available in the methodology section of this report. The full survey results are also available on the Q2i Visualisation platform: surveys.asiafoundation.org/Dashboard?SurveyCode=TLCV

The future

The intention is for this survey to be re-run at 2-month intervals to see how the response changes over time. This report and the Q2i visualisation platform will be subsequently updated to reflect this data.
Results

Biggest concerns

Overall, at the time of the survey more respondents felt that Timor-Leste was going in the wrong direction (58%) than in the right direction (38%) – giving a net score of -20%.

A higher proportion of respondents believed Timor-Leste was going in the right direction if their household was eligible for the electricity subsidy (41%) or the worker subsidy (55%).

Respondents were more likely to think Timor-Leste was going in the wrong direction if they lived outside of Dili (61%) than if they lived in Dili (49%).

Women and men were equally likely to say the country was going in the wrong direction.

Sixty-one percent of respondents said the biggest challenge facing Timor-Leste was COVID-19, including the impact on health. Other concerns included political issues (18%) and a weak economy (10%). Respondents aged 17 to 24 were more likely to say COVID-19 was the single biggest challenge (71%) compared to those aged 45 and over (53%). Those who had children exposed to the Eskola ba Uma education program most days were also more likely to say that COVID-19 is the single biggest problem (80%).

COVID-19 was one of the top three problems impacting both individuals (80%) and their community (76%). The second-highest ranked issue was a weak economy (63% for individuals, 64% for community). More respondents said that political issues were a greater problem for them as an individual (49%) than for the community (37%). Other problems included lack of food (39% / 41%) and lack of transportation (33% / 41%).

Individuals who were aged 45 or over were more likely to be concerned about the weak economy (71%). Those whose household was currently in self-quarantine were more likely to be concerned about food security (55%).

Top 3 problems as an individual and your community (Multiple response, eight most common problems shown)

1 Gender differences are noted in the analysis where these were observed. See methodology section for more details.
Respondents were very concerned about having enough money for their family now (73%) and in the future (73%). Concern was also high about the health risk of COVID-19 personally (71%) and to family/friends (67%), food security (68%), and safety (67%).

Those in Dili were less concerned about having enough money for their family now (63% very concerned). Generally, those in non-agriculture related employment were less concerned about all items (48-57% very concerned), as were those who had children exposed to the Eskola ba Uma education program (51-59%) or who accessed social media or the internet daily (57-61%).

At the moment, are you concerned about:

- Having enough money for your family in the future: 73% very concerned, 25% somewhat concerned, and 2% not at all concerned.
- Having enough money for your family now: 73% very concerned, 24% somewhat concerned, and 3% not at all concerned.
- The risk to your personal health from COVID-19: 71% very concerned, 26% somewhat concerned, and 3% not at all concerned.
- Having enough food to feed your family: 68% very concerned, 28% somewhat concerned, and 4% not at all concerned.
- COVID-19 health risk to immediate family and friends: 67% very concerned, 29% somewhat concerned, and 4% not at all concerned.
- Your level of personal safety: 67% very concerned, 31% somewhat concerned, and 2% not at all concerned.

Prevention measures and healthcare behavior

Sixty-eight percent of respondents have at some stage been in self-quarantine. This includes 27 percent currently, and 42 percent previously in self-quarantine. Thirty-one percent had never been in self-quarantine.

Those in Dili were less likely to have self-quarantined (61%). If markets were mostly closed in the local areas, respondents were more likely to have self-quarantined (74%).

By self-quarantine we mean when an individual or family stays at home except for essential tasks such as purchasing food or seeking medical care.
Respondents were asked a series of statements about their COVID-19 prevention behaviors during the past week. The most commonly adopted behaviors were wearing facemasks (86%) and washing hands (85%). Other behaviors included working from home (77%), keeping two metres distance from others (74%), avoiding public places (74%) and staying at home except for essentials (71%). A smaller majority did not attend social gatherings (65%).

Forty-eight percent of respondents said all seven behaviors applied to them very much, with seven percent indicating that none of the behaviors applied very much to them.

Women were more likely to maintain two metres distance (80%) than males (70%). If markets were closed in the local area, respondents were more likely to stay at home (81%), avoid public places (83%) and work from home (84%). If markets were mostly open, respondents were less likely to stay at home (55%).

Those who did not access information from either newspaper, radio or television daily were less likely to wear a facemask when outside of the house (75%) or wash their hands (78%).

The great majority of people indicated that if they had COVID symptoms they would take at least some type of precautionary action, and most would take several different steps. If respondents had symptoms related to COVID-19, 93 percent would go to a hospital or health clinic. Ninety-one percent would inform people around them, and 84 percent would stay at home. Three-quarters of respondents (75%) would take all three actions if they had symptoms.

Respondents who did not access television, radio or newspapers on a daily basis were less likely to tell people around them if they had symptoms (83%). If a respondent’s household was eligible for the worker wage subsidy, they were more likely to stay home if they had symptoms (97%). Older people (78%) and those in Dili (77%) were less likely to stay home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COVID-19 safe behaviors in past week</th>
<th>Applies very much</th>
<th>Applies somewhat</th>
<th>Does not apply at all</th>
<th>Can't say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wore facemask (when out)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash hands (every time there was contact)</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked from home</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kept two metres distance</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoided public places</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed at home (except for essentials, like food)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not attend social gatherings</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you had symptoms, would you:

- **93%** Go to a hospital or health clinic
- **91%** Inform people around me
- **84%** Stay home
- **94%** Would do at least two of the above
- **75%** Would do all three of the above
Government trust

Just under half (49%) of respondents trust the government to take care of its citizens during COVID-19, including over one-quarter (26%) who strongly trust. One-third (33%) distrust the government, including 11 percent who strongly distrust.

Trust was higher for households that experienced a negative impact on their household income because of COVID-19 (61% trust). Trust was also higher among respondents who never use social media or the internet (58%). Distrust was higher amongst households currently in self-quarantine (45%).

How much do you trust the government to take care of its citizens during COVID-19?

49% trust the government to take care of its citizens during COVID-19

About half of respondents (51%) thought the initial government reaction was appropriate, with a similar proportion indicating the same when asked about the current reaction (52%). A similar proportion also think that the reaction from the Timorese people was appropriate (49%).

About one-in-five respondents (20-21%) thought the reaction from the government and Timorese people was insufficient, and a slightly larger proportion (26-29%) thought the reaction was too extreme. Eighty percent of respondents gave the same rating to the government’s initial and current response.

Those currently in self-quarantine were more likely to say the reaction was insufficient (37-44%), and those who were not eligible for the electricity subsidy were more likely to say the reaction was too extreme (39-41%). When the impact of COVID-19 on household income was negative, a higher proportion of respondents also said the overall reaction was too extreme (32-37%).

What do you think of the reaction of...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government - Initially</th>
<th>21%</th>
<th>51%</th>
<th>26%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government - Currently</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timorese people</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Insufficient  Appropriate  Too extreme  Don’t know
Use of and satisfaction with government programs

If this household receives the Apoiu Monetária household subsidy from the government, how will you primarily use it?

- Purchase food: 79%
- Other purchase: 8%
- Unsure if eligible: 13%

One of the first programs announced by the government was the Uma Kain household payment, also known as Apoiu Monetāriu ba COVID-19. At the time of data collection the payment had not been distributed. Seventy-nine percent of respondents would use this to purchase food.

Sixty-nine percent of respondents indicated their household was eligible (had received money already or was waiting for money) for the electricity subsidy as part of the government’s support program. Smaller proportions indicated their household was eligible for microbusiness loans (12%) and the worker wage subsidy (11%). For households who were eligible for the electricity subsidy (69%), the majority (84%) had already received the money.

Household eligibility for the electricity subsidy (93%), worker wage subsidy (19%) and microbusiness loan (19%) was higher within Dili. A lower proportion of agriculture workers said they were eligible for subsidies (59% electricity, 6% worker wage, 6% microbusiness loan). Respondents who did not trust TV as a source of news for COVID-19 information were less likely to think someone in their household was eligible (45% electricity, 4% worker wage, 4% microbusiness). If respondents thought their household was eligible for one of the subsidies, they were more likely to think they were eligible for the other ones too.

Does anyone in this household receive any other support as part of the government’s social-economic package/stimulus/recovery program?

- Electricity subsidy
  - Received money already: 58%
  - No, but waiting for money: 11%
  - No: 18%
  - Does not apply: 12%
  - Received or waiting: 69%

- Microbusiness loan
  - Received money already: 8%
  - No, but waiting for money: 4%
  - No: 57%
  - Does not apply: 26%
  - Received or waiting: 12%

- Worker wage subsidy
  - Received money already: 4%
  - No, but waiting for money: 7%
  - No: 53%
  - Does not apply: 30%
  - Received or waiting: 11%
Other types of support households received included financial assistance in the form of loans, credit or private microfinance (5%).

Ninety-three percent of respondents eligible for the electricity subsidy rated it as at least good, including 59% who rated it very good. Those eligible for worker wage subsidies (84%) and loans for micro businesses (82%) rated the support as at least good.

Respondents provided lower satisfaction ratings for the worker wage subsidy if they lived in Dili (68% at least good).

### Level of satisfaction with government support / subsidies (For those eligible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Type</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Okay</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Very bad</th>
<th>At least Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electricity subsidy</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbusiness loan</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker wage subsidy</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Where did you find the information to get the government support?

- **TV or radio**: 78%
- **Social media**: 6%
- **Xefe/community leader**: 5%
- **Government website**: 5%
- **Friends/family**: 4%

Television or radio was by far the most common source of information about government support (78%). Other sources of information included social media (6%), the government website (5%) and Xefe/community leaders (5%).

A higher proportion of respondents in Dili sourced their information from a government website (12%) than outside of Dili (1%), whereas respondents outside of Dili were more likely to get their information through TV or radio (84%) than those within Dili (65%). Respondents who do not regularly use social media or the internet were more likely to get information from their Xefe or community leader (11%).
The government ran a program called Eskola ba Uma, also known as “School Goes Home”. It was designed to reach as many children as possible and included television, radio, online, and paper distribution methods. Sixty-six percent of households had children exposed to the Eskola ba Uma program at least weekly, with twenty-eight percent watching it most days. There remained a sizeable proportion of households whose children were never exposed to the program (27%).

Respondents and their households were more likely to be exposed to Eskola ba Uma on a weekly basis if they were aged 17 to 24 (77%), trusted television for COVID-19 information (73%), accessed either newspaper, radio or television daily (74%) or used social media or the internet daily (83%).

Close to half of respondents reported that the program was at least good (47%). Fifteen percent of these respondents rated Eskola ba Uma as very good, and 39% thought it was okay. Only 14 percent said it was bad or very bad.

How often do children in this household watch or listen to the government’s Eskola ba Uma program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyday or most days, frequently</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a week</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No children in the household</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Daily exposure to Eskola ba Uma was associated with higher satisfaction with the program overall, with those whose household had children who were exposed to the program at least daily, more likely to rate it as good or very good (79%) than those who were exposed less frequently (33%). Respondents in Dili were less satisfied with the program (36% at least good, compared to 51% outside of Dili). Households currently in self-quarantine were more satisfied with the program (63% at least good).

Do children in this household do other educational activities?

- Home schooling: 58%
- Eskola ba Uma homework: 24%
- Youtube videos: 12%
- School homework: 10%
- No other activities: 14%
- No children: 5%

Other educational activities included parents or adults home schooling (58%), homework directly from the Eskola ba Uma program (24%), and YouTube videos (12%).
### Additional government support

Ending the State of Emergency (55%) was the most common response for what the government could do to support its citizens. Other suggestions included providing more cash to households (35%), and information related to accessing government support programs (17%), as well as COVID-19 prevention (14%).

There was a higher proportion of those who had not self-quarantined suggesting to end the State of Emergency (73%) than those who were still in self-quarantine (31%). Those whose household income had been negatively impacted by COVID-19 also wanted the State of Emergency to end (68%).

Information on accessing government support programs was more frequently reported as a way the government could support its citizens during the pandemic for those in Dili (28%), working in non-agriculture areas (32%) and those currently in self-quarantine (27%). Females perceived educational support as something the government could do more of (19%), and this need for greater educational support was higher amongst those whose household was exposed to Eskola ba Uma less regularly (19%).

### During this time, what could the government do more to support its citizens?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>End State of Emergency</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash to households</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on accessing government support programs</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about COVID prevention</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational support for children</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better health services</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide food</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social and economic impacts

More people felt that the personal impact of COVID-19 was positive rather than negative for many aspects of their lives, with the exception of jobs and income.

Spending time with family was regarded as a positive impact of COVID-19 (53%), as was feeling part of a community (53%) and physical health (53%).

A majority of respondents felt negative impacts for their job (52%) and their household income (50%).

Young people between the ages of 17 to 24 were less positive about their physical health (26%), personal relationships (26%), spending time with family (22%), feeling part of community (22%) and ability to deal with challenges and stress (22%).

Those who were retired, students or carers were more positive about their mental health (53%), how safe they feel (52%), sense of purpose (51%), feeling welcome in society (58%), and standard of living (55%).

Households who were currently in self-quarantine were less positive on all measures, as were those who were not eligible for the $15 electricity subsidy.

As well as having a higher proportion of negative impact ratings, impact on jobs and household income was seemingly quite different from the other impacts. Interestingly, respondents who felt a negative impact for household income tended to also answer negatively for impact on their job, however, they were less likely to answer negatively for other items within the group of questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you say the effect of COVID-19 on you personally has been…</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Not really been affected at all</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Can’t say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spending time with your family</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling part of your community</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your physical health</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your ability to deal with challenges and stress</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your mental health</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your standard of living</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How safe you feel</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling like you are making a valuable contribution</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your personal relationships</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your sense of purpose</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your sense of support</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling welcome in society</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your job</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your household income</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Positive  ■ Not really been affected at all  ■ Negative  ■ Can’t say
Consistent with the proportions who indicated a positive impact from COVID-19 on them personally, 70 percent believed that COVID-19 had brought their community closer together. Those who were currently in self-quarantine were even more likely to believe this (84%), and this belief was also higher amongst those who were eligible for either the electricity subsidy (75%), worker wage subsidy (86%) or microbusiness loan (85%).

**How do you think your community has changed as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic?**

**It has brought our community closer together**

- True: 70%
- False: 27%
- I can't say: 3%

Although the majority of respondents agreed that the pandemic had brought their community together, they also thought that people had become more suspicious or fearful of those who had, or were suspected of having COVID-19 (78%). A majority also believed that Timor-Leste has become less tolerant of people from different areas or unknown within their community (64%).

Respondents who did not trust television for information about COVID-19 were more likely to believe that Timor-Leste had become less tolerant of community outsiders (87%).

**How do you think your community has changed as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic?**

**People have become more suspicious or fearful of those who have had COVID19 or are suspected of having COVID-19.**

- True: 78%
- False: 19%
- I can't say: 3%

**Timor-Leste has become less tolerant of people who are from different areas or unknown to those in the community**

- True: 64%
- False: 32%
- I can't say: 4%

**I can't say**
Twenty-three percent of markets were still mostly open in respondents’ local areas. Markets were more likely to be open in Dili (36%) than outside of Dili (19%).

**How many markets are open in your local area?**

23% of markets are still open in local area

---

Seventy percent of respondents indicated that in the past 30 days they sometimes had to cut the size of their meal or skip a meal because there was not enough money for food.

Respondents working in non-agriculture related industries (56%) were less likely to skip or reduce, as were those who used social media or the internet on a daily basis (59%).

In the past 30 days, did you have to cut the size of a meal or skip a meal because there wasn’t enough money for food?

At least sometimes 70%
Despite feeling that Timor-Leste was less tolerant, nearly all respondents (94%) agree that all people of Timor-Leste can live together in peace. They also believed most people in their Aldeia are ready to help each other if needed (94%), and that resources are pooled for the benefits of all (80%). Most (76%) also agreed that people in their Aldeia will only help each other if they are blood relatives, with only 13 percent disagreeing with this. A quarter (27%) of respondents agreed that people do not trust each other in their Aldeia, with 62 percent disagreeing with this statement.

Respondents who lived in Dili were of less agreement that all the people in Timor-Leste can live together in peace (89%) and that most people help each other if needed (89%). If local markets were closed, respondents were more likely to say that people could live in peace (99%), most people help each other if needed (99%), and that resources are commonly pooled for the benefits of all (89%). They were less likely to say that people will only help each other if they are blood relatives (67%).

Females were more likely to agree that resources are commonly pooled for the benefits of all (85%) than men (75%). Younger people aged 17 to 34 were also more likely to agree with this (86%).

Seventy-one percent of respondents said friends or neighbors turned to them for advice at least sometimes, however this was only done often 13 percent of the time. A majority of people agreed that people work together on projects (58%) and provided help to friends or neighbors (58%) at least sometimes, although it should be noted that there was a high proportion who never did (41% for both). Whilst 52 percent at least sometimes received help from their friends or neighbors, just under half (48%) never did.

Providing and receiving help occurred at least sometimes more outside of Dili (63% provide and 58% receive) than within Dili (44% and 36%). Where the impact of COVID-19 on household income was negative, there was less help (43% provide and 37% receive).
Ninety percent of respondents thought it was at least true sometimes that they were able to adapt to change. The majority of respondents (85%) also described themselves as able to bounce back after illness or hardship. Respondents located in Dili were more likely to think both statements were at least sometimes true (96% adapt to change and 92% bounce back).

**How much do the following things describe you?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>At least true sometimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am able to adapt to change</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I bounce back after illness or hardship</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationships with family were rated at least good by the majority (92%) of respondents, including 56% who rated their relationship as very good. Relationships with neighbors was rated similarly (88%). A slightly lower proportion rated the relationships with their community in general as at least good (80%).

For those currently in self-quarantine, 92 percent of relationships with the community in general were at least good. If household income was negatively impacted by COVID-19, a higher proportion of relationships with family (95%), neighbors (92%), and the community in general (87%) were rated at least good.

Since the State of Emergency, one-third of respondents (33%) said relationships with family had improved. Twenty-six percent said relationships with their neighbors had improved, and 21 percent reported improved relationships with the community in general. There was a small proportion (7%) who said their relationships had gotten worse with the community in general since the State of Emergency.

Where most markets were still closed, relationships improved amongst family (42%) and neighbors (32%), when compared to areas where most markets were still open (23% family and 18% neighbor improvement).
News and information

About four-in-five of respondents (81%) watched television at least a few times a week, with 66 percent watching television daily. This was higher than use of social media and internet (63% at least a few times a week, 33% daily) and radio (58% at least a few times a week, 33% daily). Newspaper was the least frequently accessed media (only 28% at least a few times a week, 10% daily).

Usage of news and information sources at least a few times a week was higher within Dili (94% television, 41% newspaper, 73% internet) compared to residents living outside of Dili (76% television, 23% newspaper, 59% internet). Radio use was not significantly different between Dili and outside of Dili. Respondents working in agriculture were less likely to watch television (71%) read a daily newspaper (16%), or use the internet (51%) at least a few times a week, and at least weekly social media/internet use was higher amongst those aged 17-24 (80%) and 25-34 (72%) compared to those aged over 45 (39%).

How often do you use different types of media and entertainment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Type</th>
<th>Every day</th>
<th>A few times a week</th>
<th>At least a few times a week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media/internet</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily newspaper</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Over four-in-five respondents had their own phone (82%), with close to all respondents who owned a phone personally owning, or knowing someone within their household that had access to the internet or social media on their phone (79%).

Younger respondents aged 17-24 were more likely to have access to the internet on a phone (91%) compared to respondents aged 45 and over (67%). Those living in Dili were more likely to have access to the internet on a phone (89%) than those who lived outside of Dili (75%). Those employed in agriculture were less likely to have access to the internet on a phone (70%) than those who worked in non-agriculture areas (92%). Ninety-six percent of those with internet access from a phone in the household used social media daily.

The most used website or app was Facebook (78%). One-in-three respondents used WhatsApp (33%) and around one-in-five respondents used YouTube (22%).

Older respondents aged 45 or over were more likely to access GMN Diario Nacional (10%) than those aged below 35 (<1%).

---

### Top 5 most used websites or apps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Website/APP</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WhatsApp</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouTube</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instagram</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMN Diario Nacional</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*As the survey was conducted over the telephone, all respondents had access to a telephone. As a comparison, in 2018 76 percent of respondents provided a mobile phone number and only 33 percent of respondents said they had access to the internet.*
At the time the survey was conducted, COVID-19 was the most closely followed topic, with over one-in-five following the topic very closely (23%) and two-thirds of respondents following this topic at least somewhat closely (66%). National (56%) and local (50%) politics were also followed at least somewhat closely.

Residents of Dili were significantly more likely to follow COVID-19 related news (83% compared to 60% outside of Dili), national politics (75% compared to 50%), local politics (59% compared to 46%) and world affairs (58% compared to 46%).

**How closely do you follow each of the following topics?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Very closely</th>
<th>Somewhat closely</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COVID-19</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National politics</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local politics</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World affairs</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business / financial</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*15.5+40.7=56.2%, 8.5+41.0=49.5%, 9.4+38.3=47.7%

**What source of news and information do you trust the most?**

- **Television** was the most trusted source for COVID-19 information (80%) and other news and information (75%).
- **Radio** was the second most trusted source of news (12% for COVID-19 and 17% generally). Other news and information sources, such as the internet or social media, Suco Council or local leaders and friends and family or neighbors had lower levels of trust.
- Respondents working in agriculture were more likely to trust radio (26% other news and information), but still overwhelmingly trusted television (65%).
Over two-thirds of respondents identified RTTL and GMN (76% and 67% respectively) as the television channels they most often watched.

Respondents that were retired, students or carers were more likely to watch RTTL (87%) than those who were unemployed (63%). Those who did not use social media or the internet were more likely to watch RTTL (85%). Those who read a newspaper, listened to the radio or watched television daily were also more likely to watch RTTL (79%).

As mentioned above, 17 percent of respondents primarily trust radio for other news and information. A wider range of stations were listened to in comparison to the number of television channels watched. Over one-in-five respondents reported that they listened to RTTL (42%), Radio Maubere (29%), and GMN (20%).

Males were more likely to listen to Community Radio (22%, compared with 5% females) whilst females were more likely to listen to GMN (31%, compared to 5%).

What television channels do you most often watch? What radio stations do you most often listen to?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Television Channels</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Radio Stations</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTTL</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>RTTL</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMN</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>Radio Maubere</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVE</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>GMN</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV Maubere</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Community Radio</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IndoVision</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Radio Falentil</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardemore TV</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top 5 challenges in accessing information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited funds or money to pay for connection</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No place to access; lack of TV or mobile phone at home</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited time to devote to media and information; busy with work</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor reception or signals from TV and radio stations and internet</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited knowledge about different information sources and their availability</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost half the respondents indicated that one of their main challenges in accessing information was limited funds (48%). Respondents aged 17 to 24 were more likely to face challenges in accessing information due to limited funds (58%), compared to those aged 45 and over (37%), as were those living outside of Dili (54%) compared to those living in Dili (33%).


**Respondent profile**

The results for District, Gender and Age used weighted data. These variables are used as weighting variables themselves – and more details as well as their respective cut-offs are contained in the methodology section.

**District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>26%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>9%</th>
<th>8%</th>
<th>7%</th>
<th>7%</th>
<th>6%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>4%</th>
<th>4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dili</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ermera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baucau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lautem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobonaro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viqueque</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ainaro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aileu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manatuto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covilima</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oecusse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufahi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender**

- Male, 50%
- Female, 50%

**Age**

- 17-19: 8%
- 20-24: 13%
- 25-29: 11%
- 30-34: 11%
- 35-39: 7%
- 40-44: 14%
- 45-49: 9%
- 50-54: 4%
- 55-59: 3%
- 60-64: 1%
- 65-69: 0%
- 70-74: 0%
- 75+: 1%

**How many other adults aged 17 or over / children aged under 17 live in your household?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What is your occupation?**

- Working on own farm: 53%
- Working – other: 16%
- Unemployed/seeking work: 13%
- Student/in training: 8%
- Domestic work: 5%
- Working on other farm: 0%
- Retired: 0%
- Other: 0%
- Don’t know: 3%

**Where do you work? (If working – other)**

- Government: 47%
- International organization: 13%
- Teacher at school / university: 10%
- Private firm / company / hotel: 10%
- Own business: 8%
- Local NGO / Civil Society: 6%
- Health worker: 3%
- Police / armed forces: 2%
Methodology

How was the questionnaire developed?

The Asia Foundation led the development of the questionnaire, with ORIMA Research providing advice where appropriate. Questions were drawn from previous research The Asia Foundation had conducted, as well as the ORIMA Research COVID-19 Recovery Tracker survey, amongst other international COVID-19 surveys. The Asia Foundation oversaw the programming and translation of the questionnaire into Open Data Kit (ODK), an open-source survey software platform.

How was the sample frame developed and how effective was it?

The sample frame for Wave 1 was drawn from validation numbers provided by previous respondents to the Timor-Leste Tatoli Survey (n=2,307). Cleaning of the sample involved the removal of blank/invalid numbers (n=1,998) and duplicate numbers (n=121). In total, 2,123 calls were made. 232 numbers resulted in completed surveys, 30 respondents refused and 1,666 numbers did not work. Bookings were kept for 35 people.

The response rate from the sample frame is calculated by the number of final survey complete (n=232) divided by the number of valid phone numbers on the sample frame (n=2,307), equal to 10.0%.

When a number was dialled and a different person answered, this person was able to also complete the survey (n=168). Likewise, after completing the survey, respondents were able to suggest others who may have been willing to participate (n=23). Nearly all (n=417) respondents gave permission to be recontacted for future research. Whilst steps have been taken to make this survey as representative as possible, the sample from this project is classified as non-probability.

How were the telephone interviews conducted?

To conduct the fieldwork, The Asia Foundation partnered with a Dili based NGO called MDI. Eleven of their interviewers have previously worked on survey projects for The Asia Foundation. In total, 14 interviewers were trained, briefed and conducted interviews for the project.

99% of respondents were willing to be recontacted for validation purposes. Staff from The Asia Foundation recontacted 27 of these respondents, with no major issues found. Monitoring was also conducted by staff from The Asia Foundation.
Fieldwork took place between 19 and 25 May 2020. The median length of interview (LOI) was 47 minutes and 25 seconds. This LOI excludes 25 cases where length was above four hours, which may have been due to the interviewer not submitting the final survey. Three of the interviews were conducted in Fatuluku, with the rest conducted in Tetum. Respondents were sent a $2 telephone credit for participating in the research.

What steps have been taken to ensure the data is representative of the Timor-Leste population?

The research was designed to be as representative as possible of the adult (17+) population of Timor-Leste as defined by the 2015 Census. Considerations in the sampling approach included the need to enable comparisons between Dili and other districts, as well as conforming to the relatively short timeframe and limited sample.

Minimum quotas (see right, above) were set to ensure appropriate gender and geographic coverage.

Additionally, individual districts outside of Dili had minimum quotas proportionate to their population. The minimum quota required for each district was 10. Districts with higher populations (such as Baucau and Ermera) had minimum quotas of 25.

The 423 cases were weighted to population benchmarks as defined in the 2015 census. This was to correct response bias from males and middle ages, as well as slight Dili over-sampling. Random Iterative Method (RIM) weighting using the anesrake package in R studio was chosen as the most appropriate weighting method with consideration to future comparability, simplicity and representation of the population. The variables used for weighting, the proportions within population, unweighted and weighted data are shown to the right.

What data processing steps were taken?

Once ORIMA received the data, the following data processing steps were conducted:

- Four pairs of cases were deemed to be a higher risk of being a duplicate due to having the same phone number, same name, similar demographics, and similar response patterns. For these pairs, one duplicate was removed and one was kept.
- 710 string question responses in Tetun were translated by The Asia Foundation.
- 12 “Don’t know” answers in multiple-response question were made exclusive.
- 64 cases over nine questions were back-coded.
- A code frame was developed for two questions (q32d and q34d).
- Variable labels and value labels were checked and modified for the purposes of reporting.
- Weighting was conducted as above.

How confident can I be in the results?

The survey results contain the responses of n=423 respondents. The effective sample size measures the equivalent sample size had perfect sampling been used without weighting. The above weighting scheme resulted in an effective sample size of 354. The statistical margin of error, based on the effective sample size, is ± 5.2% at the 95% confidence level. This can be used as a general guide when determining whether results are actually different or only different by chance. Other factors, such as the sampling method, non-response bias and measurement error should also be taken into consideration when interpreting results.
Figures within text that are flagged as different amongst sub-groups were found as significant to at least one other category when using a Welch T-test at a 95% confidence interval with a Bonferroni correction within the cTables interface of SPSS. Analysis of differences amongst sub-groups are subject to higher margins of error and these tests take this into account. However, they must only be used as a general guide only. Tests are not highlighted where no sub-group difference existed. For example, there were few differences by gender. Within this report, not all figures will add up to 100% due to rounding.
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