

1 **FULL TITLE: Perceptions and compliance with COVID-19 preventive**
2 **measures in Southern and Central regions of Mozambique: a quantitative**
3 **in-person household survey in the districts of Manhiça and Quelimane**

4
5 **SHORT TITLE: Perceptions and compliance with COVID-19 preventive**
6 **measures in Mozambique**

7
8 **Authors list:**

9 Ariel Nhacolo^{1*}, Amílcar Magaço¹, Felizarda Amosse¹, Aura Hunguana¹, Teodomiro
10 Matsena¹, Arsénio Nhacolo¹, Elisio Xerinda¹, Quique Bassat^{1,2,3,4,5}, Charfudin Sacoor¹,
11 Inácio Mandomando^{1,6}, Khátia Munguambe^{1,7}

12 **Affiliations:**

13
14 ¹ Centro de Investigação em Saúde de Manhiça (CISM), Maputo, Mozambique

15 ² ISGlobal, Hospital Clínic - Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

16 ³ ICREA, Pg. Lluís Companys 23, 08010 Barcelona, Spain.

17 ⁴ Pediatrics Department, Hospital Sant Joan de Déu, Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

18 ⁵ Consorcio de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Epidemiología y Salud Pública (CIBERESP),
19 Madrid, Spain

20 ⁶ National Institute of Health, Ministry of Health, Maputo, Mozambique

21 ⁷ Faculty of Medicine, Eduardo Mondlane University, Maputo, Mozambique

22
23 * Corresponding author: Ariel Nhacolo; e-mail: ariel.nhacolo@manhica.net. Centro de
24 Investigação em Saúde de Manhiça (Manhiça Health Research Center), Rua 12, Bairro Cambeve,
25 Município da Vila da Manhiça, Manhiça District

26
27 **Emails of Authors**

28 Ariel.nhacolo@manhica.net

29 Amilcar.magaco@manhica.net

30 Felizarda.amosse@manhica.net

31 Aura.hunguana@manhica.net

32 Teodomiro.matsena@manhica.net

33 Arsenio.nhacolo@manhica.net

34 Elisio.xerinda@manhica.net

35 quique.bassat@isglobal.org

36 Charfudin.sacoor@manhica.net

37 Inacio.mandomando@manhica.net

38 Khatia.munguambe@manhica.net

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

39

40 **ABSTRACT**

41

42 **Background**

43 The COVID-19 pandemic has led countries into urgent implementation of stringent
44 preventive measures at the population level. However, implementing these measures in
45 low-income countries like Mozambique was incredibly difficult, coupled with lack of
46 scientific evidence on the community understanding and compliance with these measures.
47 This study assessed the perceptions and implementation of COVID-19 preventive measures
48 recommended by Mozambican authorities in Manhiça and Quelimane districts, taking
49 confinement, social distancing, frequent handwashing, mask wearing, and quarantine as
50 the key practices to evaluate.

51 **Methods**

52 A quantitative survey interviewing households' heads in-person was conducted in October
53 2020 and February 2021; collecting data on perceptions of COVID-19, symptoms, means of
54 transmission/prevention; including self-evaluation of compliance with the key measures,
55 existence of handwashing facilities, and the ratio of face-masks per person. The analysis
56 presents descriptive statistics on perceptions and compliance with anti-COVID-19
57 measures at individual and household levels, comparing by district and other variables. T-
58 test was performed to assess the differences on proportions between the districts or
59 categories of respondents in the same district.

60

61

62 **Results**

63 The study interviewed 770 individuals of which 62.3% were heads of households, 18.6%
64 their spouses, and 11.0% sons/daughters. Most participants (98.7%) had heard of COVID-
65 19 disease. The most difficult measure to comply with was staying at home (35.8% of
66 respondents said they could not comply with it at all); followed by avoiding touching the
67 mouth/nose/eyes (28.7%), and social distancing at home (27.3%). Mask wearing in public
68 places was the measure that more respondents (48.8%) thought they complied 100% with
69 it, followed by avoiding unnecessary traveling (40.0%), avoiding crowded places (34.0%), and
70 social distancing outside home (29.0%). Only 30.4% of households had handwashing
71 devices or disinfectant (36.7% in Manhiça and 24.1% in Quelimane); and of those with
72 devices, only 41.0% had water in the device, 37.6% had soap, and 22.6% had other
73 disinfectant. The ratio of masks per person was only 1, which suggests that people may
74 have used the same mask for longer periods than recommended.

75 **Conclusions**

76 Community members in Manhiça and Quelimane were aware of COVID-19 but they lacked
77 understanding for implementing the preventive measures. This, together with socio-
78 economic constraints, led to lower levels of compliance with the key measures.
79 Understanding and addressing the factors affecting proper implementation of these
80 measures is crucial for informing decision-makers about ways to improve community
81 knowledge and practices to prevent infectious diseases with epidemic potential.

82
83
84
85
86
87

88 **1. INTRODUCTION**

89 Since COVID-19 was declared a pandemic disease (1), different approaches to contain the
90 spread of the virus have been adopted around the world, with countries taking stringent
91 measures which included, among others, closing the borders, banning incoming flights,
92 shutting down institutions and non-essential services, curfews, restriction on opening
93 hours of major services, enforcing quarantines to the infected and potential contacts, as
94 well as extreme measures such as complete population lock-down (2)(3). While the
95 implementation of these measures in high-income countries was already challenging, in
96 low-income countries like Mozambique they represented an incredible conundrum.
97 Mozambique initially declared level 3 State of Emergency, which included measures such
98 as closing down educational institutions, interrupting visa services, limiting mobility,
99 limiting gatherings to a maximum of 50 people and recommending a minimum distance of
100 1.5 meters between individuals. Later on, gatherings were limited to a maximum of 10
101 people and the use of masks was recommended on crowded places and public transport
102 vehicles (4). The Mozambican Government focused on prevention, recognising that the
103 health care system was far from being capable of responding to a massive number of
104 COVID-19 patients, should the pandemic reach its peak early and abruptly (4).

105 However, and even during the harshest restriction periods, while facing hard
106 confinement measures, there were reports, on the media, of crowded public transports,
107 markets and streets, and of people not having interrupted activities such as working, or
108 trading or travelling for the sake of their families' livelihood (5). For the same reasons of
109 self and family survival, there were indications that the "stay at home" principle was
110 challenging to an important segment of the population, who lives on the basis of a daily
111 income (6). Little is known about whether and how the communities understood and

112 implemented the measures recommended for preventing or reducing the spread of COVID-
113 19 in Mozambique.

114 Understanding the gaps in knowledge and compliance with measures against the
115 spread of COVID-19 in Southern and Central Mozambique would confer the opportunity to
116 develop more effective and socio-culturally appropriate sensitization initiatives to address
117 the need of COVID-19 prevention. This study aimed to assess the perceptions and
118 implementation of the measures recommended by the government of Mozambique to
119 prevent COVID-19 in rural and urban settings of Southern and Central Mozambique
120 (Manhiça and Quelimane districts), taking confinement, social distancing, hand washing,
121 mask wearing, and quarantine as the key practices to assess. Data such as these, from both
122 rural and urban areas and from two socio-economically different region of the country,
123 were crucial for informing decision-makers about ways to improve community knowledge
124 and practices regarding prevention of COVID-19 or any other future infectious disease with
125 epidemic potential.

126

127 **2. METHODS**

128 **2.1. Study design**

129 This study was a cross-sectional quantitative household survey designed to collect data
130 both at individual and household level, through interviews administered in-person to the
131 heads of households or their representatives, gathering their perceptions and practices
132 regarding anti-COVID-19 measures and in the context of their households.

133 **2.2. Study setting and population**

134 The study took place in two locations: (i) Manhiça district, a mainly rural setting located in
135 Province Maputo, in the Southern region of Mozambique; and (ii) Quelimane district, in
136 the Central province of Zambézia, which comprises urban and rural settings (Figure 1).
137 Manhiça district is 85 km North of Maputo City, the capital of Mozambique, and was
138 purposively selected because of the presence of the Manhiça Health Research Center
139 (CISM). CISM has been conducting biomedical research in the district over nearly 25 years,
140 which has facilitated the implementation of the study in a context of emergency with
141 relatively less challenges than it would have been elsewhere in rural Mozambique.

142 Similarly, the district of Quelimane was chosen because CISM has been conducting
143 biomedical research there for 5 years, particularly on causes of deaths using minimally
144 invasive tissue sampling (7). Currently, CISM is establishing an HDSS in the district.
145 Quelimane is located along the river Rio dos Bons Sinais in the Southern part of Zambézia
146 province. The district has urban and rural settings. The urban area comprises the City of
147 Quelimane (the capital of Zambézia province), where live 71.7% of the total 349,842 district
148 population (8).

149 The study population comprised heads of households or their representatives that
150 were residents in the study area, as defined by the CISM's HDSS, i.e. those who live in a
151 household in Manhiça or in Quelimane districts for three or more months or are entering
152 the district with intention for that (9). The survey adopted, also, the HDSS definition of
153 household, as a group of one or more individuals who live together in the same house or
154 group of houses, eat together, share domestic expenses, and acknowledge one of them as
155 their head or leader (9). The head of a household is the member who takes the most
156 important day-to-day decisions in the household and is the reference member (9).

157

158 **Figure 1.** Location and administrative division of Manhiça and Quelimane districts.

159 Source: Manhiça and Quelimane HDSS databases (2022) and (10).

160

161 **2.3. Sampling and sample size**

162 In Manhiça, the survey used the HDSS database as a sampling frame to randomly select a

163 sample of households that was representative at the level of Administrative Posts. In

164 Quelimane the sampling frame was a list of households given by the local authorities.

165 Although the study had multiple outcomes of interest at household level, the presence of

166 a handwashing facility with water and soap was considered as the main variable for

167 estimating the minimum sample size of households for this study. A handwashing facility

168 was defined as a device to contain, transport or regulate the flow of water to facilitate

169 handwashing (11) - a commonly used proxy indicator of actual handwashing practice,

170 which has been found to be more accurate than other proxies such as self-reports of hand

171 washing practices. Because there were no data on the proportion of households with a

172 handwashing facility during the pandemic in Mozambique, the sample size was calculated

173 to estimate a proportion of 50% with a margin of error of 5% and confidence level of 95%

174 (12). Thus, it was estimated that a sample size of 385 households for each district would

175 be sufficient to estimate this proportion (a sample size calculated this way is also suitable

176 to estimate proportions ranging from 10% to 90%) (12). At the individual level, the main

177 outcome was defined as the proportion of individuals who wash their hands at critical

178 points in time, but because there were no data for the pandemic period, the sample size

179 was calculated to estimate a proportion of 50% of people washing their hands, with a

180 margin of error of 5% and confidence level of 95%, which resulted in a sample size of 385

181 individuals for each district. Thus, because the sample size for households coincided with

182 that of individuals, the data for the two units of analysis (individual and household) were
183 collected by asking the questions to the same respondent, i.e. one respondent per
184 household.

185 **2.4. Data collection and quality assurance**

186 The data were collected in October 2020 in Manhiça and in February 2021 in Quelimane,
187 using paper-based questionnaires that were verified by demographers for consistencies
188 and completeness, and were double-entered to reduce typing errors at CISM’s Data
189 Center. Forms with errors were returned to the field for corrections. The interviewers were
190 selected from the HDSS fieldworkers (supervisors and other well-experienced
191 fieldworkers) who were carefully trained for this survey. The training included refreshing
192 the training that they had previously received on biosafety measures in the context of the
193 coronavirus pandemic, as part of CISM’s requirements. The survey questionnaire was
194 designed to collect the following data:

195 *Perceptions and level of compliance with COVID-19 preventive measures* – using
196 questions framed to capture knowledge and understanding of the disease, details of
197 symptoms, means of transmission and prevention, definitions of preventive measures, and
198 level of compliance with anti-COVID-19 measures. Thus, questions such as “have you ever
199 heard of coronavirus?”; “have you ever heard of COVID-19?”; “if YES, what it is?”; “what are
200 the symptoms or signs of Coronavirus or COVID-19?”; “how is this disease transmitted?”;
201 and “how can we prevent it?” were asked. To assess the understanding of anti-COVID-19
202 measures, respondents were asked the following questions: “could you please explain
203 what does social distancing means?”; “could you explain what it means to always wear face
204 mask?”; “what it means to avoid touching the mouth/nose/eyes?”; “what does quarantine

205 means?"; "what it means to avoid crowded places?"; "what it means to avoid travelling?".
206 This included questions for self-evaluation of compliance with the key measures
207 considered in this study. The respondents were asked to grade themselves in a scale of 0%
208 to 100%, where 0% meant that they did not comply at all with a specific measure, and 100%
209 when they thought they complied completely with a given measure. Most of the questions
210 had pre-defined answers for the interviewer to mark all the respondent's answers (multiple
211 options). The interviewers were instructed to ask the respondent "anything else?"
212 repeatedly when the respondent stopped stating their responses, to explore the
213 information as much as possible. There were open-ended questions and, for close-ended
214 questions there were spaces for the interviewers to write all the responses that did not
215 match the pre-defined options.

216 Implementation of COVID-19 preventive measures at household level - this included
217 source of water to understand the presence and functioning of a handwashing facility, the
218 capacity to keep 1.5 meters apart inside the household premises, number of face masks in
219 the household; and compliance with quarantine for members or visitors who had contact
220 with suspected cases. The fieldworkers were instructed to observe/verify the existence and
221 functioning of a hand washing facility in the household (presence of water, soap and/or
222 ashes), as recommend by the guidelines for collecting data on handwashing facilities (11).
223 Ashes were recommended by the government for handwashing where there is no soap
224 (13).

225 Symptoms of respiratory illness at household and community levels – the household
226 heads were asked whether they had had any symptom of respiratory illness since 05 March
227 2020, when COVID-19 was first declared in South Africa; whether they or any member of
228 the household had respiratory symptoms on the day of interview; and whether they knew

229 about anyone with such symptoms in their neighbourhoods. The date when COVID-19 was
230 first declared in South Africa was used as starting point because there were reports, on the
231 media, of unprecedented inflow of Mozambicans returning from South Africa as the South
232 African government had announced that would close the borders due to COVID-19; and
233 this inflow was seen as a potential source for importing Coronavirus into Mozambique (5).

234 Perceived hardships due to COVID-19 - the respondents were asked “in this problem
235 of Coronavirus, what worries you the most?” The interviewers would listen to the
236 respondent for mentions of any of the pre-defined options and pick all that were
237 mentioned. The pre-defined options included: “Hunger”; “Travel restrictions”; “I stopped
238 working”; “I am not working well”; “Afraid of being infected myself”; “Afraid that some
239 family member may be infected”; “Coronavirus does not have cure”; “I am afraid to lose
240 my job”; “I have lost my job”; “Interruptions of classes”; and others. Further, the survey
241 asked whether there had been any social event that was postponed in the household due
242 to Coronavirus

243

244 **2.5. Concepts and methods of data analysis**

245 The key COVID-19 preventive measures were defined according to the Manual for the
246 Prevention of COVID-19 published by the Ministry of Health of Mozambique in April 2020
247 (13) and other standard definitions (14). Thus the wearing of face masks was defined as
248 wearing a medical or non-medical mask by a person aged 6 years or more while indoor or
249 outdoor settings where physical distancing of 1.5 meter minimum could not be maintained
250 (15). Social distancing is keeping a minimum distance of 1.5 meter between people.
251 Quarantine was defined as keeping someone who had a close contact with someone who
252 has COVID-19 or is arriving from a place of risk of COVID-19, away from others for 14 days,

253 including in their own home (16). Confinement or staying at home was defined as making
254 all the efforts to stay at home and avoid travelling, leaving home only for cases of strong
255 motives (13). Frequent hand washing was defined as washing hands with water and soap
256 or disinfecting with alcohol every time that a person has contact with objects or other items
257 that have or may have been touched by somebody else (13).

258 The analysis presents descriptive statistics on perceptions and levels of compliance
259 with COVID-19 preventive measures at individual and at household levels, comparing the
260 two districts and comparing by other characteristics such as rural/urban place of residence,
261 occupation, age, and level of education. T-test was performed to assess the statistical
262 significance of the differences on proportions observed between Manhiça and Quelimane
263 or between categories of respondents in the same district. The open-ended responses and
264 the texts written to specify the “other” category were analysed using content analysis
265 (resorting to Stata *regexm* function, which performs a match of a word or expression in a
266 text, to arrange them in groups according to the main content of each text), to see if they
267 could fit in any of the pre-defined responses or new categories needed to be created.
268 Vague responses that could not permit assessing the accuracy of respondent’s knowledge
269 and could not fit in any of the created categories were classified as “incomprehensive or
270 vague answer”. The analyses were done using Stata 14.2 (17).

271

272

273 3. RESULTS

274 3.1. Socio-demographic profile of participants and their households

275 The study interviewed 770 individuals, of which 62.3% were heads of households, 18.6%,
276 their spouses, 11.0% their sons or daughters, and 8.1% others. Table 1 shows that 64.2%
277 of participants were living in urban areas, with a higher percentage of urban residents in
278 Quelimane (88.9%) than in Manhiça (39.3%), which is consistent with the urban-rural
279 differences between the two study sites, as described earlier. The majority (65.7%) of the
280 respondents were females, also with large differences between the two districts – more
281 females in Manhiça (76.0%) than in Quelimane (55.4%), which is in line with the sex
282 composition of the population in the Southern and Central regions of the country (more
283 female-headed households in the South than in the Center), (18). By education, 17.5% of
284 participants were illiterate, and 43.4% had only primary education, and 39.1% had
285 secondary or higher education. In relation to occupation, the majority (68.4%) were
286 unemployed and were engaged on subsistence family activities such as farming, fishing,
287 production of fire wood/charcoal, followed by public sector officers and students (12.5%),
288 and vendors in formal and informal sectors (9.5%). With regards to access to drinking
289 water, 48.2% of households had their sources of water within the household premises,
290 either piped water or wells, but Manhiça (a district that has only a small town) had higher
291 percentage of households using piped water (59.6%) than Quelimane (36.8%), a district
292 that has a major city) – probably because in Manhiça there are many private water
293 suppliers who pump underground water through electric pumps and distribute by pipe to
294 their clients, while in Quelimane the fewer private suppliers that exist do it by buying water
295 from government sources and sell it in trucks, from one neighbourhood to another (19).

296 Private suppliers may find it difficult to invest in water in Quelimane because the
297 underground water is salty (19)
298

299 Table 1. Socio-demographic characteristics of participants by study area.

Variable	Manhiça		Quelimane		Total	
	n	%	n	%	N	%
Total of participants	384	49.9	386	50.1	770	100
Relation to household head						
Head or spouse of head	307	79.9	316	81.9	623	80.9
Son or daughter	35	9.1	50	12.9	85	11.0
Other	42	10.9	20	5.2	62	8.1
Sex of participant						
Male	92	24.0	172	44.6	264	34.3
Female	292	76.5	214	55.4	506	65.7
Area of residence						
Urban	151	39.3	343	88.9	494	64.2
Rural	233	60.7	43	11.1	276	35.8
Age group in years						
Adolescent (<19)	15	3.9	22	5.7	37	4.8
Adult (20 – 64)	317	82.6	345	89.4	662	86.0
Elder (65+)	52	13.5	19	4.9	71	9.2
Level of education						
None	93	24.2	42	10.9	135	17.5
Primary	196	51.0	138	35.8	334	43.4
Secondary or higher	95	24.7	206	53.4	301	39.1
Religion						
Protestant/Evangelic	203	52.9	43	11.1	246	32.0
Catholic	31	8.1	218	56.5	249	32.6
Zion/other/none	144	37.5	30	7.8	174	22.6
Islamic/Hindu	6	1.6	95	24.6	101	13.6
Main occupation						
Peasants/fisher/charcoal/dn'twork	285	74.5	242	62.7	527	68.4
Teachers/public officers/studen	24	6.3	72	18.7	96	12.5
Vendors formal/informal	25	6.5	48	12.4	73	9.5
Carpenters/welding/builders	50	13.0	24	6.2	74	9.6
Is your main source of water at home/yard						
Yes	229	59.6	142	36.8	371	48.2
No	136	35.4	238	61.7	374	48.6
Missing	19	5.0	6	1.6	25	3.3
Main source of water, independent of location						
Piped water	263	68.4	202	52.6	465	60.4
Protected well	19	5.0	48	12.5	67	8.7
Unprotected well	30	7.9	84	21.8	114	14.9
Protected hole with pump	56	14.6	3	0.8	59	7.7
River, lake, rain, or other	9	2.3	37	9.7	46	6.0
Missing	7	1.8	11	2.8	18	2.3

300 Source: Household survey, Manhiça 2020 and Quelimane, 2021.

301

302 **3.2. Awareness about COVID-19 disease and its transmission dynamics**

303 Table 2 presents the data on the awareness of COVID-19 disease by key socio-demographic
304 characteristics of participants, and it shows that 98.7% of participants had heard of
305 Coronavirus, but this percentage dropped to 89.2% when asked about COVID-19, which
306 suggests that this disease was better known as Coronavirus than COVID-19 in October 2020
307 in Manhiça, and in February 2021 in Quelimane. The name COVID-19 was less known in
308 Quelimane (86.0%) than in Manhiça (92.5%) (T-test p -value = 0.014 when comparing the
309 two proportions), and in urban areas (97.9%) than in rural areas (100%), although this rural-
310 urban difference does not appear to be significant ($p=0.059$). Responses by religion
311 appears to not differ between the two districts ($p=0.659$), but they do by occupation –
312 public sector officers and students appear to be better informed than vendors and
313 peasants/fisherman unemployed/retired ($p=0.005$). This is consistent with the expected,
314 as one would expect public sector officers to be better informed about Coronavirus than
315 peasants and fishermen, as they tend to have more access to the media and other means
316 of public communication. In both Manhiça and Quelimane, the awareness about
317 Coronavirus disease decreased with age and increased with level of education, and
318 although this variation was not statistically significant in both Manhica ($p=0.826$) and
319 Quelimane ($p=0.963$) it appears to be an expected pattern. More than a third (34.3%) of
320 those who said they had heard of Coronavirus or COVID-19 said they were unable to define
321 Coronavirus, 18.7% said that it was a disease caused by a virus, 14.8% said it was a
322 respiratory disease, 10.0%, a disease that causes cough; 9.0%, dangerous, deadly incurable
323 disease; and 4.6% a disease that comes from China.

324

325

326 Table 2. Awareness about COVID-19 disease by socio-demographic characteristics of
327 participants, Manhiça and Quelimane.

Variable	Manhiça		Quelimane		Total		Chi2 P-value ¹
	n	%	n	%	N	%	
Total of participants	384	49.9	386	50.1	770	100	
<i>PANEL "A"</i>							
Have you ever heard of Coronavirus							
Yes	379	98.7	381	98.7	760	98.7	0.788
No	3	0.8	4	1.0	7	0.9	
Missing	2	0.5	1	0.3	3	0.4	
Have you ever heard of COVID-19							
Yes	355	92.5	332	86.0	687	89.2	0.014
No	28	7.3	53	13.7	81	10.5	
Missing	1	0.3	1	0.3	2	0.3	
<i>PANEL "B"</i>							
Awareness of Coronavirus by selected characteristics: % of those who said YES²							
Place of residence							
Urban	146	96.7 ³	338	98.5	494	97.9	0.059
Rural	233	100.0	43	100.0	276	100.0	
Age group in years							
Adolescent (<20)	15	100.0	22	100.0	37	100.0	0.906
Adult (20 – 64)	313	98.7	340	98.6	653	98.6	
Elder (65+)	51	98.1	19	100.0	70	98.6	
Level of education							
None	91	97.9	41	97.6	132	97.8	0.106
Primary	193	98.5	135	97.8	328	98.2	
Secondary and more	95	100.0	205	99.5	300	99.6	
Religion							
Catholic	31	100.0	215	98.6	246	98.8	0.659
Protestant/Evangelic	201	99.0	43	100.0	244	99.2	
Zion/none/others/none	141	97.9	29	96.7	170	97.7	
Islamic/Hindu	6	100.0	94	99.0	100	99.0	
Main occupation							
Peasants/fisher/unemployed	282	99.0	241	99.6	523	99.2	0.005
Vendors formal/informal	24	96.0	45	93.8	69	94.5	
Carpenters/welding/builders	49	98.0	23	95.8	72	97.3	
Public sector officers/ students	24	100.0	72	100.0	96	100.0	

328 Source: Household survey, Manhiça 2020 and Quelimane, 2021.

¹ The P-value in Panel "A" and "B" refers to Pearson X² test of how significant are the differences of responses between Manhiça and Quelimane.

² The focus on those who said YES do Coronavirus is because only 3 people said YES to both Coronavirus and Covid-19, so there is no need to repeat the tabulations for only 3 respondents.

³ Chi² P-value in Manhiça is = 0.009.

329 Table 3 presents the results on the knowledge of symptoms, means of transmission and
330 prevention of Coronavirus, and it shows that dry cough (17.8%), fever (15.7%), flu-like
331 symptoms (14.2%), breathing difficulties (13.6%), and pain in the throat (8.8%) were the
332 symptoms most mentioned by the respondents. By district, significant differences were
333 observed in relation to the proportion of respondents who mentioned fever ($p=0.003$), flu-
334 like symptoms ($p=0.000$), pain in the throat ($p=0.002$), and those who said did not know
335 ($p=0.000$). The mechanisms of transmission most mentioned are touching infected person
336 or object (30.9%), inhaling the air from the mouth of an infected person (21.3%), contact
337 with saliva droplets from an infected person (20.4%), and touching the mouth, nose or eyes
338 (13.3%). The means of prevention most mentioned were washing hands with soap or
339 alcohol (30.9%), using face mask always (28.6%), social distancing (16.6%), and avoiding
340 crowded places (10.2%). By district significant differences were observed in relation to
341 avoiding crowded places ($p=0.000$) and avoiding travelling ($p=0.000$).

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353 Table 3: Knowledge of symptoms, means of transmission and prevention of Coronavirus

Variable	Manhiça		Quelimane		Total		Chi2
	n	% ⁴	n	% ⁷	N	% ⁵	P-value
What are the symptoms of Coronavirus? (multiple options) [If have heard of Coronavirus]							
Dry cough	184	47.9	201	52.1	385	17.8	0.249
Fever	149	38.8	191	49.5	340	15.7	0.003
Flu-like symptoms	183	47.7	124	32.1	307	14.2	0.000
Breathing difficulties	142	37.0	153	39.6	295	13.6	0.448
Head ache	124	32.3	159	41.2	283	13.1	0.010
Pain in the throat	113	29.4	76	19.7	189	8.7	0.002
Cough with sputum	58	15.1	68	17.6	126	5.8	0.346
Muscular pain	61	15.9	60	15.7	121	5.6	0.896
Don't know	12	3.1	43	11.1	55	2.5	0.000
Vomiting	20	5.2	30	7.8	50	2.3	0.149
Other	7	1.8	7	1.8	14	0.6	0.992
Total multiple responses	1,053	-	1,112	-	2,165	100	-
How is Coronavirus transmitted? (multiple options)							
Touch infected person/object ⁶	240	62.5	248	64.3	488	30.9	0.615
Inhale air mouth of infected	186	48.4	150	38.9	336	21.3	0.007
Droplets of saliva of infected	169	44.0	153	39.6	322	20.4	0.219
Touch mouth or nose, eyes	106	27.6	104	26.9	210	13.3	0.837
Kiss infected person	100	26.0	61	15.8	161	10.2	0.000
Other transmission means	16	4.2	44	11.4	60	3.8	0.000
Do not know	0	0.0	2	0.5	2	0.1	0.158
Total of multiple responses	817	-	762	-	1,500	100.0	-
How can we prevent Coronavirus? (multiple options)							
Wash hand/soap or alcohol	298	77.6	318	82.4	616	30.9	0.097
Use face mask always	275	71.6	296	76.7	571	28.6	0.108
Social distancing	155	40.4	177	45.9	332	16.6	0.124
Avoid crowded places	124	32.4	80	20.7	204	10.2	0.000
Avoid touch mouth/noise/eye	57	14.8	53	13.7	110	5.5	0.659
Other means	21	5.5	42	10.9	63	3.2	0.006
Quarantine	31	8.1	23	6.0	54	2.7	0.251
Avoid travelling	42	10.9	3	0.8	45	2.3	0.000
Total multiple responses	1,003	-	992	-	1,995	100.0	-

354 Source: Household survey, Manhiça 2020 and Quelimane, 2021.

355

⁴ % of respondents that mentioned a symptom – tells how many respondents mentioned a symptom

⁵ % of times that a symptom was mentioned – tells which symptom was most mentioned.

⁶ Including hugging infected person

356 **3.3. Knowledge and perceptions of COVID-19 preventive measures**

357 Table 4 presents the results on how people understand the COVID-19 preventive measures.
358 The majority of respondents knew that social distancing refers to keeping some distance
359 between each other (62.0%) [62.0% comes from summing “keeping 1.5-2 meters from others”
360 (43.9%) and “to be away/be distant from others” (18.1%)], but 19.9% gave incomprehensive or
361 vague answers, and 17.5% said that they did not know. In relation to hand washing in the
362 context of COVID-19, 32.9% of respondents gave vague responses, 28.6% said that they
363 wash their hands when leaving or arriving at home; 26.0%, after touching something or
364 someone; and 7.7%, after using the toilet or when the hands are dirty or when they are
365 about to eat something. Quarantine was defined as staying at home or in the same place
366 by 36.6% of respondents; 26.5% defined it comprehensively as isolating someone who is
367 sick or suspected or who had contact with positive or suspected cases (some respondents
368 in this group indicated the period of 14 days); but 29.2% said that they did not know what
369 is was.

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377 Table 4. Knowledge and perceptions of the recommend anti-COVID-19 measures

Variable	Manhiça		Quelimane		Total		Chi2
	n	%	n	%	N	%	P-value
Total of participants	384	49.9	386	50.1	770	100	
What social distancing means?							
To keep 1,5-2m from others	170	44.3	168	43.5	338	43.9	0.000
To be away/distant from other	37	9.6	102	26.4	139	18.1	
Inconclusive/astray answer	93	24.2	60	15.5	153	19.9	
Don't know	79	20.6	56	14.5	135	17.5	
Missing	5	1.3	0	0.0	5	0.6	
In which situations do you wash your hands, in this context of COVID-19							
Inconclusive/astray answer	173	45.1	80	20.7	253	32.9	0.000
When leaving/returning home	47	12.2	173	44.8	220	28.6	
After touching something/one	116	30.2	84	21.8	200	26.0	
After toilet/before meals/dirty	14	3.6	45	11.7	59	7.7	
Don't know	24	6.3	3	0.8	27	3.5	
Missing	10	2.6	1	0.3	11	1.4	
What it means to avoid crowded places?							
Inconclusive/astray answer	113	29.4	95	24.6	208	27.0	0.000
Not more than 5-10 people	90	23.4	103	26.7	193	25.1	
Many people	30	7.8	109	28.2	139	18.1	
Not more than 20 people	57	14.8	23	6.0	80	10.4	
Don't know	31	8.1	42	10.9	73	9.5	
Not more than 50 people	43	11.2	7	1.8	50	6.5	
Missing	20	5.2	7	1.8	27	3.5	
What it means to avoid travelling?							
Inconclusive/astray answer	208	54.2	291	75.4	499	64.8	0.000
Don't know	67	17.4	59	15.3	126	16.4	
To stay at home	58	15.1	25	6.5	83	10.8	
To travel only for extreme case	42	10.9	2	0.5	44	5.7	
Missing	9	2.3	9	2.3	18	2.3	
What it means quarantine?							
To stay at home or same place	121	31.5	161	41.7	282	36.6	0.000
Don't know	112	29.2	113	29.3	225	29.2	
To isolate sick/suspect person	127	33.1	77	19.9	204	26.5	
Inconclusive/astray answer	14	3.6	25	6.5	39	5.1	
Missing	4	1.0	10	2.6	14	1.8	
What it means to avoid touching the mouth, or eyes, or nose							
Inconclusive/astray answer	112	29.2	210	54.4	322	41.8	0.000
Wash hands before touch them	147	38.3	60	15.5	207	26.9	
Don't know	72	18.8	83	21.5	155	20.1	
Missing	53	13.8	33	8.5	86	11.2	

378 Source: Household survey, Manhiça 2020 and Quelimane, 2021.

380 3.4. Implementation of anti-COVID-19 measures at individual level

381 Table 5 presents the results of participants' self-assessment of their level of compliance
 382 with anti-COVID-19 measures. It shows that 35.8% of the respondents said that they could
 383 not stay at home at all, and only 20.0% could stay at home 100% of the time. Only 21.9%
 384 of respondents said that they could wash their hands on all occasions thought to be
 385 necessary. Mask wearing in public places appears to be the measure that more people
 386 (48.8%) think they complied with it in 100% of the occasions, followed by avoiding
 387 unnecessary travels (40.0%), avoiding crowded places (34.0%), and social distancing outside
 388 the household (34.4%). On the other hand, the most difficult anti-COVID-19 measure
 389 appears to be avoiding touching the mouth or nose or eyes (with 77.4% of respondents
 390 saying that they did not comply with it or complied only in 25% or 50% of the occasions
 391 (77.4% is the sum of 28.7%, 25.1% and 23.6%). This is followed by social distancing within
 392 the household (73.1%), staying at home (66.2%) and frequent hand washing (56.0%).

393
 394 Table 5. Self-assessment of compliance with anti-COVID-19 measures at individual level

Variable	Manhiça		Quelimane		Total		Chi2 P-value
	n	%	n	%	N	%	
Total of participants	384	49.9	386	50.1	770	100	
Degree of compliance with staying at home							
0%	153	39.8	123	31.9	276	35.8	0.000
100%	98	25.5	56	14.5	154	20.0	
25%	57	14.8	63	16.3	120	15.6	
50%	44	11.5	70	18.1	114	14.8	
75%	23	6.0	74	19.2	97	12.6	
Degree of compliance with hand-washing always							
50%	132	34.4	94	24.4	226	29.4	0.000
25%	53	13.8	119	30.8	172	22.3	
100%	107	27.9	62	16.1	169	21.9	
75%	87	22.7	80	20.7	167	21.7	
0%	2	0.5	31	8.0	33	4.3	
Degree of compliance with face mask wearing in public places							
100%	192	50.0	184	47.7	376	48.8	0.000
50%	85	22.1	87	22.5	172	22.3	

75%	70	18.2	71	18.4	141	18.3	
25%	32	8.3	39	10.1	71	9.2	
0%	3	0.8	5	1.3	8	1.0	
Degree of compliance with avoiding touching the mouth, nose, and eyes							
0%	18	4.7	203	52.6	221	28.7	
25%	131	34.1	62	16.1	193	25.1	
50%	129	33.6	53	13.7	182	23.6	0.000
75%	52	13.5	60	15.5	112	14.5	
100%	52	13.5	7	1.8	59	7.7	
Degree of compliance with social distancing within the household							
0%	18	4.7	192	49.7	210	27.3	
25%	131	34.1	51	13.2	182	23.6	
50%	129	33.6	42	10.9	171	22.2	0.000
75%	52	13.5	50	13.0	102	13.2	
100%	52	13.5	7	1.8	59	7.7	
Degree of compliance with social distancing outside the household							
75%	111	28.9	154	39.9	265	34.4	
100%	138	35.9	85	22.0	223	29.0	
50%	94	24.5	93	24.1	187	24.3	0.000
25%	31	8.1	37	9.6	68	8.8	
0%	8	2.1	17	4.4	25	3.2	
Degree of compliance with avoiding crowded places							
100%	157	40.9	105	27.2	262	34.0	
75%	96	25.0	128	33.2	224	29.1	
50%	94	24.5	99	25.6	193	25.1	0.000
25%	30	7.8	33	8.5	63	8.2	
0%	5	1.3	21	5.4	26	3.4	
Degree of compliance with avoiding unnecessary travels							
100%	208	54.2	100	25.9	308	40.0	
50%	68	17.7	99	25.6	167	21.7	
75%	79	20.6	62	16.1	141	18.3	0.000
25%	19	4.9	95	24.6	114	14.8	
0%	8	2.1	30	7.8	38	4.9	

395 Source: Household survey, Manhiça 2020 and Quelimane, 2021.

396

397 **3.5. Implementation of anti-COVID-19 measures at household level**

398 Table 6 presents the degree of compliance with anti-COVID-19 measures at household
 399 level, combining data from questions and observations as described in the section on
 400 methods. It shows that sixty-nine per cent (69.4%) of households did not have hand
 401 washing facilities or disinfection (75.6% in Quelimane and 63.0% in Manhiça); and of those
 402 that did have devices, 58.5% had no water in the hand washing facility, 62.0% had no soap,

403 and 74.4% had no ash in these devices. In addition to hand washing facilities, it was asked
 404 whether there was any other disinfectant or not – 22.6% had at least one other disinfectant
 405 such as alcohol or alcohol gel. The other indicator was the existence and the number of
 406 masks in the household - almost all households (98.1%) had masks, but the ratio of masks
 407 per household member was very low (median of 1 mask per member aged 6+ years), which
 408 suggests that people were using the same mask for too long time without replacing it every
 409 few hours as recommended by the Ministry of Health of Mozambique (13).

410 Table 6. Implementation of anti-COVID-19 measures at household level, Manhiça and
 411 Quelimane

Variable	Manhiça		Quelimane		Total		Chi2 P-value
	n	%	n	%	N	%	
Total of households	384	49.9	386	50.1	770	100	
Is there a hand washing facility in the household?							
Yes	141	36.7	93	24.1	234	30.4	0.001
No	242	63.0	292	75.6	534	69.4	
Missing	1	0.3	1	0.3	2	0.3	
Total households with washing	141	100.0	93	100.0	234	100.0	
Is there water in the hand washing facility?							
Yes	44	31.2	52	55.9	96	41.0	0.001
No	96	68.1	41	44.1	137	58.5	
Missing	1	0.7	0	0.0	1	0.4	
Is there soap in the hand washing facility?							
Yes	44	31.2	44	47.3	88	37.6	0.018
No	97	68.8	48	51.6	145	62.0	
Missing	0	0.0	1	1.1	1	0.4	
Is there ash in the hand washing facility?							
Yes	19	13.5	34	36.6	53	22.6	0.000
No	116	82.3	58	62.4	174	74.4	
Missing	6	4.3	1	1.1	7	3.0	
Is there any other disinfectant in the hand washing facility?							
Yes	19	13.5	34	36.6	53	22.6	0.000
No	93	66.0	58	62.4	151	64.5	
Missing	29	20.6	1	1.1	30	12.8	
Face masks in the household							
Median of masks p/ household	4		5		5		
Household without face masks	5		10		15		
Ratio of face mask/person 6+y	1.1		0.9		0.9		

412 Source: Household survey, Manhiça 2020 and Quelimane, 2021.

413 **3.6. Prevalence of symptoms of respiratory illness**

414 The results on symptoms of respiratory illness show that 93 (12.1%) respondents have had
415 symptoms sometime since COVID-19 was announced first in South Africa (05 March 2020),
416 and 38.1% of them had symptoms in two or more episodes. However, only 6 households
417 (0.8%) had a person with symptoms at the date of interview, of which 4 had only one
418 person and 2 had two people with symptoms. By district, Quelimane had significantly
419 higher number of (past and current) cases with symptoms 80 (20.7% of respondents) than
420 Manhiça 13 (3.4%), ($p=0.000$).

421 **3.7. Perceived hardships due to Coronavirus**

422 The results on the hardships felt by the population due to Coronavirus show that the
423 closure of educational institutions was the leading hardship (with 18.3% of mentions),
424 followed by hunger (17.5%), fear of being infected or having someone from the family
425 infected (12.2%), and other worries (12.0%), (Table 7). The “other worries” included fear
426 of death and of uncertainty of the future (32.1%), closure of churches (28.3%), and loss of
427 opportunities for employment and other means of livelihood (18.3%). Most of these
428 hardships were reported with significant differences by districts (see those with p-value <
429 0.05).

430 In relation to postponement of social events due to Coronavirus, 25.3% of
431 respondents said that they had postponed at least one social event in their household –
432 31.8% of these households postponed more than one event. Wedding and alike
433 ceremonies (23.5%), religious and traditional ceremonies (22.7%), birth date parties
434 (13.4%), and gatherings for *xitique* (6.7%) are the leading postponed events. *Xitique* is a
435 term in local language of Southern Mozambique (Changana), but also used equally in
436 Quelimane, for a network or group of friends, family members, or colleagues for inter-

437 support or other means of solidarity involving money saving which is rotatively paid to one
438 member of the group. Often it involves social gathering in the household of the member
439 that is receiving the group's savings (20), (21).
440

441

442 Table 7. Participants' worries caused by Coronavirus in Manhiça and Quelimane

Variable	Manhiça		Quelimane		Total		Chi2 P-value
	n	%	n	%	N	%	
Total of participants	384	49.9	386	50.1	770	100	
In this context of Coronavirus, what worries you the most? (multiple options)							
Closure of schools	200	59.9	134	40.1	334	18.3	0.000
Hunger	155	48.6	164	51.4	319	17.5	0.550
Me or family member be infected	34	15.2	189	84.8	223	12.2	0.000
Other worries	96	43.8	123	56.2	219	12.0	0.035
I am not working well	97	58.1	70	41.9	167	9.2	0.016
Travel restrictions	110	67.1	54	32.9	164	9.0	0.000
COVID-19 has no cure	96	68.1	45	31.9	141	7.7	0.000
Increasing numbers in Moz. & out	57	42.5	77	57.5	134	7.4	0.062
I lost job or stopped working	39	45.4	47	54.7	86	4.7	0.374
I am afraid of losing my job	31	88.6	4	11.4	35	1.9	0.000
Total of times mentioned	915	-	907	-	1,822	100.0	-
Other worries in the context of Coronavirus (if option not in the list above)							
Afraid death & uncertain future	14	19.7	54	80.3	71	32.4	0.000
Closure of churches	41	66.1	21	33.9	62	28.3	0.000
Loss of job & econ. opportunities	26	65.0	14	35.0	40	18.3	0.003
Others/Don't know	12	42.9	13	57.1	28	12.8	0.911
Increase of prices	1	7.1	12	92.9	14	6.4	0.004
Missing	2	50.0	2	50.0	4	1.8	0.802
Total	96	-	123	-	219	100.0	-
Was there any social events that was postponed in the household due to Coronavirus							
Yes	76	19.8	119	30.8	195	25.3	0.000
No	300	78.1	267	68.2	567	73.6	
Missing	8	2.1	0	0.0	8	1.0	
Social events that were postponed in the household due to Coronavirus (multiple options)							
Other events	9	10.5	71	46.7	80	33.6	0.000
Wedding and like ceremonies	16	18.6	40	26.3	56	23.5	
Religious/traditional ceremony	39	45.3	15	9.9	54	22.7	
Birth date party	14	16.3	18	11.8	32	13.4	
Xitique (family/friends' gathering)	8	9.3	8	5.3	16	6.7	
Total	86	100.0	152	100.0	238	100.0	

443

Source: Household survey, Manhiça 2020 and Quelimane, 2021.

444

445

446 **4. DISCUSSION**

447 This study aimed to assess community perceptions and levels of compliance with anti-
448 COVID-19 measures recommended by the government of Mozambique in the districts of
449 Manhiça and Quelimane. At the time the study was designed and implemented, there were
450 several challenges both from the conceptual and operational perspectives, as well as from
451 the safety point of view, as both the researchers and the participants were afraid of
452 exposure to a very contagious and deadly disease by conducting or participating in the
453 study. From the perspectives of concepts and operational procedures, some concepts were
454 new to the general public, and most importantly, some concepts were changing over the
455 course of the pandemic, for example, the term “social distancing” has changed to “physical
456 distancing”, and “crowded places” were venue- and time-variant and the maximum number
457 of people allowed to gather together in one place changed continually as the disease was
458 evolving. Also, the study required visiting hundreds of households (with more than 3,500
459 people) to study a disease that had forced people to refrain from moving or visiting each
460 other to avoid transmission. Even the IRB at CISM was puzzled on whether this study could
461 be approved due to safety issues and the request made by the study team for using oral
462 audio-recorded consents instead of the commonly used written consents. At that time,
463 most studies were collecting data using information and communication technologies
464 (ICTs)(22), but this was not recommended for Manhiça and Quelimane where the coverage
465 of ICTs was very limited – which could lead to exclusion of participants without access to
466 ICTs (23). For example, a study on COVID-19 preventive behaviour using ICTs in China,
467 required that participants should have been previously registered in an online-based
468 survey platform and be literate, which means that all those not registered in that platform

469 or who were illiterate were excluded; and it ended up with only 13% of participants from
470 rural areas and 87% from urban areas (24).

471 Given the absence of previous studies on how community members understand and
472 comply with anti-COVID-19 measures in Mozambique and other countries, designing the
473 questionnaires was very challenging. Thus, the research team resorted to open-ended
474 questions for the interviewers to write everything the respondent would say because there
475 was no literature to guide the elaboration of pre-defined responses. However, too many
476 open-ended questions (and too many “others, specify”) led to hard work during the
477 analysis than would have been if the majority of questions were close-ended. This led to
478 delay in the analysis and publication of the results, although it served also as a good
479 opportunity to capture as much as possible variability of responses than would otherwise
480 have been; and it improved the researchers’ ability to analysis lengthy text-responses in a
481 quantitative survey.

482 The results show that most participants had heard of Coronavirus and COVID-19 by
483 the time of the survey, with more people acknowledging Coronavirus than COVID-19, both
484 in Manhiça and in Quelimane. At that time, there were too many new concepts around the
485 pandemic and the terms Coronavirus and COVID-19 appeared to be used interchangeably
486 to mean the same disease. Even the term “novel Coronavirus” was not as popular as the
487 two, let alone the term SARS-CoV-2. Likewise, even some apparently obvious terms like
488 confinement, stay at home, immobility, and quarantine had not been well communicated
489 to the public in Mozambique. This leads to a recommendation that in public emergencies
490 such as these, policy makers should be cautious to use the same terms consistently, and
491 avoid similar but not equal terms, for example, it has never been very clear whether
492 confinement, isolation, staying at home, and immobility meant the same or they were

493 different within the context of Coronavirus. Later on, a new term started to be publically
494 used without a clear definition, e.g. “the new normal” – intended to advise the population
495 to adapt to this new context for longer periods of time - but none knows how this was
496 interpreted because sometimes it was used simultaneously with relaxation of anti-COVID-
497 19 measures. Further, at the time this survey was conducted, some respondents in rural
498 and urbans areas of Central Mozambique did not believe that COVID-19 existed, and others
499 said that fighting for food was of high priority than following anti-COVID-19 measures
500 (Chaimite, 2020); and in Maputo city, misinformation was considered an important issue
501 for policy makers to deal with (PERC, 2020) - this study showed that 72% of respondents
502 believed hot climate prevents COVID-19, 41% believed COVID-19 is a germ weapon created
503 by a government; and 39% said they would like more information, particularly on COVID-
504 19 protection, causes and cure (PERC, 2020).

505 This study shows highs percentages of vague or inconclusive responses (ranging from
506 5.1% in the definition of quarantine, to 64.8% in the definition of avoiding travelling).
507 Adding the “don’t knows” to these vague responses leads to the conclusion that most
508 respondents did not understand very well the meaning of most of the anti-COVID-19
509 measures. This weakness needs to be addressed not only from the perspective of the
510 population, but also from how such measures were defined by the government. For
511 example the measure of keeping distance from each other was disseminated as “social
512 distancing” first, but later it changed to “physical distancing”, and the minimum distance
513 was between 1 and 1.5 meters before 2 meters came out (but the 2 meters was seldom
514 disseminated). These changes occurred also in regard to “crowded places”- it was defined
515 depending on whether the people are in a closed or open space, which was used to define
516 the maximum number of people that could gather (including for funeral), and these

517 numbers have been changing constantly. These unclear and/or constantly changing
518 measures may have confused the population.

519 Compliance with anti-COVID-19 measures at individual and at household levels is
520 low, both in Manhiça and in Quelimane – below 50% in most of the indicators used in this
521 study – see percentage of “Yes” in table 7 and of those implementing a certain measure at
522 100% in table 6. A similar result (55.5% of overall level of compliance) was found in a study
523 on the compliance with COVID-19 preventive measures among food and drink
524 establishments in Ethiopia, in 2020 (25). Our study found that even the apparently easiest
525 measure (mask wearing in public places), most people (50.8%) confessed that they did not
526 comply with it when they think they should. Only 40.0% of the respondents said that they
527 were avoiding unnecessary travels in 100% of the times, 34.0% were avoiding crowded
528 places, and 29.1% were doing social distancing outside the household. Structural and
529 personal factors may have contributed to lower compliance as most people live on daily-
530 income activities and even those with a monthly income had to go for work using crowded
531 public transports. This indicates that these measures could have been followed better by
532 the population if the government had invested on public transports system to reduce
533 overcrowding in the bus-stops and within the public transport vehicles.

534 The prevalence of symptoms of respiratory illness in the households was very low,
535 and most respondents did not know anyone with such symptoms in their communities.
536 However, the meaning or usefulness of these findings must be taken cautiously because of
537 the bias involved in self-report of symptoms, when compared to medically diagnosed
538 disease, particularly because some studies indicated that 80% of infected people in
539 Mozambique were asymptomatic (13); six in seven COVID-19 infections went undetected
540 in Africa (26), and that 75% of infected people in India were asymptomatic (27).

541 With regards to hardships imposed to people and their households by the pandemic,
542 the study shows that the closure of educational institutions, fear of being infected, hunger,
543 fear of death and of uncertainty of the future, and the closure of churches were the main
544 hardships – and these responses seem expected, particularly for Manhiça and Quelimane
545 where little or no social services exist for the most pre-COVID-9 vulnerable populations,
546 whose suffering has increased due to Coronavirus. A study in Philippines on how COVID-19
547 impacted vulnerable communities, reported increased lack of income opportunities and
548 insufficient food supply that existed before COVID-19 but had worsened due to the
549 pandemic (28). One aspect deserving further research is why people are worried about the
550 closure of churches and of *xitique*? Is it because they want to worship their God and receive
551 the *xitique*-related savings or they want the entertainment or socialization that is involved
552 in the churches and in *xitique*? These research questions may be important for mitigating
553 COVID-19 impacts because the churches are institutions that mostly welcome suffering
554 people and provide them with psychological and social strength that can improve the
555 quality of their lives (29). Similarly, *xitique* provides the means for income savings and
556 socialization not only for the least privileged, but also for relatively prosperous groups of
557 individuals (20).

558

559

560

561

562

563

564

565 **5. CONCLUSIONS**

566 The awareness about Coronavirus was high both in Manhiça and in Quelimane districts
567 (98.7% of participants had heard of Coronavirus), although the term COVID-19 was not as
568 popular as that of Coronavirus (89.2%). Most participants knew about the disease and its
569 transmission and prevention dynamics, but the level of understanding of anti-COVID-19
570 measures was low, as measured by the higher proportion of respondents that could not
571 define the key measures accurately or fairly and of those who said that did not know how
572 to define these measures. These low levels of perceptions suggest that the messages may
573 not have been transmitted in an explanatory way enough for the general population to
574 digest, particularly because some terms and rules were changing constantly over time,
575 which may have confused the population.

576 The level of compliance with anti-COVID-19 measures was low (below 50% in most
577 of the indicators used in this study) even for groups of individuals or of households that
578 one would expect to find higher levels of compliance, such as urban population and
579 households that have piped water. The measures that most people failed to comply with
580 are social distancing within the household (77.4% of respondents said that they could not
581 comply with it at all), followed by avoiding touching the mouth, nose, and eyes; staying at
582 home, and frequent hand washing. The ratio of face masks per person aged 6 years or more
583 is too low (1 mask per person), which suggests that people may be using the same mask
584 for longer periods and/or repeatedly without replacing it, which is particularly worrying
585 when considering that most people were using cloth masks whose efficacy is lower than
586 medical masks. Structural and personal factors may have contributed for this lower
587 compliance as most people live on daily-income activities and even those with a monthly
588 income had to go for work using crowded public transports. This indicates that these

589 measures could have been followed better by the population if the government had
590 invested on public transports system to reduce overcrowding in the bus-stops and within
591 the public transport system. There is a need to respond to these findings with provision of
592 more detailed information which way increase the people's awareness and adherence to
593 the efforts to fight this pandemic.

594

595 **DECLARATIONS**

596 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

597 This study was reviewed and approved by the CISM's Internal Scientific Committee (CCI)
598 and CISM's Internal Bioethics Committee (CIBS) (approval ref. CIBS-CISM/028/2020).
599 Before starting the interview, each participant was informed about the study objectives
600 and procedures and the voluntary nature of his/her participation through information read
601 out from a participant's information sheet. Participants were enrolled in the survey after
602 obtaining their oral informed consent, which was voice-recorded (not paper-based
603 consents) to minimize the risk of COVID-19 transmission associated with exchanging papers
604 and pens or stamps for finger print between fieldworkers and participants.

605 **Consent for publication**

606 The participant's information sheet requested permission for publication of the data
607 collected in a non-individualized manner.

608 **Availability of data**

609 These data are not openly accessible in a web address, but they may be obtained through
610 a formal request sent to Godifre Capinga (godifre.capinga@manhica.net), accompanied by
611 a proposal that will be analysed by CISM's internal scientific and ethical committees.

612 **Competing interests**

613 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

614 **Funding**

615 The core funding for CISM's activities comes from the Spanish Agency for International
616 Development and Cooperation. The survey in Manhiça was funded from a competitive
617 grant from Fundo Nacional de Investigaçãõ de Moçambique, while in Quelimane it was
618 funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation through the Emory University, within the
619 CHAMPS Network project.

620

621 **Authors' contributions**

622 AN: Participated in the study design and fieldwork, supported in the data cleaning and he
623 conducted the analysis and interpretation of the data, and wrote this article;

624 AM: Participated in the study design and in the implementation of field activities and
625 supervision of data collection, and contributed to the writing of this article;

626 FA: Participated in the study design and in the implementation of field activities and
627 contributed to the writing of this article;

628 AH: Participated in the data management, including data processing and cleaning;

629 TM: Participated in the data management, including data processing and cleaning;

630 ArsN: Participated in the design of the study and supported the digitalization of the
631 questionnaires and data cleaning, and contributed to the writing of this article;

632 QB: Contributed to the writing of this article;

633 CS: Contributed to the writing of this article;

634 IM: Contributed to the writing of this article;

635 KM: Conceived the study, participated in the study design interpretation of results
636 and writing of this article;

637 All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

638 **Acknowledgements**

639 The authors would like to thank the community and the community leaders, the members
640 of the Community Advisory Board and the local authorities, including the District Health
641 Authorities, the District Governments and the Municipal Authorities in Manhiça and
642 Quelimane, and all our national and international partners for their dedication and
643 collaboration.

644

645

646


647 **REFERENCES**

- 648 1. Cucinotta D, Vanelli M. WHO Declares COVID-19 a Pandemic. *Acta Biomed.*
649 2020;19(1):157–60.
- 650 2. WHO. The World Health Organization and Wikimedia Foundation expand access to trusted
651 information about COVID-19 on Wikipedia [Internet]. 2020. Available from:
652 [https://www.who.int/news/item/22-10-2020-the-world-health-organization-and-](https://www.who.int/news/item/22-10-2020-the-world-health-organization-and-wikimedia-foundation-expand-access-to-trusted-information-about-covid-19-on-wikipedia)
653 [wikimedia-foundation-expand-access-to-trusted-information-about-covid-19-on-wikipedia](https://www.who.int/news/item/22-10-2020-the-world-health-organization-and-wikimedia-foundation-expand-access-to-trusted-information-about-covid-19-on-wikipedia)
- 654 3. Bedford J, Enria D, Giesecke J, Heymann DL, Ihekweazu C, Kobinger G, et al. COVID-19:
655 towards controlling of a pandemic. *Lancet* [Internet]. 2020 Mar;395(10229):1015–8.
656 Available from: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0140673620306735>
- 657 4. Republica A da. Boletim da Republica: Decreto Presidencial n.º 11/2020, de 30 de Março
658 que Decreta o Estado de Emergência. Maputo; 2020 p. 0–1.
- 659 5. Lusa. Vendedores informais de Maputo têm de escolher entre a fome e a doença; 31 de
660 Marco 2020. 2020 Mar 31; Available from: [https://www.rtp.pt/noticias/covid-](https://www.rtp.pt/noticias/covid-19/vendedores-informais-de-maputo-tem-de-escolher-entre-a-fome-e-a-doenca_n1217054)
661 [19/vendedores-informais-de-maputo-tem-de-escolher-entre-a-fome-e-a-](https://www.rtp.pt/noticias/covid-19/vendedores-informais-de-maputo-tem-de-escolher-entre-a-fome-e-a-doenca_n1217054)
662 [doenca_n1217054](https://www.rtp.pt/noticias/covid-19/vendedores-informais-de-maputo-tem-de-escolher-entre-a-fome-e-a-doenca_n1217054)
- 663 6. Dahab M, Van Zandvoort K, Flasche S, Warsame A, Ratnayake R, Favas C, et al. COVID-19
664 control in low-income settings and displaced populations: What can realistically be done?
665 *Confl Health.* 2020;14(1).

- 666 7. Munguambe K, Maixenchs M, Anselmo R, Blevins J, Ordi J, Mandomando I, et al. Consent
667 to minimally invasive tissue sampling procedures in children in Mozambique: A mixed-
668 methods study. Hossain MB, editor. PLoS One [Internet]. 2021 Nov 8;16(11):e0259621.
669 Available from: <https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0259621>
- 670 8. INE IN de E. QUADRO 1. POPULAÇÃO RECENSEADA POR ÁREA DE RESIDÊNCIA E
671 CATEGORIA CENSITÁRIA, SEGUNDO SEXO E IDADE. PROVÍNCIA DA ZAMBEZIA, 2017
672 [Internet]. 2022. Available from: [http://www.ine.gov.mz/iv-rgph-2017/zambezia/quadro-
673 1-populacao-recenseada-por-area-de-residencia-e-categoria-censitaria-segundo-sexo-e-
674 idade-provincia-da-zambezia-2017.xlsx/view](http://www.ine.gov.mz/iv-rgph-2017/zambezia/quadro-1-populacao-recenseada-por-area-de-residencia-e-categoria-censitaria-segundo-sexo-e-idade-provincia-da-zambezia-2017.xlsx/view)
- 675 9. Nhacolo A, Jamisse E, Augusto O, Matsena T, Hunguana A, Mandomando I, et al. Cohort
676 profile update: Manhiça health and demographic surveillance system (HDSS) of the
677 Manhiça health research centre (CISM). Int J Epidemiol [Internet]. 2021 Jan 16;1–8.
678 Available from: [https://academic.oup.com/ije/advance-
679 article/doi/10.1093/ije/dyaa218/6102235](https://academic.oup.com/ije/advance-article/doi/10.1093/ije/dyaa218/6102235)
- 680 10. GADM. Database of Global Administrative Areas [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2022 Apr 11].
681 Available from: <https://gadm.org/maps.html>
- 682 11. WHO, UNICEF, JMP. Progress on Drinking Water, Sanitation and Hygiene: 2017. Vol. 33,
683 Food and Chemical Toxicology. 2017.
- 684 12. Fleiss JL, Levin B, Paik MC. Statistical Methods for Rates and Proportions [Internet].
685 Hoboken, NJ, USA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.; 2003. (Wiley Series in Probability and
686 Statistics). Available from: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/0471445428>
- 687 13. MISAU. Manual de prevencao da COVID-19 [Internet]. Maputo; 2020. Available from:
688 [https://www.misau.gov.mz/index.php/manuais-e-material-
689 educativo?download=322:manual-de-prevencao-a-covid-19](https://www.misau.gov.mz/index.php/manuais-e-material-educativo?download=322:manual-de-prevencao-a-covid-19)
- 690 14. CDC. Handwashing in Communities: Clean Hands Save Lives [Internet]. 2020. Available
691 from: <https://www.cdc.gov/handwashing/index.html>
- 692 15. WHO. Mask use in the context of COVID-19. World Heal Organ [Internet].
693 2020;(December):1–10. Available from: [https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/advice-
694 on-the-use-of-masks-in-the-community-during-home-care-and-in-healthcare-settings-in-
695 the-context-of-the-novel-coronavirus-\(2019-ncov\)-outbreak](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/advice-on-the-use-of-masks-in-the-community-during-home-care-and-in-healthcare-settings-in-the-context-of-the-novel-coronavirus-(2019-ncov)-outbreak)
- 696 16. CDC. COVID-19: Quarantine vs. Isolation. 2020;317422.
- 697 17. StataCorp. Stata 14.2 Statistics/Data Analysis. Texas: StataCorp LP; 2015.
- 698 18. INE IN de E. II Recenseamento geral da população e habitação. Resultados definitivos.
699 Maputo; 1999.
- 700 19. Pública MM da AE e F. Diagnóstico integrado de infraestruturas e serviços básicos para os
701 municípios da província de Zambézia: Relatório de diagnóstico do Município de Quelimane
702 [Internet]. Quelimane; 2020. Available from:
703 https://www.pdul.gov.mz/content/download/162/881/file/DIISB_Quelimane_EIII.pdf
- 704 20. Trindade CC. Convívio e solidariedade: práticas de xitique em Moçambique. In: XI
705 Congresso Luso Afro Brasileiro de Ciencias Sociais Diversidades e Des(igualdades)

- 706 [Internet]. Salvador: Universidade Federal de Bahia; 2011. Available from:
707 <https://silo.tips/download/convivio-e-solidariedade-praticas-de-xitique-em-moambique>
- 708 21. Silva TC e. A organização dos trabalhadores do sector informal dos mercados de Maputo e
709 sua acção na promoção de melhores condições de vida e de trabalho O papel da
710 Associação dos Operadores e Trabalhadores do Sector Informal - ASSOTSI [Internet].
711 Genebra; 2005. Available from: https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---europe/---ro-geneva/---ilo-lisbon/documents/publication/wcms_714572.pdf
712
- 713 22. Elliott R. Coronavirus in Africa: A study of the knowledge and perceptions of coronavirus
714 (COVID-19) in South Africa, Kenya, and Nigeria [Internet]. 2020. Available from:
715 <https://www.geopoll.com/blog/coronavirus-africa/>
- 716 23. Magaço A, Munguambe K, Nhacolo A, Ambrósio C, Nhacolo F, Cossa S, et al. Challenges
717 and needs for social behavioural research and community engagement activities during
718 the COVID-19 pandemic in rural Mozambique. *Glob Public Health* [Internet]. 2021 Jan
719 2;16(1):153–7. Available from:
720 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17441692.2020.1839933>
- 721 24. Chen X, Chen H. Differences in Preventive Behaviors of COVID-19 between Urban and
722 Rural Residents: Lessons Learned from A Cross-Sectional Study in China. *Int J Environ Res*
723 *Public Health* [Internet]. 2020 Jun 20;17(12):4437. Available from:
724 <https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/17/12/4437>
- 725 25. Kayrite QQ, Hailu AA, Tola TN, Adula TD, Lambyo SH. Compliance with COVID-19
726 Preventive and Control Measures among Food and Drink Establishments in Bench-Sheko
727 and West-Omo Zones, Ethiopia, 2020. *Int J Gen Med* [Internet]. 2020 Nov;Volume
728 13:1147–55. Available from: <https://www.dovepress.com/compliance-with-covid-19-preventive-and-control-measures-among-food-an-peer-reviewed-article-IJGM>
729
- 730 26. WHO. Six in seven COVID-19 infections go undetected in Africa [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2022
731 May 29]. Available from: <https://www.afro.who.int/news/six-seven-covid-19-infections-go-undetected-africa>
732
- 733 27. Dayanand D, Irudhayanathan I, Kundu D, Manesh A, Abraham V, Abhilash KP, et al.
734 Community seroprevalence and risk factors for SARS-CoV-2 infection in different
735 subpopulations in Vellore, India, and their implications for future prevention. *Int J Infect*
736 *Dis* [Internet]. 2022 Mar;116:138–46. Available from:
737 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1201971221012558>
- 738 28. Fallesen D. How COVID-19 impacted vulnerable communities in the Philippines [Internet].
739 2021. Available from: <https://blogs.worldbank.org/eastasiapacific/how-covid-19-impacted-vulnerable-communities-philippines>
740
- 741 29. Chifeche V, Dreyer Y. Faith communities, youth and development in Mozambique. *HTS*
742 *Teol Stud / Theol Stud* [Internet]. 2019 Nov 29;75(4). Available from:
743 <http://www.hts.org.za/index.php/HTS/article/view/5450>
744

Figure 1. Location and administrative division of Manhiça and Quelimane districts.



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.17.22282473>; this version posted November 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Source: Manhiça and Quelimane HDSS databases (2022) and (10).