BEHAVIOURAL INSIGHTS ON COVID-19 IN THE KYRGYZ REPUBLIC

Monitoring knowledge, risk perceptions, preventive behaviours and trust to inform pandemic outbreak response
### Summary: General Findings

For discussion and further analysis and interpretation

#### Knowledge and Perceptions
- Knowledge regarding COVID-19, protective measures, and government policy continues to be high among the majority, but the number of those struggling with knowledge is significant.
- Risk perceptions continue to be relatively low, particularly for the perceived severity of infections.
- Belief in the ability to avoid infection has grown somewhat.

#### Individual Behaviours
- The uptake of protective behaviours remains below desirable levels and risky behaviours such as not adhering to physical distancing or avoiding social events are common.
- The majority of respondents continue to express strong willingness to get vaccinated.
- Recommendations from doctors and the MoH are more important to people undecided on vaccines.

#### Support for Policies
- A larger proportion of respondents than in Round 1 considered restrictions to be greatly exaggerated.
- The acceptance of policies and restrictive measures continues to vary strongly.
- Strict restrictions on travel or reintroducing the state of emergency remain highly unpopular.
- Perceptions of fairness of decisions and restrictions remain low for younger respondents.

#### Economy and Wellbeing
- Negative economic impacts and worries about future finances continue to be very common among the respondents.
- The pandemic has had a detrimental impact on healthy lifestyles, particularly exercise and diets.
- Avoiding health-care continues to be significant and can have long-term public health consequences.
- Avoidance of people by ethnicity remains common.

### Методология

Данные собирались посредством компьютерного телефонного интервью (Computer-assisted telephone interviewing, CATI), в ходе которого было опрошено 1000 человек из всех семи областей Кыргызстана и двух основных городов - Бишкека и Оша. Сбор данных осуществлялся под руководством Министерства здравоохранения и социального развития КР и все данные, собранные в рамках этого проекта, принадлежат данному министерству.
SECTION 1: Knowledge and Perceptions
Findings

- There are **no statistically significant changes** in the health literacy of respondents between rounds 1 and 2.
- Around 70% of respondents of respondents continue to feel **confident** in their ability to understand information and recommendations.
- Judging media reliability continues to be the most difficult aspect of health literacy with up to 45% reporting challenges.
- 73% of respondents continue to feel certain about knowing protective measures.

There are no statistically significant changes in the measured variables. However, given the short time in between the data collection points, it is not necessarily a sign that messaging done after round 1 was not successful.

Predictors

- Respondents with **higher education** have higher health literacy.
- Health literacy is **positively** correlated with trust in the government and the medical sector as well as perceptions of fast viral spread.
- Perceptions of **high infection severity** and **media hype** around COVID-19 correlate with lower health literacy.

**FEELING SURE ABOUT PROTECTIVE MEASURE TO AVOID AN INFECTION**

Rated on scales ranging from 1 (very unsure) to 5 (very sure). Mean values and 95% confidence intervals.

**HEALTH LITERACY**

How easy or difficult would you say it is to... (1 - very difficult) (5 - very easy)

- **to follow recommendations about when to engage in social activities**
  - 01.12.2020: 4.13
  - 25.12.2020: 4.1

- **to understand information about what to do if you think you have COVID-19**
  - 01.12.2020: 3.86
  - 25.12.2020: 3.95

- **to follow recommendations about when to stay at home**
  - 01.12.2020: 3.86
  - 25.12.2020: 3.84

- **to understand recommendation about when to engage in social activities**
  - 01.12.2020: 3.84
  - 25.12.2020: 3.89

- **to find the information you need?**
  - 01.12.2020: 3.8
  - 25.12.2020: 3.8

- **to judge in the information in the media is reliable?**
  - 01.12.2020: 3.9
  - 25.12.2020: 3.83
Risk perceptions

Findings
• Risk perceptions continue to be relatively low with only 15% perceiving high risk from COVID-19
• The majority (64%) continue to see COVID-19 as somewhat risky
• The lowest risk perceptions among respondents continue to relate to the severity of a potential infection with only 25% thinking it is highly severe
• Larger portions consider themselves highly susceptible (44%) and highly likely to get infected (34%)

There are no significant changes in risk perceptions and low levels continue to be driven largely by low perceived severity of infection. However, risk group members’ higher risk perceptions suggest that risk factors for severe infections are somewhat understood.

Predictors
• Respondents who are a part of risk groups perceive their susceptibility and severity of infection as higher
• Highly educated respondents view the infection as less severe
• Older respondents think they are more likely to get infected
• Perceptions of viral closeness and frequency of media consumption correlate with higher risk perceptions

PERCEIVED RISK OF AN INFECTION
Mean score including susceptibility, probability an severity perceptions, each originally rated on scales ranging from 1 (low) to 5 (high)

- 1/12/2020
- 25/12/2020

- high risk (≥5)
- medium risk
- low risk (≤3)

PERCEIVED SUSCEPTIBILITY
Grouped results, originally rated on scales ranging from 1 (not susceptible) to 5 (very susceptible)

PERCEIVED PROBABILITY OF AN INFECTION
Grouped results, originally rated on scales ranging from 1 (extremely unlikely) to 5 (extremely likely)

PERCEIVED SEVERITY OF AN INFECTION
Grouped results, originally rated on scales ranging from 1 (not severe) to 5 (very severe)
Perceptions and emotions

Findings
- A slightly larger proportion (from 45% to 50%) of respondents feel confident in their ability to avoid an infection.
- The perceptions of viral closeness have somewhat reduced as 49% feel it to be far away (44% in round 1), as has the perceived speed of spread (from 72% to 68% perceiving fast spread).
- 49% of respondents feel high levels of fear due to the virus, up from 46% in round 1.

The changes in emotionality are not large between the two data collection points. Despite perceptions of fast viral spread and closeness being high, the levels of fear and anxiety remain substantially lower, which suggests either good resilience or underestimated risks.

Predictors
- Negative emotions are felt more by respondents who are female or risk group members and have high education levels.
- Healthcare workers perceive the virus as being closer.
- Perceptions of closeness and negative emotions are higher with those who know infected peers.
- The frequency of media consumption correlates with higher negative emotions.

FEELING ABLE TO AVOID AN INFECTION
Rated on scale ranging from 1 (difficult) to 5 (easy). Mean values und 95% confidence intervals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Not so easy</th>
<th>Somewhat easy</th>
<th>Very easy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01.12.2020</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.12.2020</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISTANCE
To me, novel coronavirus feels...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Far away</th>
<th>Neither close nor far away</th>
<th>Close</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01.12.2020</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.12.2020</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PERCEIVING VIRUS AS SPREADING FAST
From me the Corona virus is...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Spreading rather slow</th>
<th>Spreading somewhat fast</th>
<th>Spreading rather fast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01.12.2020</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.12.2020</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FEAR
From me the Corona virus is...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>(Rather) not fear inducing</th>
<th>Somewhat fear inducing</th>
<th>(Very) fear inducing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01.12.2020</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.12.2020</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 2: Individual Behaviours
Protective Behaviours

Findings
- There are no statistically significant changes in the uptake of protective behaviours and their adoption remains below desirable levels.
- Highest levels of compliance were measured with wearing masks (80%) and hand sanitation (77%).
- Lowest compliance relate to staying home while sick (3.12/44%) and the avoidance of social events (2.76/32%)
- Up to 18% of respondents say they have used antibiotics to prevent or treat COVID-19 (same as round 1)

Predictors
- Compliance with protective behaviours is higher among older and female respondents.
- Uptake correlates positively with the frequency of media consumption, trust in the government and medical sector, and perceptions of fast viral spread.
- Perceptions of media hype around COVID-19 correlate with lower uptake of protective behaviours.
- Respondents who have infected peers are less likely to maintain physical distance.

The uptake of protective behaviours continues to leave room for improvement as risky behaviours such as not adhering to physical distancing combined with not avoiding social events create large potential for viral transmission. Despite relatively high levels, the goal for adherence to wearing masks and hand sanitation should be higher than the current levels. Lower trust in institutions among those reluctant to adopt protective behaviours creates challenges for communications.

MALADAPTIVE USE OF ANTIBIOTICS
Used antibiotics to prevent or treat COVID-19

UPTAKE OF PROTECTIVE MEASURES
Rated on scales ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (very much). Mean values and 95% confidence intervals
Vaccinations

Findings
- A slightly higher majority than in Round 1 (60% vs 59%) express willingness to get vaccinated whereas 27% are strongly against it (29% in round 1), though the difference is not statistically significant
- Around one third of respondents continue to be skeptical about the effectiveness of the vaccine
- Around a half of respondents would not get vaccinated if they had already had COVID-19 or if others were vaccinated
- 17% of respondents express general distrust and lack of support towards vaccines in the national schedule

The sustained majority willingness to get vaccinated is highly supportive for any planned vaccination campaigns, particularly as willingness is higher among older respondents who are likely to be vaccinated first.

Predictors
- Respondents more critical towards vaccines tend to be younger and living without children
- Vaccination willingness correlates with health literacy, risk perceptions, economic worries, and trust in the medical sector
- Respondents against vaccines in general are more likely to be young, male, higher educated, living without children, and have lower health literacy, media consumption, and trust
- Perceptions of media hype correlate with lower vaccination willingness and general anti-vaccination views

PLEASE SHARE YOUR POSITION ON A POTENTIAL FUTURE COVID-19

Current data collection. Scale 1 (strongly disagree) - 5 (strongly agree)

PLEASE SHARE YOUR POSITION ON A POTENTIAL FUTURE COVID-19

Apart from COVID-19, I think everyone should be vaccinated according to the national vaccination schedule

YES 83%
NO 17%
Vaccination concerns

Findings
- No measured concerns receive high levels of responses among undecided people in the survey. The impact of vaccines on restrictions is the largest concern (23%) as opposed to country of origin in Round 1 (then at 31%, now 21%)
- 13% of undecided respondents are worried about side-effects, and this is less important to them than the overall respondents (22%)
- For undecided respondents, the recommendations from both doctors and the MoH are more important than to the respondents overall (21%/21% for undecided, 17%/12% in general)

Predictors
- Recommendations from either family doctors or the MoH are more important to older, urban, and female respondents
- Recommendations from the MoH are less important to risk group members
- The ease of access to vaccines is more important to female respondents and those with higher perceptions of susceptibility, trust, and viral closeness and spread

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Future COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whether a high vaccination uptake would lift restrictions on movement and gathering in groups</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation of the Ministry of Health; Labour and Social Protection/National Agency for Public Health</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation from my family doctor</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country in which the vaccine is produced</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether the vaccine is free of change</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether the vaccine is used in other countries</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk of getting infected with COVID-19 at the time when the vaccine is available</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether the vaccine has been in use for a long time with no serious side-effects</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How easy it is to get the vaccine (e.g. available out-of-hours or in pharmacies)</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 3: Support for policies
General policy perspectives

Findings
• Strong support continues for enforced isolations for infected individuals (78%) and for increased testing in the population (73%)
• However, up to 54% (up from 46% in round 1) of respondents think that the current restrictions are greatly exaggerated
• 69% of respondents accept avoidance of people based on ethnicity (62% in round 1)
• Up to 76% would continue to follow restrictions after the peak of infection even after they are no longer formal requirements (77% in round 1)

The growth of the proportion of respondents who think restrictions are exaggerated is concerning and should be better understood to ensure that support for and adherence to government policies needed to address the pandemic continues.

Predictors
• Respondents who are older, urban, and have lower education are more likely to think the restrictions are exaggerated
• Perceiving restrictions as exaggerated correlates with probability of infection, perceptions of fast viral spread, and trust in government
• Enforced isolation is more strongly supported by older and less educated respondents
• Supporting enforced isolation correlates with media consumption, trust in the medical sector, and perceived fast viral spread

VOLUNTARY COMPLIANCE

ACCEPTANCE IF MEASURES

ACCEPTANCE IF MEASURES
Rated on scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)
Support for specific policies

Findings
• No statistically significant changes were observed regarding decisions taken. **Mask mandates** remain with **vast support** (4.61/88%)
• Smaller majorities continue to support **reopening restaurants/cafés** (3.79/63%) and **schools/kindergarten facilities** (3.58/59%)
• Support for **reopening schools in general** grew from 3.83 to 3.99 (70% strongly support)
• Support **remains low and stable** for **bans on interregional public transport** (2.58/30%) and reintroducing a **state of emergency** (2.45/28%)

Support continues to vary greatly between the different policies with slightly higher risk appetite expressed regarding reopening schools. Support is very low for more extreme measures such as travel bans and a state of emergency.

Predictors
• Mask mandates are more popular among **female** and **urban** respondents
• Those with **infected peers** are more likely to **support mask mandates** and **resist reopening schools**
• **Trust** in the **government** and the **medical sector** correlates with higher support for policies
• **Risk** and **viral spread** perceptions correlate with support for mask mandates
• **Perceptions of media** hype correlate with lower support for **mask mandates** and higher support for **opening schools**
• **Older** respondents are more likely to support **opening schools**

**AGREEMENT WITH DECISIONS TAKEN**
Rated on scale ranging from 1 (no support at all) to 5 (strong support). Mean values and 95% confidence intervals.

**ACCEPTANCE FOR FUTURE RESTRICTIONS**
Level of agreement (Scale 1 not at all - 5 strong support)
Findings

- Perceptions regarding the fairness of policies have slightly increased and up to 65% now consider them fair and 66% would convince others that they are.
- Only 14%/15% of respondents disagree strongly with the fairness of decisions (17%/18% in Round 1).

The perceptions on fairness continue to be positive in the majority. However, particularly younger people without families continue to view the decisions as unfair. Understanding their concerns and addressing them as appropriate may help improving perceptions and support.

Predictors

- Fairness perceptions are lower among younger respondents living in rural areas.
- Fairness correlates positively with perceptions of risk, viral spread, and trust in government and the medical sector.

### Fairness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I would convince others that the decisions are right</th>
<th>I think the decisions are fair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="chart1.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart2.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fairness is rated on scales ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Mean values and 95% confidence intervals are as follows:

- **01/12/2020**
  - I would convince others that the decisions are right: 3.77 (3.78 to 3.92)
  - I think the decisions are fair: 3.78 (3.76 to 3.80)

- **25/12/2020**
  - I would convince others that the decisions are right: 3.92 (3.84 to 3.99)
  - I think the decisions are fair: 3.96 (3.93 to 4.00)
Trust in institutions

Findings
• There are no statistically significant changes in trust towards institutions to handle COVID-19 well, and a significant degree of distrust continue to be expressed towards all institutions
• The medical sector continues to enjoy the highest trust, including hospitals (63%), MoH (59%), and doctors (54%)
• Despite small improvements, the lowest levels of trust continue to be expressed towards city administrations (41%), churches/mosques (42%), and schools (44%)

Trust in institutions overall is quite low, but the higher trust with the medical sector is positive considering their importance in dealing with and communicating messages regarding the pandemic.

Predictors
• Trust in institutions is stronger among female respondents, healthcare workers, and those who consume media frequently
• Higher education, living in rural areas, and knowing infected peers correlate negatively with trust in national institutions
• Perceptions of media hype around COVID-19 correlates with lower trust in institutions

CONFIDENCE IN INSTITUTIONS
Rated on scales ranging from 1 (very low confidence) to 5 (very high confidence). Mean values and 95% confidence intervals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>1/12/2020</th>
<th>25/12/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family doctor</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agency for PH</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City administration</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean values and 95% confidence intervals
Economic impacts

Findings
• The worries about the future economic consequences continue to be very common among respondents with up to 72% expressing strong worry (69% in round 1)
• Only 16% of respondents are not worried about future economic consequences (17% in round 1)
• Around a third of respondents have already suffered economic hardship due to COVID-19

Worries about the future economic situation continue to be extremely common, and many have felt economic impacts already. Data from other countries suggests that suffering financial hardship can negatively impact uptake of protective behaviours and support for policies. As such, it is important to understand and address impacts as much as possible not only to protect livelihoods but also to tackle the pandemic.

Predictors
• Respondents who are older, have had peers infected, and consume media frequently are more likely to worry about economic consequences

Private financial situation over last three month
- Improved
- Same
- Worse
- NA
Findings
• The majority of respondents continue to express a good ability to recover from stressful events (57%)
• However resilience has decreased on other indicators and up to 42% of respondents say they find it hard to get through or snap back from bad or stressful events

The reductions in resilience expressed is concerning as maintaining good levels of resilience is important for people to cope with the stress of COVID-19 and the impacts of restrictions, as well as to preserve or rebuild livelihoods.

Predictors
• Resilience is lower among older respondents and those with higher health literacy

RESILIENCE
(STRONGLY) DISAGREE
NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE
(STRONGLY) AGREE

It does not take me long to recover from a stressful event
57% 27% 17%

It is hard for me to snap back when something bad happens
43% 38% 19%

I have a hard time making it through stressful events
42% 40% 18%

RESILIENCE
Rated on scales ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Mean values and 95% confidence intervals.

01.12.2020
25.12.2020

It does not take me long to recover from a stressful event
3,5
3,55

It is hard for me to snap back when something bad happens
2,93
3,07

I have a hard time making it through stressful events
2,88
3,0
Negative pandemic behaviours

Findings
• The levels of negative pandemic behaviours are quite high but have remained stable since round 1
• Issues with less healthy lifestyles are present, especially for exercising less than normal (47%) and eating a worse diet (20%)
• The avoidance of people based on ethnicity continues to be very common (43%)
• Postponing or avoiding vaccinations (28%) and doctors visits (23%) remain engaged in by significant minorities

Negative pandemic behaviours continue to be high both in relation to less healthy lifestyles and health-seeking. These may have negative impacts on public health in the long term.

Predictors
• Drinking and smoking more than usual is more common among male respondents
• Drinking is more common with those with lower education
• Unhealthier diets are more common in urban areas
• Frequent media consumptions and trust in government correlate with less exercise

PANDEMIC BEHAVIOR
Results from recent survey.

- Excerciese less than usual
  - Да: 47%
  - Нет: 53%

- Postponed vaccination for myself or my child
  - Да: 28%
  - Нет: 72%

- Avoid going doctor
  - Да: 27%
  - Нет: 73%

- Buy drugs i heard helping againsts COVID-19
  - Да: 23%
  - Нет: 77%

- Eat more unhealthy food than usual
  - Да: 20%
  - Нет: 80%

- Smoked more
  - Да: 8%
  - Нет: 92%

- Drink more alcohol than usual
  - Да: 6%
  - Нет: 94%
Findings

- **Active interest** in COVID-19 is reducing as the **majority** of respondents (51%) never or rarely search for information relating to it (46% in round 1)
- Perceptions that there is **media hype** around COVID-19 have **slightly grown**, as 44% consider there to be a lot of hype (40% in round 1)
- No large changes were observed in trust for information sources. The most trusted sources of information include healthcare workers (4.11), the WHO (3.97), and official reports and press releases (3.75/3.79)
- The trust in the COVID-19 hotline has **increased** slightly (3.71->3.8)
- The least trusted sources continue to be social media (3.02), newspapers (3.12), and celebrities/influences (3.22)

**TRUST IN INFORMATION SOURCES**

Rated on scales ranging from 1 (very little trust) to 5 (great deal of trust). Mean values and 95% confidence intervals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Source</th>
<th>01/12/2020</th>
<th>25/12/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with healthcare workers</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVID-19 hotlines</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government press releases</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official reports Republican headquarters on coronavirus</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical institutions press releases</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrities an social media influencers</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed newspapers</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FREQUENCY SEARCHING FOR INFORMATION ABOUT CORONA VIRUS / COVID-19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Searching</th>
<th>1/12/2020</th>
<th>25/12/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never / Rarely</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often / Very Often</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MEDIA HYPE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hype Level</th>
<th>1/12/2020</th>
<th>25/12/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Rather) Not Media Hyped</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Media Hyped</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Very) Media Hyped</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Searching</th>
<th>1/12/2020</th>
<th>25/12/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never / Rarely</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often / Very Often</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>