The COVID-19 pandemic is having far-reaching impacts on how people earn a living and meet critical needs. The Caribbean COVID-19 Food Security and Livelihoods Impact Survey was launched by CARICOM to rapidly gather data on impacts to livelihoods, food security and access to markets.

Two rounds of the survey have been carried out, implemented by the World Food Programme on behalf of the CARICOM Secretariat. This summary analyses data collected in the second round, carried out over the last two weeks of June 2020, which received 5,707 responses from 23 countries and territories in the Caribbean. It builds on findings from the first survey implemented in April 2020, which received 4,537 responses from 19 countries and territories. The survey was shared via social media, email and text message.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Round 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 2020</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,537 Responses</td>
<td>5,707 Responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COVID-19 and measures to contain it have impacted market access, but access may be improving. Seventeen percent of respondents reported that they could not access stores and markets at some point in the week prior to the survey, compared to about half in the April 2020, when a 24-hour curfew was in effect.

The pandemic appears to be taking an increasing toll on incomes. Sixty-two percent of respondents have experienced job loss or a decline in salaries in their households, significantly higher than the April survey (43%). Nearly 9 out of 10 respondents who perceive their income as well below average reported such income loss.

Disruptions to livelihoods are widespread. Nearly half of all respondents reported that their ability to carry out livelihoods was impacted, mainly owing to movement restrictions, concerns leaving the home and reduced demand for their products and services. Concerns about reduced demand for goods and services were more predominant reasons for business owners compared to salaried workers, which was similar to the April survey.

Many people appear to view their loss in buying power as tantamount to reducing their market access. In April 2020, movement restrictions and store closures were the main impediment to market access, whereas lack of money to spend was the main reason in June 2020.

The vast majority of respondents (84%) have changed their shopping behaviour since the pandemic began, mainly by buying larger quantities than usual, going to different stores or choosing cheaper or less preferred brands. Since the survey in April 2020, respondents have shifted from buying less large quantities to cheaper and less preferred brands.

Slightly more respondents are reporting reducing their food consumption compared to the April 2020 survey, with a quarter reporting consuming less or going without eating. Respondents who perceive their income as below or well below average income appear to be more severely impacted. The percentage with food stocks of at least one week (70%) was lower than in the April survey (89%).

The vast majority of respondents (89%) predict that their livelihoods will be impacted in the future. People with income that they consider far below average are considerably more pessimistic than people with income far above average, and business owners have a more negative outlook than salaried workers.

The main worry of most respondents are about job loss at the moment. Almost as many are concerned about contracting the illness. Almost one-third expressed worry about meeting their essential needs. Since April, worries about food seem to have shifted to worries about a job and pay.

People's sentiments, gauged using artificial intelligence (AI) analysis of answers to open-ended questions, appear to have become more negative since April 2020.

While the use of web-based questionnaires makes this study possible, the survey's representativeness is affected in unknown ways by people's access to the internet and their incentives to respond.
**Age and sex breakdown of respondents**

Respondents are generally more likely to be female than male, and they tend to be concentrated in the 26-40 and 41-60 age groups.

- **71%** Female
- **29%** Male

---

More than two thirds of respondents were female and the largest age group was from 41 to 60

---

“I was unable to attend my moms funeral due to cancelation of flights to Trinidad and I'm unemployed and financially unstable.” – female, age 28

“I have more work and procedures because I work in the healthcare industry.” – male, age 29

“The closing of essential services during the lockdown both government and non-government in Barbados has impacted me as an immigrant.” – female, age 25
Main household income sources

Respondents were asked to indicate the main income source/s for their household. Multiple choices could be selected. The main income source, for 68% of men and 76% of women, is salaried work. This is true for all age groups though less so for those over 60. It is also true for all perceived income groups including those with income well below average where 51% have salaried work (and an additional 12% rely on informal/casual labor). The second largest source is income from own business or trade. Although for those over 60 it is from other sources. Over one quarter of respondents with perceived income above average and well above average have business income as a main source of income, while one quarter of those with perceived income well below average rely on support from family and friends.

By sex

Salaried work | 75% | 67%
---|---|---
Own business / trade | 18% | 24%
Support from family and friends | 24% | 9%
Government assistance | 9% | 7%
Informal / Casual labor | 9% | 5%
Remittances from abroad | 7% | 8%
Petty trade | 7% | 6%
Other | 7% | 6%

---

| By survey | June 2020 | April 2020 |
---|---|---|
Salaried work | 74% | 79% |
Own business / trade | 20% | 30% |
Support from family and friends | 9% | 3% |
Government assistance | 7% | 4% |
Informal / Casual labor | 8% | 4% |
Remittances from abroad | 2% | 1% |
Petty trade | 1% | 1% |
Other | 6% | 0% |
**DEMOGRAPHICS OF RESPONDENTS**

- **By age**
  - **Over 60**
    - Salaried work: 37%
    - Own business / trade: 17%
    - Support from family and friends: 3%
    - Government assistance: 3%
    - Informal / Casual labor: 11%
    - Remittances from abroad: 7%
    - Petty trade: 9%
  - **41-60**
    - Salaried work: 27%
    - Own business / trade: 9%
    - Support from family and friends: 21%
    - Government assistance: 9%
    - Informal / Casual labor: 5%
    - Remittances from abroad: 5%
    - Petty trade: 1%
  - **26-40**
    - Salaried work: 19%
    - Own business / trade: 10%
    - Support from family and friends: 7%
    - Government assistance: 7%
    - Informal / Casual labor: 11%
    - Remittances from abroad: 11%
    - Petty trade: 1%
  - **25 and under**
    - Salaried work: 26%
    - Own business / trade: 26%
    - Support from family and friends: 10%
    - Government assistance: 6%
    - Informal / Casual labor: 6%
    - Remittances from abroad: 10%
    - Petty trade: 2%

- **By sex**
  - Female: 75%
  - Male: 25%

- **By perceived relative income**
  - **Much below average**
    - Salaried work: 17%
    - Own business / trade: 17%
    - Support from family and friends: 67%
    - Government assistance: 8%
    - Informal / Casual labor: 18%
    - Remittances from abroad: 24%
    - Petty trade: 9%
  - **Below average**
    - Salaried work: 17%
    - Own business / trade: 17%
    - Support from family and friends: 12%
    - Government assistance: 12%
    - Informal / Casual labor: 2%
    - Remittances from abroad: 11%
    - Petty trade: 2%
  - **Average**
    - Salaried work: 19%
    - Own business / trade: 19%
    - Support from family and friends: 7%
    - Government assistance: 6%
    - Informal / Casual labor: 2%
    - Remittances from abroad: 7%
    - Petty trade: 1%
  - **Above average**
    - Salaried work: 28%
    - Own business / trade: 28%
    - Support from family and friends: 3%
    - Government assistance: 3%
    - Informal / Casual labor: 3%
    - Remittances from abroad: 3%
    - Petty trade: 6%
  - **Much above average**
    - Salaried work: 29%
    - Own business / trade: 29%
    - Support from family and friends: 4%
    - Government assistance: 4%
    - Informal / Casual labor: 4%
    - Remittances from abroad: 4%
    - Petty trade: 8%
COVID-19 and measures to contain it have impacted market access, with 17% of respondents reporting that they could not access stores and markets at some point 7 days prior to responding to the June survey, and almost no difference by sex or age. This is much lower than in the first round of the survey (52%), which took place during the 24-hour curfew that was in effect. In the April 2020 survey, movement restrictions and closure of stores and markets were the primary reasons given for not having access to markets. In June 2020, the main reason was a lack of income to spend in markets. In June 2020, the main reason was a lack of income to spend in markets.

People are changing the way they shop and shopping routines have changed for 84% of respondents. While the majority of households is still buying larger quantities than usual, a clear trend can be observed away from that type of shopping behavior, towards buying smaller quantities, cheaper or less preferred brands and making greater use of online delivery. The reason for this shift may be a decreasing purchasing power, which is reflected in the loss of jobs and decreased income for nearly two out of three respondents.

Availability of food, medicines and hygiene items has increased, but these items are still not fully accessible in stores. Most respondents (90%) said that staple foods were “always available,” up from 50% in April 2020. Slightly more than half (57%) said that medicines were “always available,” up from 39% in April 2020. Very few indicated that these items were entirely unavailable. Nearly three quarters of all respondents (73%) reported an increase in food prices, compared to around half in the first survey.

**17% reported a time when they could not access markets in the past 7 days**
**IMPACT ON MARKET ACCESS**

**Reasons for limited market access**

Respondents were asked the main reason for not being able to access markets/grocery stores. Multiple choices were possible. A major reason, given by 20% of men and 39% of women, was a lack of cash to spend in stores. This financial constraint was also given by more than 40% of those with perceived relative income below and well below average. This reason was not an option on the survey form; respondents wrote it in as “Other.” It suggests that many respondents view their lack of buying power as tantamount to a lack of market access. Other reasons include markets and grocery stores being closed, travel and movement restrictions limiting access to markets. Other-not financial is not an option on the survey form; respondents wrote it in as “Other.” Some respondents view their lack of buying power as tantamount to a lack of market access. Other reasons include markets and grocery stores being closed, travel and movement restrictions limiting access to markets.

For those who faced a time when they could not access markets in the past 7 days, the main reasons were…

- **Lack of cash to spend**
  - Female: 39%
  - Male: 20%

- **Markets/Grocery stores were closed**
  - Female: 14%
  - Male: 18%

- **Transport limitations**
  - Female: 14%
  - Male: 5%

- **Concerns about leaving the house due to the outbreak**
  - Female: 21%
  - Male: 29%

- **Movement Restrictions**
  - Female: 16%
  - Male: 24%

- **Other-not financial**
  - Female: 1%
  - Male: 2%

- **Household members are unwell**
  - Female: 2%
  - Male: 8%

- **Household members are quarantining**
  - Female: 10%
  - Male: 29%

* This option was not provided for the April 2020 survey.
Availability of items in stores

Very few respondents reported that key items are unavailable in stores, but 26% said that essential medications are only partially/sometimes available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Available?</th>
<th>Fresh food items</th>
<th>Basic food items</th>
<th>Hygiene items</th>
<th>Essential medicines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always Available</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially/sometimes available</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Food prices

Nearly three-quarters of respondents observed an increase in food prices, significantly greater than April. This could be the result of stores compensating for difficulties securing product, or a lack of supply driving up prices. It may also be the result of increased purchases of food items due to worry about stock. This could be an area of further investigation.

“A quarter of respondents said that essential medications are only sometimes/partially available.”

“The food prices became too high and this impacted your spending power.” – female, age 44

“I have to be very wary when shopping of the food prices and sometimes had to leave out some groceries.” – female, age 45
Shopping behaviour

The vast majority of respondents (84%) changed their shopping behavior after the pandemic hit.

Among those who changed their shopping behavior, many bought larger quantities than usual, went to different stores, or bought cheaper or less preferred brands. Those who perceived their income as well above average reported higher percentages of online shopping while many of those who perceived their income well below average bought smaller quantities than usual and cheaper and less preferred brands.

**Have you changed your shopping behaviour compared to usual? | By sex**

- **Female**
  - Yes: 85%
  - No: 15%

- **Male**
  - Yes: 81%
  - No: 19%

**How respondents changed their shopping behavior | By sex**

- **Female**
  - Buying larger quantities than usual: 23%
  - Buying smaller quantities than usual: 37%
  - Buying cheaper or less preferred brands: 23%
  - Going to different stores: 30%
  - Started or increased online ordering or delivery services: 37%

- **Male**
  - Buying larger quantities than usual: 23%
  - Buying smaller quantities than usual: 33%
  - Buying cheaper or less preferred brands: 32%
  - Going to different stores: 32%
  - Started or increased online ordering or delivery services: 26%
How respondents changed their shopping behavior | By age

Multiple choices could be selected.

- Buying larger quantities than usual
- Buying smaller quantities than usual
- Buying cheaper or less preferred brands
- Going to different stores
- Started or increased online ordering or delivery services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Buying larger quantities than usual</th>
<th>Buying smaller quantities than usual</th>
<th>Buying cheaper or less preferred brands</th>
<th>Going to different stores</th>
<th>Started or increased online ordering or delivery services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 and under</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 40</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 60</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

How respondents changed their shopping behavior | By perceived relative income

Multiple choices could be selected.

- Buying larger quantities than usual
- Buying smaller quantities than usual
- Buying cheaper or less preferred brands
- Going to different stores
- Started or increased online ordering or delivery services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Relative Income</th>
<th>Buying larger quantities than usual</th>
<th>Buying smaller quantities than usual</th>
<th>Buying cheaper or less preferred brands</th>
<th>Going to different stores</th>
<th>Started or increased online ordering or delivery services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well below average</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well above average</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPACT ON FOOD SECURITY

Food consumption

The COVID-19 pandemic and measures to stop its spread are impacting food consumption. Slightly more than half of all respondents (55%) had no difficulty consuming enough food during the week prior to the survey, which was lower than in April (63%). Around one in five (22%) skipped meals or ate less, and 17% ate less preferred foods. Half of those who perceive their income as well below or below average skipped meals or ate less, with one in ten going a whole day without eating. Trends were similar between sexes, but respondents aged 40 and under, and those who were in single and mixed families, appeared to be more severely impacted.

In the past 7 days, over 80 percent of respondents with a perceived income well below average reported difficulties regarding their food situation compared to normal times

Those over 60 appear to be relatively food secure - almost three fourths report having no difficulties eating the past 7 days

“There is no work and no food and I can’t provide nothing to eat for my child and stepchild.” – female, age 21

“There needs to be a way for people to get information about how to make diet modifications in a crisis.” – female, age 41

“I have expanded my backyard gardening because of possible food shortages in the future.” – male, age 53

“I have to choose between feeding my family and paying bills.” – female, age 37

“Depleted all most of my savings trying to provide for household” – female, age 44

Which statement best reflects your food situation over the past 7 days?

- I went one whole day without eating: 3% (June 2020), 1% (April 2020)
- I skipped meals or ate less than usual: 22% (June 2020), 14% (April 2020)
- I ate less preferred foods: 17% (June 2020), 14% (April 2020)
- I had no difficulties eating enough (normal pattern): 55% (June 2020), 64% (April 2020)
- I increased my food intake: 3% (June 2020), 6% (April 2020)
IMPACT ON FOOD SECURITY

Which statement best reflects your food situation over the past 7 days?

- I went one whole day without eating
- I ate less preferred foods
- I increased my food intake
- I skipped meals or ate less than usual
- I had no difficulties eating enough (normal pattern)

By sex

Female
- Well below average: 3%
- Below average: 23%
- Average: 17%
- Above average: 54%
- Well above average: 3%

Male
- Well below average: 2%
- Below average: 20%
- Average: 18%
- Above average: 58%
- Well above average: 1%

By age

25 and under
- Well below average: 4%
- Below average: 25%
- Average: 16%
- Above average: 50%
- Well above average: 6%

26 - 40
- Well below average: 4%
- Below average: 29%
- Average: 19%
- Above average: 45%
- Well above average: 4%

41 - 60
- Well below average: 2%
- Below average: 19%
- Average: 17%
- Above average: 60%
- Well above average: 2%

Over 60
- Well below average: 1%
- Below average: 12%
- Average: 13%
- Above average: 72%
- Well above average: 1%

By perceived relative income

- Well below average: 10%
- Below average: 51%
- Average: 21%
- Above average: 18%
- Well above average: 72%

- Well below average: 5%
- Below average: 38%
- Average: 28%
- Above average: 27%
- Well above average: 2%

- Well below average: 1%
- Below average: 15%
- Average: 66%
- Above average: 2%
- Well above average: 2%

- Well below average: 6%
- Below average: 11%
- Average: 66%
- Above average: 51%
- Well above average: 81%

- Well below average: 4%
- Below average: 4%
- Average: 2%
- Above average: 2%
- Well above average: 2%
**Impact on food stocks**

Respondents were asked whether their household has any food stock. Nearly 9 out of 10 do, but 30% have less than one week or none at all. The majority (70%) had food stocks of at least one week at home, down from 89% in the April survey. The 25 and under and the 26-to-40 year age group were most likely to have food stocks of less than one week or none at all. Also, 65% of those who perceived their income as well below average had food stocks of less than one week (39%) or none at all (26%).

**Does your household have any food stock?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>June 2020</th>
<th>April 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes. Less than 1 week</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes. More than 1 week</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**By age**

- **25 and under**
  - No: 12%
  - Yes. Less than 1 week: 15%
  - Yes. More than 1 week: 73%
- **26 - 40**
  - No: 13%
  - Yes. Less than 1 week: 24%
  - Yes. More than 1 week: 63%
- **41 - 60**
  - No: 7%
  - Yes. Less than 1 week: 22%
  - Yes. More than 1 week: 71%
- **Over 60**
  - No: 5%
  - Yes. Less than 1 week: 14%
  - Yes. More than 1 week: 82%

**By perceived relative income**

- **Well below average**
  - No: 26%
  - Yes. Less than 1 week: 39%
  - Yes. More than 1 week: 36%
- **Below average**
  - No: 15%
  - Yes. Less than 1 week: 34%
  - Yes. More than 1 week: 51%
- **Average**
  - No: 5%
  - Yes. Less than 1 week: 16%
  - Yes. More than 1 week: 79%
- **Above average**
  - No: 2%
  - Yes. Less than 1 week: 12%
  - Yes. More than 1 week: 86%
- **Well above average**
  - No: 8%
  - Yes. Less than 1 week: 8%
  - Yes. More than 1 week: 83%
Disruptions to livelihoods

% of respondents facing a time in the last two weeks prior to the survey when their livelihood activities were affected

Livelihoods are being widely disrupted, primarily as a result of movement restrictions to contain the pandemic, concerns for leaving their home, and reduced demand for goods and services. Many respondents (46%) reported that their ability to carry out livelihoods was impacted, although less than in April (69%). Both men and women seem to be affected equally, while younger age groups have been affected at higher proportions than older cohorts. 71% of respondents who perceive their income as well below average report disruptions to their livelihood.

71% of those who perceive their income as well below average faced livelihood disruptions
Of those whose livelihoods were disrupted, 50% attributed this to movement restrictions (down from 82% in April), and 24% cited reduced demand for their products and services. Almost 40% cited concerns leaving their house (up from only 9% in April).

Was your ability to carry out livelihoods activities affected in the past two weeks?

**By income source**

- Salary work: 43% (June 2020) vs. 57% (April 2020)
- Business: 57% (June 2020) vs. 43% (April 2020)

**By perceived relative income**

- Well below average: 71% (June 2020) vs. 29% (April 2020)
- Below average: 57% (June 2020) vs. 43% (April 2020)
- Average: 44% (June 2020) vs. 56% (April 2020)
- Above average: 30% (June 2020) vs. 70% (April 2020)
- Well above average: 17% (June 2020) vs. 83% (April 2020)

For those that reported livelihood disruptions, the main reasons were...

- Movement restrictions: 50% (June 2020) vs. 82% (April 2020)
- Concerns leaving the house: 9% (June 2020) vs. 38% (April 2020)
- Reduced demand for goods/services: 24% (June 2020) vs. 16% (April 2020)
- No market to sell products: 7% (June 2020) vs. 10% (April 2020)
- Livelihood Inputs are unavailable: 10% (June 2020) vs. 8% (April 2020)
- Transport limitations: 12% (June 2020) vs. 16% (April 2020)
- Increased demand for goods/services: 6% (June 2020) vs. 10% (April 2020)
- Livelihood Inputs are too expensive: 14% (June 2020) vs. 5% (April 2020)
- Adult members of the household are unwell: 2% (June 2020) vs. 0% (April 2020)

June 2020 vs. April 2020
IMPACT ON LIVELIHOODS

The main reasons for livelihood disruptions are similar for men and women with movement restrictions cited by the most respondents followed by concerns leaving the home and a reduced demand for goods and services. Perceived income groups and age groups follow a similar pattern with the exception of aged 25 and under and over 60 who highly cite movement restrictions and concerns leaving the home, and those who perceive their income as well below average having less of an issue with movement restrictions than other income groups.

The main reasons for livelihood disruptions for salaried workers were movement restrictions, however the next highest was concerns leaving the home, cited by 39%. For those who owned a business, the next highest livelihood disruption after movement restrictions, was reduced demand, cited by 41%.

For those that reported livelihood disruptions, the main reasons were:

By sex

Male
- Movement restrictions: 28%
- Reduced demand for goods/services: 14%
- Livelihood Inputs are unavailable: 7%
- Transport limitations: 2%

Female
- Movement restrictions: 37%
- Reduced demand for goods/services: 22%
- Livelihood Inputs are unavailable: 15%
- Transport limitations: 2%

By age group

25 and under
- Movement restrictions: 11%
- Concerns leaving the house: 25%

26 - 40
- Movement restrictions: 5%
- Reduced demand for goods/services: 12%

41 - 60
- Movement restrictions: 9%
- Increased demand for goods/services: 9%

Over 60
- Movement restrictions: 8%
- Increased demand for goods/services: 10%
## IMPACT ON LIVELIHOODS

### By perceived relative income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Relative Income</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above average</th>
<th>Well above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Movement restrictions</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced demand for goods/services</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihood Inputs are unavailable</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased demand for goods/services</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult members of the household are unwell</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### By income source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Source</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above average</th>
<th>Well above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Movement restrictions</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced demand for goods/services</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihood Inputs are unavailable</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased demand for goods/services</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult members of the household are unwell</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Impact on Livelihoods**

**Income changes**

Most respondents’ households have lost employment or salaries since the COVID-19 outbreak. Livelihood disruptions translated into loss of jobs or reduced salaries for 62% of respondents, significantly higher than in the previous survey (43%). Men and women appeared equally impacted. The loss of jobs or reduced salaries were most prevalent in the 26-40 year age group, cited by 74% of this group. As in the previous survey, business owners were more affected, with 63% reporting loss of jobs or reduced salaries compared with 42% of salaried workers. Business owners cited reduced demand (41%), movement restrictions (54%), and concerns leaving the house (35%) as the primary reasons for livelihood disruptions. Concerns about leaving the house due to the outbreak, an important reason in April, remains a concern among business owners. Salaried workers attribute their lost livelihood to movement restrictions (53%), concerns about leaving the house (39%), and reduced demand for their services (22%). Job losses or reduced salaries are also very high among those with mixed families and those who perceive their income as below average and well below average. Nearly 9 out of 10 households that describing their income as well below average experienced job loss or reduced income.

Has your household income changed since the COVID-19 outbreak? | By income source

- **Salaried work**
  - Increased employment or revenues: 1%
  - No change: 61%
  - Had to resort to secondary or alternative activities: 4%
  - Loss of jobs or reduced salaries: 1%

- **Own business**
  - Increased employment or revenues: 2%
  - No change: 72%
  - Had to resort to secondary or alternative activities: 9%
  - Loss of jobs or reduced salaries: 1%

---

“No job ... no money.” – female, age 32

“Due to significantly reduced income, the ability to cover monthly expenses has become impossible.” – male, age 28

“Fall under the vulnerable category, everything has been disrupted, Trusting God.” – female, age 43
Has your household income changed since the COVID-19 outbreak?

- Loss of jobs or reduced salaries
- Had to resort to secondary or alternative activities
- No change
- Increased employment or revenues

**By perceived relative income**

- Well below average: 87% (4% 7% 2%)
- Below average: 81% (6% 12%)
- Average: 58% (4% 37% 1%)
- Above average: 39% (5% 53% 3%)
- Well above average: 35% (2% 60% 2%)

**By sex**

- Female: 62% (4% 31% 1%)
- Male: 59% (4% 34% 1%)

**By age**

- 25 and under: 60% (5% 34% 1%)
- 26 - 40: 74% (4% 21% 2%)
- 41 - 60: 58% (6% 35% 1%)
- Over 60: 41% (5% 53% 2%)

**By household composition**

- Alone: 40% (4% 56%)
- Single parent: 64% (5% 32%)
- Mixed: 76% (4% 18% 1%)
- Immediate family: 63% (5% 31% 2%)

*Respondents aged 26 to 40 and those with below and well below average perceived relative income reported the highest loss in jobs or reduced salary.*
Households engaged in farming/fishing

According to the Central Bank of Barbados, agriculture, forestry, and fishing in Barbados contribute to 4.3% of GDP and employ 4.1% of the labour force. In the survey, 2% of respondents were engaged in fishing while 18% were engaged in farming or raising livestock. In both cases these activities are primarily for their own consumption.

The pandemic seems to have led to an increase in gardening and household activities, with 51% of respondents indicating that they have increased the amount of time spent on these activities. Most of this increase is due to households engaged in food production expanding production. During the pandemic 71% of these households have increased their home gardening or substance production, while only 27% of households not originally engaged in food production have done the same.

Households engaged in food production and/or livestock raising are similar to the survey average on key metrics of well-being. The sample sizes for fishing households are too small to analyze in detail. CARICOM and the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) are conducting a more in-depth assessment and analysis of the impacts of COVID-19 on agricultural livelihoods, production and food systems.

More information about how the COVID-19 pandemic has impacted Caribbean small-scale fisheries and what solutions and adaptation methods are being used to ensure the continuity of livelihoods has been shared through resources and a regional webinar.

The majority of households engaged in food production have increased their food production

“Covid 19 though me how to save money to purchase food and cook instead of fast food.” – female, age 37

“I have been away from work for three months fortunately with pay. I enjoyed the time home spending time with my son, gardening, creating a business plan and relaxing.” – female, age 26
IMPACT ON LIVELIHOODS

Future livelihood impacts

Respondents were asked to look ahead and predict the level of impact to their livelihoods as a result of disruptions from COVID-19. The vast majority expect impacts—especially those in the 26-40 age group and owners of businesses. 49% of those who perceive their income as well below average expect to have severe impacts on their livelihoods. Men and women have similar answers to this question.

Expected livelihood impacts as a result of disruptions from COVID-19

- 90% expect some impact
- 26% expect moderate to severe impact
- 14% expect severe impact

How do you expect your livelihood will be impacted as a result of disruptions from COVID-19? | By survey round

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>June 2020</th>
<th>April 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little or no impact</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate impact</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe impact</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate to severe impact</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Due to significantly reduced income, the ability to cover monthly expenses has become impossible.” – male, age 28

“It feels like all companies are downsizing and don’t have room for new workers. It is discouraging.” – female, age 28

“Loss of tenants, and non payment of rent by tenants. Adapted by doing a number of maintenance and improvement projects by myself, at as low a cost as possible.” – male, age 40

“Change to working from home highlights technology divide and poor infrastructure capabilities” – female, age 41

“My mental health is heavily impacted because I cannot afford Psychotherapy.” – male, age 43

“My business has had clients cancel due to travel restrictions and fear.” – female, age 43

“Unable to return to work whilst children are not attending school.” – female, age 44

“Covid have had initially a negative impact on finances as with everyone else,however it has also allowed me to focus and become more aware of managing my finances.” – male, age 50

“Was the worst thing I’ve ever been through in life, Landlord provided us with an eviction notice with no place to go ..... but God will provide.” – female, age 23

“Life will never be the same again.” – female, age 38

Due to significantly reduced income, the ability to cover monthly expenses has become impossible.”
IMPACT ON LIVELIHOODS

How do you expect your livelihood will be impacted as a result of disruptions from COVID-19?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severe impact</th>
<th>Moderate to severe impact</th>
<th>Moderate impact</th>
<th>Some impact</th>
<th>Little or no impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

By sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>25 and under</th>
<th>26-40</th>
<th>41-60</th>
<th>Over 60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Future livelihood impacts

More than half of people who say their income is far below the national average expect severe impacts from COVID-19. Only 4% of those who say their income is far above average expect severe impacts.

By subjective income level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Well below average</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above average</th>
<th>Well above average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Half of respondents aged 26-40 expect having more severe to severe impacts due to COVID-19
**WIDER IMPACTS**

**Main worries**

More than half of all respondents are mainly worried or concerned about unemployment at the moment. Almost as many are also concerned about illness. Almost one-third expressed worry about meeting their essential needs. These worries are a few percentage points higher among females. Those over 60 are more worried (80%) about the illness than other age groups. Those who perceive their income as well below average are far less concerned about illness (25%) and far more concerned with unemployment (74%) than those who perceive their income as well above average (63% illness and only 23% unemployment).

What are you mainly worried or concerned about at the moment...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illness</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to cover essential needs</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to cover food needs</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having to resort to savings</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social isolation</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruptions to education</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child(ren)/dependent care</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement restrictions</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to access services</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence in the household</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence in the community</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By sex

- **Female**
  - Unemployment: 57%
  - Illness: 30%
  - Inability to cover essential needs: 15%
  - Inability to cover food needs: 16%
  - Having to resort to savings: 2%
  - Social isolation: 10%
  - Disruptions to education: 2%
  - Child(ren)/dependent care: 17%
  - Movement restrictions: 10%
  - Unable to access services: 14%
  - Violence in the household: 1%
  - Violence in the community: 0%

- **Male**
  - Unemployment: 51%
  - Illness: 20%
  - Inability to cover essential needs: 20%
  - Inability to cover food needs: 22%
  - Having to resort to savings: 16%
  - Social isolation: 11%
  - Disruptions to education: 11%
  - Child(ren)/dependent care: 11%
  - Movement restrictions: 16%
  - Unable to access services: 14%
  - Violence in the household: 1%
  - Violence in the community: 0%
**WIDER IMPACTS**

**Main worries**

- Unemployment
- Inability to cover food needs
- Social isolation
- Child(ren)/dependent care
- Unable to access services
- Violence in the community
- Inability to cover essential needs
- Having to resort to savings
- Disruptions to education
- Movement restrictions
- Violence in the household

**By age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Unemployment</th>
<th>Inability to cover food needs</th>
<th>Social isolation</th>
<th>Child(ren)/dependent care</th>
<th>Unable to access services</th>
<th>Violence in the household</th>
<th>Inability to cover essential needs</th>
<th>Having to resort to savings</th>
<th>Disruptions to education</th>
<th>Movement restrictions</th>
<th>Violence in the household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 and under</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-40</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**By perceived relative income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative Income</th>
<th>Unemployment</th>
<th>Inability to cover food needs</th>
<th>Social isolation</th>
<th>Child(ren)/dependent care</th>
<th>Unable to access services</th>
<th>Violence in the household</th>
<th>Inability to cover essential needs</th>
<th>Having to resort to savings</th>
<th>Disruptions to education</th>
<th>Movement restrictions</th>
<th>Violence in the household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well below average</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well above average</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unpaid care and work

The COVID-19 pandemic has impacted the amount of time people are spending on unpaid care and domestic work. Most respondents reduced time spent shopping, which was reported by 55% overall, 53% for females and 43% for males, and 68% whose perceived income was well below average. While domestic work increased among a little over half of respondents, the increase was most prevalent among households who perceived their income as above average (62%) and female survey respondents (53%) compared to their male counterparts (45%).

Has the time that you spend on any of these unpaid activities below changed since the Covid-19 outbreak?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>Childcare</th>
<th>Shopping</th>
<th>Subsistence</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decreased</strong></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increased</strong></td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not applicable</strong></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By age groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>Childcare</th>
<th>Shopping</th>
<th>Subsistence</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>25 and under</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>Childcare</th>
<th>Shopping</th>
<th>Subsistence</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>26-40</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>Childcare</th>
<th>Shopping</th>
<th>Subsistence</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>41-60</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>Childcare</th>
<th>Shopping</th>
<th>Subsistence</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Over 60</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A greater proportion of women also reported an increase in duties related to childcare (44%) compared to men (34%). Single parent households in particular are experiencing a significant increase in childcare (55%) when compared to other types of households. The COVID-19 pandemic also has increased households’ engagement in gardening/subsistence production and affected slightly their time spent supporting the community.
### By age groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>Childcare</th>
<th>Shopping</th>
<th>Subsistence</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Well below average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Below average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Above average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Well above average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### By household composition

#### Alone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>Childcare</th>
<th>Shopping</th>
<th>Subsistence</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mixed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>Childcare</th>
<th>Shopping</th>
<th>Subsistence</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Single parent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>Childcare</th>
<th>Shopping</th>
<th>Subsistence</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Immediate family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>Childcare</th>
<th>Shopping</th>
<th>Subsistence</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How people are coping and adapting

Both survey rounds gave respondents space to give fuller and more nuanced insights on how they are coping and adapting to the disruptions caused by COVID-19. In June, out of the 5,707 respondents to the survey in the region, 2,343 or 41% responded to the open-ended question, resulting in a total count of 34,370 words. Text analysis was used to categorise and interpret the degree of positive and negative emotions within the responses using machine learning. Sentiments seem to have deteriorated compared to April, with very negative comments increasing.

In the April survey for the region as a whole, 63% of responses were classified as “negative” but only 3% as “very negative.” In June, the “very negative” percentage jumped to 35%, whereas the “negative” percentage dropped to 46%.

For Barbados, 71% of responses in April were classified as negative and 8% as very negative, slightly more negative than the regional averages. Responses are similarly negative in June, but as in the region as a whole, the “very negative” responses increased dramatically. In both rounds, respondents in Barbados expressed concerns and uncertainty due to actual or potential job losses and their ability to pay for rent, utility bills, mortgages and food. Some with jobs dependent on tourism described immediate impacts and concerns for the future. Food was a common subject in the comments. Some respondents anticipated a shortage in the availability of fresh fruit and vegetables due to the closure of supermarkets and movement restrictions. Some are adapting by utilising fruit and vegetable delivery services, while others have started to grow them at home. Many expressed anxiety about the uncertainty surrounding food security on island, including mental health issues.

Differences between the two survey rounds may reflect changes in people’s market behavior in response to the COVID-19 pandemic over time. However, they also may reflect differences in survey respondents that affect survey results in unknown ways.
Key themes

The word clouds represent key themes on how people in Barbados are being impacted and are adapting to disruptions from COVID-19. The shift from worries about access to “Food”, the most prevalent word in the previous round, to worries about “Jobs” and “Pay”, the most common words in this round, shows the shift in thinking as the pandemic persists.

From April to June, there has been a shift from worries about access to “Food” to worries about a “Job” and “Pay”
CONCLUSION

In June 2020, most of the measures put in place by the government of Barbados to curb the spread of the coronavirus had been eased in response to decreasing COVID-19 cases. Though many economic and commercial activities resumed, the broader impacts of the pandemic on how people live, work and meet their basic needs have continued – and the toll on incomes appears to be worsening.

While access to markets is improving and fewer people reported disruptions to their livelihoods compared to April, even more respondents (62%) are facing job loss or decreased incomes in their households. These trends appear most severe for self-perceived low-income households, business-owners and people aged 26-40. Impacts to food consumption are also most acute with low-income households, with a worrying number of respondents reducing what they eat. The pandemic is shifting life at home, with time spent on domestic work and childcare increasing, particularly for women.

Trends for Barbados are largely consistent with what was observed at the regional level, but respondents’ perspectives on how the pandemic is impacting their lives seem to be more negative. The vast majority predict that their livelihoods will be impacted in the future as well, with 41-60 year olds and business owners having the most negative outlooks. People with income they consider to be far below the nation’s average are considerably more pessimistic in their predictions than people with income far above average.

With COVID-19 bringing a near halt to tourism and disrupting the economy and commercial activities, the government of Barbados has introduced policies and programmes to assist people losing incomes and to support food security. With rising food prices and negative impacts to income and food consumption deepening even as restrictions eased, it is critical to support and expand these measures, prioritizing those who are most vulnerable to the socio-economic impacts of the pandemic.
“My fiancée’s pregnant and we’re living in two separate household so me getting to take care of her has been really difficult.” – male, age 21

“As a student the disruption to my exams and possible university acceptance as well as not knowing if I will be able to afford university.” – male, age 19

“My health had gotten worse.. and I unfortunately resorted to drugs.” – male, age 25

“The closing of essential services during the lockdown both government and non-government in Barbados has impacted me as an immigrant.” – female, age 25

“I have become used to the isolation and working from home. I don’t want to return to “normal”. The thought depresses me.” – female, age 50

“Living by myself was a very lonely experience. First time I ever encountered feeling abandoned.” – male, age 51

“The disruptions have been far less than I expected based on what I see happening in the rest of the world” – male, age 67

“I am in the vulnerable group but people think you are paranoid when you ask people to respect the protocols.” – female, age 60

“Having to work from home. People do not respect working hours. You get calls at any time of day.” – female, age 62

“Increased my donations to those on need.” – male, age 72
### ANNEX. REGIONAL OVERVIEWS

#### Income changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Loss of jobs/reduced salaries</th>
<th>Hard to resort to secondary income sources</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Increased employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aruba</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Lucia</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sint Maarten</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turks and Caicos</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curacao</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayman Islands</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermuda</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Livelihood disruptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Loss of jobs/reduced salaries</th>
<th>Hard to resort to secondary income sources</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Increased employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Lucia</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turks and Caicos Islands</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayman Islands</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sint Maarten</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curacao</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermuda</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aruba</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
METHODOLOGY AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The second round of the CARICOM Caribbean COVID-19 Food Security and Livelihoods impact survey was launched via a webform, which was accessible on mobile/smartphone and PC/desktop. The data collection period was inclusive of 14 June to 1 July 2020. The survey was circulated via email, social media, SMS, media and other communication channels.

The World Food Programme (WFP) performed the data collection, monitoring and analysis. Responses were visualised live on an interactive dashboard and monitored to ensure their legitimacy based on cross referencing with prior knowledge and secondary data. Data validation methods were designed into the survey form to mitigate against intentional or unintentional outliers.

The qualitative analysis was performed in collaboration with Joseph Xu from Google’s AI unit using Natural Language Processing (NLP). NLP, a branch of AI which analyses and interprets human languages, provided: (a) a sentiment analysis to determine the number of positive versus negative responses and (b) auto-categorisation of responses. To moderate the non-representative nature of the data, the analysis team further refined the classifications presented by the algorithms.

WFP expresses warm appreciation to Flow and Digicel for distributing the survey link by SMS. Special thanks to the International Telecommunication Union for their support in facilitating the SMS distribution. Thanks to UNHCR for their support with the Spanish translation of the survey.
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