

Supplementary Appendix

Appendix Table 1. Results from OLS regression models testing statistical significance of **self-reported mask use** by gender, age, location

	Phone surveys							
	Sometimes uses mask				Always uses mask			
	coefficient	95% CI	control mean	N	coefficient	95% CI	control mean	N
Panel A: Gender								
<i>male</i>			0.874	6225			0.747	6225
female	0.003	[0.036, 0.043]			0.017	[0.031, 0.043]		
Panel B: Age								
<i>19-25</i>			0.902	4759			0.796	4759
26-45	-0.019	[0.093, 0.055]			-0.031	[0.134, 0.055]		
46-60	-0.038	[0.125, 0.048]			-0.043	[0.155, 0.048]		
61+	-0.028	[0.110, 0.055]			-0.034	[0.147, 0.055]		
Joint F-Test		0.837				0.901		
Panel C: Location								
<i>public transportation</i>			0.883	3812			0.819	3812
market	0.099***	[0.074, 0.124]			0.098***	[0.065, 0.124]		
village	-0.045***	[0.069, 0.022]			-0.162***	[0.202, 0.022]		
Joint F-Test		<0.001				<0.001		

Notes: Results from ordinary least squares regression models with standard errors clustered at the village/market level. Each panel represents a separate regression model. Phone data were transformed so that each observation represents a respondent's outing to a public place. Models were estimated separately for each measure of interest: "Sometimes uses mask" and "Always uses mask" using phone data. *P*-value notation: *** *p*<0.001, ** *p*<0.01, * *p*<0.05

Appendix Table 2. Results from OLS regression models testing statistical significance of **observed mask use** by gender, age, location, and situation

	Direct observations							
	Mask visible				Mask worn correctly			
	coefficient	95% CI	control mean	N	coefficient	95% CI	control mean	N
Panel A: Gender								
<i>male</i>			0.092	9300			0.046	9300
female	0.028**	[0.007, 0.049]			0.002	[0.008, 0.013]		
Panel B: Age								
<i>19-25</i>			0.065	9482			0.022	9482
26-45	0.043***	[0.026, 0.059]			0.029***	[0.017, 0.040]		
46-60	0.081***	[0.056, 0.107]			0.049***	[0.033, 0.064]		
61+	0.075**	[0.020, 0.129]			0.042*	[0.007, 0.077]		
Joint F-Test		<0.001				<0.001		
Panel C: Location								
<i>public transportation</i>			0.248	8394			0.152	8394
market	-0.066	[0.150, 0.018]			-0.089**	[0.139, 0.040]		
village	-0.188***	[0.248, 0.128]			-0.130***	[0.167, 0.093]		
Joint F-Test		<0.001				<0.001		
Panel D: Situation								
<i>socializing</i>			0.118	8404			0.036	8404
alone	-0.037**	[0.063, 0.010]			-0.003	[0.020, 0.013]		
commuting	0.131***	[0.073, 0.188]			0.116***	[0.077, 0.156]		
Joint F-Test		<0.001				<0.001		

Notes: Results from ordinary least squares regression models with standard errors clustered at the village/market level. Each panel represents a separate regression model. Phone data were transformed so that each observation represents a respondent's outing to a public place. Models were estimated separately for each measure of interest: "Sometimes uses mask" and "Always uses mask" using phone data and "Mask visible" and "Mask worn correctly" using direct observations. *P*-value notation: *** *p*<0.001, ** *p*<0.01, * *p*<0.05

Supplementary Appendix

Appendix Table 3. Results from OLS regression models testing statistical significance of self-disclosed mask use by subsets of phone surveys in Ugunja subcounty in Kenya

	Phone surveys							
	Sometimes uses mask				Always uses mask			
	coefficient	95% CI	control mean	N	coefficient	95% CI	control mean	N
<i>Non-missing age</i>			0.876	6225			0.761	6225
Missing age	0.004	[0.032, 0.041]			-0.016	[0.057, 0.025]		
<i>Surveyed before August</i>			0.867	6225			0.738	6225
Surveyed August or later	0.021	[0.016, 0.057]			0.048*	[0.006, 0.089]		
<i>Not in village where direct obs took place</i>			0.884	6225			0.760	6225
In village where direct obs took place	-0.017	[0.055, 0.021]			-0.003	[0.045, 0.039]		

Notes: Results from ordinary least squares regression models with standard errors clustered at the village/market level. Phone data were transformed so that each observation represents a respondent's outing to a public place. Models were estimated separately for each measure of interest: "Sometimes uses mask" and "Always uses mask" using phone data.


Appendix Table 4. Statistical differences between self-reports and direct observations persist in models restricted to data from August-September 2020 from the same 71 villages to match timeline and geography of direct observations

	Observed mask use			Self-reported mask use			Self-reported vs. observed mask use	
	Direct observations (N=9,549)			Phone interviews (N=)			Always/sometimes vs. worn/visible	
	Worn	Visible	None	Always	Sometimes	Never	Difference	[95% CI]
Full sample	0.047	0.057	0.896	0.772	0.089	0.139	0.757	[0.699 - 0.814]
Gender								
Male	0.046	0.046	0.908	0.789	0.075	0.136	0.772	[0.664 - 0.879]
Female	0.049	0.072	0.880	0.765	0.095	0.140	0.739	[0.672 - 0.806]
Age								
19-25	0.022	0.043	0.935	0.781	0.018	0.201	0.734	[0.543 - 0.924]
26-45	0.051	0.057	0.892	0.818	0.115	0.068	0.825	[0.782 - 0.867]
46-60	0.071	0.076	0.854	0.758	0.029	0.213	0.641	[0.496 - 0.785]
60+	0.064	0.075	0.860	0.717	0.113	0.170	0.690	[0.542 - 0.839]
Location								
Market	0.062	0.120	0.817	0.894	0.082	0.024	0.592	[0.508 - 0.677]
Public transport	0.152	0.096	0.752	0.806	0.035	0.159	0.794	[0.718 - 0.869]
Village	0.021	0.039	0.940	0.607	0.150	0.242	0.698	[0.609 - 0.786]

Notes: Observed mask use is the proportion of people: 1) wearing masks correctly, 2) having masks visible, and 3) having no mask visible. Self-reported mask use is the proportion of people reporting: 1) always wearing masks, 2) sometimes wearing masks, 3) never wearing masks. We tested for statistical differences in self-reported vs. observed mask use by comparing the proportion of people disclosing they always or sometimes use masks vs. the proportion of people observed wearing or having masks visible using OLS regression with standard errors clustered at the village level, where each row is a separate regression conditional on the descriptive characteristic. Phone data were transformed so that each observation represents a respondent's outing to a public place.

Supplementary Appendix

Appendix Figure 1. Main study findings repeated for a subset of phone surveys conducted during August-September 2020 and the same 71 villages to exactly match the timeline and geography of direct observations data



Notes: Proportions estimated on sample of 807 respondents who had been to a public place in past 7 days and 9,549 observations conducted in 71 villages and 10 market centers. Phone surveys were restricted to same villages and timeline and weighted by the probability of being selected for the phone interviews. Panel B is restricted to participants with age data; no statistically significant differences found in mask use between participants with and without age data. Age and gender in direct observations were estimated by enumerators.