A Social Observatory for JEEVika:
A Project of the Bihar Rural Livelihoods Promotion Society
JEEViKA

• A poverty reduction project with the aim of improving access to credit, encouraging stable livelihoods, and engendering social change.

• Self Help Groups (SHGs) of 10-15 women created, federated into Village Organizations (VO) of 10-15 SHGs

• Project executed by BRLPS, an autonomous body under The Govt. of Bihar, supported by The World Bank
Social Observatory

- Close Collaboration with Project Implementers (Mr. Arvind Chaudhari – CEO, BRLPS and Mr. Ajit Ranjan – Head M&E, BRLPS) to help facilitate learning-by-doing
  - Impact Evaluation using Randomized roll outs
  - Field Based Experiments to assess impact on psychological and sociological outcomes
  - In-depth qualitative study following 12 villages over two years
  - Process Evaluation – tracking implementation challenges in a rolling sample
  - Improving quality of Management Information System (MIS) database with user-friendly dashboards
Key outcomes of interest

Household-level economic outcomes:
• Level and cost of debt
• Asset portfolio
• Consumption level and patterns
• Income-generating activities

Private empowerment and welfare:
• Women’s dignity, voice and mobility
• Women’s say in household decision-making
• Women’s subjective well-being

Public engagement:
• Participation in political processes
• Instances of collective action
Quantitative Impact Evaluation

• Joint with Upamanyu Dutta (Lead Economist, NRLM), and Vivian Hoffmann (Dept of Ag. Econ, University of Maryland)
• Highlights overall impact of the Intervention on income, subjective well-being and women’s empowerment
• Baseline Survey conducted by GFK-MODE in 179 panchayats across 7 districts of Bihar
  – 8950 Households surveyed July-September 2011
• Program implemented out in 90 randomly selected panchayats
  – Stratified by district, average high cost outstanding debt (≥ 4% / month)
• Follow-up survey
  – scheduled for July-September 2013.
Study Instruments: Quantitative Baseline

• Household Level Questionnaires
  General Module: household-level economic indicators
  Women’s Module: women’s mobility, decision-making, public participation

• Community Level Questionnaires
  General: village composition, wealth distribution
  Women’s: Quality of public services; collective action
Study Instruments: Quantitative Follow-up

• Household Level Questionnaires
  Two modules as in baseline
  Objective measures of empowerment: e.g. willingness to travel alone to receive compensation, household choices over compensation

• Community Level Questionnaires
  Two modules as in baseline: changes in collective action, participation in local political processes?
## Sample characteristics at baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JEEViKA</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>P-value of difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-cost debt (Rs.)</td>
<td>8499</td>
<td>8472</td>
<td>0.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(211.8)</td>
<td>(189)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-day food cons (Rs.)</td>
<td>2638.5</td>
<td>2676</td>
<td>0.1436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own-produced food (Rs.)</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>0.9491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.3)</td>
<td>(9.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have say over own work</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>0.7464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit health ctr. Alone</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.5017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit friend alone</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Subjective well-being

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JEEViKA</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very sad</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad</td>
<td>1,295</td>
<td>1,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>1,423</td>
<td>1,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very happy</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P-value (Pearson chi2): 0.420
Qualitative Study

• Joint with Paromita Sanyal, Dept of Sociology, Cornell University

• In collaboration with Praxis

• Highlights the social and political process behind the change, catalysts and challenges affecting such interventions
Selection of villages for Qualitative Survey

• Using data from Quantitative Baseline Survey, select similar villages in project and control panchayats in terms of:
  • Demographics
  • Land distribution
  • Administration - Within same block and similar leadership
  • Credit access

• Field visits to confirm qualitative similarity and finalize 10 communities across 4 districts
Open-ended questions to be investigated

• How intervention actually functions
• Process of economic change
• Process of social change
• Process of political change
• Role of inequality in influencing change
• Gender dynamics of the intervention and potential backlash by men
Methods

• In two districts randomly assigned treatment-control pairs
• In two districts: triplets (treatment, control and a Phase 1 village where Jeevika has been active for 2 years)
• Each village will be visited every three months by a team of 3-4 investigators
• They will reside in the village for a week
• Conduct in-depth interviews with key informants, FGDs, PRA work
• Summarize findings in village reports
• PIs will participate in field visits
• Village reports will be analyzed in depth by PIs.
Field Experiments

• Joint work with Karla Hoff (Development Research Group, The World Bank)

• An important source of change in the development process occurs within people—
  - their world-views and self-concepts
  - their sense of having certain basic rights.

• Experiments are well-suited to assessing transformations of social actors and norms

• We propose to undertake experiments to assess women’s:
  
  • self-confidence,
  • ability to work with persons with higher social status,
  • bargaining power in the household.
  • access to social networks to obtain information
  • the lenses through which they view the world
Methods - Field Experiments

Same Sample as qualitative villages

For most experiments, we will draw random samples from 4 treatment and 4 control villages in two different years to assess treatment effects:
   - in the short-run
   - in the long-run (permitting a diff-in-diff analysis)

The detailed knowledge we have of these villages will permit us to assess the channels through which the Livelihoods project affects outcomes.

For one game—a test of self-confidence—we will draw on a random sample of all villages in the treatment and control groups.

The results of our experiments will complement, and provide a check on, qualitative work that assesses whether women are imbued with a sense of agency: e.g., to confront problems in their villages through collective action.
Process Evaluation

• Conducted by Sutra mainly for Jeevika’s own management purposes
• Expanded remit of investigation to include social and economic change
• Will be reading them carefully to understand implementation processes
MIS: Management Information System
(Upamanyu Dutta + BRLPS M&E team)

• Profile of an SHG, constituent members, annual (proposed) survey capturing key socio-economic indicators at member level.

• Monthly Didi Sheets capturing the weekly transactions of savings, disbursements and repayments. Transaction data is available with at least 1 month lag.

• VO Level MIS being rolled out, similar to SHG level

• Dashboard to display results as required by project staff at all levels with tools for simple cross-tabs and graphical analysis.
Conclusion

• Goal is to make Bihar a test-case for a Social Observatory for the National Rural Livelihoods Mission - 25 states, 270 million women, $5 Billion

• Change the culture of learning-by-doing in a large-scale community based project that requires an enormous amount of contextual understanding, innovation, experimentation and learning from failure, to be effective.
Survey Based Assessment Study

MGNREGA & PDS
Research Analysis and Documentation - M&E
MGNREGA scheme- Jeevika's intervention

• Phased implementation by Jeevika in MGNREGA convergence, nearly 6 months in campaign mode so far

• Major aims of the campaign
  a) Creating awareness about the scheme through SHGs and VOs
  b) Promoting participation in PRIs and facilitating submission of work application
  c) Facilitating timely payment of wages through institutional structures
MGNREGA Study

• Comprehensive questionnaire based cross-sectional study carried out in 4 different blocks and the responses recorded in the form of soft data.

• With 10 villages from each block and a respondent size of 30 per villages, the study covered a total of 40 villages and nearly 1200 respondents.

• Job card numbers were also take wherever possible to maintain authenticity of data.

• Blocks covered: Dhamdaha, Musahari, Noorsarai and Lakhnaur.

  Detail
MGNREGA Study

• Comparison of MGNREGA in Jeevika campaign villages and Non campaign areas.
• Retrospective component included in questionnaire to gauge changes as compared to last year
• Major areas of focus:
  ➢ Awareness about the scheme
  ➢ Participation in PRI
  ➢ Work application
  ➢ Average payment and no. of man days.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nos. of Significance</th>
<th>JEEViKA Campaign Areas</th>
<th>Non-campaign areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blocks covered</td>
<td>Dhamdaha, Noorsarai, Musahari, Lakhnaur</td>
<td>Dhamdaha, Noorsarai, Musahari, Lakhnaur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Villages covered</td>
<td>20 villages</td>
<td>20 villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>598 respondents</td>
<td>603 respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeevika Members</td>
<td>546 members</td>
<td>444 members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of females</td>
<td>453 respondents</td>
<td>428 respondents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major Findings

**Awareness**

- 71% more respondents in Jeevika campaign areas fall under highly aware category as compared to Non-campaign areas

**Source of Information**

- In Jeevika campaign villages, Jeevika was most effective as an information source with 55% respondents falling under highly aware category.

*In both campaign and non-campaign villages, Jeevika+ Govt. together were more effective in spreading information than formal sources alone like PRIs and PRS. (Indicates value of effective convergence)*
Major Findings

Gram Sabha participation

- In Jeevika campaign villages, the participation among the respondents has increased by more than 100% from last year as compared to non-campaign areas where there is a 35% increase in participation.

- Even in non-campaign villages, the increase is driven by Jeevika members as Non-Jeevika respondents who participated stay constant at 26 both years.

Graph
Major Findings

Work application

- In Jeevika campaign villages, 45% more respondents applied as compared to last year. On the other hand, 36% less respondents applied in non-campaign areas as compared to last year.

- More specifically, in campaign villages, there were 166 respondents who applied this year but not last year. The number was just 38 in non-campaign areas.
Major Findings

Work and *Payment scenario*

- Out of the combined 1201 respondents, 428 respondents reported working last year.
- The reported average number of man days are 35.14.
- Average weighted payment is pegged at Rs 65.60 per day for these respondents.
- Out of the 428 respondents who worked, 165 respondents reported a time of more than one month in getting their payments.

*Note:* All the figures above are for the combined survey data of four blocks. The scenario may vary from block to block.
PDS- Jeevika’s intervention

• VO run public distribution shops.
• SHG women procure and distribute grains to the beneficiaries.
• The aim is to have empowered women groups participating in delivery of public services in a better manner.
• Nearly 100 Jeevika VO run PDS are functioning across the state.
High complaints against private dealer PDS

List of complaint PDS shared with Jeevika

Examination of VO capacity in concerned PDS villages

Rest of the complaint PDS re-assigned to private dealers

PDS shops re-assigned to Jeevika VO wherever readiness expressed

How Jeevika VO get to run a PDS?
PDS Study Design

• Comprehensive questionnaire based cross-sectional study carried out in 4 different blocks and the responses recorded in the form of soft data

• 4 blocks, 40 villages, 1200 respondents

• The control villages were the ones where non-Jeevika PDS shops were running for many years (*not an ideal situation*)

• Ideally, a comparison with re-assigned PDS shops would have given an even better picture (Jeevika PDS are reassigned based on complaints)

• The study also included a retrospective component for comparing Jeevika PDS’ performance with the past PDS.
### Major Findings

#### Frequency, Quantity and Price:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block wise</th>
<th>JEEVIKA run PDS</th>
<th>Earlier PDS</th>
<th>Current Private dealer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Frequency of Wheat Distribution</td>
<td>6.23 months (6.04)</td>
<td>6.08 months (5.73)</td>
<td>4.85 months (4.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Quantity of Wheat Distributed</td>
<td>9.6 Kg</td>
<td>9.15 kg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Frequency of Rice distribution</td>
<td>6.24 months (5.95)</td>
<td>5.97 months (5.3)</td>
<td>4.88 months (4.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Quantity of Rice distribution</td>
<td>14.37 kg</td>
<td>12.7 kg</td>
<td>14.40 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Quantity of Kerosene</td>
<td>2.6 liters</td>
<td>2.64 liters</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Amount charged (Total)</td>
<td>Rs. 139.3</td>
<td>Rs. 130.7</td>
<td>Rs. 143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major Findings

- **Perceived Quality of food grains**

1. Good and fit for human consumption; 2. Inferior but still consumed
3. Inferior and good for animals; 4. Unfit for any consumption
Major Findings

- Regularity of Shop opening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jeevika PDS</th>
<th>Non-Jeevika PDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The charts show the distribution of regular and irregular shop opening for Jeevika and Non-Jeevika PDS.
• Returning back empty handed:
Limitations

• Recall errors

• Social dynamics

➢ M&E plans to have regular studies like this at least once a year for different interventions. The data will not only be helpful in getting a snapshot of the situation but will also act as an on-field validation tool.
• ADDITIONAL SLIDES FOR DETAIL
## Villages Covered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JEEViKA campaign Villages</th>
<th>Non-campaign villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOORSARAI (NALANDA)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Jagdishpur Tiyari (Jagdishpur)</td>
<td>1) Begumpur (Mamurabad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Kathouli (Muzaffarpur)</td>
<td>2) Ahiyapur (Nadiouna)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Muzaffarpur (Muzaffarpur)</td>
<td>3) Kewai (Naduana)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Kakariya(Meyar)</td>
<td>4) Lohari (Meyar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Bara Khurd (Bara Khurd)</td>
<td>5) Mahadev Bigha (Nadiouna)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MUSAHARI (MUZAFFARPUR)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Manika Harikes (Manika Harikes)</td>
<td>1) Sagahari (Taraura Gopalpur)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Jalalpur (Baikatpur)</td>
<td>2) Raghunathpur (Tarura Gopalpur)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Baikatpur (Baikatpur)</td>
<td>3) Rohua (Rohua)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Dwarika Nagar (Baikatpur)</td>
<td>4) Dumri (Dumri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Madhopur (Baikatpur)</td>
<td>5) Budhnagra (Dumri)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents Profile

Non-campaign villages
- Jeevika Members: 444
- Non-Jeevika Members: 159

Jeevika Campaign villages
- Jeevika Members: 546
- Non-Jeevika Members: 52

Female
- Non-campaign villages: 428
- Jeevika Campaign villages: 145

Male
- Non-campaign villages: 175
- Jeevika Campaign villages: 453
In Jeevika Intervened Villages, nearly 71% more respondents fall under high awareness category as compared to Non-Jeevika intervened Villages. (depicted in green)

Highly aware: Answer 4-5 questions correctly
Moderately aware: Answers 3 questions correctly
Low aware: Answer 0-2 questions correctly
Even in villages where Jeevika has not intervened, a higher percentage of Jeevika joined respondents (27%) were under the highly aware category as compared to Non-Jeevika joined respondents (14.5%).
Jeevika forms a major source of information in campaign villages along with formal sources like PRIs and PRS. There is a clear shift from other sources to Jeevika. The others form a major source of information in non-campaign villages followed closely by formal sources.
Performance of different sources (Non Campaign Villages)

Only Govt (232)
- Low awareness: 29
- Moderately aware: 51
- Highly aware: 157

Only Jeevika (66)
- Low awareness: 2
- Moderately aware: 2
- Highly aware: 34

Others (237)
- Low awareness: 2
- Moderately aware: 2
- Highly aware: 17

Govt+Jeevika (28)
- Low awareness: 24
Performance of different sources (Jeevika Campaign Villages)

Only Govt (171)
- Highly aware: 64
- Moderately aware: 63
- Low awareness: 44

Only Jeevika (239)
- Highly aware: 132
- Moderately aware: 37
- Low awareness: 70

Others (113)
- Highly aware: 8
- Moderately aware: 28
- Low awareness: 77

Govt+Jeevika (53)
- Highly aware: 29
- Moderately aware: 17
- Low awareness: 7
PRI participation has increased in campaign villages by more than a 100%. Even in non-campaign villages, the increase is driven by Jeevika members as non-jeevika participant stay constant at 26 both years.
Overall participation in Gram Sabha has increased in villages where Jeevika has intervened in MGNREGA. More specifically, in Jeevika intervened villages, nearly double number of respondents appeared in Gram Sabha after missing it last year. (Depicted in green in both the pie-charts)
Only in Jeevika campaign villages, the work application percent has gone up significantly.
Change in submission of work application

Overall work application has increased in villages where Jeevika has intervened in MGNREGA. More specifically, in Jeevika intervened villages, nearly 5 times more respondents applied for work this year after missing it last year as compared to non-campaign areas.
Out of the total 428 respondents who worked last year, 234 respondents reported to have worked for 15 days or less. This accounts for nearly 55% of the total sample.
Out of the total 428 respondents who worked last year, 95 respondents have reported to have received a payment of Rs 20 per day or less. 65 respondents report to have received no payments.