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ECONOMIC SHOCKS DURING LOCKDOWN

UDAYA cohort households (N=794)

- Households with at least one member who lost job (%)
  - Male: 64%
  - Female: 64%
  - Total: 64%

- Can survive less than 2 weeks
  - Male: 46%
  - Female: 38%
  - Total: 43%

- Can survive 2 weeks to one month
  - Male: 19%
  - Female: 11%
  - Total: 15%

- More than one month
  - Male: 61%
  - Female: 43%
  - Total: 56%

UDAYA cohort migrant households (N=264)

- Households with at least one member who lost job (%)
  - Male: 68%
  - Female: 69%
  - Total: 68%

- Can survive less than 2 weeks
  - Male: 46%
  - Female: 37%
  - Total: 40%

- Can survive 2 weeks to one month
  - Male: 17%
  - Female: 14%
  - Total: 15%

- More than one month
  - Male: 64%
  - Female: 48%
  - Total: 56%

SHG leaders (N=179)

- Family members of at least one SHG member needed cash desperately
  - Total: 82%

- At least one SHG member in the group lost income/job
  - Total: 56%

AWARENESS OF SOCIAL PROTECTION SCHEMES

Note: *Based on answers given spontaneously in response to a single question about the awareness of social protection schemes, multiple responses possible.

- Almost 9 out of 10 participants, regardless of sex, were aware of at least one social protection measure.
- Most widely known measure was PM Jan Dhan Yojana (83% listed it spontaneously), followed by free dry ration (65%).
- Most participants heard about these measures either from television (64%) or social media (51%).
Almost all of them (95%) with a ration card received ration during lockdown.

- 68% of households who had a ration card (74% among poor/poorest, 80% among medium and 65% among rich/richest group)
  - Almost all of them (95%) with a ration card received in the month preceding the interview.
  - Only two-fifths of them (40%) with a ration card reported that the ration received was sufficient.

- 49% of households who had a pregnant/lactating woman or a child aged 6-72 months.
  - One-third of them (36%) received take-home ration in the month preceding the interview.
  - Those who did not receive (60% migrant HH) mentioned reasons such as anganwadi worker did not provide, respondent did not know that take-home ration is distributed through the anganwadi centre (15%), the household name was not in the anganwadi centre list (26%), and respondent/family member could not go to the centre to take the ration because of lockdown (10%).

A larger proportion of respondents belonging to economically poor or average households, residing in rural areas, had received cash benefits from at least one social protection schemes than others.

**CASH BENEFITS RECEIVED**

- Cash from at least one SP scheme
- Rs.500 under PMJDY
- Cash benefit of Rs. 1000 as corona relief package
- Cash for migrant workers
- Pending payments under MNREGA
- Cash in lieu of mid-day meal

- More than half of the respondents (55%) received cash benefits from at least one social protection scheme.
- Two-fifths (37%) received INR 500 under Pradhan Mantri Jan Dhan Yojna (PMJDY).
- About a fifth (18%) received INR 1,000 as COVID-19 relief package.
  - 92% of these households were able to withdraw and use the money thus received.
- 38% of households had a migrant.
  - 10% of these households received cash for migrant workers.
- 20% of households had a child aged 6-14 attending a government school.
  - A little over a quarter (29% 95% CI: 22.2, 35.7) received cash in lieu of mid-day meals.
- Participants who received any cash benefits, received on average a modest amount of INR 1000 (Median).

**LIMITATIONS**

- Findings cannot be generalized to the overall situation in Bihar given the selection bias in the sample, as mentioned in the Method section.
- Given the need to keep the duration of the telephone survey short enough to ensure the quality of data, questions to assess the eligibility of respondents to avail social protection measures were not included. Therefore, findings on the coverage of the social protection measures in this brief should be taken as indicative rather than definitive.
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