

Participation and Social Assessment: Tools and Techniques

Compiled by
Jennifer Rietbergen-McCracken
Deepa Narayan

© 1998

The International Bank for Reconstruction
and Development / THE WORLD BANK
1818 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20433, U.S.A.

All rights reserved
Manufactured in the United States of America
First printing April 1998

The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in this publication are entirely those of the authors and should not be attributed in any manner to the World Bank, to its affiliated organizations, or to the members of its Board of Executive Directors or the countries they represent.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Rietbergen-McCracken, Jennifer, 1962–

Participation and Social Assessment: Tools and Techniques

/ compiled by Jennifer Rietbergen-McCracken,

Deepa Narayan.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 0-8213-4186-3

1. Economic development projects—Study and teaching. 2. Rural development—Study and teaching. 3. Community development—Study and teaching. 4. Social participation—Study and teaching.

5. Evaluation research (Social action programs) I. Narayan-Parker, Deepa. II. Title.

HD75.8.R54 1998

338.9—dc21

98-14646
CIP



The text and cover are printed on recycled paper.

The material in this kit can be photocopied and reproduced without written permission of the publisher if the original text is properly acknowledged and the objective is not for profit. If any sections of the kit are translated into other languages, please send a copy of this material to the Social Development Family of the World Bank (address on page 13).

Contents

	Foreword	viii
	Acknowledgments	ix
	Acronyms	x
Users' Notes		1
Section 1:	Introduction to the Resource Kit	3
	What is Included in the Kit?	3
	Definitions of "Participation" and "Stakeholders"	4
	How Do the Different Modules Fit Together?.....	5
	How Do the Participatory Methodologies Differ?	6
Section 2:	How to Use the Resource Kit	9
	Tips for Trainers	9
	Learning-by-Doing	9
	Learning Objectives	9
	The Trainer as a Facilitator	10
	Organizing a Training Event.....	10
	Suggested Length of Training Sessions	11
Section 3:	Resources and Contacts for Further Information	13
	Social Assessment	13
	Stakeholder Analysis	13
	Participatory Rural Appraisal	13
	Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation.....	14
	Beneficiary Assessment	14
	SARAR	15
	Internet/Web Sites	15
	Social Assessment (Module I)	17
Section 1:	Overview	19
	Social Assessment	19
	What Does Social Assessment Help Us Achieve?.....	20
	Definition: Social Analysis.....	21
	Social Assessment Process	22
	What Kinds of World Bank–Supported Operations Use Social Assessment?	24
	How Does Social Assessment Help in Different Contexts? 25	
	Social Assessment Methods Vary in Different Project Contexts	26
	Full-Size Text Boxes	27
Section 2:	Case Studies	35

	Argentina Rural Poverty Alleviation Project	35
	Azerbaijan Baku Water Supply Project	38
	Balochistan Primary Education Project	41
	El Salvador Basic Education Project	43
Section 3:	Suggestions for Seminars	45
	Sample Agenda	45
	Small Group Work: Designing a Social Assessment	47
	Common Questions in Social Assessment	48
	Role Play of a Participatory Process for Designing a Social Assessment	49
	Designing a Social Assessment for a Historic City Rehabilitation Project.....	50
	Stakeholder Analysis (Module II)	63
Section 1:	Overview	65
	Why Do a Stakeholder Analysis?	65
	What Is a Stakeholder Analysis?	66
	Stakeholder Analysis: A Four-Step Process	67
	Step 1. Identify Key Stakeholders	67
	Step 2. Assess Stakeholder Interests and the Potent- tial Impact of the Project on These Interests	68
	Step 3. Assess Stakeholder Influence and Importance	69
	Step 4. Outline a Stakeholder Participation Strategy	70
	Methods for Stakeholder Analysis.....	71
	Stakeholder Analysis Matrices	72
	Full-Size Text Boxes	77
Section 2:	Techniques	89
	Stakeholder Analysis Matrices	90
	Stakeholder Workshops	94
Section 3:	Case Studies	99
	India Ecodevelopment Project	99
	Nigeria STD/AIDS Prevention Project	105
	Case Study: Ukraine Coal Pilot Project.....	108
Section 4:	Suggestions for Seminars	113
	Sample Agenda	113
	Small Group Work	115
	Small Group Work Assignment.....	116
	Participatory Rural Appraisal (Module III)	121
Section 1:	Overview	123
	Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA)	123
	How Participatory?	124

	Key Principles	125
	Key Techniques	126
	Range of Uses in World Bank Work	127
	Some Limitations and Risks	128
	Organizational and Logistical Issues	129
	PRA and Surveys Compared	130
	Full-Size Text Boxes	131
Section 2:	Techniques	141
	Sequencing and Combining Techniques	141
	Value of the Visual Techniques	141
	Semi-Structured Interviewing/Conversational Interviewing.....	143
	Participatory Mapping	145
	Institutional Mapping	147
	Problem Ranking.....	149
	Preference Ranking	152
	Wealth Ranking	154
	Seasonal Calendars	157
	Daily Activity Charts	159
Section 3:	Case Studies	161
	Estonia Agriculture Project	161
	India Ecodevelopment Project	164
	Jamaica Urban Poverty and Violence Study.....	173
	Mali Livestock Development Strategy Formulation	177
	Zambia Participatory Poverty Assessment	180
Section 4:	Suggestions for Seminars	183
	Sample Agenda	183
	Small Group Work: Experimenting with Some PRA Techniques.....	185
	Small Group Work: Designing a PRA	187
	Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (Module IV)	189
Section 1:	Overview	191
	Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation.....	191
	Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: Key Principles	192
	Participatory and Conventional Approaches to Monitoring and Evaluation Compared	193
	The Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation Cycle	194
	Key Stages in Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation	195
	Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: Some Practical Questions	196
	Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: Some Methods	197
	Full-Size Text Boxes	198

Section 2:	Techniques	205
	Additional Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation	
	Techniques	206
	Visual Self-Evaluation Tools	207
	Testimonials	210
	Photographing the Evidence	212
	Community Records and Indicators	214
Section 3:	Case Studies	217
	Self-Evaluations by Implementing Organizations in a	
	Livestock Development Program in Bolivia	217
	Self-Assessment by Women Beneficiaries of Micro-	
	enterprise Management Training Program in India	220
	Monitoring Community Use of Project Goods and Services	
	in Nepal	223
	Community-Based Monitoring in an Ecodevelopment	
	Project in Sri Lanka	226
	Monitoring the Impacts of Structural Adjustment	
	in Zambia	231
Section 4:	Suggestions for Seminars	235
	Sample Agenda	235
	Informal Exercise: Why People Resist Change	237
	Small Group Work: Sri Lanka Case	238
	Small Group Work: Sri Lanka Case—Background	
	Material	239
	Small Group Work: Designing a Participatory	
	M&E System	240
	Handout on Participatory Evaluation Using SARAR A	
	Techniques	241
	A Hypothetical Participatory Evaluation Workshop—	
	SARAR Techniques Feature in Project Staff’s	
	Mid-Term Review of Rural Roads Project	242
	Beneficiary Assessment (Module V)	253
Section 1:	Overview	255
	Beneficiary Assessment	255
	Key Features	256
	Key Techniques	257
	Range of Uses in World Bank Work	259
	Organizational and Logistical Issues	260
	Some Limitations and Risks	261
	Full-Size Text Boxes	262
Section 2:	Techniques	269
	Sampling	269
	Focus Group Discussions	270

	Participant Observation	274
Section 3:	Case Studies	277
	Angola Water Supply and Sanitation Assessment	277
	Senegal National Agricultural Extension Project	280
	Turkey Basic Education Project	283
	Zambia Social Recovery Fund	286
Section 4:	Suggestions for Seminars	289
	Sample Agenda	289
	Small Group Work: Experimenting with Interviewing	291
	Small Group Work: Designing a Beneficiary Assessment ...	292
	SARAR (Module VI)	293
Section 1:	Overview	295
	SARAR	295
	SARAR Methodology: How Participatory?	296
	Key Principles	297
	Categories of Techniques	298
	SARAR: Some Key Techniques	299
	Uses in World Bank Work	300
	Some Limitations and Risks	301
	Organizational and Logistical Issues	302
	Full-Size Text Boxes	303
Section 2:	Techniques	313
	Sequencing and Appropriate Combinations of Techniques	313
	Pocket Charts	314
	Three Pile Sorting	316
	Story with a Gap	318
	Force-Field Analysis	320
	Gender Analysis—Access to Resources	323
	Nonserial Posters	326
	Software-Hardware Game	327
Section 3:	Case Studies	331
	Bolivia Water Supply and Sanitation Project	331
	Indonesia Water Supply and Sanitation Project	334
	Nepal Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Project	337
	Tanzania Participatory Poverty Assessment	340
Section 4:	Suggestions for Seminars	343
	Sample Agenda	343
	Small Group Work: Experimenting with Selected SARAR Techniques	345
	Force-Field Analysis	345
	Software-Hardware Game	346
	Small Group Work: Designing a SARAR Application	347

Foreword

In every village and every urban slum that I have visited around the world, I have been profoundly moved and impressed by the spirit, will, creativity, and determination of people to live and provide for their families, even in the most difficult circumstances. Our challenge as outsiders is to find ways of tapping and unleashing the inherent creativity of people to mobilize resources, come together, and solve their own problems.

It is now commonly accepted that participatory approaches and partnerships in development are essential for improving the livelihoods of the poor. I am pleased that the Social Development and Poverty Reduction groups in the World Bank have collaborated with so many people inside and outside the Bank to pull together methods for supporting the participation of the poor in various social and political contexts.

I commend the cooperative work of the people and groups who have developed these materials, and who continue to translate theory and concepts into operational tools. It is through results on the ground that we will make a difference in the lives of the poor. I encourage others to do the same.

James D. Wolfensohn
President
The World Bank
April 1998

Acknowledgments

This resource kit was jointly developed by the Social Development Family in the Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development Network, and the Poverty Group of the Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Network of the World Bank, with the participation of many World Bank staff. The toolkit is a revised and updated version of *Participatory Tools and Techniques: A Resource Kit for Participation and Social Assessment*, distributed in June 1997.

This work was carried out under the overall supervision of Deepa Narayan and Gloria Davis. A number of people, World Bank staff and external consultants, contributed significant portions of some of the modules, including Sue Jacobs, Mary Schmidt (Social Assessment module), Paul Francis, Claude Salem (Stakeholder Analysis module), Al Fernandez (Participatory Rural Appraisal module), Lyra Srinivasan, Jacob Pfohl (SARAR module), Lawrence Salmen (Beneficiary Assessment module), and Françoise Coupal (Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation module).

The case studies also draw on the work and writing of people both inside and outside the World Bank, including Maria Elena Castro, Chona Cruz, Jim Edgerton, John Hall, Steen Jorgensen, Ratna Josodipoero, Mary Judd, Ernest Massiah, Betsy McGean, Michael Mertaugh, Caroline Moser, Jessica Mott, Miranda Munro, Deepa Narayan, Andy Norton, Valeria Junho Pena, Jacob Pfohl, Jacomina de Regt, Caroline Robb, Jennifer Sara, Franz Schorosch, Moses Thompson, Denise Vaillancourt, Tosca Van Vijfeijken, and Julia Weissman. In addition, the participatory monitoring and evaluation module draws on the work of other agencies: ActionAid-Nepal; Heifer Project International; Brandeis University, USA, with the government of Sri Lanka; Clark University, USA, with Egerton University, Kenya; and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Thanks go to these agencies for sharing their experiences.

Patti Petesch provided editorial support, Nona Sachdeva and Fana Abraha assisted in the initial formatting of the text, and Tomoko Hirata was responsible for the design and artwork.

The series of training sessions on which the modules are based was funded by the World Bank Learning and Leadership Center and the World Bank Environment Department's Social Policy Division, now the Social Development Family of the Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development Network of the World Bank. Development of this resource kit was financed by the Swedish International Development Authority Trust Fund, and the Social Development Family and the Poverty Group.

Acronyms

AIDS	Acquired Immuno-Deficiency Syndrome
BA	Beneficiary Assessment
ESSD	Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development
ESW	Economic and Sector Work
GTZ	Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
IDA	International Development Association
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NGO	Nongovernmental Organization
ODA	Overseas Development Administration (now known as Department for International Development)
PME	Participatory Monitoring and Assessment
PPA	Participatory Poverty Assessment
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
PREM	Poverty Reduction and Economic Management
PROWESS	Promotion of the Role of Women in Water and Environmental Sanitation Services
SARAR	Self-Esteem, Associative Strength, Resourcefulness, Action Planning, and Responsibility for Follow-through
SIDA	Swedish International Development Authority
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WHO	World Health Organization

Users' Notes

Section 1: Introduction to the Resource Kit

The resource kit aims to share information and experiences on participatory methods in order to support the adoption of participatory approaches in World Bank–supported projects and studies. The materials included in the kit have been selected to provide the core essential information about the different methods and applications, with the primary focus on providing practical guidance and case examples.

Two audiences have been kept in mind in developing the kit: first, World Bank staff both in headquarters and the field who are interested in learning more about the use of participatory methods and social assessment; and second, trainers both within and outside the World Bank who are looking for support material to assist them in designing and delivering training events on participation and social assessment.

What is Included in the Kit?

This resource kit consists of modules on the following topics:

- ♦ **Social Assessment:** a methodology for incorporating an analysis of social issues and developing a framework for stakeholder participation in the design of a project;
- ♦ **Stakeholder Analysis:** a methodology for identifying and analyzing the key stakeholders in a project, and planning for their participation;
- ♦ **Participatory Methodologies:** a set of three methodologies for consulting and collaborating with local-level stakeholders—
 - Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA)
 - Self-esteem, Associative strength, Resourcefulness, Action planning, and Responsibility (SARAR)
 - Beneficiary Assessment (BA); and
- ♦ **Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation:** an important but often ignored application of participatory techniques.

The modules include the following four sections:

Overview: an introductory presentation of the module’s methodology or approach, including definitions, key principles, core tools, limitations, and logistical considerations.

Techniques: a sample of the trademark techniques and tools, with very brief guidelines for their use and short examples of their applications in the field (the Social Assessment module does not have a separate section on techniques, as this approach draws on the participatory techniques described in the other modules).

Case Studies: a collection of four or five cases, largely of World Bank–supported operations, where the methodology has been applied, showing the process and techniques involved, the difficulties and limitations that were encountered, and the outputs and impact of the work.

Suggestions for Seminars: a sample agenda of a one-day training seminar with suggestions for experiential exercises and discussion points for small group breakout sessions.

In addition to the six modules, a video is included in the kit. This is a compilation of three participation-related videos produced in the context of World Bank operations:

Participation and the World Bank's Work: Learning To Get Better At It includes footage of several participatory projects and interviews with many World Bank staff sharing their personal views about participation and how the World Bank is addressing this issue.

The Poverty Experts: A Participatory Poverty Assessment in Tanzania documents a participatory initiative in Tanzania, where 85 poor communities are actively involved in an assessment of the nation's poverty. The film highlights some striking differences between the perspectives of the poor and the results of a more traditional survey.

Groundwork: Participatory Research for Girls' Education tells the story of a Participatory Rural Appraisal exercise on girls' education in The Gambia. The film provides a close-up view of how outside researchers can facilitate a community's own analysis of problems and solutions to ensure follow-up action by the local people after the the study is finished.

Definitions of "Participation" and "Stakeholders"

The terms *participation* and *stakeholders*, as used in this kit, are defined as follows:

Participation is "a process through which stakeholders influence and share control over development initiatives, decisions and resources which affect them."¹ Participation can take different forms, ranging from information-sharing and consultation methods, to mechanisms for collaboration and empowerment that give stakeholders more influence and control.

Stakeholders, in the context of World Bank–supported activities, are "those affected by the outcome—negatively or positively—or those who can affect the outcome of a proposed intervention."² Stakeholders can include:

¹ The World Bank, 1994, "The World Bank and Participation," Operations Policy Department, Washington, D.C.

² The World Bank, 1996, *The World Bank Participation Sourcebook*, Environmentally Sustainable Development, Washington, D.C.

Borrowers (elected officials, line agency staff, local government officials, and so on); directly affected groups (including the poor and disadvantaged); indirectly affected groups (such as NGOs and private sector organizations); and the World Bank management, staff, and shareholders.

How Do the Different Modules Fit Together?

While the approaches and methodologies included in the kit are presented as separate modules, there is extensive overlap among many of them. Indeed, the different methodologies are often combined in practice, using a selection of complementary participatory techniques. Below is an overview and diagram (Figure 1) of the modules to highlight how they connect together.


Social Assessment provides a framework for incorporating participation and social analysis into the design and delivery of World Bank–assisted projects and economic and sector work (ESW).³ Social Assessments focus on issues of operational relevance, prioritize critical issues from among the many social variables that potentially affect a project's impacts and success, and recommend how to address those issues to ensure that implementation arrangements take into consideration key social and institutional concerns. In this regard, a Social Assessment may be undertaken at the very beginning of a development intervention to set the framework for subsequent participatory efforts. As such, Social Assessments can contribute to the development of participatory approaches in particular operations, as well as focus attention on important social issues that need to be taken into account in the design and implementation of the operations.

Stakeholder Analysis is the starting point of most participatory work or Social Assessments. Stakeholder Analysis addresses the fundamental questions of: (i) Who are the key stakeholders in the project or study being undertaken or proposed? (ii) What are the interests of these stakeholders? (iii) How will they be affected by the project? (iv) How influential are the different stakeholders? and (v) Which stakeholders are most important for the success of the project? When undertaken within the context of a Social Assessment, a Stakeholder Analysis can contribute to more in-depth analysis of the project's social and institutional context. And, when undertaken prior to other participatory efforts, a Stakeholder Analysis can go as far as developing a participation strategy—including the identification of appropriate forms of involvement for the different stakeholder groups—based on an analysis of their interests in, influence on, and importance to the project.

A participatory approach to project work can be applied during all or some of the stages of the intervention, from the time of planning to implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. In any of these stages, the three participatory methodologies described in this kit—PRA, SARAR, and BA—can be used. The key distinctions

³ Economic and sector work (ESW) is the term used to denote the non-lending work of the World Bank, including studies and research not directly related to projects.

between these three methodologies are shown in Table 1 below. **Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation** is one particular application of these methodologies in which a range of stakeholders (and particularly local-level stakeholders) are involved in an assessment of a project, policy intervention, or institution as part of an ongoing monitoring effort or in a final evaluation of the work.



How Do the Participatory Methodologies Differ?

The three methodologies featured in the kit can be thought of as three *packages* of participatory techniques. The packages differ in how they have been developed (by whom and for what purpose) and, to some extent, in how they have been applied in the field. Nevertheless, the participatory *techniques* that comprise the packages are similar and complementary, and can be “mixed and matched” together for any one piece of participatory work. Indeed, some of the best participatory efforts have combined the most appropriate techniques from the various methodologies so that the end result is not a “pure” PRA, BA, or SARAR, but a customized mixture of these and other participatory packages.

As outlined in Table 1, PRA, BA, and SARAR have quite different origins. PRA was developed in the late 1980s largely by NGOs and research institutions in Asia and Africa as well as by similar groups in Europe and the United States. The precursors of PRA include Rapid Rural Appraisal and Agroecosystems Analysis,

methodologies concerned with learning about rural communities and rural people's livelihoods, and with addressing social as well as physical conditions at the community level. PRA was developed as development practitioners and researchers became more aware of the importance of involving local people in these analyses to enable communities to communicate with project staff and decisionmakers on their own terms. It is the use of visual techniques, developed by the community members themselves during such *locally led analyses*, that is the trademark of PRA work. PRA has often been used as a means of facilitating the development of community-led action plans.

In contrast, BA was developed in the early 1980s during World Bank-supported studies of urban slums in Latin America. BA has its origins in anthropology, psychology, and action research, and is primarily concerned with listening and giving voice to the poor beneficiaries of development projects. BA makes use of *verbal* techniques to facilitate a *dialogue* with local people, while analysis of the collected information remains the responsibility of the outside researchers. BA also stresses the need to involve high-level decisionmakers in designing and implementing the consultations with beneficiaries; their participation helps to ensure that the feedback obtained will have a direct impact on the interventions and policies under consideration.

For its part, SARAR was developed in Asia in the late 1970s by a mother-and-son team (Lyra and Chris Srinivasan) working in poor communities in the Philippines, India, and Indonesia. SARAR is derived from human growth approaches in psychology and education. The methodology has been used mostly for purposes of raising awareness and empowering communities to plan local-level development activities and to organize for the implementation of these activities. Like PRA, visual aids are used to stimulate discussion and facilitate decisionmaking by the communities; but, in the case of SARAR, the drawings are usually prepared in advance rather than by the participants during the course of the event. In addition to its use in community-level settings, SARAR has also been used at an agency level to facilitate a joint analysis by staff at all levels, and to help reorient and train staff in the adoption of more participatory approaches.

Notwithstanding these differences in origin, the methodologies have been applied in very similar ways: all have been used in economic and sector work (ESW) as well as in projects, and during the different stages of the project cycle. While BA has traditionally been applied to obtain feedback for monitoring and reorienting a project already under way, and PRA and SARAR have been used most often up front for planning purposes, these distinctions are now blurring. And, while community-level applications remain the most common, all of these methodologies have been put to use successfully at an institutional level as well. For more information on the methodologies, please refer to the modules and the recommended reading section at the end of this booklet.

**Table 1. Participatory Methodologies Compared:
Participatory Rural Appraisal, Beneficiary Assessment, and SARAR**

	PRA	BA	SARAR
Origins			
• Where	Rural communities, Asia, Africa	Urban slums, Latin America	Rural communities, Asia
• Institutional context	NGOs	World Bank	Mother-and-son team, then further developed with UNDP, UNICEF
Influences	Rapid Rural Appraisal, Agroecosystem Analysis	Anthropology, Action Research	Education, Psychology
Outsiders' Roles	Facilitating local people's own analysis and informing decisionmakers	Listening to the local people and making their voice heard by decisionmakers	Raising local people's awareness (their problems, opportunities, responsibilities) and facilitating their planning
Verbal/ Key Techniques	Visual: Developed by local people, including mapping, ranking, seasonal and historical analyses	Verbal: Conversational interviews, focus groups, participant observation	Visual: Local people and prepared drawings, card sorting, ranking, gender analysis

Section 2: How to Use the Resource Kit

Readers are encouraged to dip into this kit to find what interests them. Cover-to-cover reading is not required! For those readers who are looking for materials to use in training courses and seminars, the sections in the modules are designed for use either as handout sheets to give participants or as presentation material for a trainer's own use. For example, the Overview section of each module has been designed for use in a brief introductory presentation—with the notes accompanying the text box on each page providing the trainers with background information for their presentation, or materials for the participants. At the end of each Overview section, the text boxes are repeated in full-size so trainers can easily photocopy these onto transparency sheets for use with an overhead projector. The two sections on Techniques and Case Studies will provide trainers with more detailed background on the approaches and methodologies, and can form the basis of presentations on how these methods have been applied in a range of situations. Finally, the sections in each module on Suggestions for Seminars offer further ideas for the design of training sessions.

The material in the kit represents only a basic introduction to the approaches and methodologies. Trainers are encouraged to supplement the information here with their own experiences. In particular, trainers may know of other case studies that may be more relevant to the region or sector with which their workshop participants are familiar.

Tips for Trainers

Learning-by-Doing

As the sample agendas in the modules suggest, the training seminars on participatory methodologies and approaches are best done in an experiential manner. That is, participants should be given the opportunity to learn-by-doing, even if there is no opportunity for actually practicing the techniques in the field. Instead, simulation exercises can be performed in the classroom, using hypothetical or real-life cases, role plays, and hands-on use of the techniques to give participants a feel for how the methodologies are applied. These sessions can be combined with brief presentations and discussions.

Learning Objectives

The objective of most training courses on participatory approaches and methodologies, particularly classroom-based seminars for World Bank staff, is not to equip participants with all of the skills needed to go out and use these methods in the field. Rather, the learning objective is usually to familiarize participants with the methods, enabling them to understand:

- ◆ what the methodology has to offer;
- ◆ how it compares with alternative methodologies;
- ◆ what kinds of questions and issues the methodology can address;
- ◆ what kinds of outputs they can expect from the methodology;
- ◆ what inputs (time, funds, skills, attitudes, training, logistical support) would be required to undertake the methodology; and
- ◆ how to go about designing, implementing, and supervising the use of this methodology by others (for example, consultants and staff from NGOs, research institutions, and government agencies).

The Trainer as a Facilitator

The participatory nature of the training seminars suggested here requires the trainer to play a facilitatory role that encourages participants to learn-by-doing rather than by simply listening. Clearly, trainers will need to have the necessary ability and aptitude to play this role, as well as experience in the actual methodology or approach on which the seminar is focused. A facilitator needs to create a flexible and relaxed environment in which participants can share control over the training and contribute to the learning themselves. The kinds of capabilities and attributes needed to be an effective trainer and facilitator include:

- ◆ a warm personality, with an ability to show approval and acceptance of trainees;
- ◆ good social and leadership skills, especially an ability to bring the group together and exercise control without overpowering the process;
- ◆ a manner of teaching that generates and uses the ideas and skills of the participants;
- ◆ a careful organizer so that resource materials are well presented and logistical arrangements smoothly handled;
- ◆ skill in noticing and resolving participants' problems;
- ◆ enthusiasm for the subject and capacity to convey the information in an interesting way;
- ◆ flexibility in responding to participants' changing needs; and
- ◆ knowledge of the subject matter.⁴

Organizing a Training Event

In putting together a training event, the trainer will need to be sure that everything is in place, from the extending of invitations to the participants to the arrangements for coffee and cookies during the session. A checklist of some key concerns in preparing for a training workshop include:

⁴ Adapted from J. Rogers, 1989, "Adults Learning," Open University Press, Milton Keynes, U.K., cited in J. N. Pretty et al., 1995, *Participatory Learning and Action: A Trainer's Guide*, the International Institute for Environment and Development, London.

- ◆ Are you clear about the overall training objectives?
- ◆ What are your specific training objectives?
- ◆ Have you reached an agreement with co-trainers about the division of roles, training objectives, the program, and training styles?
- ◆ What are the main characteristics of the likely participants?
- ◆ Have you adapted your schedule to the time of year when the training workshop is being held?
- ◆ Have you planned your sessions taking into account the time of day when they will take place?
- ◆ Have you prepared the sessions to include an introduction, main section, and summary?
- ◆ Have you planned your sessions to include a variety of learning methods?
- ◆ Have you identified clearly the “golden nuggets” that you wish to communicate to the participants?
- ◆ Are you aware of your style of intonation, articulation, and expression?
- ◆ Are you planning to use several techniques to calm yourself before the session starts?
- ◆ Have you planned for question and answer sessions?
- ◆ Are the room and seating arrangements suitable for your session?
- ◆ Have you planned for changes in seating arrangements?
- ◆ Have you checked all of the electrical equipment you will use?
- ◆ Have you prepared all of the audiovisual aids that you will require, without overdoing it?
- ◆ Have you planned an evaluation for your session or workshop?⁵

Suggested Length of Training Sessions

Ideally, a period of one day or more should be allocated for training seminars dedicated to one technique or application in order to allow participants to become familiar with the practical issues involved. Time is also needed for some experiential learning in addition to presentations and discussions. Where the training seminars are being conducted in-country, there may be possibilities for including some actual fieldwork, with participants testing several techniques in a nearby community, or taking field trips to observe the use of these techniques as part of the ongoing work within a project.

Sample agendas are provided in each module for one-day training sessions to give some idea of what is feasible in this time frame. Suggestions are also provided for possible formats of small group work within these agendas. In some cases, additional case study or activity material is provided for use in longer training sessions and follow-up training events. Again, trainers are encouraged to adapt the seminars to the needs and experiences of the participants.

⁵ *Ibid.*

Section 3: Resources and Contacts for Further Information

The following information is included to assist you in ordering the publications or contacting the resource staff mentioned in this toolkit. The toolkit was jointly developed by the:

Social Development Family
Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development (ESSD) Network
The World Bank
1818 H Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20433 USA
Telephone: 202-473-3675
Fax: 202-522-3247
E-mail: ctumale@worldbank.org

Poverty Group
Poverty Reduction and Economic Management (PREM) Network
The World Bank
1818 H Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20433 USA
Telephone: 202-473-9475
Fax: 202-522-3283
E-mail: plizarondo@worldbank.org

To order additional copies of this toolkit and other World Bank publications, contact:

The World Bank
Box 7247-8619
Philadelphia, PA 19170-8619 USA
Telephone: 703-661-1580
Fax: 703-661-1501
E-mail: books@worldbank.org
World Wide Web: <http://www.worldbank.org/>

To contact World Bank staff by telephone, call the World Bank operator at 202-477-1234 or use the general World Bank fax number: 202-477-6391. To contact most World Bank staff by e-mail, combine the first initial of the first name and the full last name and then add @worldbank.org. For example, the e-mail address for Cristina Tumale is: ctumale@worldbank.org.

For additional assistance, contact the Social Development Family through the Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development (ESSD) Network Advisory Service at Telephone: 202-522-3773, Fax: 202-522-2243, E-mail: eadvisor@worldbank.org.

Social Assessment

Finsterbursch, K., J. Ingersoll, and L. Llewellyn. 1990. *Methods for Social Analysis in Developing Countries*. Boulder: Westview Press. ISBN 0-81337-82-9X.

Overseas Development Administration. 1995. *A Guide to Social Analysis for Projects in Developing Countries*. London. ISBN 0-11-580258-4.

World Bank. 1996. *Guidelines for Using Social Assessments to Support Public Involvement in World Bank-GEF Projects*. Environment Department, Global Environment Division, Washington, DC.

Stakeholder Analysis

Overseas Development Administration. 1995. *Guidance Note on How To Do Stakeholder Analysis of Aid Projects and Programmes*. Social Development Department, London.

U.S. Agency for International Development. 1992. *Stakeholder Analysis: A Vital Tool for Strategic Managers*. Implementing Policy Change Project, Washington, DC.

Participatory Rural Appraisal

Chambers, Robert. 1992. *Rural Appraisal: Rapid, Relaxed and Participatory*. Institute of Development Studies (University of Brighton), IDS Discussion Paper No. 311, Sussex.

Pretty, Jules N., et al., 1995. *Participatory Learning and Action: A Trainer's Guide*. International Institute for Environment and Development, London. ISBN 1-899825-00-2.

Schönhuth, M., and U. Kievelitz. 1994. *Participatory Learning Approaches: Rapid Rural Appraisal, Participatory Appraisal. An Introductory Guide*. German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ), Frankfurt. ISBN 3-980167-5-6.

Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation

Aubel, Judi. 1993. *Participatory Program Evaluation: A Manual for Involving Program Stakeholders in the Evaluation Process*. Catholic Relief Services, Senegal. Available through PACT Publications, 777 United Nations Plaza, New York, New York 10017.

Campos, Jennie, and Francoise Coupal. *Participatory Evaluation: A Handbook for UNDP Staff*, United Nations Development Programme, Strategic Planning and Evaluation Unit, New York.

Feuerstein, Marie-Therese. 1986. *Partners in Evaluation: Evaluating Development and Community Programmes with Participants*. MacMillan Publishers Ltd. ISBN 0-333-42261-9. Distributed by Teaching Aids at Low Cost, P.O. Box 49, St. Albans, Hertfordshire, AL1 4AX, UK.

Narayan, Deepa. 1993. *Participatory Evaluation: Tools for Managing Change in Water and Sanitation*. World Bank Technical Paper No. 207, Washington, DC.

Beneficiary Assessment

Salmen, Lawrence. 1995. *Beneficiary Assessment: An Approach Described*. World Bank, Environment Department, Social Assessment Series Paper No. 23, Washington, DC.

Salmen, Lawrence. 1987. *Listen to the People: Participant Observation Evaluation of Development Projects*. New York: Oxford University Press. ISBN 0-19-520545-6.

SARAR

Narayan, Deepa. 1996. *Towards Participatory Research*. World Bank Technical Paper No. 307, Washington, DC. ISBN 0-8213-3473-5.

Narayan, Deepa, and Lyra Srinivasan. 1994. *Participatory Development Toolkit: Training Materials for Agencies and Communities*. World Bank, Washington, DC. ISBN 0-8213-2687-2. This consists of a guidebook and accompanying visual training materials in a "briefcase" style toolkit.

Srinivasan, Lyra. 1990. *Tools for Community Participation: A Manual for Training Trainers in Participatory Techniques*. United Nations Development Programme, PROWESS/UNDP Technical Series, New York. Available through PACT Publications, 777 United Nations Plaza, New York, New York 10017.

Internet/Web Sites

Electronic Development and Environment Information System (ELDIS)

This page, hosted by the British Library for Development Studies, contains a variety of information sources including websites, databases, library catalogs, bibliographies, e-mail discussion lists, research project information, and map and newspaper collections. The subject areas covered include: participation, development economics, children, development education, food security, gender, statistics, forestry, health, climate, development aid, disasters, refugees, waste management, and environmental monitoring.

E-mail: blds.eldis@sussex.ac.uk

Internet: <http://nt1.ids.ac.uk/eldis/eldis.htm>

Institute of Development Studies (IDS)

The IDS site includes information on PRA and participation from the Institute of Development Studies, Sussex. It includes full text of an introduction to PRA, listing of country contacts or networks for 55 countries, a set of topic-based abstracts on participation (see separate entry), information on PRA activities and publications from IDS.

Address:

University of Sussex, Falmer

Institute of Development Studies, PRA

Brighton BN1 9RE, UK

Tel: 01273 606261

Fax: 01273 621202

E-mail: Information management and support, Heidi Attwood:

h.attwood@sussex.ac.uk

Networking and South-South interactions, Kamal Singh: k.l.singh@sussex.ac.uk

Workshops and liaison, Robert Chambers: qdef9@sussex.ac.uk

Research, John Gaventa: n.beard@sussex.ac.uk

Internet: <http://www.ids.ac.uk/pramain.html>

<http://nt1.ids.ac.uk/eldis/pramain.html> (for PRA bibliography)

International Association for Public Participation (IAP2)

This group publishes a quarterly newsletter and a semi-annual journal that feature interviews and news on public participation, case studies, announcements for trainings and conferences, state-of-the-art techniques and national and international trends. The IAP2 bookstore offers an extensive selection of both IAP2 and non-IAP2 publications for sale. The organization maintains a membership directory and a training directory that identifies the individuals and organizations that provide training in public participation by country, region, and topic.

Address:
 IAP2
 PO Box 10146
 Alexandria, VA 22310, USA
 Tel: 1-800-644-4273 (inside North America)
 Tel: 703-971-0090 (outside North America)
 Fax: 703-971-0006
 E-mail: iap2hq@pin.org
 Internet: <http://www.pin.org/iap2.htm>

International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)

IIED is an NGO promoting sustainable patterns of world development through research, training, policy studies, consensus building and public information. IIED operates seven programs: Environmental Planning and Management; Human Settlements; Sustainable Agriculture; Forestry and Land Use; Drylands Environmental Economics, including Collaborative Research in the Economics of Environment and Development (CREED); and a European Program.

Address:
 International Institute for Environment and Development
 3 Endsleigh St
 London WC1H ODD, UK
 Telephone: 0171 388 2117
 Fax: 0171 388 2826
 E-mail: General: resource.centre@iied.org
 Sustainable Agriculture Program: iiedagri@gn.apc.org
 Internet: <http://www.oneworld.org/iied>

Participatory Initiatives, University of Guelph

This center for PRA materials, based at University of Guelph, has a collection of full text resources, bibliographies, methodologies, including: (1) listing of organizations; (2) a facilitator's toolbox: a compilation of techniques to foster participatory initiatives and development, and methods for work with both groups and individuals, with associated practical materials, exercises/workbooks; (3) short bibliographies on participation, facilitation, participatory learning and analysis; (4) information on the Canadian PRA/MARP network for participatory research/action, plus the Community Soundings program (community regeneration in Ontario).

Address:
 Participatory Initiatives
 88 Dublin St. N.
 Guelph, ON Canada N1H 4N1
 Tel: (519) 837-3970
 E-mail: pi@tdg.uoguelph.ca
 Internet: <http://tdg.res.uoguelph.ca:80/~pi>

USAID GP-NET - Global Participation Net

The GP-NET is a listserv which provides an opportunity for USAID staff and development practitioners around the world to exchange information, share ideas, and discuss issues related to participatory development. There are over 475 subscribers, half of which are USAID employees. Well-know scholars and practitioners as well as private consultants and graduate students make up the list of non-USAID subscribers. As well as participating in discussions on such topics as participatory evaluation, GP-NET subscribers can request advice on participation questions. GP-NET is also an archive which holds all of USAID's participation documents, including The Participatory Practices Case Study Series and the Participation Forum Summaries. To subscribe, free of charge, send a message with your internet address to Chanya Charles at:
 E-mail: ccharles@rrs.cdie.org, or ccharles@aed.org

Social Assessment

Module I

Section 1: Overview

Social Assessment Is... SOCIAL ANALYSIS + PARTICIPATION

... a *process* that provides a framework for prioritizing, gathering, analyzing, and incorporating *social information and participation* into the design and delivery of development operations.

Social Assessment is a process for ensuring that development operations (i) are informed by and take into account the key relevant social issues; and (ii) incorporate a participation strategy for involving a wide range of stakeholders.

There are many social variables that potentially affect the impacts and success of projects and policies—such as gender, age, language, displacement, and socioeconomic status. Through data collection and analysis, Social Assessments enable project planners in consultation with other stakeholders to prioritize critical issues and determine how to address them.

Social Assessments need to be selective and strategic, focusing only on those variables of operational relevance.

What Does Social Assessment Help Us Achieve?

- ◆ Identify stakeholders
- ◆ Identify and prioritize social issues such as:
 - poverty
 - age
 - ethnicity
 - gender
- ◆ Establish a participatory process

People are the reason for and the means of development. Their cultures, societies, and organizations provide the foundation on which development programs rest. People's varied needs, aspirations, beliefs, and expectations are among the factors that shape their response to development activities.

Social Assessment was developed as a tool for project planners to understand how people will affect, and be affected by, development interventions. It is carried out in order to identify key stakeholders and establish an appropriate framework for their participation in project selection, design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation.

Social Assessment also aims to ensure that project objectives and incentives for change are acceptable to the range of people who are intended to benefit from the intervention, and that project viability and risks are assessed early. Some common questions explored in Social Assessments include:

- ◆ What will be the impact of the project on the various stakeholders, particularly women and vulnerable groups? Are there plans to mitigate adverse impacts?
- ◆ What social risks might affect project or program success?
- ◆ What institutional arrangements are needed for participation and project delivery? Are there adequate plans to build the capacity required at the appropriate levels?

Definition: Social Analysis

The systematic investigation of

- ◆ demographic factors
- ◆ socioeconomic determinants
- ◆ social organization
- ◆ sociopolitical context
- ◆ needs and values
- ◆ institutions

in order to:

- ◆ account for social differences
- ◆ assess impact and risks
- ◆ mitigate adverse impacts
- ◆ build capacity of institutions and individuals

The social analysis component of a typical Social Assessment investigates one or more of the following issues.

Demographic factors: number of people, their location, population density, age, and so on.


Socioeconomic determinants: factors affecting incomes and productivity, such as risk aversion of the poorest groups, land tenure, access to productive inputs and markets, family composition, kinship reciprocity, and access to wage opportunities and labor migration.

Social organization: organization and capacity at the household and community levels affecting participation in local-level institutions as well as access to services and information.

Sociopolitical context: implementing agencies' development goals, priorities, commitment to project objectives, control over resources, experience, and relationship with other stakeholder groups.

Needs and values: stakeholder attitudes and values determining whether development interventions are needed and wanted, appropriate incentives for change, and capacity of stakeholders to manage the process of change.

With this information, Social Assessment helps project planners assess the social impact of investments and, where adverse impacts are identified, determine how they can be avoided or mitigated.



Most teams that have undertaken Social Assessment in World Bank–supported projects recommend that it begin early in the project cycle, and continue as an iterative process all the way through to monitoring and evaluation.

Conduct Stakeholder Analysis. The first step in Social Assessment is an analysis of the relevant stakeholder groups, their interests, influence, and power, and how they will be affected by the project. (See *Stakeholder Analysis Module* for further information.)

Identify social factors. Defining operationally relevant social issues that may affect project delivery and outcomes is generally done by listening to affected groups, experts, and government officials who have knowledge of the larger sociocultural, political, and economic context that can affect project design and implementation.

Gather data. The gathering of information should focus only on issues of operational relevance, and should be undertaken with as much local participation as possible. Where there is little or no local experience with social research and analysis, resources should be allocated for intensive training and supervision. Social Assessment teams should be prepared to work in local languages, and data collection methods should be appropriate for the kinds of issues to be addressed.

Analyze data and assess priorities. Data analysis should focus on answering operational questions and generating action-oriented recommendations.

Develop plans in consultation with stakeholders. Findings should be discussed with affected people to ensure that conclusions and recommendations are appropriate. A common flaw in designing Social Assessments is to allot too little time to the analysis of findings and the facilitation of stakeholder discussions on the results and their implications. One means of providing operationally relevant material is to produce an action plan, which specifies:

- ◆ what social measures and institutional arrangements are to be incorporated in the project;
- ◆ how they will be carried out and monitored;
- ◆ how changes that occur as the project is implemented will be addressed; and
- ◆ how key stakeholder groups will be involved throughout the project.

The action plan, informed by the data and analysis in the Social Assessment, should be incorporated into the overall project.

What Kinds of World Bank–Supported Operations Use Social Assessment?

Social Assessment is being used in policies or projects involving:

- ◆ indirect social benefits and direct social costs
- ◆ significant uncertainty or risk
- ◆ large number of direct beneficiaries
- ◆ targeted assistance.

Different types of operations raise very different social concerns. It is the task of the social scientist, or of the Social Assessment team, to identify the key concerns and the appropriate methods and tools for gathering, analyzing, and providing operationally relevant information for decisionmakers.

For example, a forest project involving protected areas might bring indirect benefits to all of humanity with respect to enhanced species conservation; however, the project may also involve direct social costs to local people who no longer have access to those forest resources. In such cases, promoting alternative livelihoods and building consensus on project objectives may be critical. In a project with many beneficiaries, such as a social investment fund, tailoring the operation to the needs of the people involved may be of highest priority. A project directed at the very poor, however, may involve key concerns related to distinguishing the target group from among the rest of the population, overcoming barriers to their involvement, and finding appropriate intermediaries. In a project with high risks (such as post-conflict situations), iterative planning and stakeholder participation throughout the life of the project can be crucial to success.

How Does Social Assessment Help in Different Contexts?

Type of Project/Policy	Examples	Social Attributes	Social Assessment helps to:
Indirect social benefits and direct social costs	Infrastructure, biodiversity, structural adjustment, privatization, and restructuring	Broad popular support but local costs can engender opposition; equity is a major issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Identify key stakeholders and vulnerable groups ♦ Minimize adverse impacts ♦ Develop procedures for public involvement ♦ Unify broad range of stakeholders
Significant uncertainty or risks	Transition and post-conflict interventions, planned with little participation	Solution unclear at the outset; lack of information, consensus, commitment, or capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Identify stakeholders and their priorities ♦ Provide a process for iterative planning ♦ Develop flexible solutions ♦ Build capacity for relevant social analysis and participation
Large number of beneficiaries and few social costs	Education, health, credit, agricultural extension, decentralization	Broad consensus on objectives; implementation arrangement is critical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Identify key stakeholders ♦ Action planning ♦ Focus on cost-effectiveness and appropriate delivery channels
Targeted assistance	Poverty alleviation, policies to benefit women or refugees, institutional reform	Targeted groups have little access to resources and needs cut across sectors; weak institutional linkages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Provide voice for poor and marginalized groups ♦ Participatory process for planning ♦ Build capacity

In each of the various project contexts, Social Assessment is a tool for gathering social information, understanding public values, assessing risks, and defining the priorities that require further attention and resources. By providing a forum for systematic consideration of key questions such as those below, Social Assessment enables project planners and policymakers to set priorities for development.

What is the magnitude of the project's impact? While there is no absolute definition of large or small, gathering information about the number of people or the size of the geographic area affected provides a useful perspective to focus attention on impacts of the greatest magnitude.

Are there equity implications? Regardless of the magnitude of impacts, special attention should be given to the effects of projects on disadvantaged populations. Projects that lead to disproportionate harm to these groups should be reconsidered; proactive mitigation measures or fundamental redesign may be needed.

Are there serious social risks that threaten implementation or project success? The World Bank as a stakeholder has a responsibility to identify social issues or conflicts that may lead to project failure.

Social Assessment Methods Vary in Different Project Contexts

- ◆ Workshop-based methods
- ◆ Participatory assessment methods

Social Assessment may be carried out by a single social scientist, who contacts the key stakeholders and completes the assessment; or, in cases that are complex or require more systematic participation, a team may undertake the work. Social Assessment activities can take place throughout the project cycle, but the integration of social factors into project design works best when it begins at the identification stage. The methods for social analysis and participation that are most commonly used include:

Workshop-based Methods. Collaborative decisionmaking often takes place in the context of stakeholder workshops, which bring stakeholders together to assess issues and design development projects collaboratively. A trained facilitator guides stakeholders through a series of activities to promote shared learning and problem-solving.¹

Participatory Assessment Methods. Social Assessments can also be informed by field visits to communities and other key local-level stakeholders to learn about their perspectives and priorities. The consultations make use of participatory assessment methodologies, such as Participatory Rural Appraisal, SARAR, or Beneficiary Assessment.² These methodologies provide tools for collaborating with local people in analysis and planning, and can contribute to the development of action plans and participation strategies.

¹ Objectives-Oriented Project Planning (ZOPP) and PC/TeamUp are useful methods for achieving these goals in a workshop setting. Another method, involving the role play of a stakeholder workshop to design a Social Assessment, is included in the Suggestions for Seminars section of this module.

² See separate modules on these three methodologies.

Social Assessment

An Overview

Social Assessment Is... SOCIAL ANALYSIS + PARTICIPATION

... a process that provides a framework for prioritizing, gathering, analyzing, and incorporating social information and participation into the design and delivery of development operations.

What Does Social Assessment Help Us Achieve?

- ◆ Identify stakeholders
- ◆ Identify and prioritize social issues such as:
 - poverty
 - age
 - ethnicity
 - gender
- ◆ Establish a participatory process


Definition: Social Analysis

The systematic investigation of

- ◆ demographic factors
- ◆ socioeconomic determinants
- ◆ social organization
- ◆ sociopolitical context
- ◆ needs and values
- ◆ institutional capacity

in order to:

- ◆ account for social differences
- ◆ assess impact and risks
- ◆ mitigate adverse impacts
- ◆ build capacity of institutions and individuals



What Kinds of World Bank–Supported Operations Use Social Assessment?

Social Assessment is being used in policies or projects involving:

- ◆ indirect social benefits and direct social costs
- ◆ significant uncertainty or risk
- ◆ large number of direct beneficiaries
- ◆ targeted assistance.

How Does Social Assessment Help in Different Contexts?

Type of Project/Policy	Examples	Social Attributes	Social Assessment helps to:
Indirect social benefits and direct social costs	Infrastructure, biodiversity, structural adjustment, privatization, and restructuring	Broad popular support but local costs can engender opposition; equity is a major issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Identify key stakeholders and vulnerable groups ◆ Minimize adverse impacts ◆ Develop procedures for public involvement ◆ Unify broad range of stakeholders
Significant uncertainty or risks	Transition and post-conflict interventions, planned with little participation	Solution unclear at the outset; lack of information, consensus, commitment, or capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Identify stakeholders and their priorities ◆ Provide a process for iterative planning ◆ Develop flexible solutions ◆ Build capacity for relevant social analysis and participation
Large number of beneficiaries and few social costs	Education, health, credit, agricultural extension, decentralization	Broad consensus on objectives; implementation arrangement is critical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Identify key stakeholders ◆ Action planning ◆ Focus on cost-effectiveness and appropriate delivery channels
Targeted assistance	Poverty alleviation, policies to benefit women or refugees, institutional reform	Targeted groups have little access to resources and needs cut across sectors; weak institutional linkages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Provide voice for poor and marginalized groups ◆ Participatory process for planning ◆ Build capacity

Social Assessment Methods Vary in Different Project Contexts

- ◆ Workshop-based methods
- ◆ Participatory assessment methods

Section 2: Case Studies

Case Study: Argentina Rural Poverty Alleviation Project

Key Features:

- ◆ Workshop approach to Social Assessment;
- ◆ Use of Participatory Rural Appraisal findings to give focus to a subsequent questionnaire-based survey; and
- ◆ Strong participation by poor rural communities.

Context:

An assessment conducted in 1994 revealed that between 36 and 42 percent (and as high as 70 percent in some areas) of the rural population of Argentina lives in poverty, and that the rural poor is a very heterogeneous group. Preparation of the Rural Poverty Alleviation Project focused on assessing the needs of the various types of rural poor and developing efficient mechanisms for channeling resources to them. In this context, a Social Assessment helped to identify the potential strengths and weaknesses of state agencies, local governments, community-based organizations, and NGOs to implement the various project components.

Objectives:

The objectives of the Social Assessment were to:

- ◆ identify key characteristics of the rural poor;
- ◆ identify the needs and demands of different poor groups;
- ◆ gain understanding of the survival strategies and coping mechanisms of the rural poor;
- ◆ define a menu of possible activities that could be supported through a poverty alleviation project;
- ◆ identify existing community organizations and poverty reduction programs; and
- ◆ develop a framework for beneficiary participation and feedback.

Process:

The Social Assessment consisted of three sets of activities. First, a series of regional workshops was held with beneficiaries and intermediary organizations to elicit their perspectives on poverty-related issues. Provincial coordinators of an existing government program selected workshop participants, with the understanding that they should represent a broad spectrum of the rural economy. These coordinators also identified potential workshop sites. The cost of the workshops approached US\$150,000, of which 80 percent was provided by the government.

Subsequently, three local consultants produced studies on NGOs, poverty, and problems of government service delivery in rural areas in order to cross-check and supplement the results of the workshops.

Finally, the results generated from the workshops were used to give direction and focus to a subsequent survey of 1,000 households in three provinces to examine variables that affect income.

Techniques:

A team of four local consultants was hired to organize and facilitate the regional workshops, which made use of a number of techniques associated with Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA). Led by a sociologist, the team also included an agricultural economist, an agronomist, and a community organizer. In preparation for the workshops, the consultants were trained in group dynamics by a World Bank staff member. The consultants were selected based on their experience in conducting workshops with local-level stakeholders (such as indigenous peoples, women's groups, and small producers), their knowledge of the participants' situations, experience with PRA methods, capacity for observation and recording, and ability to organize and write up results in a systematic way.

Facilitated by two of the local consultants, each regional workshop lasted three days and brought together representatives from several rural communities and community organizations. The PRA methods used included problem ranking, institutional mapping, wealth ranking, and preference ranking. During the first day the consultants explained the goals and methods of the workshop. On the second day participants broke into working groups to: (i) analyze the different characteristics of the rural poor and propose indicators for identifying them; (ii) rank problems affecting poor rural communities; (iii) map the institutions that affect the rural poor and how organizations and individuals interact with them; and (iv) define criteria for ranking and selecting project activities that could contribute to poverty reduction and rural development. A plenary session was held on the morning of the third day in which participants were challenged to balance the perspectives of the individual working groups with the problems and priorities of the larger community.

Initially, 23 regional workshops were planned, but many of the women found it difficult to spend three days away from home. Thus, nine of the planned workshops were held at a more local level and over a longer period of time to enable women to attend sessions for a few hours each day. For each workshop, the team summarized the information in a matrix and presented the output to the participants on the third day. The team drafted reports on each workshop, including their own observations and reflections.

Impacts and Outcomes:

One of the outputs of the Social Assessment was a framework for integrating participation into the project. NGOs will work with local committees to select and implement rural development subprojects. This is hoped to strengthen beneficiary participation, improve coordination and collaboration between NGOs and state agencies, and achieve better program targeting.

Limitations and Difficulties:

Analyzing and processing the workshops' findings proved quite time-consuming, with, in fact, the consultants spending four months analyzing the workshop matrices and conducting a desk review of secondary studies.

Background Documentation:

Roberto Benecia, April 1995 (draft), "Regional Participatory Diagnostic Workshops: Beneficiaries and Intermediary Organizations. Systematization of Results," World Bank, Latin America and the Caribbean Country Department 1. For more information contact Estanislao Gacitua-Mario at egacituamario@worldbank.org.

Case Study: Azerbaijan Baku Water Supply Project

Key Feature:

Strong link between Social Assessment findings, project design, and policy dialogue.

Context:

As part of its efforts to make the transition from a centrally planned to a market economy, the government of Azerbaijan asked the World Bank to help improve the city of Baku's water supply system. Baku is home to 2.5 million people (one-third of the country's population), and the Baku Water Supply Project is the World Bank's first lending operation in Azerbaijan. As such, the World Bank considers two aspects of the project to be particularly important to give priority to the needs of the poor without adversely affecting other social groups, and to ensure that the project's development impacts are sustainable. To this end, the World Bank team initiated a Social Assessment.

Objectives:

The objectives of the Social Assessment were to:

- ♦ identify stakeholders and propose a framework for participation in project design and implementation;
- ♦ evaluate the project's social impacts on households and identify potential adverse social affects;
- ♦ design measures that would mitigate any negative effects;
- ♦ identify cost-effective interventions to be undertaken immediately to improve the water situation; and
- ♦ ensure that the project's objectives are appropriate and acceptable to the diverse groups of intended beneficiaries.

Process and Techniques:

The Social Assessment consisted of three activities: rapid user surveys, consultations, and a stakeholder workshop.

A rapid survey of 450 households covering the entire city was undertaken by researchers from Baku University. The survey topics included water availability and quality, willingness to pay for improvements, and the cost of current coping strategies for obtaining water. A key finding of the survey was a discrepancy between the apparent abundance of water resources and the inability of the local water agency to satisfy local demand. Consequently, a second household survey involving another 400 households was conducted to determine the levels of water consumption, conservation, and household leakage. The Baku Water Agency selected the samples, provided supplementary data, and interpreted the collected data for the surveys.

Based on these early findings, the government made a commitment to adopt a participatory approach to project design and implementation. To be effective, however, greater understanding of the behavior of other water users, such as industry and agriculture, was needed. This led to: a survey of 51 Baku enterprises that focused on water consumption, recycling, metering, and cost recovery; an examination of existing Baku Water Agency reports; and a study on industrial output and water use.

To complement the rapid surveys, various consultative activities and case studies were undertaken, including:

- ◆ informal discussions with displaced persons and those in temporary shelters to identify their needs and perspectives;
- ◆ discussions with representatives of international organizations and national and local governments;
- ◆ interviews with informal and formal private sector providers of water and water supply equipment; and
- ◆ case studies of a small subset of households to identify better the strategies they use to cope with shrinking incomes and acute economic difficulties.

Finally, a stakeholder workshop was held, bringing together 72 participants from all sectors of society, including user groups, government ministries (ministers and other high-level representatives attended), local NGOs, the academic community, local experts, the media, and donors (the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the World Bank).

The total cost of the Social Assessment, including data collection, analysis, and write up, was approximately US\$50,000.

Limitations and Difficulties:

The World Bank's loan approval schedule created time pressures due to the fact that the Social Assessment was conceived late in project preparation. Researchers had only a few months to gather, analyze, and present information in a useful way to influence the project design. This late start limited the quality of the analysis and the extent to which the findings could be incorporated into other project preparation work. Other difficulties encountered included a limited capacity on the part of the researchers for conducting household surveys, and a lack of computers for the work.

Impact and Outcomes:

The insights gained from the Social Assessment enabled project designers and other stakeholders to make the necessary adjustments in the project to meet specific local needs. For example, one of the most important findings from the Social Assessment was the fact that Baku residents were willing to pay more for water, a revelation that contradicted the view of some important policymakers. It was found that poor people were willing to spend as much as 6 percent of their income on securing water, a fact manifested in their current coping strategies (for

example buying water from private vendors at high prices). Thus, it became apparent that the poor will profit the most from any improvements. The Social Assessment also led to the development of a project component for metering and billing of water, measures that are designed to conserve water and improve cost recovery.

The Social Assessment made significant contributions to policy dialogue between the government and the World Bank, notably on: the need for improved governance and the establishment of an autonomous water agency; the need to incorporate participation and consultation in water system planning and implementation; and the need for effective monitoring of private wells and illegal water vending, which pose health risks. The stakeholder workshop was particularly instrumental in generating a high level of consensus on the project and, with the wide media coverage of the event, extensive support and ownership by many more segments of the population.

Background Documentation:

World Bank, May 1995, "Azerbaijan: Baku Water Supply Rehabilitation Project," Environment Department Social Assessment Series No. 017. For more information contact Ayse Kudat at akudat@worldbank.org.

Case Study: Balochistan Primary Education Project

Key Features:

- ◆ Strong institutional analysis component;
- ◆ Emphasis on establishing a baseline for future monitoring; and
- ◆ Use of Social Assessment in an impact evaluation of an ongoing program.

Context:

During the last decade the government of Pakistan doubled the amount of real resources for primary education and tripled recurrent expenditures. These measures did little, however, to improve enrollment, educational quality, school achievement, or dropout and repetition rates. Nevertheless, there were some pockets of success, particularly in areas where parents' groups were involved in school reform and management. For the past two years, the World Bank has supported the Community Support Process (CSP) through the Balochistan Primary Education Credit. The CSP fosters the creation of parents' groups called Village Education Committees (VECs) to support local educational development. The CSP appears to have achieved substantial progress in establishing new girls' schools and increasing female enrollment in Balochistan—a province where the idea of education for girls is new and where managerial capacity in the government's education system is weak. These encouraging results led the World Bank task manager of the project and personnel from the Department of Education (DOE) to undertake a Social Assessment to identify the social, organizational, and cultural factors that have helped to produce this success.

Objectives:

The objectives of the Social Assessment were to:

- ◆ analyze the role of VECs in the CSP schools as key institutions in educational development;
- ◆ build capacity among NGOs active in the CSP to develop an appropriate strategy, and develop a mechanism for monitoring and evaluating the CSP; and
- ◆ develop a model for future participatory research activities by the DOE.

Process and Techniques:

DOE staff and a local NGO collaborated with an experienced international consultant to undertake the Social Assessment. They used a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods to understand whether, and to what extent, community participation had contributed to increasing girls' enrollment, attendance, and achievement.

The researchers capitalized on the wealth of information already available from the DOE and from school and NGO records to perform regression analysis on data from 19 districts, representing a cross section of ethnic, economic, and geographical conditions. The researchers also gathered new data on the perceptions of parents, teachers, students, and other stakeholders of factors that have led to improved school outcomes. For this work, a professor from Balochistan University was hired to train and supervise local researchers in the use of participant observation, structured interviews, and semi-structured interviews. The researchers worked with stakeholders from 24 primary schools in Balochistan, including CSP and control schools.

Data collection and analysis, which took six months and cost US\$60,000, was paid for by the World Bank division responsible for the Primary Education Project and a matching grant from the World Bank's Fund for Innovative Approaches in Human and Social Development (FIAHS).

Outputs and Impacts:

The Social Assessment found promising trends in girls' education where parents are actively involved. The study revealed that parents are more willing to educate their daughters when a CSP girls' school is available and when they have some control over teacher selection. The Social Assessment also found the agreements that parents enter into with the government—which outline the terms for local control of establishing and managing schools—to be very important. As a result of these findings, the government agreed to experiment with transferring more financial and decisionmaking authority to VECs to encourage further institutional development and local control over resources.

The data collected during the Social Assessment will form a baseline for monitoring the performance of community schools over the long term. It will also provide a basis for monitoring the effectiveness of reforms in textbook supply, teacher training, and local-level administrative policies throughout the primary education system. The DOE has set up a new policy monitoring and evaluation unit, of which one of its duties is to conduct further Social Assessments.

The Social Assessment process also helped to build local capacity. Researchers were drawn from a pool of people who will continue to shape education policy and practice in the province. They included a community extension worker, a board member of an NGO active in the implementation of the CSP schools, a university lecturer in education, and a survey specialist from the DOE.

Background Documentation:

World Bank, May 1996, "Pakistan: Social Assessment Demonstrates Successes of Participatory Approaches," Environment Department Dissemination Notes, Social Assessment Series No. 43, Washington, D.C. For more information contact Mae Chu Chang at mchang@worldbank.org.

Case Study: El Salvador Basic Education Project

Key Feature:

Emphasis on qualitative research techniques (focus groups, semi-structured interviews, and case studies).

Context:

Since 1991 the government of El Salvador has implemented the innovative Community-Managed Schools Program (EDUCO) to increase enrollment in rural areas, decrease repetition and dropout rates, and improve management of education. The program promotes the participation of rural communities in defining and administering education services by transferring resources from the central government to the community to operate newly-created schools. The World Bank-supported Basic Education Modernization Project seeks to extend EDUCO to other rural areas, and to foster decentralization by shifting control to elected community education associations (ACEs) and municipalities. A Social Assessment was undertaken as part of the preparation for the project.

Objectives:

The objectives of the Social Assessment were to:

- ◆ identify the stakeholders and the major benefits and risks of the proposed education reforms; and
- ◆ formulate an action plan focusing on the implementation capability of the government and on community participation in implementing the reforms.

Process and Techniques:

The Social Assessment was conducted between November 1994 and February 1995, cost approximately US\$25,000, and was co-financed by the Inter-American Development Bank, the World Bank, and the government. The assessment had two components: (i) an institutional analysis of the organizational and legal framework of the education system; and (ii) the identification of the main stakeholders and their values and interests, evaluation of the education system, level of knowledge about the system, and willingness to participate in reforms.

The Social Assessment used a variety of methods, including a desk review, focus groups, in-depth interviews, and a case study. The desk review consisted of an examination of bibliographies, reports, official and legal documentation, and other existing information. Focus groups, rather than individual interviews, were chosen for both practical and methodological reasons: the time frame was limited and the reforms would rely upon the capacity of groups (school boards), rather than individuals (principals), taking over responsibilities in school management. Twenty-four focus groups were formed with teachers and parents in rural and

urban areas, and included both ACE members and nonmembers, and parents of children in both the EDUCO and traditional school systems.

In-depth interviews were held with members of the government agency in charge of the reforms, Ministry of Education personnel, principals, supervisors, NGOs, and donors. In addition, a case study was conducted of an ACE to examine the creation and management of an EDUCO school. Inquiries were made into the process by which teachers are selected, hired, and fired; decisionmaking of the ACE; and women's participation in ACE meetings.

Limitations and Difficulties:

Finding local researchers who were acceptable to the government and other stakeholders temporarily slowed the work. And, as the consultants hired for this research were not accustomed to the World Bank style of analysis and report writing, the World Bank team spent much time translating the Social Assessment findings into operationally useful information.

Outcome and Impacts:

The Social Assessment found the Ministry of Education's communication strategy not to be effective in informing the public about educational reforms. This had led to public misconceptions about the government's plans to modernize education, and had prevented some stakeholders from supporting the reforms. The Social Assessment exercise contributed to promoting a more informed discussion of education reforms between stakeholders and, based on the findings of the assessment, the project now includes specific actions to develop a communication program.

Due to the highly positive reception of the Social Assessment, it is to be followed by a detailed Beneficiary Assessment to consult with parents and students, including homeless children. The Beneficiary Assessment aims to support project implementation by providing information on local understandings of the meaning of education, its relationship to mobility and equity, and what is considered the fair share of responsibilities and costs for education among families, communities, and the government.

Background Documentation:

Valeria Junho Pena, October 1995, "Social Assessment: El Salvador Basic Education Modernization Project," World Bank, Latin America and the Caribbean Technical Department, Environment Division Dissemination Note No. 13, Washington, D.C. For more information contact Valeria Junho Pena at vpena@worldbank.org.

Section 3: Suggestions for Seminars

This section includes a sample agenda for a one-day training seminar on Social Assessment as well as suggestions for experiential exercises and discussion points for small group work during the seminar. These ideas are provided only as a starting point for trainers and seminar organizers. There are many alternative ways of designing these training events, and experienced trainers will have their own style of working and their own preferences for the kinds of exercises to use. Ideally, of course, a training seminar would be much longer than one day—longer seminars would allow time for participants to discuss the needs of their own projects and how they see the Social Assessment addressing any particular concerns and questions.

SAMPLE AGENDA

9:00–9:15	Welcome and Introductions
9:15–10:15	Overview Presentation and Discussion
10:15–10:30	Break
10:30–11:00	Case Study Presentation and Discussion Presentation by someone who has conducted a social assessment, discussing the process and content of the work.
11:00–12:30	Social Assessment Role Play Simulation Case See case material on Fez Medina Urban Rehabilitation Project, Morocco (below).
12:30–13:30	Lunch
13:30–14:00	Discussion of Role Play Case
14:00–14:30	Presentation of Participants' Cases Those participants who are currently planning or considering using Social Assessment in a project present very brief descriptions of the project background. These cases will be the basis of the small group work.
14:30–14:45	Formation of Small Groups Participants choose which case interests them most, and a facilitator makes any adjustments to the groups to ensure some mixing of participants and to avoid any groups being too large or small.

14:45–15:00	Break
15:00–16:30	Small Group Work: Designing a Social Assessment Each group works on the real-life case to identify the objectives of the Social Assessment and consider some of the key elements in planning the work. (See below for small group assignment sheets.) A facilitator, knowledgeable about Social Assessment, will need to accompany each group.
16:30–17:00	Plenary Presentations of Small Group Work Brief reports by each small group and discussion.
17:00–17:30	Wrap-Up and Evaluations

SMALL GROUP WORK: DESIGNING A SOCIAL ASSESSMENT

You will need to elect a rapporteur to record a summary of your discussions on one or two sheets of flip-chart paper for presentation in plenary. Your facilitator will help you with accomplishing the following tasks.

Introduction of Project Context

The participants currently working on this case should very briefly outline the project context, the current status of plans for the Social Assessment, and the key issues they want the Social Assessment to address.

Defining the Social Assessment Objectives

- ◆ Which questions on the attached sheet are relevant to this Social Assessment?
- ◆ Are there other relevant questions?
- ◆ Prioritize these questions as they relate to this Social Assessment.
- ◆ Choose the two most important questions and expand on them. What are the specific subtopics that need to be addressed?

Designing the Social Assessment Process

- ◆ Where will you find a team to work on the Social Assessment?
- ◆ What kind of skill mix do you need on the Social Assessment team?
- ◆ How much money and time will it take?
- ◆ What is the best timing for this work?
- ◆ Which stakeholder groups will you need to involve in order to obtain support and resources for this work?

COMMON QUESTIONS IN SOCIAL ASSESSMENT

Who are the stakeholders?

Are project objectives consistent with their needs, interests, and capacity?

What social and cultural factors affect the ability of stakeholders to participate or benefit from the proposed policy or project?

What will be the impact of the project or program on the various stakeholders, particularly women and vulnerable groups? Are there plans to mitigate adverse impacts?

What social risks might affect project or program success?

What institutional arrangements are needed for participation and project delivery?

Are there adequate plans to build the capacity required at the appropriate levels?

ROLE PLAY OF A PARTICIPATORY PROCESS FOR DESIGNING A SOCIAL ASSESSMENT

The following exercise gives participants an opportunity to design a Social Assessment while taking on the roles of a variety of stakeholders who are likely to be affected by the project in question.³ The role play highlights a number of social issues that the Social Assessment will have to address, and the actual process of designing the Social Assessment illustrates some of the difficulties of working in collaboration with stakeholders who hold diverse and sometimes conflicting views.

The facilitator of this exercise should first distribute the two-page introduction to the social assessment and the project, which is based on a real-life project aiming to rehabilitate the historic city of Fez, Morocco. Participants should spend five minutes reading this introduction and then the facilitator should introduce the exercise and assign a role to each participant (note: the facilitator will need to cut the attached role descriptions into separate strips as each participant should receive only the description for their own role).

Before beginning the role play of a stakeholder workshop, participants can be divided into four groups:

- ◆ government stakeholders
- ◆ World Bank stakeholders
- ◆ Fez merchants
- ◆ Fez residents and religious leaders.

These groups can be given 15 minutes or so to discuss their positions and to prepare for the workshop discussions. Then all of the participants should be brought together, either around a table or seated in a circle on the floor, and the workshop can begin (note: to make it easier for participants to remember each others' roles, name cards can be prepared in advance and placed in front of each person).

A total of one and a half hours should be allowed for this exercise, and time given for a brief follow-up discussion to allow participants to reflect on the process and any lessons that emerged.

³ This role play exercise was developed by Dan Aronson of the World Bank.

DESIGNING A SOCIAL ASSESSMENT FOR A HISTORIC CITY REHABILITATION PROJECT

Background to Task

Your task is to draw up a Terms of Reference for the Social Assessment of a forthcoming World Bank–funded project in Fez, Morocco. The project aims to improve environmental conditions and to upgrade the historic walled urban center—the Medina. This portion of the old city encompasses overlapping commercial and residential zones, a palace compound, special courtier neighborhoods, and open areas.

The components of the proposed project include:

- ◆ *environmental upgrading of sewerage*, domestic and solid waste management, relocation of polluting activities, rehabilitation of housing, and resettlement of affected populations;
- ◆ *provision of urban infrastructure and community facilities*, through a system of improved access roads, allowing the rehabilitation and development of adjacent areas by private or public developers, as well as rehabilitation of significant historic buildings for social uses, such as community health, training, and women’s centers; and
- ◆ *technical assistance* with emphasis on municipal management, training, and technology transfer of best practices in heritage conservation works.

The Social Assessment will need to include a social impact analysis of how the project will affect the different stakeholders and to develop mitigation plans to address any major adverse impacts. The Social Assessment will also need to analyze the positions of the different stakeholders in relation to the project to understand their perspectives and priorities on the sociocultural, environmental, heritage, and housing aspects of the intervention.

The Terms of Reference for the Social Assessment should set out: (i) the goals of the Social Assessment; (ii) the tasks that need to be done; (iii) the particular skills that are needed (number and types of analysts/facilitators); (iv) a general schedule for implementing the Social Assessment; and (v) a strategy for synthesizing and disseminating the results and ensuring follow-up action.

Background to Fez

Fez dates back to the ninth century and features a series of important cultural monuments and heritage sites (mosques, schools, brotherhood quarters, homes) from various historical periods. Its heyday was from the 12th to the 15th centuries, when it was the capital of an empire that stretched across much of current Morocco and the Iberian Peninsula. Political decline from the 17th to the 19th centuries, and the growth of new areas beyond the walls in the 20th, have left the Medina in slow decay—but also untouched by the bulldozers of development. Fez is still important politically, culturally, and commercially. Its history and intact

architecture enabled Fez to be recorded on the UNESCO list of World Heritage Sites. Many agencies have planned restoration and upgrading for years, but institutional jealousies have hampered action. Major proponents of the current project include the “Agency for the De-Densification and Rehabilitation of Fez,” the electricity and water utility companies, the highest authorities of the government (including the king and the prime minister, who will both contribute personally to the preservation), and “brown” environmental managers who are alarmed by pollution in the city and downstream.

The Medina houses 180,000 people, a quarter of the population of greater Fez. There are good social surveys for at least part of the Medina; half of the people are tenants, and only about one-third are rural migrants to the city. Some upgrading of infrastructure has been done over the years: electricity is available, some underground drainage and sewage exists, and water lines go to nearly all buildings. Nonetheless, well-to-do owners have fled the Medina to less dense suburbs; and housing stock is degrading in part because ownership is absentee or ambiguous, and because no system of real estate taxes is in operation. Low-rent housing is scarce outside the Medina except in the totally unserved shantytowns. Thus, the Medina “traps” the poor, who might otherwise move away as they prosper. Housing degradation is worst in the core, where mud-brick buildings are cracking and walls occasionally collapse. Some solid waste is collected, but most is thrown into gullies, ruined houses, and streambeds.

The city’s teeming workshops and markets provide half of the jobs in Fez. Commerce and industry are intermixed with housing, but are concentrated in the oldest and core part of the Medina and along one major axis that leads toward a western gate. Some industries use electrical machinery, but most work is hand-crafted and thousands of children are employed as weavers, embroiderers, and leather and brass workers. Traditional industry and commerce are highly diversified and intricately interlaced with subcontracting, supply networks, and credit, but they have also added toxic chemicals to their processes, and worker exposure is high. Effluents go untreated into the streams that run through the city and then join with a river that provides water for a major agricultural area.

INDUSTRIAL TANNER

You are among the 20 owners of industrial-scale tanneries along the river that runs through the Medina. Tanning is the family tradition, but you intended to leave it and went to a technical college. Then you inherited the business, and decided to expand and use modern technology. You have your own old building, use modern machines, and employ 45 people. You export much of your output to Spain and Italy, but you sell some dyed skins to local craft workers who make jackets, backpacks, and other leather goods.

You also pollute the river with high levels of chrome and acid through the drains from your factory. The Agency for Fez Rehabilitation has proposed that you and others like you move to a new site just east of the old city, where preparations have been made for recuperating and reprocessing the waste water and chemical run-off. The price of the space, however, is much higher than you expected. At the same time, your entire operation is threatened by the fact that Italian, Spanish, and French tanners are now buying raw skins directly from Moroccan abattoirs. You fear that you cannot pass the increased cost of the new site on to your customers. Indeed, some of your fellow tanners have closed down to await some resolution of this economic crisis.



TRASH COLLECTOR

You are one of about 200 mostly elderly and unschooled men who remove solid waste from the Medina. At two in the morning and with your donkey, you leave your shantytown, which is two miles from the Medina, to report to the yard. There, a contractor hires you by the day starting at four in the morning. You are a regular and work 10 hours a day. Your daily route is in a residential area, and involves going up and down narrow lanes, picking up a few bags of refuse at a time, and transporting them to a large dumpster just outside the Medina walls at the nearest gate. Sometimes in the late afternoon you can earn a little extra money by working at a construction site transporting excess earth and broken bricks out of the Medina at a rate of about 35 kilos per load.

ABSENTEE LANDLORD

There are thousands of people like you. You are one of the sons of a Medina homeowner who died many years ago. You and your brothers are educated, and you live and work in the new city. The small house where you grew up was passed to all of you when your father died. At the time he was renting out extra rooms to two families that were originally from a village where you have relatives. You and your brothers have not been able to decide whether to sell the house, so you now rent to six families, each of which has one room around the small courtyard of the house. One of the old trusted tenants collects the rents each month and brings them to you. You have not been to the house in more than two years.

You have heard of a possible program to offer loans for renovating Medina housing. You would not want to move your own family to the Medina, but if such a program would allow you to renovate and raise rents, you might be interested. That depends, of course, on whether the rising rents would be worth the trouble—it's hard to get your brothers to agree on anything!

DIRECTOR, ADER-FEZ

You are an architect and urban planner. You were born in the Medina, where your aged father is the director of one of the centuries-old religious colleges. The tomb of the college founder is a center of religious pilgrimage from all over North Africa. For you, the uniqueness and sanctity of the old city is a source of pride, reverence, and nationalism. In a sense you are one of the major caretakers of a World Heritage Site.

Your agency has planning responsibility for the Medina. Under your overall supervision a master plan has been drafted, and specific technical studies have been undertaken for various components of the project proposed for World Bank funding. On paper, the agency also has responsibility for implementation, but you lack staff or technical capability to undertake the contracting and oversight. With assistance from various Islamic philanthropic organizations, your accomplishments have been limited to the conservation and restoration of several run-down old colleges and brotherhood headquarters buildings.

GOVERNOR, PREFECTURE OF FEZ-MEDINA

You are not from Fez but you have been posted here by the minister of the interior in recognition of your political skills, your training as a lawyer with an interest in land law, and your love of Moroccan history. You lived for eight years in Paris, and have been trained in short administrative courses at the Ecole Nationale d'Administration, the elite public administration institute. You have friends from Fez, now well-off businesspeople in Casablanca, who have renovated old homes in the Medina and come back for the occasional weekend. You have an official home, a villa in the new suburbs, but the idea of elegant living in the Medina intrigues both you and your wife.

You recognize that you come to Fez as a stranger, and it is all too clear that city politics are in the hands of an opposition party that considers the central administration to be bleeding the urban areas for tax revenues. You want to get on with the rehabilitation of the Medina, but you know that by pushing ahead with the weight of the national administration, whom you represent, you will be opposed by powerful local interests. Besides, even with outside assistance for the project, there will be difficulty in sustaining the costs of running an upgraded city. It is frustrating to you that so much must be done and yet you have to proceed slowly due to local politics.



ELDERLY WOMAN, RESIDENT OF THE OLDEST QUARTER WITHIN THE OLD CITY

At the age of 11 you were married to the son of one of the oldest families of the city. You spent many years within the walls of your husband's family home, which also housed the families of a set of brothers in the various apartments around the refreshing garden courtyard. Now, however, your children have moved away and your husband has died. You are allowed to retain his apartment, which has passed to your sons' ownership. Two brothers-in-law and their families still reside in other wings of the house, but a fourth apartment has been let out to a stranger.

The sheer age of the present house means that many repairs are needed. It is a bit shameful that the family has not seen fit to restore the now-dilapidated wooden balconies and windows that face the street from the upper story of the house, nor the large door that leads to the street. You also regret that the neighborhood has become more and more run-down, with storefronts being opened in some of your friends' front walls and the press of people in the narrow lane becoming ever more dense. You and your woman friends succeeded in resisting the invasion of the lane by a group of fruit sellers who tried to set their stalls against your walls, but the streets are dirtier now, and the public fountain where your poorer friends got their water has ceased to function.

BRASS MERCHANT

You began in the metal industry as a 10-year-old, running brass craft pieces from your boss's shop. You ran the brass objects from one subcontractor after another for plating, embossing with elaborate designs, polishing, fitting additional parts, polishing again, and finally for selling by the small shopkeepers. You were a bright child and you reported to your boss on the activities of the other boys who were delivering goods the same way. Your boss, the owner of a large tourist shop, soon had you reporting on which other merchants seemed to be advancing credit to the suppliers and subcontractors, who seemed to be getting paid and who wasn't, and what customers got the best treatment. That helped him to set his own prices, and to know when to cut off wholesalers who were having trouble paying their bills. Eventually, your boss must keep to the shop, but he finances a large artisanal trade that you yourself supervise on his behalf. You live above his shop and spend part of each day in the shop with your boss, serving clients and discussing conditions in the artisanal industries. You are also recognized for the sage advice that you offer other members of the ancient mosque that you attend near your house. Your own children are at school in the Medina, and you hope that they will further their education so that one day they will be well-to-do merchants like your boss.

DIRECTOR-GENERAL, ASSOCIATION FOR THE CONSERVATION OF FEZ

You are the executive director of the largest cultural association in greater Fez. Your association organizes cultural events that capitalize on the profound history of the city (a worldwide exhibition on religious architecture, and a seminar on Maghrebian and Spanish traditional music, for example). In promoting the "adoption" of historic buildings by individual benefactors, you have succeeded in getting contributions from the presidents of two Moroccan banks, the head of the largest Moroccan department store, and the president of a large clothing factory. In this way various monuments in the old city could be restored. Your association has direct links to the royal household, and one of the princesses opened the most recent event—the installation of a sound-and-light show that projects lights from a hillside into the old city as it narrates local history.

You know, of course, that the Medina is a living city, but you do not have the mandate to carry out noncultural activities for the residents of the old city. It is your hope that increasing worldwide recognition of the city will lead to increased tourism from both the Muslim and the non-Muslim worlds.

SAW MILLER—CARPENTER

You occupy an ancient warehouse in the northern sector of the Medina. You buy logs from wholesalers outside the city, and you transport them by sections in a small truck to your workshop, which is 200 meters from the end of a short road that enters the Medina nearby. Neighbors in this residential area complain of the noise from the sawmills, but there is nowhere else in the Medina that allows the logs to be brought in this close to the worksite.

Vibrations from the large electric saws that you use for finer cutting of lumber have caused cracks in the walls of the building. You know that the building has some historic value because it was carefully measured and recorded in a census of historic buildings. The owner of the building, however, has never raised the question of evicting you as there are few other tenants who would pay as much rent as you do for this location.

Being in the Medina allows you and your younger brothers to talk to all manner of people contemplating construction and renovation work. You get many of your customers by servicing the specific needs of jobs as they get under way. If you moved away from the Medina, you would have to rely on the customers coming to you; however, you do not think it is wise to assume that you do not need to be out searching for work almost every day.

**PUBLIC OVEN TENDER**

You have your job as an act of charity. You have lived all of your life in the Medina, except for the period you served in the army. Without sons and widowed early in life, you eventually sought work from the leaders of the religious institutions in your neighborhood. They found a position for you at the public oven.

The large oven that you tend heats water for the public baths adjacent to one of the oldest mosques in the city. The oven is below ground level and the water pipes run in and out above the fire vault.

You and several other men gather the refuse of the artisanal industries nearby: wood shavings and chips from the woodworkers, scraps of leather, shredded bits of cloth from the clothing makers, old polishing rags, and everything else that can be burned. It then all goes into the oven. There is tremendous smoke and dust from burning these “fuels,” but it also provides one way of recycling materials from other industries and of keeping the craft zones of the Medina clean.

Also, heat from your oven is passed next door to one of the neighborhood bakeries, where girls bring daily their mother’s dough for baking into bread. Your work, then, dirty as it makes both you and the air each day, is vital for the material life of your neighbors and for their acts of religious and personal cleansing in the baths.

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNER, WATER SUPPLY AGENCY OF GREATER FEZ

When you studied environmental economics in Toulouse you did not realize that you would become a sewerage planner. Your work, however, is personally challenging and a source of pride. You were born in the Medina, and moved to the new city with your family at the age of six. When you first went back to the Medina, as an adult and a planner, you were shocked by the contrast between your fond memories and the extensive degradation of the physical infrastructure that you now saw before you.

You know that the system of ancient drains, for which there are no records, is decayed and broken in many places. The old system of fresh water distribution from the many springs within the old city is—miraculously, you think—still mostly intact, and is serving some of the oldest areas in the city. Nevertheless, 10 percent of the dwellings in the Medina have no sewage connections at all.

Overwhelming these problems is the question of toxic waste—including highly dangerous heavy metals—being dumped into the main streams that run through the city. Moreover, the major river is polluted by sewage from the new city even before it gets to the Medina. In short, the river has turned into an open sewer, and is dangerous to the people who live in the plain below.

Your agency has plans for: sewage treatment in the new city, enclosure of the river as a main drain, recuperation of the toxic wastes, extension of the new sewerage lines within the Medina, and further treatment facilities downstream. The national budget, however, has consistently omitted items for Fez, apparently favoring the cleanup of the larger city of Casablanca and the national capital, Rabat.

TASK MANAGER, WORLD BANK

This project was not in your division's pipeline until special pleas for its inclusion were registered at the highest levels of contact between the World Bank and the borrower. You are a civil engineer by training, and your urban projects to date have mainly been in transport planning and in sites and services projects.

You are of at least two minds about this project. On the one hand, you think that it should be split apart and done as elements of separate projects in water supply, sewerage, transport, site and service preparation, and housing. On the other hand, you realize that the Medina of Fez is a unique situation, a unified system in which all of the elements are linked to one another. You know that simply parceling out each activity to a different project will risk the possibility that rehabilitation of the city will languish or be done in fits and starts that amount to very little.

One thing that you are prepared to do is to listen to the views of the many stakeholders in the proposed project to see if you can learn from them some route to effective planning for the project. You don't know how best to undertake this exercise.

**ANALYST, SENIOR OPERATIONS ADVISER'S OFFICE, WORLD BANK**

You have just moved to this regional department. The project comes to your attention both because it is inherently interesting and because you have noticed how much money has already been spent on project identification and early preparation.

You have taken a course on project quality-at-entry. You are forced to be skeptical of what you learned, however, because you know that you must help enforce norms on preparation and operations costs for your department. Nonetheless, partly because you speak Arabic, you have been added to the current preparation mission.

SOCIAL SCIENTIST

You are a private consultant, and you know Morocco well because you worked in Rabat for many years. You are the author of a book on the growth of the capital city, and you actually lived in the Medina while you were doing your research. You have never worked for the World Bank.

You have heard about the plans for rehabilitating Fez, but you have not been directly involved. You have some colleagues who worked on brief assignments there, but not in the Medina. Your strength, besides your Moroccan experience, is in urban research methods and you are also the author of a book on social survey methods.

The Task Manager of the project, having heard about you from his acquaintances, has hired you to be on the planning team for the project. Your specific duties, however, have not been well defined.



MALE FAMILY HEAD, MEDINA

You migrated to Fez in search of work when you seemed to be down on your luck in the smaller city 80 kilometers to the west. You found work in one of the tourist shops on the main commercial street, selling small artisanal items to tourists and other residents of the Medina. You have a knack for getting passersby to enter the shop, and your boss is pleased with your level of sales.

This has given you some hope. You would like to get your young family out of the Medina—with its crowded houses, schools, and clinics, and where you have to walk nearly a kilometer to get to the nearest bus stop. But you think you will never be able to pay the rents demanded for an apartment elsewhere that has water and electricity services like your room does here in the Medina.

Five years ago you heard that the government may be planning to create some building subdivisions where you could actually buy a lot very cheaply and build your own house. It has something to do with the government wanting people to move away from the Medina so that the remaining residents can have more room, or something like that. In any case, despite the fact that you have asked many times, you have not been able to find out where you sign up for this possibility. Yet, because the idea is still in the air, you have stopped looking for a rental apartment outside the Medina.

CITY COUNCILOR

You were born into a family of ancient lineage in Fez. Your uncle is the imam of a mosque, your brother is the provincial representative of one of the major national ministries, and your sister is the head of the largest women's organization in the new city. You studied in Egypt and Tunisia, and for years you were a professor of history at the university in Casablanca. Ten years ago you returned to Fez, in part to dedicate yourself to the further study of religion. You represent your neighborhood—which was built in the 1920s and is the most modern quarter in the Medina—to the City Council. You were elected because of your family connections and your piety and renown as a scholar.

You want the Medina to prosper, but you do not want to open it only to European tourism. If it thrives, you think, it should be on its own Islamic foundations as a religious, cultural, and economic center. You do not deny that the urban infrastructure is becoming dilapidated, but you are not sure that you want the national government to come in and fix everything. Your position is that the city council itself, and the municipal authorities that are responsible to the council, should plan and execute the upgrading of the city. To do this, the city will need taxation authority and many other instrumentalities that it does not now have. You are one of the leaders of the fight for a kind of "home rule."



FEMALE HOUSEHOLD HEAD

You are the mother of three children. You were born in the Medina in the home where your own widowed mother now lives, which is several houses down the lane. Your husband worked as a brass polisher in a basement artisan's workshop; but he became sick from the acid fumes and the metal dust in the air and had to quit his job. Four years ago he went to Casablanca, where his brother had a job in a modern clothing factory. Since then, he has not sent any money home, and you suspect that he is living with another woman in his room there.

You were forced to move with your children from a three-room apartment into one room of a dilapidated house, also in the Medina. It has a single standpipe for water and a common toilet for the eight families who share the building. The house itself is built directly over one of the many streams that run through the Medina, and dampness from the stream permeates the stucco walls of the house. You are sure that the cold and dampness contribute to the nearly constant colds and coughs from which your children suffer.

You buy flour from one of the wholesalers in the vegetable market at the edge of the Medina, and you make money by cooking meals that you sell at lunch hour to workers in the brass shops. You can pay your rent, although you have your children eat at your mother's whenever they can. You would like to escape the misery of your existence, but you don't know how you could afford to do so.

TEACHER, PRIMARY SCHOOL IN THE MEDINA

You came to Fez from a smaller town to the east to complete your secondary schooling, and you did well enough to win a place at a Teacher Training Institute. Upon graduation four years ago, you were assigned to one of the small primary schools deep inside the Medina. At first you were pleased with the assignment because you had been living in the Medina anyway to save money while you were in training. Now, however, you have saved some money, and you are starting to wonder what you will do.

On the one hand, you would like to stay in the Medina where you have friends, where there is a lively night life for you, and where life is relatively cheap. On the other hand, you want to buy a *mobylette* (a motor scooter), but there is no safe place to keep it at night, and you are tired of the shared water and sanitary facilities in the building where you live. There are larger flats nearby, some even with private toilets, but frankly you wish that the whole neighborhood was cleaner, that the electricity for your TV did not flicker every time the machines were turned on at the electroplating shop two streets away, and that you were surer of the safety of the drinking water. You also know that your school, because it is for “only the Medina children,” does not get the supplies and maintenance that it needs. All of this makes you inclined to seek a transfer to a place where you can forget the Medina.



FRUIT VENDOR

Good ideas can have bad effects! That is what you have learned from “development” as it has affected you.

You are a woman who sells vegetables on the side of a busy alley that connects the main commercial streets of the Medina to one of the better residential neighborhoods. Until just two years ago it was a pleasant if poor living. You went to the produce wholesale market at the edge of the Medina in the morning, and you usually got really good fruit by rising early and making friends with the wholesalers. You would carry it to the alley market yourself, and by lunchtime around one in the afternoon you would have sold it and returned home to tend to your household chores. The money you earned helped you and your husband to have a better apartment than you would otherwise and to get the small extra purchases—paper, erasers, clothes—that make your children enthusiastic about going to school.

This changed for the worse two years ago. The city had the idea of moving the wholesale vegetable market way off to the industrial suburb several kilometers away. Now you have to buy your fruit from middlemen who carry boxes of fruit on mule-back to your little market area. They must make money, too, so you had to raise your fruit prices even though your fruit was not of the same quality as before. Moreover, the middlemen come at various times throughout the day, and sometimes the alley is totally clogged with mules, vendors, boxes of fruit, and passersby. All in all, you make less, have less satisfied customers, and have a harder time than before. You are thinking simply of giving up this trade. The city’s good idea has left you in frustration!

CARPET MERCHANT

You and your two brothers own a carpet emporium in one of the large old “Andalusian” homes just off the main commercial street in the Medina. You rent from the heirs of the family that owned it, and who long ago moved to the new part of Fez. You yourself live in the Medina, in a single-family home that has one of the more open and pleasant views over the south flank of the slope on which the Medina is built.

About half of your sales are to people from all over the Fez area, and for the other half you depend upon the tourist trade that the Medina attracts. You are a strong supporter of the conservation of the city, and you have become a member of the “Association Fès-Sais,” which is seeking to build up tourism both from Europe and from the Middle East by restoring the old Muslim monuments and mosques.

You like the Medina more or less the way it is. You pass your days engaged in sales and enjoying the cool rooms of your shop’s airy premises. You wish that it were easier to bring rolls of carpets through the streets, but the present system of bringing a few at a time by mule is sufficient. You certainly do not want them to start tearing down sections of the Medina because you fear that tearing at the “fabric” of the city risks driving away the tourists. Nevertheless, you are a reasonable and educated man, and you will listen to proposals and speak your mind.

Stakeholder Analysis

Module II

Section 1: Overview

Stakeholder Analysis

Why do Stakeholder Analysis?

- ◆ To identify stakeholders' interests in, importance to, and influence over the operation;
- ◆ To identify local institutions and processes upon which to build; and
- ◆ To provide a foundation and strategy for participation.

Stakeholder Analysis is a vital tool for understanding the social and institutional context of a project or policy. Its findings can provide early and essential information about who will be affected by the project (positively or negatively); who could influence the project (again, positively or negatively); which individuals, groups, or agencies need to be involved in the project, and how; and whose capacity needs to be built to enable them to participate.

Stakeholder Analysis, therefore, provides a foundation and structure for the participatory planning, implementation, and monitoring that follows.

Source: This Overview section draws upon the work of a discussion group that was written up by Sue Jacobs. Group members included Claude Salem, Tosca Van Vijfeijken, Deepa Narayan, Jennifer Rietbergen-McCracken, and Sue Jacobs, all of the World Bank. Other sources for this work include Richard Montgomery at the Center for Development Studies, Swansea, and the report by the British Overseas Development Administration (now known as Department for International Development), 1995, "Guidance Note on How to Do Stakeholder Analysis of Aid Projects and Programmes," Social Development Department, London.

Stakeholder Analysis

What is a stakeholder?

“Stakeholders are people, groups, or institutions which are likely to be affected by a proposed intervention (either negatively or positively), or those which can affect the outcome of the intervention.”

Stakeholders include:

- ◆ The Borrower
- ◆ The Poor
- ◆ Other Affected Groups
- ◆ Interested Groups, including the World Bank.

Stakeholders are those people who stand to gain or lose something by a project or policy intervention, or those who are capable of affecting the outcome of the intervention.

Stakeholders in World Bank–financed operations include:

The Borrower. The World Bank’s most immediate client is the government and agencies responsible for project or policy implementation.

The Poor. Key stakeholders, given the World Bank’s objective of helping countries to reduce poverty, the poor often lack information and power and tend to be excluded from the development process. Particular attention needs to be given to vulnerable groups such as the landless, women, children, indigenous people, and minority groups.

Other Affected Groups. Other individuals, families, communities, or organizations may be positively or adversely affected by World Bank–financed projects or policy interventions.

Interested Groups. Others who have vested interests in development initiatives include donors, NGOs, religious and community organizations, local authorities, and private sector firms. With its own objectives, policies, and institutional responsibilities, *the World Bank* is itself a stakeholder in its work with client countries.

Stakeholder Analysis: A Four-Step Process

Step 1. Identify Key Stakeholders

Assess:

- ◆ Who are potential beneficiaries?
- ◆ Who might be adversely impacted?
- ◆ Have vulnerable groups been identified?
- ◆ Have supporters and opponents been identified?
- ◆ What are the relationships among the stakeholders?

Stakeholder Analysis is essentially a four-step process. This page and those that follow describe each step in the analysis, indicate who should be involved in the work, and then provide a series of matrices that can help to guide the process.

The first step of a Stakeholder Analysis is to identify the *key* stakeholders—whose participation will be sought—from the large array of institutions and individuals that could potentially affect or be affected by the proposed intervention.

This can be achieved by drawing up a simple list. When answering the questions above, consider the borrower, beneficiaries, affected groups, and other interested groups (including the World Bank). The list that results from this exercise can provide the first input into the Stakeholder Analysis matrices included below.

Stakeholder Analysis: A Four-Step Process

Step 2. Assess Stakeholder Interests and the Potential Impact of the Project on These Interests

Assess:

- ◆ What are the stakeholder's expectations of the project?
- ◆ What benefits are there likely to be for the stakeholders?
- ◆ What resources might the stakeholder be able and willing to mobilize?
- ◆ What stakeholder interests conflict with project goals?

Once the key stakeholder groups have been identified, their possible interests in the project or economic and sector work (ESW) can be considered. Some stakeholder interests are less obvious than others and may be difficult to define, especially if they are “hidden,” multiple, or in contradiction with the stated aims or objectives of the organization or individual. The above questions can guide the inquiry into the interests of each key stakeholder or group.

In the case of some institutions these questions can be answered through a review of secondary information. For more informal groups and local people, assessment of their interests will probably require some form of consultation, either directly with these stakeholders or with people “on-the-ground” who are familiar with these groups.

With this background, consideration can be given to how the project might affect these interests—positively or negatively. All of this information can be summarized and added to the Stakeholder Analysis matrices.

Stakeholder Analysis: A Four-Step Process

Step 3. Assess Stakeholder Influence and Importance

For each stakeholder group, assess its:

- ◆ power and status (political, social, and economic)
- ◆ degree of organization
- ◆ control of strategic resources
- ◆ informal influence (for example personal connections)
- ◆ power relations with other stakeholders
- ◆ importance to the success of the project.

Influence refers to the power that stakeholders have over a project. It can be exercised by controlling the decisionmaking process directly and by facilitating or hindering the project's implementation. This control may come from a stakeholder's status or power, or from informal connections with leaders.

Another variable, that of **importance**, relates to the degree to which achievement of project objectives depends on the active involvement of a given stakeholder group. Stakeholders who are important to the project are generally those whose needs the project seeks to meet as well as those whose interests converge with the objectives of the project. Some stakeholders may be very **important** to a project (for instance, rural women in a reproductive health project) but may have very limited **influence** over the project. These stakeholders may require special efforts to enable them to become active participants to ensure that their needs will indeed be met.

Both the influence and importance of different stakeholder groups can be ranked along simple scales, and mapped against each other, as an initial step in determining appropriate strategies for their involvement. Both variables can be assessed in a preliminary manner based on the knowledge of those familiar with the stakeholders concerned. More in-depth assessments of importance and influence would require direct consultations (for instance, to ask local-level stakeholders for their reactions to a proposed intervention).

Stakeholder Analysis: A Four-Step Process

Step 4. Outline a Stakeholder Participation Strategy

Plan stakeholder involvement according to:

- ◆ interests, importance, and influence of each stakeholder group
- ◆ particular efforts needed to involve important stakeholders who lack influence
- ◆ appropriate forms of participation throughout the project cycle.

On the basis of the previous three steps in the Stakeholder Analysis process, some preliminary planning can be done on how the different stakeholder groups can best be involved in subsequent stages of the project or ESW. As a rule of thumb, the appropriate approaches for involving stakeholders of differing levels of influence and importance can be as follows:

- ◆ **stakeholders of high influence and high importance** should be closely involved throughout to ensure their support for the project or ESW;
- ◆ **stakeholders of high influence and low importance** are not the target of the project but may oppose the intervention; therefore, they will need, as appropriate, to be kept informed and their views acknowledged to avoid disruption or conflict;
- ◆ **stakeholders of low influence and high importance** require special efforts to ensure that their needs are met and their participation is meaningful; and
- ◆ **stakeholders of low influence and low importance** are unlikely to be closely involved in the project and require no special participation strategies (beyond any information-sharing strategies aimed at the “general public”).

Methods for Stakeholder Analysis

- ◆ Best done in collaboration with key stakeholder groups;
- ◆ Not only a desk study—use participatory methods where possible:
 - stakeholder workshops,
 - local consultations,
 - participatory analysis; and
- ◆ Use secondary data where available and reliable.

While it may be possible for World Bank staff to undertake a preliminary Stakeholder Analysis based on their own knowledge of the project or ESW and the relevant stakeholders, the process will be much enhanced and the learning shared if other groups are involved. Representatives of the main collaborating institutions (government agencies, NGOs, academic institutions, and others) can often provide detailed information on the in-country stakeholders. Bringing these collaborating groups together for the Stakeholder Analysis will also provide an opportunity for them to discuss, and hopefully agree on, which stakeholders should be involved and how. However, in some cases the Stakeholder Analysis will involve the identification and discussion of sensitive information (such as the hidden agendas of certain stakeholder groups, or why certain groups are likely to oppose the project), which are often more likely to surface in more private settings with individual stakeholder groups.

In addition to reviewing secondary data and meeting with selected stakeholders, several other more participatory techniques can be used to gather information. The use of participatory approaches in a Stakeholder Analysis also builds a sense of ownership in the work by a broader range of stakeholders. *Stakeholder workshops* are particularly useful at the beginning of the process to generate a complete listing of stakeholder groups, and in the final stages of the analytical work to build consensus on a participation strategy for the key stakeholders. *Consultations* and *participatory analyses* (using some of the techniques of *Participatory Rural Appraisal*, *SARAR*, or *Beneficiary Assessment*, for example) with those stakeholders about whom less is known (usually those with less influence) are often a major component of Stakeholder Analysis.

Stakeholder Analysis Matrices

The following three tables represent a framework for recording and organizing the information generated by a Stakeholder Analysis.¹ An example of a completed set of matrices for a hypothetical World Bank–financed education project is provided in the Techniques section of this module.

¹ These tables are based on similar matrices in ODA, *op. cit.*, and by Claude Salem of the World Bank.

Table 2.
Step 3 of Stakeholder Analysis (continued):
Mapping Key Stakeholders' Relative Influence and Importance

INFLUENCE OF STAKEHOLDER	IMPORTANCE OF ACTIVITY TO STAKEHOLDER						
	Unknown	Little/No Importance	Some Importance	Moderate Importance	Much Importance	Critical Player	
Unknown							
Little/No Influence							
Some Influence							
Moderate Influence							
Significant Influence							
Very Influential							

Note: Insert key stakeholders in the appropriate cell.

Table 3.
Step 4 of Stakeholder Analysis: Formulation of Stakeholder Participation Strategy

STAGE IN PROJECT PROCESS	TYPE OF PARTICIPATION			
	Information-sharing (one-way flow)	Consultation (two-way flow)	Collaboration (increasing control over decisionmaking)	Empowerment (transfer of control over decisions and resources)
Project Identification				
Preparation Appraisal				
Implementation, Supervision, and Monitoring				
Evaluation				

Note: Insert specific participation strategy(ies) for key stakeholders (such as information campaign for general public; workshop with ministry and NGOs; or PRAs with community groups). For an example of a completed chart, see Table 3 in the Techniques Section of this module.

Stakeholder Analysis Mode

An Overview

Stakeholder Analysis

Why do Stakeholder Analysis?

- ◆ To identify stakeholders' interests in, importance to, and influence over the operation;
- ◆ To identify local institutions and processes upon which to build; and
- ◆ To provide a foundation and strategy for participation.

Stakeholder Analysis

What is a stakeholder?

“Stakeholders are people, groups, or institutions which are likely to be affected by a proposed intervention (either negatively or positively), or those which can affect the outcome of the intervention.”

Stakeholders include:

- ◆ The Borrower
- ◆ The Poor
- ◆ Other Affected Groups
- ◆ Interested Groups, including the World Bank .

Stakeholder Analysis: A Four-Step Process

Step 1. Identify Key Stakeholders

Assess:

- ◆ Who are potential beneficiaries?
- ◆ Who might be adversely impacted?
- ◆ Have vulnerable groups been identified?
- ◆ Have supporters and opponents been identified?
- ◆ What are the relationships among the stakeholders?

Stakeholder Analysis: A Four-Step Process

Step 2. *Assess Stakeholder Interests and the Potential Impact of the Project on These Interests*

Assess:

- ◆ What are the stakeholder's expectations of the project?
- ◆ What benefits are there likely to be for the stakeholders?
- ◆ What resources might the stakeholder be able and willing to mobilize?
- ◆ What stakeholder interests conflict with project goals?

Stakeholder Analysis: A Four-Step Process

Step 3. Assess Stakeholder Influence and Importance

For each stakeholder group, assess its:

- ◆ power and status (political, social, and economic)
- ◆ degree of organization
- ◆ control of strategic resources
- ◆ informal influence (for example personal connections)
- ◆ power relations with other stakeholders.

Stakeholder Analysis: A Four-Step Process

Step 4. Outline a Stakeholder Participation Strategy

Plan stakeholder involvement according to:

- ◆ interests, importance, and influence of each stakeholder group
- ◆ particular efforts needed to involve important stakeholders who lack influence
- ◆ appropriate forms of participation throughout the project cycle.

Methods for Stakeholder Analysis:

- ◆ Best done in collaboration with key stakeholder groups;
- ◆ Not only a desk study—use participatory methods where possible:
 - stakeholder workshops,
 - local consultations,
 - participatory analysis; and
- ◆ Use secondary data where available and reliable.

Table 2.
 Step 3 of Stakeholder Analysis (continued):
 Mapping Key Stakeholders' Relative Influence and Importance

INFLUENCE OF STAKEHOLDER	IMPORTANCE OF ACTIVITY TO STAKEHOLDER						
	Unknown	Little/No Importance	Some Importance	Moderate Importance	Much Importance	Critical Player	
Unknown							
Little/No Influence							
Some Influence							
Moderate Influence							
Significant Influence							
Very Influential							

Note: Insert key stakeholders in the appropriate cell.

Table 3.
Step 4 of Stakeholder Analysis: Formulation of Stakeholder Participation Strategy

STAGE IN PROJECT PROCESS	TYPE OF PARTICIPATION			
	Information-sharing (one-way flow)	Consultation (two-way flow)	Collaboration (increasing control over decisionmaking)	Empowerment (transfer of control over decisions and resources)
Project Identification				
Preparation Appraisal				
Implementation, Supervision, and Monitoring				
Evaluation				

Note: Insert specific participation strategy(ies) for key stakeholders (such as information campaign for general public; workshop with ministry and NGOs; or PRAs with community groups). For an example of a completed chart, see Table 3 in the Techniques Section of this module.

Section 2: Techniques

Stakeholder Analysis can be undertaken in a variety of ways, depending on the degree to which stakeholders have already been identified and plans for their participation developed. In situations where much is known about the different stakeholder groups, their relationships with each other, and appropriate strategies for their participation, it may not be necessary to conduct a full-blown Stakeholder Analysis. A simpler format may be sufficient, with the task manager doing the bulk of the Stakeholder Analysis based on his or her knowledge of the stakeholders and the project. This preliminary analysis can then be expanded and cross-checked by talking with some of the stakeholders involved and by holding brief workshops with in-country counterparts to focus on developing and reaching consensus on participation strategies for the stakeholder groups identified.

Conversely, where little is known about potential stakeholders and how they will affect and be affected by the project, a more in-depth analysis and a more participatory process will be required. Stakeholder Analysis in this case is best done in the field, together with the policy or project development team. This is particularly important where the project is likely to have an impact on “new” stakeholders (that is groups who have not been involved in World Bank-funded projects before), or where there is a good deal of controversy and conflict involved. Stakeholder analyses in these situations will generally require (i) extensive use of participatory consultation techniques to understand the perspectives and concerns of the different groups involved, and (ii) careful management of a series of workshops where representatives of the stakeholder groups identified can come together to look for common ground and discuss ways in which their participation could be “built-in” to the project.

How to do a Stakeholder Analysis will also depend on the point at which the analysis is done in the project cycle. If done at an early stage, the analysis will probably enable more learning and more systematic use of a range of techniques. Stakeholder Analysis done at a later stage may be more limited in both its scope and use of consultative or participatory techniques.

This section provides guidance on working with a set of matrices and convening stakeholder workshops—two useful tools in undertaking a Stakeholder Analysis. Additionally, a number of other methods have proven useful in Stakeholder Analysis, including a variety of Participatory Rural Appraisal, SARAR, and Beneficiary Assessment techniques that involve direct consultations with stakeholders (for further information, please refer to the Techniques sections of these modules).

Stakeholder Analysis Matrices

The thought process involved in undertaking a Stakeholder Analysis can be facilitated and documented using a series of matrices. As outlined in the Overview section of this module, Stakeholder Analysis can be regarded, in simplified form, as a four-step process:

- Step 1. Identification of stakeholders;
- Step 2. Analysis of stakeholder interests and how the project will affect these interests;
- Step 3. Analysis of the influence and importance of each of the stakeholders identified; and
- Step 4. Development of a participation strategy for involving the different stakeholders.

The manner in which these steps are performed will vary—sometimes involving just the task managers and a few key stakeholders, and other times involving many different stakeholders in broad-based consultation and participatory analysis. In either case, the matrices on the following pages can serve as a framework for more systematic analysis, and for a simplified presentation of the assumptions and criteria upon which the analysis is based.

To illustrate the use of the matrices, a Stakeholder Analysis for a hypothetical education project has been simulated. The basic characteristics of this hypothetical project include: a primary objective of increasing girls' enrollment, decentralization of control to communities through parent associations and community-managed schools, and a high degree of support for this initiative from the wife of the president of the (hypothetical) client country. A discussion of how to use the matrices and blank copies of each matrix can be found in the Overview section of this Module. To review, the three variables used to construct the matrices are listed below:

- ♦ **interests:** the priority concerns of the stakeholder group (or what is “at stake” for them);
- ♦ **influence:** the degree to which the stakeholder group has power and control over the project and can thus facilitate or hinder its implementation; and
- ♦ **importance:** the degree to which the achievement of project objectives depends on the active involvement of a given stakeholder group.

Table 1.
Steps 1, 2, and 3 of Stakeholder Analysis of Hypothetical Girls' Education Project:
 Identification of Stakeholder Groups, Their Interests, Importance, and Influence in Community-Managed Schools

Stakeholder Groups	Interest(s) at Stake in Relation to Project	Effect of Project on Interest(s)	Importance of Stakeholder for Success of Project	Degree of Influence of Stakeholder over Project
Ministry of Education	Achievement of targets	+	4	5
	Control over resources, activities	-		
	Patronage of First Lady	+		
Teachers	Job security	?	3	2
	Support from community	+		
	Preference for urban posting	-		
Parents	School available in community	+	5	1
	Accountability of teachers	+		
	Girls' help with homework	-		
School-age girls	Employment opportunities	+	5	1
	Socializing with peers	+		
	Free time	-		
Traditional religious leaders	Concern over erosion of traditional values	-(?)	2	4
	Attendance at religious schools	-(?)		
Adult literacy NGOs	Increased literacy	+	1	1
	Financial viability	0		
	Improved links with MOE	?		

U=Unknown
 1=Little/No Influence
 2=Some Influence
 3=Moderate Influence
 4=Significant Influence
 5=Very Influential

U=Unknown
 1=Little/No Importance
 2=Some Importance
 3=Moderate Importance
 4=Very Important
 5=Critical Player

Table 2.
Step 3 of Stakeholder Analysis (continued):
Mapping Key Stakeholders' Relative Influence and Importance

INFLUENCE OF STAKEHOLDER	IMPORTANCE OF ACTIVITY TO STAKEHOLDER					
	Unknown	Little/No Importance	Some Importance	Moderate Importance	Very Important	Critical Player
Unknown						
Little/No Influence		adult literacy NGOs				school-age girls, parents
Some Influence				teachers		
Moderate Influence						
Significant Influence			traditional religious leaders			
Very Influential					Ministry of Education	

Table 3.
Step 4 of Stakeholder Analysis:
Formulation of Stakeholder Participation Strategy in Hypothetical Education Project

STAGE IN PROJECT PROCESS	TYPE OF PARTICIPATION			
	Information-sharing (one-way flow)	Consultation (two-way flow)	Collaboration (increasing control over decisionmaking)	Empowerment (transfer of control over decisions and resources)
Project Identification		Preliminary visits to rural schools; talk with teachers, parents re: girls' schooling.	Joint assessment of priority activities and target areas with MOE.	
Preparation Appraisal	National public awareness campaign (on objectives of project).	Extensive PRAs with communities, teachers, NGOs. (seeking suggestions for community-level activities).	Decentralization to local authorities with capacity-building.	Capacity-building of parent associations.
Implementation, Supervision, and Monitoring	National public awareness campaign (on how to get involved).	BAs for regular feedback; repeated participatory monitoring using PRA, SARAR, BA techniques.	National steering committee with representatives of parent associations, teachers, MOE officials, local authorities.	Transfer of decision-making power and budget control to parent associations.
Evaluation	Video (showing process and results of evaluations).	Participatory evaluation (BA, SARAR, PRA techniques) with communities, teachers	Commission independent evaluation by local NGOs.	Self-assessments by parent associations.

Stakeholder Workshops

The use of stakeholder workshops is not limited to Stakeholder Analysis, but is a technique commonly employed throughout projects and ESW for everything from participatory planning to conflict resolution, reviewing the results of ESW, and evaluating the impacts of a project. Given the focus here on Stakeholder Analysis, this section will refer only to this application of stakeholder workshops.

In general, workshops are more suited to engaging the more powerful and articulate groups of stakeholders. Meaningful participation of community members and other local-level stakeholders is rarely achieved without special preparatory arrangements and careful facilitation. Two options exist for ensuring the views of these less powerful stakeholders are taken into account. The first option involves holding a number of local-level workshops to hear the views and concerns of stakeholders at this level, and then feeding the findings and recommendations from these workshops into a national-level workshop. This process can be reinforced by inviting representatives from the local-level workshops to give brief presentations at the national level forum. Alternatively, a national-level stakeholder workshop can be informed by the results of earlier participatory consultations and analyses that were undertaken at the community level to elicit the views of the local people. Again, representatives from the teams who visited the communities, or community members who were involved, can be invited to the national-level workshop to reinforce the feedback process.

When used for the purposes of Stakeholder Analysis, workshops have proven a particularly powerful technique for generating a sense of ownership among the different stakeholders involved, and for breaking down institutional and hierarchical barriers to enable stakeholders to collaborate effectively. The forums can therefore serve to set in motion a participation process that is based on individual stakeholders having a shared understanding of each others' interests and concerns. This "process outcome" is important even (and, indeed, perhaps especially) in cases where conflicts among the stakeholders may remain unresolved.

Box 1 provides some suggestions on how to organize workshops for Stakeholder Analysis. Several systematic methodologies provide a process framework for conducting stakeholder workshops.² However, stakeholder workshops do not necessarily need to follow structured models. Often a more ad hoc approach is used, where a task manager organizes the forum (usually in conjunction with a professional workshop designer/facilitator and other stakeholders) based on an agreed purpose and agenda. Boxes 2 and 3 highlight ad hoc workshop formats, and Box 4 provides an example of a more structured event.

² Two such methodologies are ZOPP (Objectives-Oriented Project Planning, developed by GTZ) and TeamUp (a derivative of ZOPP, with expanded scope and software support), both of which have been used in the context of World Bank-supported operations.

Box 1
Stakeholder Workshop Tips

- ◆ Enlist the help of a trained workshop designer and facilitator.
- ◆ Plan a series of linked workshops of different sizes, compositions, and locations (for example, a number of smaller workshops at the local level that feed into a subsequent national-level workshop).
- ◆ Organize and manage a committed core team to provide oversight and impetus to the process—for example a task manager, key lead agency staff, beneficiary representative, and consultant facilitator.
- ◆ Ensure that all key stakeholder groups participate over the course of the workshop, including the powerful, the poor, the reluctant actors, the marginal groups, the interested observers, and the enthusiastic supporters.
- ◆ Ensure that groups with special needs (such as women's groups, illiterate stakeholders) are given voice through special arrangements.
- ◆ Choose the appropriate workshop techniques for undertaking a Stakeholder Analysis with the participants.

Source: Based on a presentation by Jim Edgerton (of the World Bank) at a World Bank Africa Region seminar on Stakeholder Workshops, November 1995.

Box 2

Stakeholder Workshop Fostered Teamwork, Frankness in Nigeria STD/AIDS Assessment

An informal workshop was held during the early development of a proposed Sexually Transmitted Diseases (STDs) Prevention Project in Nigeria. The three-member World Bank team met with three officials from the State AIDS Program and the AIDS action managers from the three local government areas where the project was to be targeted. These participants identified a much wider range of potential stakeholders than had been considered by the World Bank team (adding, for example, brothel owners and male commercial sex workers). They also pinpointed the reasons why each of these stakeholder groups should be consulted in the project preparation process, and made an initial assessment of the interests that each group might have in the project.

In addition, the participants analyzed the possible impact of the project on these interests—considering, for example, the possibility of traditional healers facing a loss of income (if STD sufferers turn to health care providers in clinics and hospitals), while at the same time the healers would gain an opportunity through the project to learn Western medical skills.

In listing themselves as stakeholders too, the participants showed remarkable honesty; indeed they went on to define their overriding interest in the project as obtaining more funds! The research team agreed to make all decisions as a group (and this mode of decisionmaking became an explicit condition of World Bank assistance). The ownership of and capacity to undertake the participatory assessment was greatly enhanced by bringing these key stakeholders together for the workshop.

Source: Based on November 1995 presentation by Ernest Massiah (of the World Bank) at a World Bank Africa Region seminar on Stakeholder Analysis. Further discussion of this case can be found in the Case Studies section of this module.

Box 3
**Stakeholder Workshop Helped Bridge Gap between Policymakers and
Indigenous Communities in Mexico**

Following the premature closing of a forest management project in Mexico, which had been the center of both social and environmental controversy, a major review of the forest sector was undertaken by the World Bank and the government of Mexico to try to avoid such problems in future investments. The review incorporated social assessment and participatory methods, such as focus groups, visual methods, and photographs, to elicit the views of local forest communities and to facilitate their analysis of local problems and development of appropriate solutions.

The findings from these consultations were discussed in an intensive three-day stakeholder workshop for government officials and World Bank staff. The workshop participants formulated a number of strategic recommendations that were incorporated into the sector report. Another workshop was held to disseminate the findings with a much broader range of stakeholders, including government staff, representatives of *ejidos* (traditional collective communities), members of the NGO and academic communities, and World Bank specialists.

These workshops provided a productive forum for identifying and taking steps to resolve contentious issues, and also helped policymakers see the legitimacy of concerns raised by representatives of indigenous communities. Involving all of the key decisionmakers in the stakeholder workshop certainly accelerated the process of turning recommendations into policy, and smoothed the way for designing a subsequent project that is more participatory—and that stands a better chance of meeting the needs of the communities while protecting fragile ecosystems.

Source: World Bank, May 1996, "Mexico Resource Conservation and Forest Sector Review—Incorporating Social Assessment into Economic and Sector Work," Environment Department, Social Assessment Dissemination Note No. 44, Washington, D.C.

Box 4**Stakeholder Workshop Involves Private Sector Stakeholders in Project Preparation, Uganda**

A World Bank–supported project to promote private sector development in Uganda recently used a stakeholder workshop as a key step in a Stakeholder Analysis and project planning. At a very early stage of the project design process (after an initial identification mission), a large group of stakeholders from the private sector and relevant government agencies were invited to a workshop. A structured approach was used for the two-day workshop, based on the TeamUp method, which places particular emphasis on building teams and designing stakeholder participation.

Each of the 80 participants started by defining what interests they represented and what their position was in relation to the proposed project. An exercise called “spectrum of confidence” was used to enable participants to establish their level of skepticism or confidence in the ability of the private sector to design and implement a project to meet their needs. A number of other participatory techniques were used to facilitate a collaborative effort in developing and comparing alternative project designs. Finally, participants elected a task force to take the design process further.

This structured approach proved well-suited to this large gathering of people with very diverse interests. The workshop not only brought conflicts to the surface and revealed areas of common ground, but also set the scene for a participatory project that addressed the majority of private sector beneficiary interests.

Source: Moses Thompson, 1995, “Participatory Project Preparation and Appraisal at the World Bank: The Ugandan Private Sector Competitiveness Project,” Team Technologies, Inc., Chantilly, Virginia.

Section 3: Case Studies

NOTE:

The three cases presented here illustrate quite different approaches to Stakeholder Analysis as used in the context of project planning. The India case is based on very extensive investigations and required considerable time. The participatory assessment work involved more than 40 NGOs and yielded detailed documentation of the stakeholder groups and the likely impacts of the project, particularly on the vulnerable groups. By comparison, the Nigeria case uses a more focused approach. The World Bank task manager and a research team of local government officials and university researchers identified and analyzed key stakeholders for project success in an initial workshop; and the research team then went into the field to conduct a series of local-level participatory assessments with specific target groups. The Ukraine case highlights a Stakeholder Analysis conducted in the context of a very short time frame and with limited scope for incorporating participatory strategies. It identifies at-risk groups from mine closings and predicts the likely impacts of the closures on these groups' livelihoods.

While none of these cases uses the set of Stakeholder Analysis matrices shown in the Overview and Techniques sections of this module, they do address a similar sequence of questions. Significantly, however, the work described in all three cases goes beyond a simple Stakeholder Analysis to include elements of more extensive Social Assessments or project planning. In this respect, readers should bear in mind that not all Stakeholder Analyses need be as exhaustive and costly as the ones described here.

Case Study: India Ecodevelopment Project

Key Features:

- ◆ Stakeholder Analysis undertaken jointly by government officials and NGOs in a highly participatory manner; and
- ◆ Comprehensive identification of stakeholder groups, their relationships with each other, and the likely impacts of the project on each group.

Context:

This project, planned to begin implementation in October 1996, has been prepared with very extensive participation, including government-NGO collaboration in the Stakeholder Analysis. The government organized and facilitated the process in partnership with a national NGO, and more than 40 NGOs then participated in consultations, studies, and meetings with project staff and government officials.

Objectives:

The Stakeholder Analysis was conducted to:

- ◆ identify the major stakeholder groups involved, including the most vulnerable groups—such as tribals, women, the poor;
- ◆ analyze the interactions between stakeholder groups and the protected areas to determine the opportunities for maximizing positive impacts on both and the priorities for project investments;
- ◆ assess potential project activities in relation to the project objectives of reducing negative impacts and improving positive interactions; and
- ◆ identify other key social issues that are likely to affect project success.

Process:

The Stakeholder Analysis was achieved through the compilation of results from a number of activities, including: (i) PRA work conducted jointly by government officials and local NGOs in each of the eight project sites to provide baseline information (see Case Studies section in the PRA module for highlights on this aspect of the project); (ii) an analysis of secondary data by a national NGO to complement the PRA findings; (iii) a series of meetings and consultations among NGOs, government officials, and project staff on a range of issues throughout the preparation process; (iv) analysis provided by government officials in six of the eight states involved of the expected social impacts of their ecodevelopment program and the strategy they plan to adopt to ensure that vulnerable groups will be full participants in project decisionmaking and benefits; and (v) a detailed analysis by independent anthropologists who were contracted for the pre-appraisal and appraisal missions.

The social scientists working on the project pooled the information from these various activities to form a series of matrix-based analyses of the above mentioned issues. Given the rather complex nature of this process, it is very difficult to estimate the costs involved in the Stakeholder Analysis. The World Bank Environment Department contributed the costs of a social scientist from headquarters to work with the independent anthropology consultants on the Stakeholder Analysis during the World Bank missions. Overall, project preparation has taken more than four years, with the majority of the activities related to the Stakeholder Analysis occurring from late 1992 to late 1994.

Techniques:

As mentioned above, a variety of methods have been used to generate information for the Stakeholder Analysis, including a range of PRA techniques, stakeholder workshops, secondary data collection, and quantitative surveys. The subsequent matrix-based summaries provide a systematic analysis of all the key stakeholder groups. The key steps in this analysis are:

- ◆ identification of project stakeholders in each of the seven project areas (the project was proposed for eight sites, but was appraised for only seven due to

difficulties in one site; see Attachment 1 for a list of stakeholder groups identified), including human settlements within the protected area boundaries, government agencies operating in and around the protected areas, private enterprises using protected area resources, local villagers in the periphery of the protected areas, and tourists and pilgrims visiting the protected areas;

- ◆ more detailed analyses of scheduled tribes and castes in the project sites, with approximate sizes of each population;
- ◆ analysis of the interactions between the stakeholder groups and the protected areas; and
- ◆ analysis of expected project impacts on vulnerable groups—women, tribals, and the poor (see Attachment 2 for analysis of project impacts on women).

Limitations and Difficulties:

The Stakeholder Analysis was based on data of very mixed quality because of the different methods being used, the large number of different actors involved, and the large area covered. The results will, therefore, need to be reviewed and refined as new information becomes available.

Outputs and Impacts:

By conducting such a thorough Stakeholder Analysis, involving all the key stakeholder groups, the chances of the project succeeding have been greatly enhanced, particularly when the complex and potentially enormous social impacts are taken into account. Not only are project planners and government officials more aware of the likely impacts on each stakeholder group, they are also better informed about the interactions between stakeholders, and how these relations can be improved.

The Stakeholder Analysis revealed a whole range of social and cultural issues in the different sites that will need to be addressed during implementation. To ensure that subsequent work takes account of these social and cultural realities, contract sociologists will be hired to continue the Stakeholder Analysis in a participatory manner to work on, among other things, predicting social consequences of project activities on stakeholder groups; identifying mitigation strategies, particularly for vulnerable stakeholders; and monitoring the project's impacts on the different groups.

Background Documentation:

World Bank, August 3, 1996, "India Ecodevelopment Project," Staff Appraisal Report No. 14914-IN, Washington, D.C. For more information contact Jessica Mott at jmott@worldbank.org.

Project Stakeholders by Protected Area (PA)
(from Annex 18 of Staff Appraisal Report)

Stakeholders	Buxa, West Bengal	Gir, Gujarat	Nagahole, Karnataka	Palamau, Bihar630	Pench, Madhya Pradesh	Periyar, Kerala	Ranthambhore, Rajasthan
Inside PA	15,600		7,100				
People in Forest Settlements		4,500				3,900	
Grazier Settlements		2,600					1,210
Revenue Enclaves				39,000	12,000		3,067
Temple Complexes		Present				Present	Present
Forest Department	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present
Other Govt. Agencies and Industries	Mining	Wildlife, Irrigation	Tourism, Wildlife, Elect.	North Koel Hydro	Fisheries, Hydro	Tourism, Pulp, Irrigation	
Outside PA							
Peripheral Revenue Villages	20,400	65,000	63,000	36,000	36,000	58,000	60,000
Migratory Grazers							Present
Commercial and Industrial	Tea Estates, Wood, Non-Timber Forest Products		Tea Estates		Fisheries		
Water Use Agencies		Irrigation	Irrigation	Hydro/irrig		Irrigation	
Visitors-Tourists	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present
Visitors-Pilgrims	Present	Present				Present	Present
Smugglers/Poachers	Present		Present	Present		Present	Present
Ritual Hunters							
NGOs		Present	Present	Present		Present	Present
Researchers		Present	Present			Present	Present

Attachment 2

Project Impacts on Women
(from Annex 18 of Staff Appraisal Report)

Village Ecodevelopment Investment	Expected Benefits	Possible Negative Impacts	Measures to ensure benefits & mitigate negative impacts	Monitoring mechanism
Forestry Plantations	Employment; fuel, fodder, and intercroops	Decreased income from sale of firewood; decreased diversity of non-timber forest products available to meet household needs and for sale; loss of indigenous knowledge	Participatory micro-planning including feasibility analyses; joint forest management policies; mixed plantations	Monitoring plan to include locally identified measures of performance and procedures, NGO participation, and Ecodevelopment and Forest Protection Committees' review meetings; research
Cattle Improvement	Increased income	Increased time for fodder collection	Micro-planning; contact with female Forest Department staff; effective participation in decisionmaking	Same
Energy Conservation	Decreased expenditure on fuelwood; decreased collection time	Decreased income from fuelwood sales	Alternative income activities	Same
Ecotourism (in present form)	Negligible; some possible employment opportunities	Resentment toward government and private agencies capturing economic benefits; (prostitution in Periyar?)	Govt. orders on sharing of entry fees; micro-planning; targeting of training and employment	Same
Non-Timber Forest Product Cultivation (outside PA)	Income; employment	Capture of benefits by other groups/ entrepreneurs; loss in income due to decreased diversity of products for sale as efforts concentrate on fewer products	Micro-planning; research	Same
Alternative Incomes	Increased incomes; employment opportunities	Marginal benefits without culturally appropriate choice of options and training	Micro-planning; contact with female Forest Department staff; participation in decisionmaking; training	Same

Project Impacts on Women
(continued)

Village Ecodevelopment Investment	Expected Benefits	Possible Negative Impacts	Measures to ensure benefits & mitigate negative impacts	Monitoring mechanism
Agricultural Improvement	Increased income; increased food supplies	Increased workload due to intensification/diversification of crops	Micro-planning	Same
Soil and Water Conservation	Increased yields; employment opportunities	Increased workload; options identified by groups other than women	Effective participation in decisionmaking	Same
Voluntary Relocation	Access to irrigated land, housing, and other facilities; increased income	Terms of relocation not met; loss of income and capital resources; decreased access to resources (such as forests); loss of indigenous knowledge; cultural isolation; increased workload	Participatory operational plans; cultural continuity activities; transition support; NGO participation	Same
Reduction in Wildlife Damage	Increased yields; increased income; improved relations with Forest Dept.; employment	Time spent in patrolling	Provision of equipment; joint patrols with Forest Department	Same
Park Management Investments	Expected Benefits	Possible Negative Impacts	Measures to ensure benefits & mitigate negative impacts	Monitoring mechanism
Survey and Demarcation	Employment; exclusion of land from protected areas	Loss of cultivable land; decreased access to forest land	Government orders on resource-sharing	Same
Habitat Management structures such as firelines	Employment; resource-sharing	Decreased access to forest resources	Government orders on resource-sharing	Same
Habitat Enrichment	Employment; resource-sharing	Reduction of grazing area (buffer zones) and access to non-timber forest products	Targeting of employment; Government orders	Same

Case Study: Nigeria STD/AIDS Prevention Project

Key Feature:

An informal Stakeholder Analysis approach was used to identify stakeholder groups and to plan local consultations with these groups using participatory assessment methods.

Context:

Although currently on hold due to political problems in Nigeria, this project in Plateau State involved an informal Stakeholder Analysis workshop that preceded a series of local consultations and meetings with target groups and other stakeholders. The Stakeholder Analysis became an increasingly open process, with many of the participating groups having never before met face-to-face. The analysis provided valuable information on local development and health priorities, as well as on the varied beliefs and understandings of the different target groups relating to sexually transmitted diseases and Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (STDs/AIDS).

Objectives:

The objectives of the Stakeholder Analysis and the subsequent local-level consultations were to: (i) create an opportunity for government officials at the local, state, and federal levels to work together—and along with local university researchers—in participatory research and project planning; and (ii) determine—by means of participatory methodologies—the various stakeholder groups' views on the causes, symptoms, treatment, and prevention of STD/AIDS, and their respective interests in the project.

Process:

The Stakeholder Analysis involved three different stages. The first step was a preliminary identification of stakeholders, based on the work of pre-appraisal and appraisal missions. This consisted of producing a list of general stakeholder categories, including commercial sex workers, truck drivers, antenatal women, youth, service providers and local, state, and federal government officials. No attempt was made at this stage to assess the interests of these different stakeholder groups or the likely impacts of the project on them.

The second phase of the process occurred when the task manager returned to Nigeria to discuss the planned consultative research with local- and state-level government officials. They expanded the list of stakeholders quite substantially, including for example, traditional healers and religious leaders, and disaggregated the general stakeholder groups identified during the first step into distinct sub-groups. For instance, the category of commercial sex workers was disaggregated into brothel owners, the head commercial sex worker in each brothel, and male as well as female sex workers. The interests of all stakeholder groups and the likely impact of the project on their interests, whether positive or negative, were also

considered at this time. For example, female sex workers were regarded as both potential winners and losers, with the project possibly reducing the number of their clients, but also improving their own health. Also of note, the government officials proved quite open about assessing their own interests in the project—namely that of obtaining more money for their health programs.

The third stage of the Stakeholder Analysis was undertaken when the government officials and local university researchers came together to decide with which of the stakeholders identified they would actually be able to consult in the seven urban and rural sites selected for the fieldwork in three local government areas of Plateau State. This involved targeting particularly vulnerable groups, considering likely access to each group, as well as determining the length of time available for the consultations. A few stakeholder groups had to be excluded from some of the local-level consultations (truck drivers, antenatal women, and patent medicine dealers); however, the majority of the stakeholders were included in the consultations at each site.

Following these consultations, a number of meetings were organized to bring together representatives from the different stakeholder groups to discuss and comment on the findings. Meetings were organized in each of the three local government areas included in the study; and in these forums, probably for the first time, prostitutes, religious leaders, women, and students sat in the same room discussing sexual practices and STD/AIDS concerns. Discussions were heated at times—with, for instance, prostitutes countering the protests of religious leaders that certain practices (such as oral sex) and target groups (male sex workers) did not exist. A state-level meeting was also held to bring together representatives from each of the local government areas to start to develop recommendations for the project based on the findings from the fieldwork.

The whole process of Stakeholder Analysis and consultations took approximately two years. There proved to be ample time for analysis and report preparation due to the political problems that were delaying the rest of the project preparations. The task manager received a grant of US\$20,000 from the Africa Region's Client Consultation Fund at the World Bank, which covered the consultations and the subsequent stakeholder meetings. A further grant of US\$65,000 from the Ford Foundation allowed a continuation of the work. The task manager spent a good deal of time organizing the process, including the development of a field guide for the research teams; and he also relied on considerable support from the World Bank's Resident Mission in Nigeria.

Techniques:

The Stakeholder Analysis itself did not use any particular techniques except the meetings and brainstorming sessions that were held with the government and university stakeholders involved. However, the Stakeholder Analysis was also closely linked to the local consultations and subsequent stakeholder review meetings. The fieldwork provided an opportunity to test, discuss, and cross-check the assumptions made by the research teams regarding the categories of high-risk groups, and the groups' likely interests in an STD/AIDS prevention program. The consultations,

conducted by the local university researchers (following a period of training in participatory techniques), used a menu of 19 different participatory assessment techniques, from which the researchers selected the most appropriate ones for each consultation. Rather than a questionnaire, consultations most often took the form of semi-structured interviews and included such techniques as body mapping (where women were asked to draw how they imagined their internal reproductive organs were connected to their other body parts), priority ranking of health problems, and preference ranking of different health service providers (among hospitals, clinics, traditional healers, chemists, and so on for various medical needs).

Limitations and Difficulties:

The political problems in Nigeria have been responsible for long delays and, at the time of this writing, a suspension of the project's preparation. Some of the problems encountered in the actual process of Stakeholder Analysis include: difficulties in oversight by the headquarters-based task manager, administrative problems in the World Bank related to processing the relatively small Ford Foundation grant; and an initial reluctance by the research team to use some of the participatory techniques (as they felt insulted, given their research abilities, by the proposal to use such simple information-gathering tools). Perhaps more important, however, the locally prepared report proved quite lengthy and of mixed quality. The approach thus involved some tradeoffs between the objectives of increasing collaboration among and strengthening the capacity of the various levels of government officials and the university researchers involved, on the one hand, and the quality and speed of the work, on the other. Had an international expert in AIDS research been employed to conduct the research, the results would likely have been of better quality and available sooner, but key process objectives would have suffered.

Outputs and Impacts:

The active involvement of local and state government personnel in the planning and conduct of the analysis should prove useful as they take steps to design a more effective program to prevent the spread of STD/AIDS. Also of note, the process tapped into the research and evaluation capacity of the local university, thereby strengthening the links among academia, the government, and community-level health concerns. In addition, the experience gained by those involved in the participatory research is spreading, as some members of the research team have subsequently provided training on participatory methodologies to researchers doing similar work in another part of the country; and two team members participated in an international AIDS conference in Israel to share their experiences. The exercise also gave rise to recommendations that identify and outline strategies for a more central role for local communities in the state's STD/AIDS program planning, implementation, and monitoring.

Background Documentation:

For more information contact Ernest Massiah at emassiah@worldbank.org.

Case Study: Ukraine Coal Pilot Project

Key Feature:

As part of a fast-track pilot project involving mine closures, a rapid Stakeholder Analysis was undertaken to identify vulnerable groups and to examine social impacts and mitigation strategies.

Context:

This Stakeholder Analysis was undertaken within the context of a fast-track pilot project involving the rapid closing of three coal mines in Ukraine, and the addition of possibly another 40 more closures. These measures are associated with a structural adjustment loan, which will involve the restructuring of the entire coal sector. Although once strong, the sector is now a major drain on the economy due to many mines nearing exhaustion and operating with substantial financial losses. The Stakeholder Analysis focused primarily on the social mitigation measures that would be required for these planned closures. The social impacts are likely to be very high, especially if the closures are done rapidly, as many of the affected towns are actually operated by the mining companies and can offer out-of-work mine workers little or no alternative sources of employment.

Objectives:

The principal objectives of the Stakeholder Analysis were to: (i) identify and distinguish the groups likely to be affected by the mine closures; (ii) determine the baseline conditions in the three affected communities to assist subsequent monitoring efforts; and (iii) elicit the perceptions of the miners on the closures and their priorities for assistance.

Process:

The first phase of this Stakeholder Analysis began during the appraisal mission of the pilot project in February 1996. Two social scientists accompanied the mission team to investigate the social dimensions of the closure plans. The work was led by a social science consultant from the United States-based Research Triangle Institute, who spent three weeks in the field (one week in each of the three mines slated for closure in the pilot). The second social scientist, a World Bank staff member from headquarters, spent one week in the field to conduct further consultations. As preparation for this work, a list of some 14 stakeholder groups had been identified by the consultant based on observations made during a previous mission and existing project documents. Of these stakeholder groups, four were selected as priorities for the initial Stakeholder Analysis consultations: (i) underground mine workers; (ii) surface mine workers; (iii) workers associated with other operations supported by the coal mining companies (schools, kindergarten, housing and so forth); and (iv) former mine employees.

Due to time constraints, the consultations were in fact limited to only the first two of these groups; discussions were also held with mine union representatives and mine management staff. The Stakeholder Analysis resulted in the identification of

four stakeholder groups among the mine employees, characterized by the extent of their vulnerability to the closures. This analysis was informed by the responses of mine managers, trade union representatives, and mine workers to two key questions: (i) Who will be hit the hardest by the mine closing? and (ii) Who will adapt best to the impacts of mine closure? The four at-risk groups thus identified were: (i) highest risk stakeholders—single female heads of households with children, whose husbands have died or abandoned them (these women work as unskilled laborers and have no alternative sources of income); (ii) high-risk stakeholders—men and women having relatively unskilled jobs, working in clerical positions or in ancillary services; (iii) at-risk stakeholders—skilled engineers who have little chance of finding similar work in other mines due to very limited demand for their services; and (iv) at-risk but mobile stakeholders—highly skilled underground workers (such as those in charge of explosives) who could be reemployed elsewhere if they were able and willing to move to other mines. This vulnerability analysis also had a gender dimension in that all women staff work above ground, and are, therefore, in the two most vulnerable groups. The Stakeholder Analysis included a breakdown of the percentages of staff in each of the four vulnerable groups, as shown in Attachment 1.

The second phase of the Stakeholder Analysis is now being planned to provide information on the following: (i) the relative power of the different stakeholder groups identified, and the relationships between them; (ii) more systematic baseline data on the three affected communities; (iii) assessments of the poverty, gender, health, and nutrition implications of the closures; (iv) consultations with miners who have already left the mines to pursue employment elsewhere to find out how they have fared. It is planned to contract a locally based NGO, Search for Common Ground, to undertake this second phase of the work. It will involve consultations with a wide range of stakeholders. This phase will also include information-sharing on the proposed closures (such information is currently unavailable to miner families), and an attempt to obtain feedback from the different groups on the proposed components of the pilot project. The total cost of the Stakeholder Analysis (including the first and second phases) will be approximately US\$100,000, with an another US\$50,000 being set aside for additional stakeholder consultation activities and participation. These costs will be covered by the Policy and Human Resources Development Fund, a World Bank trust fund financed by the government of Japan.

Techniques:

The first phase of the Stakeholder Analysis used in-depth interviews and focus group discussion techniques for the consultations. An interview guide (not a questionnaire) was developed for the individual interviews with miners. These interviews, conducted either in the miners' homes or at the mines, consisted mostly of open-ended questions but also included some standard questions on their current livelihoods to develop a profile of the miner families. Focus group discussions, arranged with the help of union representatives, were also held with miners at their site of work. The consultations with the miners were undertaken by the consultant social scientist, working with a local interpreter from the World Bank field office. Prior to the consultations, the interpreter was trained by the consultant

in the use of qualitative research techniques, and was responsible for the bulk of the dialogues with the mine workers. Interviews with mine management staff were conducted without the help of an interview guide, and interviews with union representatives mostly took the form of focus group discussions.

Limitations and Difficulties:

The fast-track schedule of this project (which was done partly to demonstrate to the Ukrainian government that, despite a poor disbursement record to date, World Bank projects can achieve fast results) has meant that there was little time for the Stakeholder Analysis to be undertaken in a thorough manner and with the use of participatory approaches. Nor was there time for the results of the Stakeholder Analysis to be built into the preparation of the pilot project. Moreover, given that this project and the associated structural adjustment loan involve a highly political issue for the Ukrainian government (as miners have a powerful political voice), and potentially substantial investments for the World Bank, there may be a great deal of resistance to any findings from the Stakeholder Analysis that could be seen as impeding the progress of these projects.

Outputs and Impacts:

One of the most revealing findings of the Stakeholder Analysis was the fact that the social costs of the closures are likely to be much higher than were originally foreseen. An initial estimate by some of the economists involved in the project, based on economic data available from headquarters, predicted that about 80 to 90 percent of the miners made redundant by the closures would be reabsorbed by other mines. In stark contrast, the Stakeholder Analysis showed that even under a best case scenario some 75 to 80 percent of the redundant mine staff will remain unemployed for the first two years. The absorption capacity of other mines is very low and labor mobility is very limited due to severe housing shortages. The Stakeholder Analysis also found that the proposed mitigation package for affected mine staff is very inadequate as it assumes rapid reemployment elsewhere or a transfer into entrepreneurial activities with the support of a proposed microenterprise fund. The Stakeholder Analysis found very little interest among those workers consulted in such a fund, as most see it as the responsibility of the government to provide alternative employment opportunities in their hometowns. In any case, many workers expressed doubts whether these closures would actually take place, as they had been warned of possible closures for decades with no results; and they also felt that the closures could be avoided if management were improved and modernization measures taken. This reveals an urgent need to provide better information to the affected groups, and will be a substantial part of subsequent work on the project.

Background Documentation:

World Bank, April 1996, "Ukraine Coal Pilot Project," Staff Appraisal Report No. 15351-UA, Washington, D.C. For more information contact Jeffrey Balkind at jbalkind@worldbank.org or Betsy McGean at bmcgean@worldbank.org.

Attachment 1

Affected At-Risk Populations
(from Annex 8 of Staff Appraisal Report)

Levels of Risk:

The analysis revealed four levels of risk. The definitions of these levels were informed by the responses of mine managers, trade union representatives, and mine workers to two key questions: (1) Who will be hit the hardest by the mine closing? and (2) Who will adapt best to the impacts of mine closure?

Level One: Highest Risk [5 percent of all mine staff]

A woman, alone with children, with 70 percent or more of the family income derived from mine wages. This person is clearly the most at risk of losing everything.

L.N. is 35 years old and has lived in the community all her life. She has two school-age daughters. Her ex-husband moved away and provides no child support. She has worked in the mine five years as an unskilled above-ground worker and earns US\$32 a month in total family income, all of which comes from the mine. Her job will be one of the first to go and is not considered to be transferable to another mine. She is very worried about how she will take care of her children.

Level Two: High-Risk [29 percent of all mine staff]

Other aboveground workers comprise this category. As a general observation, aboveground workers are considered a highly vulnerable group of workers, not possessing particularly transferable skills. All women staff work aboveground, and 83 percent of the total number of aboveground workers are women.

V.C. is 60 years old and has lived all 60 years in this community. She has worked 30 years in the same mine. She currently works aboveground in the stockyard in an unskilled position. She and her husband have a monthly family income of US\$64, which includes their pensions. Their family income is closely tied to the mine and will be cut in half, to about US\$1 a day, when the mine closes. She is frightened when she thinks about it closing. No one will hire her.

Level Three: At-Risk [33 percent of all mine staff]

Underground workers in the engineering and other professions comprise this group. They are the highest risk group of the underground workers.

V.G. is a 40 year-old man who has worked 25 years in the mine. He is an electrician underground and earns US\$64 a month to support his wife and two school-age children. He is totally dependent on the mine; his wife is unemployed and 100 percent of the family income comes from the mine. He has no savings and worries that the mine closing is going to be a disaster for his family.

Level Four: At-Risk but Mobile [33 percent of all mine staff]

Underground skilled workers (face miners, drifters, timberers/fitters, and coal transport workers). These workers have the best chance of adjusting to a mine closing. They are potentially the most in demand for their skills and hence the most mobile.

O.Z., 38, has worked underground in the mine for 19 years, most recently handling explosives. Seventy-five percent of his family income comes from the mine. His wife earns US\$18 a month working in the hospital and he is worried that the hospital will close if the mine closes. He earns US\$88 a month. He is worried about the future for his two sons—where will they work? He has lived in the same community his whole life and does not want to leave for another job. His skills raise considerably his chances of getting a new job.

Section 4: Suggestions for Seminars

This section includes a sample agenda for a one-day training seminar on Stakeholder Analysis as well as suggestions for experiential exercises and discussion points for small group work during the seminar. These ideas are provided only as a starting point for trainers and seminar organizers. There are many alternative ways of designing these training events, and experienced trainers will have their own style of working and their own preferences for the kinds of exercises to use. Ideally, of course, a training seminar would be much longer than one day to give participants a chance to work through a detailed case study or to practice some techniques in the field.

SAMPLE AGENDA

9:00–9:30	Welcome and Introductions
9:30–10:30	Overview Presentation and Discussion
10:30–10:45	Break
10:45–12:00	Case Study Presentation and Discussion Presentation by someone who has conducted a Stakeholder Analysis, describing the process and content of the work.
12:00–12:30	Introduction to Stakeholder Analysis Matrices and Discussion Facilitator presents the Stakeholder Analysis matrices. Participants discuss how these matrices might be useful in their work.
12:30–13:30	Lunch
13:30–14:30	Presentation of Participants' Cases Those participants who are currently planning or considering undertaking a Stakeholder Analysis present very brief descriptions of the project background. These cases will be the basis of the small group work.
14:30–14:45	Formation of Small Groups Participants choose which case interests them most, and a facilitator makes any adjustments to the groups to ensure some mixing of participants and to avoid any groups being too large or small.
14:45–15:00	Break

15:00–16:30	Small Group Work: Simulating a Stakeholder Analysis Each group works on the real-life case to go through the process of a Stakeholder Analysis, using the matrices below as a guide. A facilitator, knowledgeable about Stakeholder Analysis, will need to accompany each group.
16:30–17:00	Plenary Presentations of Small Group Work Brief reports by each group and discussion.
17:00–17:30	Wrap-Up and Evaluations

SMALL GROUP WORK

The following matrices can be used to give structure to the simulation of a Stakeholder Analysis by the small groups. Where possible, each group should use as the basis of their simulation a project or study in which a Stakeholder Analysis is already being planned or at least considered. While in practice a Stakeholder Analysis will require more in-depth analysis—often involving direct consultations with local-level stakeholders as well as workshops or meetings with institutional stakeholders—the matrices are useful as a means of illustrating the assumptions and analysis upon which the work is based.

There should be at least one person in each group who is familiar with the case being discussed. This individual can start the group work by giving a very brief (five-minute) introduction of the operation and what they would like to achieve by doing a Stakeholder Analysis. The group members then work together to fill in the matrices—identifying the key stakeholder groups (or, as time will be limited, six of the key stakeholder groups), analyzing how they will affect and be affected by the project, and planning for their participation. A completed set of matrices is provided in the Techniques section of the module as an example.

The following assignment sheet can be handed out to participants to help guide their work. The matrices should be enlarged to fit a flip chart, making it easier for the participants to work together as a group.

SMALL GROUP WORK ASSIGNMENT

Elect a rapporteur to record a summary of the group's discussion, fill in the matrices, and briefly present the results in plenary. Your facilitator will help you to accomplish the following tasks.

Discuss the range of stakeholders likely to be involved in the project, and select six key stakeholder groups for the purposes of the exercise.

In Table 1 identify, for each stakeholder group:

- ◆ what *interests* they are likely to have in the project;
- ◆ what *effect* the project will probably have on these interests (positive, negative, or neutral);
- ◆ the level of *importance* of the stakeholder for the project (in other words, to what extent the project focuses on meeting the needs of the stakeholder);
- ◆ the level of *influence* that the stakeholder is likely to have over the project (the extent to which the stakeholder has some control over how the project operates).

Using the information in Table 1, map the relative importance and influence of the stakeholder groups in Table 2. Discuss how the stakeholder groups compare to each other and consider how, if at all, the project should involve the different groups in each stage of the project cycle.

In Table 3, insert some examples of how some of the stakeholder groups can be involved in each stage of the project cycle. The following guide may be useful as you plan.

- ◆ **stakeholders of high influence and high importance:** should be closely involved throughout to ensure their support for the project;
- ◆ **stakeholders of high influence, low importance:** may oppose the project as their interests are not the target of the project, and will, therefore, need to be kept informed and their views acknowledged, where appropriate, to avoid disruption or conflict;
- ◆ **stakeholders of low influence, high importance:** special efforts will need to be made to ensure that their needs are met and their participation is meaningful; and
- ◆ **stakeholders of low influence, low importance:** are unlikely to be closely involved in the project, and no special participation strategies are required for this group (beyond any information-sharing strategies aimed at the “general public”).

Table 2.
Step 3 of Stakeholder Analysis (continued):
Mapping Key Stakeholders' Relative Influence and Importance

INFLUENCE OF STAKEHOLDER	IMPORTANCE OF ACTIVITY TO STAKEHOLDER					
	Unknown	Little/No Importance	Some Importance	Moderate Importance	Very Important	Critical Player
Unknown						
Little/No Influence						
Some Influence						
Moderate Influence						
Significant Influence						
Very Influential						

Table 3.
Step 4 of Stakeholder Analysis:
Formulation of Stakeholder Participation Strategy Project

STAGE IN PROJECT PROCESS	TYPE OF PARTICIPATION			
	Information-sharing (one-way flow)	Consultation (two-way flow)	Collaboration (increasing control over decisionmaking)	Empowerment (transfer of control over decisions and resources)
Project Identification				
Preparation Appraisal				
Implementation, Supervision, and Monitoring				
Evaluation				

Participatory Rural Appraisal

Module III

Section 1: Overview

Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA)


“An approach (and family of methodologies) for shared learning between local people and outsiders to enable development practitioners, government officials, and local people to plan together appropriate interventions.”

Participatory Rural Appraisal—a misnomer:

- ♦ **Participatory** — more or less
- ♦ **Rural** — but also urban uses
- ♦ **Appraisal** — but also used in identification, implementation, evaluation, and ESW

Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) evolved from a series of qualitative multidisciplinary approaches to learning about local-level conditions and local peoples' perspectives, including Rapid Rural Appraisal and Agroecosystem Analysis. The pioneers of PRA development have been NGOs and agricultural research organizations, and in recent years the World Bank and other donors have begun to adopt PRA-type methods in their work.

The term itself is misleading because more and more PRA is being used not only in rural settings (a recent World Bank study of urban violence in Jamaica used a range of PRA techniques), and not only for project appraisal, but throughout the project cycle, as well as for ESW (economic and sector work). Indeed, the term *PRA* is one of many labels for similar participatory assessment approaches, the methodologies of which overlap considerably. It is probably more useful to consider the key principles behind PRA and its “trademark techniques,” rather than the name *per se*, when assessing its appropriateness to a particular situation.



Just how participatory is a PRA activity? In most of the World Bank uses of PRA to date, the method has been used primarily for consultation with local people to learn about their priorities and perspectives on the project or ESW topic. However, many NGOs use PRA as part of their regular interactions with communities, and in many cases it is the local people who are responsible for undertaking the bulk of the PRA work. In this setting, PRA can serve as an effective means of facilitating shared decisionmaking and empowerment of communities, contributing to a shifting of power and control from outside intervenors to the local people.

When used in an empowering mode, PRA can help in the identification and strengthening of local organizations, which can take over a good deal of the responsibility for implementation and monitoring of community-level activities. A few World Bank uses of PRA have also achieved these more intensive forms of participation, at least in part (for example, PRA as used in the Egypt Matruh Natural Resource Management Project¹).

¹ See World Bank, February 1996, *The World Bank Participation Sourcebook*, Washington, D.C., pp. 47–51.

PRA: Key Principles

- ♦ **Participation:** local people serve as partners in data collection and analysis
- ♦ **Flexibility:** not a standardized methodology, depends on purpose, resources, skills, time
- ♦ **Teamwork:** outsiders and insiders, men and women, mix of disciplines
- ♦ **Optimal Ignorance:** cost and time efficient, but ample opportunity for analysis and planning
- ♦ **Systematic:** for validity and reliability, partly stratified sampling, cross-checking

The five key principles of PRA listed above form the basis of any PRA activity no matter what the objectives or setting. PRA relies heavily on participation by the communities visited, as the method is designed to enable local people to participate, not only as sources of information (as is the case in more formal survey work), but as partners with the PRA team in gathering and *analyzing* the information. It is here that the visual techniques come into play, allowing non-literate people to participate fully.

Since there is no one blueprint of a PRA activity, the actual techniques chosen and the manner in which they are used are adaptable to the project or ESW context and the resources available. Generally, a PRA is best conducted by a local team (speaking the local languages) with a few outsiders present, a significant representation of women, and a mix of sector specialists and social scientists, according to the topic. The team spends time in the communities not only in information-gathering but also with in-the-field analysis and initial planning.

As PRA-generated data is seldom conducive to statistical analysis (given its largely qualitative nature and relatively small sample size), alternative ways have been developed to ensure the validity and reliability of the findings. These include sampling based on approximate stratification of the community by geographic location or relative wealth, and cross-checking, that is using a number of techniques to investigate views on a single topic (including through a final community meeting to discuss the findings and correct inconsistencies).

PRA: Key Techniques

- ♦ **Interviews/Discussions:** individuals
households
focus groups, community meetings
- ♦ **Mapping:** community maps
personal maps
institutional maps
- ♦ **Ranking:** problem ranking
preference ranking
wealth ranking
- ♦ **Trend Analysis:** historical diagramming
seasonal calendars
daily activity charts

PRA offers a “basket of techniques” from which those most appropriate for the project context can be selected. The central part of any PRA is semi-structured interviewing—that is, interviewing based not on a questionnaire but on a checklist of issues that the PRA team adapts according to the interview situation. These interviews are, therefore, more like conversations guided informally by the interviewers. While sensitive topics are often better addressed in interviews with individuals, other topics of more general concern are amenable to focus group discussions and community meetings.

During these interviews and discussions, several diagrammatic techniques are frequently used to stimulate debate and record the results. Many of these visuals are not drawn on paper but on the ground with sticks, stones, seeds, and other local materials, and then later transferred to paper for a permanent record. Mapping techniques, very useful at the start of a PRA activity, involve: community members depicting the physical or social characteristics of their community, or individuals drawing their own personal perspective of the community and the areas of most importance to them, or key informants mapping the extent to which local organizations interact with each other. Ranking exercises, done either by individuals or groups, reveal the priority problems and preferences of the population or, in wealth ranking, the local definition and indicators of poverty and the stratification of the community by relative wealth. Other diagrams address the historical and seasonal trends and daily routines of local livelihoods.

Visual-based techniques are important tools for enhancing a shared understanding between outsiders and insiders, but may hide important differences of opinion and perspective when drawn in group settings, and may not reveal cultural-based information and beliefs adequately. They therefore need to be complemented by other techniques, such as careful interviewing and observation, to cross-check and supplement the results of diagramming.

PRA: Range of Uses in World Bank Work

- ♦ **Stage:**
 - primarily for project identification and preparation
 - also for evaluation and ESW
- ♦ **Scale:**
 - primarily project-wide
 - also countrywide and community-level planning
- ♦ **Sectors:**
 - primarily natural resource management
 - also social sectors and infrastructure
- ♦ **Outputs:**
 - recommendations for project design
 - local people's evaluation of project
 - community-level implementation plans
 - local people's perspective for ESW
 - (empowerment of communities)

The PRAs that have been conducted to date in World Bank work have primarily been during the early stage of the project cycle, particularly during preparation. However, PRAs have also been used during identification, evaluation, and as part of ESW studies. Examples of these different uses include: a PRA in the identification of a rural development project in Mauritania; a PRA in the preparation of an emergency rehabilitation project in Maharashtra, India; a PRA in the evaluation of the Economic and Social Adjustment Credit in Zambia; and a PRA-based ESW in The Gambia on girls' education.

While most World Bank applications of PRA have been in the natural resource management sector, PRAs have also been used in social sector and infrastructure investments. And, while most PRAs in the World Bank have been done on a project-wide scale (through sampling of representative communities in the project area), there have also been countrywide PRAs (as in the ESW on Women in Development in Morocco, or the Participatory Poverty Assessments in Ghana and Zambia; again through careful sampling of regions and communities), and PRAs at the community level (such as a PRA in a water and sanitation project in India to decide the location of water points).

It is worth noting that all of these World Bank applications of PRA have occurred within the last four or five years.

PRA: Some Limitations and Risks

- ◆ Raising expectations—planned intervention may not meet priority felt needs
- ◆ Desire for quantitative, statistically verifiable data
- ◆ Desire for package or blueprint approach
- ◆ Indiscriminate use of techniques
- ◆ Trade-offs in training versus getting good quality results
- ◆ Rushing and overlooking the poor and disadvantaged
- ◆ Translating diagrammatic analysis into a standard World Bank report
- ◆ Credibility of results
- ◆ Follow-up in community, government, World Bank

Many of the limitations of PRA work are not unique to this method—they are inherent in any research method that aims to investigate local conditions.

The risk of raising expectations may be impossible to avoid, but can be minimized with careful and repeated clarification of the purpose of the PRA and the role of the team in relation to the project, or government, at the start of every interview and meeting. If World Bank managers or government officials are not familiar with PRA-type work, they may try to use it as a standard survey to gather primarily quantitative data, using large sample sizes, and a questionnaire approach. This will greatly compromise the quality of the work and the insights produced. And, if the PRA team is not adequately trained in the methodology before the work begins, there is often a tendency to use too many different techniques, some of which are not relevant to the topic at hand. In general, when a training element is involved, there will be a trade-off between the long-term objective of building the capacity of the PRA team and getting good quality results in their first experience of using the methodology.

One common problem is that insufficient time is allowed for the team to relax with the local people, to listen to them, and to learn about the more sensitive issues under consideration. Rushing will also often mean missing the views of the poorest and least articulate members of the communities visited. The translation of PRA results into a standard World Bank project or ESW report poses considerable challenges, and World Bank staff and government officials unfamiliar with participatory research methods may raise questions about the credibility of the PRA findings. Finally, there can be a lack of adequate follow-up in the communities, the government, and the World Bank.

PRA: Organizational and Logistical Issues

- ♦ **Technical Support from in/outside World Bank (PRA Experts):**
 - liaise with local team(s)
 - advise on sampling and methods
 - synthesis of field reports
 - integration into project/ESW work
- ♦ **Local Team(s):**
 - NGO? University? Consulting firm?
 - training required? translation required?
 - trainers available locally, or build in training of trainers program?
- ♦ **Logistics:**
 - transport to communities
 - accommodation, in communities if possible
 - food for team and refreshments for community meetings
 - workshop venue near field sites
- ♦ **Cost and Time**
 - depends on purpose.
 - if project area limited, allow one month (including one week of training)
 - if project area dispersed, split team into small groups to visit communities simultaneously.

Task managers who have used PRA have generally found it useful to seek the services of an experienced PRA practitioner, either in the World Bank or outside. The PRA expert helps in planning the methodology and working with the local team(s) throughout the process to ensure the results are produced on time and in an appropriate format for the project or ESW. This expert may also have the role of trainer, if a training component is required.

A variety of local counterpart institutions have been involved in World Bank–supported PRA work, including NGOs with prior experience in participatory assessment methods, social scientists from a local university, and private local consulting firms. In situations where training of the team is necessary, it is best to recruit an in-country trainer. If an international consultant needs to be brought in for this role, the training can be combined with a training-of-trainers to enable future work to draw on local expertise. Training materials may need to be translated into local languages.

The logistical arrangements for PRA work include: transport dedicated to the PRA work from start to finish to allow teams to move easily between and within communities and between the field and the workshop site; simple accommodation, in the communities if possible or in a nearby town; food for the team (which can often be arranged with the communities in advance) and refreshments for community meetings; and a suitable workshop venue, with electricity, an overhead projector, a portable computer for word processing, and adequate meeting space for the team's discussions.

The costs and time implications of PRA will vary greatly, depending on whether the method is used as a one-off activity, or as a regular part of the project team's interactions with the communities.

PRA and Surveys Compared

Features	PRA	Surveys
Duration	short	long
Cost	low to medium	medium to high
Participation	medium to high	low to none
Methods	basket of tools	standardized methods
Major research tool	semi-structured interviewing	formal questionnaire
Sampling	small to medium purposive	large random
Statistical analysis	little or none	major part
Analysis	in-the-field on-the-spot	back-in-office

To illustrate how PRA compares with other methodologies, this table contrasts PRA with questionnaire surveys—the method with which most task managers are most familiar. However, it should be noted that PRA is not intended to be a replacement for good quality survey work. Indeed, PRA is often used *in conjunction* with other methods—for example, the findings from a preliminary study using PRA techniques can usefully give direction and focus to a subsequent questionnaire-based survey. In turn, the survey can verify and quantify the PRA's qualitative findings and be applied on a larger scale. PRAs done *after* quantitative surveys can verify or challenge survey findings, and can go some way toward explaining the information collected by the surveys. PRA techniques can also be used alongside selected techniques from other participatory methodologies, such as Beneficiary Assessment or SARAR (see separate modules on these methodologies).

In some situations, however, a PRA may be sufficient in itself to provide the necessary answers and insights. In this case, choosing between PRA and other methods will require the task manager involved to have a general idea of what a PRA can offer, what inputs are needed, and how these features compare with the other methodologies being considered.

Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA)

An Overview


Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA)

“An approach (and family of methodologies) for shared learning between local people and outsiders to enable development practitioners, government officials, and local people to plan together appropriate interventions.”

Participatory Rural Appraisal—a misnomer:

- ◆ **Participatory** — more or less
- ◆ **Rural** — but also urban uses
- ◆ **Appraisal** — but also used in identification, implementation, evaluation, and ESW

PRA: How Participatory?



info. sharing ↔ consultation ↔ collaboration ↔ empowerment



PRA: Key Principles

- ◆ **Participation:** local people serve partners in data collection and analysis
- ◆ **Flexibility:** not a standardized methodology, depends on purpose, resources, skills, time
- ◆ **Teamwork:** outsiders and insiders, men and women, mix of disciplines
- ◆ **Optimal Ignorance:** cost and time efficient, but ample opportunity for analysis and planning
- ◆ **Systematic:** for validity and reliability, partly stratified sampling, cross-checking

PRA: Key Techniques

- ◆ **Interviews/Discussions:**
 - individuals
 - households
 - focus groups, community meetings
- ◆ **Mapping:**
 - community maps
 - personal maps
 - institutional maps
- ◆ **Ranking:**
 - problem ranking
 - preference ranking
 - wealth ranking
- ◆ **Trend Analysis:**
 - historical diagramming
 - seasonal calendars
 - daily activity charts

PRA: Range of Uses in World Bank Work

- ◆ **Stage:**
 - primarily for project identification and preparation
 - also for evaluation and ESW
- ◆ **Scale:**
 - primarily project-wide
 - also countrywide and community-level planning
- ◆ **Sectors:**
 - primarily natural resource management
 - also social sectors and infrastructure
- ◆ **Outputs:**
 - recommendations for project design
 - local people's evaluation of project
 - community-level implementation plans
 - local people's perspective for ESW
 - (empowerment of communities)

PRA: Some Limitations and Risks

- ◆ Raising expectations—planned intervention may not meet priority felt needs
- ◆ Desire for quantitative, statistically verifiable data
- ◆ Desire for package or blueprint approach
- ◆ Indiscriminate use of techniques
- ◆ Trade-offs in training versus getting good quality results
- ◆ Rushing and overlooking the poor and disadvantaged
- ◆ Translating diagrammatic analysis into a standard World Bank report
- ◆ Credibility of results
- ◆ Follow-up in community, government, World Bank

PRA: Organizational and Logistical Issues

- ◆ **Technical Support from in/outside the World Bank (PRA Experts):**
 - liaise with local team(s)
 - advise on sampling and methods
 - synthesis of field reports
 - integration into project/ESW work
- ◆ **Local Team(s):**
 - NGO? University? Consulting firm?
 - training required? Translation required?
 - trainers available locally, or build in training of trainers program?
- ◆ **Logistics:**
 - transport to communities
 - accommodation, in communities if possible
 - food for team and refreshments for community meetings
 - workshop venue near field sites
- ◆ **Cost and Time:**
 - depends on purpose.
 - if project area limited, allow one month (including one week of training)
 - if project area dispersed, split team into small groups to visit communities simultaneously.

PRA and Surveys Compared

Features	PRA	Surveys
Duration	short	long
Cost	Low to Medium	medium to high
Participation	medium to high	low to none
Methods	basket of tools	standardized methods
Major research tool	semi-structured interviewing	formal questionnaire
Sampling	small-to-medium purposive	large random
Statistical analysis	little or none	major part
Analysis	in-the-field on-the-spot	back-in-office

Section 2: Techniques

The “basket of techniques” that PRA offers is quite extensive, and the key to a successful PRA activity is knowing which techniques to use and in what sequence. For this reason, it is useful when planning a PRA activity to first list the issues that need to be investigated and then to develop a matrix showing techniques that can be used to investigate each issue. This matrix, which is best developed with the PRA team during their preparation/training workshop, can then help guide the work in the field. Box 1 is an example of such a matrix developed for the urban component of the Zambia Participatory Poverty Assessment.

Sequencing and Combining Techniques

Careful sequencing of PRA techniques is important to ensure good quality results. Some techniques (for example, community mapping) are particularly effective at the beginning of a PRA activity to provide the PRA team with an orientation to the community and to encourage an atmosphere of participation and shared learning. Other tools, such as wealth ranking, work better at a later stage of the fieldwork once the researchers have developed a degree of rapport with the local people, enabling an open discussion of more sensitive topics.

The PRA techniques described in this section are among the most commonly used, and make up the “trademark techniques” of PRA work. However, they should not be regarded as a “fixed menu”—often PRA techniques are used in combination with other methods. In many instances, the techniques will need to be adapted or new ones developed to fit the type of study and the physical and social conditions in the communities visited. Readers are encouraged to refer to the techniques sections of the SARAR and BA modules for descriptions of complementary participatory techniques.

Value of the Visual Techniques

An important feature of the diagrammatic techniques of PRA is that they allow an on-the-spot analysis of the issues being visually represented. For example, in constructing a preference ranking matrix comparing the different sources of credit available, the local people involved are analyzing their own situation and providing a visual to facilitate discussions with the PRA team about the issues that have emerged during the ranking exercise (including perhaps, affordability, accessibility, and uses of credit). The PRA team can then pick up on these issues in subsequent interviews and can cross-check the ranking findings through other techniques. Where possible, the diagrams shown in this section are accompanied by a brief description of the insights gained during the process.

Visual techniques, particularly when drawn on the ground, also make it difficult for any one person to dominate, as participants are usually on their hands and knees with little eye contact among each other.

Box 1
Matrix of Techniques Suggested in Zambia Participatory Poverty Assessment
(Urban Context)

ISSUES	METHODS
Perception and indicators of wealth, well-being, poverty, vulnerability, powerlessness. Local terminologies and their correspondence with such concepts. Differences in perception by gender.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Well-being/wealth ranking for criteria and indicators – Semi-structured interviews
Perceptions of change over time in welfare, indicators, terms of trade, access to employment/income.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Time line – Matrix scoring over time for changes in the labor market
Access to services (and usage of services), such as health, education, credit. Perceptions of services, including views (or awareness) of recent change. Again, differing perceptions and values for men and women.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Institutional diagramming – Semi-structured interviews – Time lines of health and education services
Seasonal stress: food, security, health, income, expenditure, activity (by selected occupational groups)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Seasonal calendar—by occupational/residential group activity, income, expenditure, health
Assets of urban households	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Wealth-ranking/grouping livelihood analysis
Fallback strategies in times of crisis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Livelihood analysis – Semi-structured interviews – Ranking exercises
Perceptions of consumption levels in terms of food, clothing, and relation to well-being	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Well-being grouping/ranking, social mapping – Semi-structured interviews
Local institutions of self-help and support for the urban poor (such as market-traders' associations, trade associations, churches)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Institutional mapping – Semi-structured interviews
Role of community institutions in service/infrastructure provision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Institutional mapping – Semi-structured interviews
Responsibilities, obligations within households (support to children, provision of food, payment of school fees, and so forth by gender)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Semi-structured interviews – Decisionmaking matrix

Source: World Bank, November 30, 1994, *Zambia Poverty Assessment*, Report No. 12985-ZA, Vol. V: Participatory Poverty Assessment, Southern Africa Department, Human Resources Division, Washington, D.C.

Semi-Structured Interviewing/Conversational Interviewing

The central technique on which any PRA is based is Semi-Structured Interviewing (SSI), or Conversational Interviewing as it is sometimes called. SSI does not involve a formal questionnaire, but instead makes use of a flexible interview guide to help ensure that the interviews stay focused on the relevant issues, while remaining conversational enough to allow participants to introduce and discuss issues that they deem relevant. See Box 2 for some tips on using this technique. The interview guide can be prepared with input from the research team, project staff, and representatives from the government agency(ies) involved. A segment of the interview guide developed for the Zambia Participatory Poverty Assessment is shown in Box 3.

Interviews can be conducted with:

- ◆ **individuals** from the community to learn about their own situation in detail, to discuss issues that would be difficult to address in group situations, and to reveal their personal perspective on particular topics;
- ◆ **key informants**, or people with specialist knowledge, to gain insights on a particular subject, or people who can represent a particular group or viewpoint; and
- ◆ **groups**, either randomly encountered by the PRA researchers, or systematically selected to allow a focused discussion of a particular issue (see the description of focus group discussions in the Techniques section of the Beneficiary Assessment module).

Box 2

Semi-Structured Interviewing: Organizing Tips

-
- ◆ The interview team should consist of two to four people of different disciplines.
 - ◆ Begin with the traditional greeting and state that you are here to learn.
 - ◆ Begin the questioning by referring to someone or something visible.
 - ◆ Conduct the interview informally and mix questions with discussion.
 - ◆ Be open-minded and objective.
 - ◆ Let each team member finish their line of questioning (don't interrupt).
 - ◆ Carefully lead up to sensitive questions.
 - ◆ Assign one notetaker (but rotate).
 - ◆ Pay attention to nonverbal cues.
 - ◆ Avoid leading questions and value judgments.
 - ◆ Avoid questions that can be answered with "yes" or "no."
 - ◆ Individual interviews should be no longer than 45 minutes.
 - ◆ Group interviews should be no longer than two hours.

Source: J. Theis and H. M. Grady, 1991, *Participatory Rapid Appraisal for Community Development: A Training Manual Based on Experiences in the Middle East and North Africa*, Save the Children Federation and the International Institute for Environment and Development, London.

Box 3

Segment of Interview Guide Used in Zambia Participatory Poverty Assessment

Local perceptions of poverty, vulnerability, well-being

- Attributes of a poor person (man/woman)
- Attributes of a rich person (man/woman)
- Describe the life of a poor person (man/woman)
- Describe the life of a rich person
- Describe a poor family
- Describe a rich family
- (Rural) Are there poor villages and rich villages in the area? What is the difference (abundance of natural resources, infrastructure, services)?
- (Urban) Are there poor communities/areas and rich communities/area in the town? Describe the difference.
- Do you know any proverbs/stories about poverty?
- What are the things that would make someone content in life?
- What was the effect of the 1991 drought on your community?
- Who in the community was best able to cope with the drought? Characteristics of those households/people (*might be a social category—such as young men, not a group of households*).
- Who in the community was least able to cope with the effects of the drought? Characteristics of those households/people.

Strategies for poverty reduction

- Events in life that can make a person (man/woman) or household poorer? (*Note: these may be different for men and women; for example loss of a husband is not the same as loss of a wife.*)
- Has anyone in the community become richer in the last 10 years? How?
- Has anyone in the community become much poorer in the last 10 years? How?
- Ways in which a poor man/woman can improve his/her situation
- What actions can a community take to improve the situation of all of the people?
- What actions can a community take to improve the situation of the poor/vulnerable?
- What agencies from outside the community have helped the community in the last 10 years, and how?
- Which agencies used to help the community 20 years ago? If no longer helping, then why not? (*Note: try to probe for different views and expectations of government and nongovernmental agencies.*)

Major concerns and problems

- What are the main problems in your community at present? Probe causes of these.
- Main problems in your community 10 years ago. If no longer there, what has removed them?
- What are the major problems for your household at the moment? Causes of these?
- What were the main problems facing your household 10 years ago? If they have changed, why?
- Do you see all your neighbors facing the same problems? If different, what and why?

Source: *Zambia Poverty Assessment*, op. cit.

Participatory Mapping

Mapping exercises as used in a PRA activity not only provide the researchers with information about the physical characteristics of the community, but can also reveal much about the socio-economic conditions and how the participants perceive their community. The maps are usually drawn by a group of villagers either on the ground using chalk or on a large sheet of paper. The exercise often attracts much attention and generates useful debate among the mapmakers and the onlookers. The final map is then recorded by the PRA team to use in subsequent discussions. See Box 4 for some tips on mapping.

Various thematic maps can be developed depending on the focus of the research:

- ◆ **historical maps** document changes that have occurred in the community and can be used, for example, to generate discussion on the causes and effects of environmental degradation;
- ◆ **social maps** illustrate the individual households that make up the community and different symbols can be used to show particular household-level characteristics—relative wealth, levels of resource use, number of school-age children in or out of school, membership/involvement in a community group or project activity, and so on; and
- ◆ **personal maps**, drawn by individuals rather than groups, can show the perspectives of different sections of the community (men versus women, rich versus poor), in terms of, for example, the boundaries of the community, the places most important to them, or their vision of how the community could be improved.

An example of a social map drawn by villagers who took part in a PRA in India is shown in Box 5.


Box 4 Participatory Mapping: Organizing Tips

-
- ◆ Decide with the local people what sort of map will be drawn (historical, social, natural resources, and so forth).
 - ◆ Conduct the exercise with people who know the area and the topic of the mapping exercise and who are willing to share their knowledge.
 - ◆ Let the participants choose a suitable place (ground, floor, paper) and medium (sticks, stones, seeds, pen) for the mapping.
 - ◆ Help the people get started but let them draw the map themselves. Be patient and don't interrupt them. It's their map!
 - ◆ Sit back and watch (what is drawn first, what is drawn biggest, what parts of the map generate discussion among the mappers and onlookers).
 - ◆ Once the map is drawn, ask questions about what is shown, and take note of issues to follow-up on in subsequent interviews.
 - ◆ Keep a permanent (paper) record, including mappers' names to give them credit.

Source: Adapted from Theis and Grady, op. cit.

Box 5
Social Map Showing Wealth Ranking in a Village in West Bengal, India

A PRA in West Bengal focused on learning about local people's perceptions of rural poverty. Social mapping was used to enable villagers to identify the poorer households and to rank them using their own indicators of poverty. The social map of one village, Berapal, was drawn by a group of villagers gathered in a central meeting place. Once the map was drawn, the participants identified four different wealth groups, from the poorest of the poor to the richest. The locally determined indicators of poverty included households headed by widows and agricultural laborers who had no land and no regular source of income or food.



Source: Neela Mukherjee, May 1992, *Villagers' Perceptions of Rural Poverty through the Mapping Methods of PRA*, PRA Notes No. 15, the International Institute for Environment and Development, London.

Institutional Mapping

Institutional maps, sometimes called Venn or chapati diagrams, are visual representations of the different groups and organizations within a community and their relationships and importance for decisionmaking. Participants (community members familiar with both the formal and informal groups present) are asked to use circles—either drawn on paper, or cut out and placed on the ground—to depict the different groups. The *relative importance* of a group is shown by the *relative size* of the circle representing it—the larger the circle, the more important the group. The extent to which the different groups *interact* with each other is shown by the *degree of overlap* shown in the diagram—the greater the overlap, the more interaction and collaboration between the groups. Outside institutions with a presence at the community level can also be depicted in the diagram. See Box 6 for some tips on using this technique.

This technique can be done either as part of a group discussion, to generate a consensus view of the community's social infrastructure, or can be undertaken by individuals to illustrate the different perspectives of, for instance, men versus women, project staff versus community members, or project participants versus nonparticipants. The example of institutional mapping in Box 7 was produced by a focus group of 17 women in one community as part of the Participatory Poverty Assessment in Zambia.

Box 6 Institutional Mapping: Organizing Tips

- ◆ Ask participants to identify key institutions and individuals responsible for decisions in the community.
- ◆ Cut out (or ask the participants to draw) circles to represent each institution or individual.
- ◆ Ask participants to choose or draw circles of different sizes, depending on the relative importance of the individual/institution represented.
- ◆ Ask the participants to arrange the circles as follows:
 - separate circles = no contact among the individuals/institutions
 - touching circles = information is shared between them
 - small overlap = some cooperation in decisionmaking
 - large overlap = considerable cooperation
- ◆ When the diagram is completed, use it to ask participants about, for example, how things have changed in the past 10 or 20 years; what kinds of improvements they would like to see regarding the institutions and individuals represented; and the size of membership of the different groups.
- ◆ Keep a permanent (paper) record of the diagram, including participants' names to give them credit.


Source: Adapted from Theis and Grady, op. cit.

Box 7

Institutional Map of a Zambian Village, as Seen by a Focus Group of 17 Women

MPEWA Village, Eastern Province, 28.9.93

Drawn on ground with chalk.



The women explained their Venn diagram, saying for example:

- ◆ *the headman* is seen as very important—he helped bring the grinding mill to the village; he settles social conflicts and mobilizes the community to help the needy.
- ◆ the *traditional healer* is seen as more accessible (drawn inside the community) than the hospital (drawn outside).
- ◆ the *chief* is drawn outside the community since he does not visit.
- ◆ the *church* is placed outside the community as it “doesn’t seem to be helping much anymore” though its spiritual function is still seen as important.

The women then went on to produce a Venn diagram showing the “ideal” situation. This vision included, for example, the church back in the community (“belonging” to the community again) and the traditional healer less important than the hospital.

Source: *Zambia Poverty Assessment*, op. cit.

Problem Ranking

Several different techniques can be used to elicit local people's perceptions of the most important problems they face (see Box 8 for some tips on problem ranking). One simple method is to ask participants to list the six or so main problems in their community (this could be a general question, or one focused on a particular problem area, such as constraints to agricultural production, or health-related problems) and then ask them to rank these problems in order of importance. An example of problem ranking is shown in Box 9, and concerns violence in Jamaica.

A more systematic technique called pairwise ranking uses cards to represent the different problems. The facilitator shows the "problem cards" two at a time, each time asking, "Which is the bigger problem?" As the participants make the comparisons, the results are recorded in a matrix. The final result is obtained by counting the number of times that each problem "won" over the others and arranging them in appropriate order. An example of this pairwise-ranking technique is shown in Box 10, which addresses the different reasons why some girls in a rural community in The Gambia do not attend school.

Box 8 Problem Ranking: Organizing Tips

- ◆ Choose the theme of the ranking, depending on the topic of the PRA.
- ◆ Ask the participants (individuals being interviewed or members of a group discussion) to select about six of the most important problems related to the theme.
- ◆ Note down each of the six problems on a separate card—use pictures or symbols instead of text, where possible.
- ◆ Place two of the cards in front of the interviewee and ask him/her to choose the bigger problem and to give reasons for the choice. Mark down the response in the appropriate box in the priority ranking matrix.
- ◆ Present a different pair and repeat the comparison.
- ◆ Repeat until all possible combinations have been considered (when all boxes of the matrix have been filled).
- ◆ List the problems in the order in which the interviewee has ranked them by sorting the cards in order of priority.
- ◆ Check with the interviewee whether any important problems have been omitted from the list. If there are any, place them in the appropriate position in the ranking.
- ◆ Repeat the pairwise-ranking exercise with other individuals and tabulate their responses.
- ◆ If appropriate, use the ranking to begin a discussion about potential solutions to the priority problems.

Source: Adapted from Theis and Grady, *op. cit.*

Box 9

Problem Ranking of Types of Violence in Urban Communities in Jamaica

Greenland: Girl High School Students

Types of Violence	Seriousness*	Frequency**
Gun violence	1	10 – 20
Drug violence	3	12 – 15
Rape	2	1 – 5
Fighting (bottles and stones)	4	10 – 10
Domestic violence	7	5 – 10
Verbal abuse	5	20 – 25
Physical abuse	6	20 – 15

* The seriousness of the crime was shown by a sequence ranking with one the most serious.

** The frequency was fixed scoring out of 30 as the average number of incidents per month.

The six school girls attending an after-school program who undertook the listing explained gun violence as having to do with: gang warfare, drug violence related to people stealing to buy drugs, and fighting as taking place among people with weapons other than guns. Gun violence was seen as the most serious problem because it prevents students from attending school and after-school programs when the shootings get very bad; also because it claims the lives of fellow students, as recently happened to a 16-year-old boy. Rape was the next most important problem. Drug violence included the fact that drug users are sometimes beaten by “the community” because of the habit. Although verbal and physical abuse were frequent, it was the least serious type of violence identified.

Campbell Town: Group of Mixed-Aged Women Teachers

Types of Violence	Ranking	Causes	Impact
Criminal	2	No jobs	Everyone
Child abuse	3	Single parenting	Child
Gun violence (gangs)	1	No jobs	Community
Domestic	4	Jealousy	Children
Political	6	Dependency	Community
Drug abuse	5	Peer Pressure	Community

The group of women teachers saw lack of jobs as the principal cause of both gang violence and criminal activities, such as theft and burglary—some not wanting to work and preferring to gamble, steal, and stay on street corners. They identified a number of specific implications in relationship to children. Some were unable to return to school because gang warfare meant they could no longer go into spatially defined areas controlled by conflicting gangs. In addition, when outbreaks of crime erupted, the school was forced to close. Abuse of children was quite common, and they also pointed out cases of parents giving drugs to children—so that parents can go out at night—with the children sleepy and unable to operate the following day.

Note: Community names are fictitious to maintain anonymity.

Source: C. Moser and J. Holland, December, 1995, *A Participatory Study of Urban Poverty and Violence in Jamaica: Analysis of Research Results*, World Bank, Urban Development Division, Washington, D.C.

Box 10
Problem Ranking of Reasons for Girls Not Attending School,
in a Village in The Gambia

Pairwise Ranking Matrix

Problems	Lack of facilities	Pregnancy	School fees	Losing traditional values	Distance from home	Early marriage
Lack of facilities		pregnancy	lack of facilities	lack of facilities	lack of facilities	early marriage
Pregnancy			pregnancy	pregnancy	pregnancy	pregnancy
School fees				school fees	school fees	school fees
Losing traditional values					distance from home	early marriage
Distance from home						early marriage
Early marriage						

Problems	No. of Times Preferred	Rank
Pregnancy	5	1
Early marriage	4	2
Lack of facilities	3	3
School fees	2	4
Distance from home	1	5
Losing traditional values	0	6

Source: E. Kane, 1995, *Groundwork: Participatory Research for Girls' Education. A Manual to Be Used with Groundwork: The Video*, World Bank, Economic Development Institute, Washington, D.C.

Preference Ranking

Similar to problem ranking, preference ranking involves participants assessing different items or options, using criteria that they themselves identify (see Box 11). For example, a PRA on micro-enterprises could include a preference ranking of the different kinds of income-generating activities found in a community. Other examples of the kinds of options that can be ranked include different crops, tree or fodder species, sources of credit, health services, and so on. A common form of preference ranking uses a matrix with items/options along the horizontal axis and the elicited criteria along the vertical axis, as shown in the example in Box 12. This technique works well as an introductory exercise in a group discussion as it can reveal interesting differences among group members. These discrepancies can be explored later during the discussion or subsequent interviews with individuals. Gender differences are particularly worth exploring, as men and women often have quite different preferences and criteria for those preferences.


Box 11 Preference Ranking: Organizing Tips

- ◆ Select the topic of the ranking, depending on the area of investigation (such as tree species, alternative sources of health care, credit, income, and so on).
- ◆ Ask participants to list about six of the most common alternative items/options within this topic. Elicit the criteria by asking, for each item:
 - “What is good about this item?” “What else?” (continue until no more replies);
 - “What is bad about this item?” “What else?” (continue until no more replies).
- ◆ List all the criteria.
- ◆ Turn negative attributes into positive ones (for example, “vulnerable to pests” becomes “pest resistant”).
- ◆ Help participants to draw up a matrix with criteria listed down the side of the matrix and options along the top—where possible use symbols or real-life samples (such as leaves of the trees being compared) and minimize text.
- ◆ For each criterion, ask participants to assign scores to each of the items according to their relative performance, distributing a fixed number of stones or seeds among the different items.
- ◆ When the matrix is complete, cross-check the ranking results by asking, “If you could only have one of these, which would you choose and why?” This helps reveal the relative weighting that participants have given to the different criteria.
- ◆ Follow-up on the ranking results in subsequent discussions to explore different viewpoints.

Source: Adapted from Theis and Grady, *op. cit.*

Box 12
 Preference Ranking of Income-Generating Activities in India

During a PRA by an Indian NGO, MYRADA, a group of village women ranked their preferences for a number of different income-generating activities using a simple matrix-ranking technique. After selecting the items to be ranked, the women identified their own criteria, including the amount of time required by the activity and the level of profit possible. Pictures and symbols were used to represent the different items and criteria, and the women used a five-point scoring system to compare the different options. The outcome, shown below, reveals, for example, that brick making is one of the most profitable activities but also requires additional labor and a lot of hard work by the women themselves. Other activities, such as selling leaves as plates, are less profitable but also less time-consuming and labor-intensive ways of earning cash.



Wealth Ranking

Wealth ranking, or well-being ranking, involves community members identifying and analyzing the different wealth groups in a community. It enables researchers to learn about the socioeconomic stratification of the population and local people's definitions and indicators of wealth/well-being.

The most common version of this technique involves a series of individuals, a focus group of community members, ranking their entire community (or a particular section of the community if there are too many households to rank it all—say more than 100—or if the participants are familiar with only their own neighborhood). The PRA facilitators introduce the technique using local terms for wealth and poverty and encourage participants to first discuss how they define these terms and how they would describe a poor household or a rich household (that is, their criteria for assessing a household's relative wealth).

The actual ranking is done using card sorting, as described in Box 13. If possible, the ranking should be repeated with different participants and the results compared, looking for any large discrepancies or differences of opinion, as well as differences in wealth criteria, for example between men and women. The results of a wealth ranking can be used in various ways. The facilitators can use the stratification as a basis for sampling households for subsequent interviews (for instance, by asking for examples of households in the different wealth groups to visit with later in the PRA). The results can also help in targeting efforts at particular groups, such as the very poorest households. Wherever possible, the results should be cross-checked with secondary data and by follow-up interviews with key informants. The wealth ranking results can be translated into numerical scores for each household to assist with direct comparisons between the different informants' rankings and to calculate the "average scores" for an overall ranking.² However, even without this extra level of analysis, the results can prove very insightful.

An example of a relatively simple wealth ranking conducted in the Zambia Participatory Poverty Assessment is shown in Box 14.

An alternative method, if cards are not available or if participants prefer, is to use stones to represent the different households. As the participant does the ranking he or she places the stone in the appropriate pile and tells the facilitator which household the stone represents. The facilitator then notes the households in each pile and recites the lists back to the participant for a final check.

An even simpler and more approximate method is to begin with a pile of stones, seeds, beans, or whatever is at hand to represent all the households in the community. Participants can then divide this pile into a series of smaller piles of different sizes, representing the proportion of households in each wealth group. As before, facilitators can then ask for names of households in each group to visit later.

²For more information, see Theis and Grady, *op. cit.*

Box 13
Wealth Ranking: Organizing Tips

- ◆ With the participants, construct a list of all the households to be ranked.
- ◆ Write the name of each household on separate cards.
- ◆ Ask participants to divide the set of cards into several piles, to represent the different wealth groups within the community. Let participants decide how many piles to make. In some cases, they may choose to distinguish only two or three different groupings (say, rich, medium, and poor) but in other cases, they may divide the community into many more piles.
- ◆ For nonliterate participants read out the name of each household during the card sorting.
- ◆ Once the participants finish the card sorting, ask them to go back and check the piles and make any adjustments they wish.
- ◆ When the participants are content with the results, ask probing questions about, for example, the factors determining a household's place in the ranking; what could lead to a household moving from one wealth group to another; and so on.
- ◆ When using wealth ranking as a basis for sampling during the PRA, ask participants to identify two or three "typical" households within each wealth group that the team can visit at a later stage.
- ◆ Record the results of the ranking in terms of the characteristics of households in each wealth group and, where appropriate, the names of the households in each group.

Some Cautions:

- ◆ In some communities, relative wealth/poverty is a very sensitive topic, and this technique may need to be conducted in a private setting to allow participants to talk freely. In some cases, the technique may have to be avoided altogether.
- ◆ This technique has sometimes proved problematic in urban areas, where people tend to be less familiar with their neighbors than in rural communities.
- ◆ The results of the wealth ranking should be cross-checked by using other means of addressing the issue of relative wealth, such as by a social mapping exercise.

Box 14

Wealth Ranking by Card Sorting in a Village in Zambia

Wealth Ranking by Cards, Jumbe, Eastern Province (Mr. Phiri)

The informant first ranked the 13 households of the village into two groups, but then split them into three:

Group 1

“Nchasko”—those who are “not in a bad state.” These were five households, all male-headed, and all related by matrilineal kinship.

- ◆ mostly sell tobacco
- ◆ have all lived and worked in town
- ◆ all relatively educated
- ◆ one man owns a building he rents as a shop
- ◆ houses are larger, made from better materials

To be rich this group would need: fertilizer loans, tractor hire facilities.

Group 2

Seven households—three male-headed, four female-headed.

- ◆ mostly rely on mat making for extra income
- ◆ three female-headed households
- ◆ problems in getting money—lack planning
- ◆ low levels of farm production

To improve their situation, “they don’t need help from anyone, they just need to help themselves.”

Group 3

Muleme Banda is the only person in this category. She lives on her own—has no children or husband. She is old and incapable of carrying out basic domestic tasks like carrying water. She is often without food, and depends on charity and relatives for survival. She does grow some sorghum.

To be better off she needs: combined village assistance—money to buy essentials like salt and food. She also needs help in drawing her water, thatching her house, and other major jobs.

A woman asked to rank the same households made four groups—with Muleme Banda again as the bottom category—her top category was also the same. She would not elaborate on the breakdown.

Notes: The situation of the really destitute was regarded as a matter for the community—not for outside assistance. The situation of the intermediate group was regarded as one of self-help. The situation of the relatively well-off was regarded as one that outside agencies could help to solve. A strong correlation again emerged of isolated women (no husband or living children) and “core” poverty.

Source: *Zambia Poverty Assessment*, op. cit.

Seasonal Calendars

Seasonal calendars drawn by the local people are very useful means of generating information about seasonal trends within the community and identifying periods of particular stress and vulnerability. Best undertaken in the context of a group discussion (to help verify the information obtained), seasonal calendars are often drawn on the ground with the relative trends depicted using stones or seeds, as in a preference-ranking matrix. In other instances, simple line graphs can be drawn to show seasonal increases or decreases. A whole series of seasonal variables can be included in one calendar to give an overview of the situation throughout the year. These variables can include: rainfall, crop sequences, labor demand, availability of paid employment, out-migration, incidence of human diseases, expenditure levels, and so on. Important periods, such as festivals, can also be shown. See Box 15 for some tips on using seasonal calendars.

On the whole, the trends need only be shown as rough, qualitative ones. Quantification (such as acreage of each crop, or man-hours of labor) is rarely necessary for the purposes of the PRA. The finished calendar can be useful as a way of indicating, for example, when project-related activities should be planned so as not to interfere with the busiest times of the year, or the critical period(s) when alternative sources of income or food are needed the most. The seasonal calendar shown in Box 16 comes from the Participatory Poverty Assessment in Kenya.

Box 15 Seasonal Calendar: Organizing Tips

- ◆ Ask participants to mark out the year using their local calendar—this may be different from the Western calendar.
- ◆ Use whatever material is available locally to show the trends—colored chalk can be used to draw line graphs; different-size piles of seeds, stones, beans, even goat droppings can be used to show the seasonal variations; or sticks can be broken into different lengths to indicate relative magnitudes.
- ◆ Combine all seasonal patterns into one diagram to show correlations between variables and identify any periods of particular stress.
- ◆ Cross-check and refine the seasonal calendar throughout the fieldwork.

Source: Adapted from Theis and Grady, *op. cit.*

Box 16
Seasonal Calendar of Poverty, Drawn by a Group of Villagers in Nyamira, Kenya*

Item	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Light meals	000	000	0	0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	00
Begging	000	000	0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	00
Migration	000	000	0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	00	000
Unemployment	000	000	00	0	0	00	–	–	–	–	–	–
	000	000				0	00					
Income	–	–	0	00	00	00	000	000	000	000	000	0
				00	00	00	000	000	00	0	0	0
Disease	–	–	0	0000	0000	000	00	000	00			
Rainfall	–	–	0000	0000				0	0	000	000	00

* Zeros (0) in table represent stones used by participants to indicate the degree of change by month. Thus, three zeros in the January column for “Light Meals” means that light meals are three times more likely that month than they are in March or April.

This calendar was constructed using leaves, stones, and symbols to identify each item, and participants then used a stick to mark the seasonal differences on the ground. The greatest stress was found to be from December to May, a period when food stocks, employment opportunities, and income are at the lowest. People cope by begging for food and by eating “lighter meals.” During this period, men and, to a much lesser extent, women engage in seasonal migration to bigger farms, tea estates or wherever they can find work. The highest incidence of disease, especially malaria and diarrhea, coincides with the long rainy season from April to July.

Source: D. Narayan and D. Nyamwaya, 1996, “Learning from the Poor: A Participatory Poverty Assessment in Kenya,” World Bank, Environment Department Paper No. 34, Washington, D.C.

Daily Activity Charts

Daily activity charts are useful as a way for community members to show graphically how they spend their day. The diagrams also make it easy to compare the daily activities of different groups of people, such as women versus men, employed versus unemployed, married women versus widows. See Box 17 for some tips on using this technique.

In the same way as a seasonal calendar shows the busiest times of the year, a daily activity chart can show the busiest times of the day and can, therefore, be useful in helping plan the timing of project-related activities. For example, it can show the most appropriate time of day for organizing a women's training course.


The example in Box 18 comes from the Participatory Poverty Assessment in Zambia, and shows the different activity patterns in the dry and rainy seasons for widows in a rural community.

Box 17

Daily Activity Chart: Organizing Tips

- ◆ The charts are best done by a small focus group of people in the same general situation.
- ◆ As with the other diagrammatic tools, participants should select whatever materials they feel comfortable using—not necessarily pen and paper.
- ◆ If comparing the charts of different focus groups, have representatives of each group present so they can explain their diagram and discuss the reasons for the differences.
- ◆ Where possible, cross-check the information through direct observation and interviews.

Box 18
Daily Activity Charts Drawn by a Group of Widows in Zambia



13.10.93

Drawn on paper with markers by:

E. Munanyanga, R. Muleza, R. Chibola, N. Mukonde, E. Muleza, J. Muleza, E. Hamahobo, J. Katemba, J. Lubemba, S. Hamambwe, C. Haamoobe, C. Milimo

Village: Hamilumbe, Makonka

Facilitator: N. Bubala

The women who drew these charts described the differences between the rainy and dry season patterns. In the dry season, the women must spend much longer getting water from the well and collecting firewood every day to stockpile it in readiness for the rainy season. When the rains come, things are much busier and the women's days are much longer because of all the work to be done in the fields. The women contrasted their long work day with the men of the village who generally rest after the morning's work in the field, and spend the afternoon visiting or drinking beer. There were also significant differences between the situation of widows and married women, which were revealed when a group of married women drew their own daily activity chart. The particular vulnerability of older widows was highlighted: many of these widows have no cattle for ploughing and so must rely on hand and hoe; some have no children to help with the household chores; and with their added workload, the widows get less sleep than the married women.

Source: *Zambia Poverty Assessment*, op. cit.

Section 3: Case Studies

Case Study: Estonia Agriculture Project

Key Features:

- ◆ Use of PRA methods for project preparation to develop a social profile of farming households and to assess farmers' priorities.
- ◆ Capacity building of Ministry of Agriculture staff to enable them to develop a participatory planning process with new farmer-managed institutions.

Context:

The government of Estonia requested World Bank funds for the rehabilitation of field drainage infrastructure, the maintenance of which had been severely neglected since the dismantling of state-run institutions in 1991. Under the proposed Estonia Agriculture Project, the rehabilitation of these systems will be managed by Land and Water Associations (LWAs), whose members will contribute 20 percent of the rehabilitation costs and operate and maintain the improved systems. These are new responsibilities for farmers, and the Ministry of Agriculture (MOA) was uncertain whether farmers were willing to invest in drainage rehabilitation, were able to pay, or were willing to act collectively through LWAs. The MOA, therefore, requested technical assistance in carrying out a participatory assessment of these issues to test the likely feasibility and sustainability of the proposed investment. The first of three phases of this assessment has now been conducted.

Objectives:

The objectives of this phase of the participatory assessment were to: (i) learn about farmers' attitudes on the benefits of subsurface drainage rehabilitation, and their willingness and ability to pay for this work; (ii) facilitate farmers' analyses of resource constraints, and the social, technical, environmental, and institutional problems to be addressed during rehabilitation; (iii) explore farmers' perceptions of land restitution and ownership issues, their concerns regarding the formation and management of LWAs, and their role in designing the rehabilitation, operation, and maintenance systems; (iv) identify farmers' consensus on the next steps to be taken in partnership with the MOA; and (v) identify vulnerable rural households.

Process:

This first phase of the assessment was designed as both a training program for the PRA research team and the launching of the PRA work in two of the five counties targeted by the project. The two stakeholder groups that were the primary focus of capacity building in this participatory approach were county-level MOA staff, with whom farmers will interact on a regular basis, and social scientists from the Estonia Agriculture University, who would become a permanent resource to undertake participatory assessments for future project design in Estonia. Two consultant trainers from the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) in London were contracted to carry out the training and supervise the assessment in the areas preliminarily selected for drainage rehabilitation. These trainers brought expertise in land and water management issues, and experience in PRA from other parts of Europe. One of the trainers also coordinated the overall PRA work, and spent one week in Estonia prior to the training to meet with stakeholders and arrange the program.

The four-day PRA training workshop was attended by 20 participants, including key stakeholders such as county-level engineers, farmer union representatives, municipality staff concerned with land issues, and the social scientists. The participants then split into two teams to carry out the PRA fieldwork over a period of 10 days, analyze the results and hold large feedback meetings with farmers. After discussion of the findings, the participants developed a participatory planning process that will now be tested with new LWAs before the next phases of the assessment work are conducted.

The total cost of the four-week mission was US\$100,000; funding sources were the regular budget of the World Bank department involved (50 percent), the Fund for Innovative Approaches in Human and Social Development (FIAHS) (30 percent), and the government of Estonia (20 percent).

Techniques:

The principal PRA techniques used were :

- ◆ ***semi-structured interviews*** to identify and analyze local perceptions, priorities on drainage rehabilitation, the formation and function of LWAs, land tenure and other land management issues;
- ◆ ***farm profiles*** to analyze drainage and other resource problems at the individual farm level;
- ◆ ***resource maps at catchment or community level*** to analyze drainage and other resource problems at catchment level;
- ◆ ***social mapping at catchment level*** to identify land tenure issues, different social groups, asset distribution across social groups, potential focus groups and key informants, and local innovators and experimenters;
- ◆ ***systems analysis*** to analyze farmers' livelihood strategies through farming and other activities; and
- ◆ ***seasonal calendars*** to help plan the timing of drainage rehabilitation activities.

Limitations:

As part of the PRA training, participants were encouraged to develop their own field guides of questions to investigate and methods that could be used to address each question. This enabled the MOA staff to synchronize the information collection with their support to LWA formation, and a participatory planning process was identified. However, without additional capacity building in phase two, the MOA may be tempted to apply this process as a blueprint, without developing the necessary flexibility to take into account the different social factors in each catchment area.

Poor logistical support affected the availability of translators and some participants, so that additional PRA methods—such as matrix ranking, pairwise scoring, and network diagrams—were not included in the fieldwork and the three catchment areas were not fully assessed.

Outputs and Impacts:

The PRA process enabled farmers to articulate their priorities and assess how they could cooperate, and to agree on the modalities for LWAs to develop action plans for their catchments. These views will now assist MOA facilitators and design engineers in planning and budgeting the rehabilitation works to ensure they meet the local capacity and demand. This initial PRA work has also set in motion a process by which farmers' participation in these kinds of decisions will be integrated into the subsequent stages of the project.

The PRA findings revealed that farmers were most concerned with understanding the financial arrangements for the rehabilitation, and with the capacity of local contractors to deliver good quality work that would not impact negatively on their future maintenance obligations and costs. The PRA teams eventually decided that a summary of the project should be prepared, with a sample catchment map and flow diagram, and information on the financial procedures and cost recovery obligations of farmers. This paper will be used early in the public consultation process.

It had been assumed that the Estonian social scientists would be the appropriate resource for carrying out the participatory assessments. This was not the case. Instead, the MOA engineers were more adept at learning from farmers and setting the participatory tone of the assessment. In fact, they were so determined to build on the techniques they were learning that they recommended the MOA form a National Training Team for Social Assessment, a recommendation endorsed by the MOA and the World Bank. In the meantime, the Estonia Agriculture University is reviewing its social science teaching and research methods to incorporate PRA techniques.

Background Documentation:

World Bank, February 1996, "Involving Farmers: Social Assessment in the Estonia Agriculture Project," Environment Department Dissemination Note No. 39, Social Assessment Series, Washington, D.C. For more information contact Brian Berman at bberman@worldbank.org or Kathryn McPhail at kmcp@mail@worldbank.org.

Case Study: India Ecodevelopment Project

Key Features:

- ◆ Extensive use of PRA by government officials and NGOs during project preparation to establish baseline information and contribute to a stakeholder analysis.
- ◆ PRA methods have been built into subsequent stages of the project to identify and plan community-level activities and to monitor these micro-plans annually.

Context:

This project, planned to begin implementation in October 1996, has been prepared with high levels of participation. The PRA was organized and facilitated by the government in partnership with a national NGO that has extensive experience with PRA. More than 40 NGOs have participated in consultations, studies, and meetings along with project staff and government officials. The PRA work undertaken to date is, therefore, part of a much larger participatory effort, and detailed plans for subsequent PRA work have already been built into the project design.

Objectives:

PRAs were conducted in order to:

- ◆ establish baseline profiles of affected populations in the eight proposed project sites;
- ◆ assess the capacity of local institutions to implement eco-development activities; and
- ◆ encourage local communities to participate in project planning and design.

Process:

The PRAs were conducted jointly by state or park officials (usually the assistant conservator of forests or the range officer) and representatives from a local NGO in sample villages throughout each of the eight project sites. Training in PRA methods was provided by the national coordinating NGO (the Indian Institute of Public Administration [IIPA]) and the Society for the Promotion of Wastelands Development (SPWD) in two interstate training exercises in February and July 1993 and in several local PRA sessions.

The PRAs were conducted in a two-year period beginning in 1993. This relatively long time span was due in part to the lack of PRA-experienced NGOs in some states, and some problems that emerged from some of the PRAs. PRAs were not completed at all sites as scheduled, the extent of participation was sometimes poor, and key information was sometimes not collected. Thus, a second set of PRAs was

conducted to cover more villages and augment the data already gathered. This second period of fieldwork took place from April to September 1994. The overall cost of the PRA work is impossible to estimate given the lack of documentation, but it was estimated that the PRA work in one of the eight sites was approximately US\$350 per week of fieldwork for every 10 households consulted in the PRA. Most of the PRAs lasted between one and two weeks in each community and included teams of four to six people. The costs of the PRA work were covered by project preparation funds.

The IIPA also conducted cross-site baseline information from secondary sources to supplement the PRA findings, particularly on the stakeholder groups present in and around the protected areas and the existing socioeconomic characteristics. In addition, independent anthropological researchers on the pre-appraisal and appraisal missions cross-checked the PRA findings. The IIPA was in charge of consolidating the PRA findings and the secondary data, and presenting a menu of proposed activities that could be undertaken at the community level. Government and NGO representatives provided feedback on these findings through a series of technical reviews, national consultations, and project planning workshops. Although PRA results have yet to be presented to local communities on a formal basis (through organized village meetings and presentations), some project sites have had consultations and small group meetings to discuss possible project activities and key issues.

Limitations and Difficulties:

The skills, training, and orientation of some of the PRA teams limited the quality of some of the work, and necessitated a second round of PRAs. In addition, the fact that the PRAs were undertaken before any project design details had been formulated, and long before implementation was due to start, meant that expectations were raised in the communities visited, as the PRA teams were trying to get feedback on some of the possible components of the project design.

Techniques:

A summary of the PRAs conducted in each site and the techniques used in each PRA is provided in Attachment 1. Informal interviews with individuals were complemented by small group discussions of six to ten people, sometimes as focus groups, such as with women, tribals, or people with similar livelihoods. Social mapping and diagramming were often done during these small group discussions. Examples of the information provided by the PRA techniques include:

- ◆ key problem areas, identified during detailed social mapping;
- ◆ planting and collection schedules provided by seasonal calendars, and used in determining the timing of credit and input procurements;
- ◆ geographic variations across a site depicted in transects; and
- ◆ the value of different tree species and non-timber forest products, elicited through matrix ranking.

Methodological issues that one of the project reviewers felt were a weakness included: the lack of a consistent method of sampling, both at the community and household level; and the lack of documentation on the sample size of households involved in the PRA work, reflecting a larger problem of a lack of quality control over the PRA work.

Another comment on the PRA methodology, made by the task manager, was that the initial PRAs during project preparation were somewhat unfocused. Subsequent improvements in the methodology led to the later PRAs, conducted during appraisal, being much more productive in terms of their contributing to the participatory aspects of project design. So, while the initial PRAs tended to come up with communities' wish lists of activities, the later ones provided realistic and prioritized lists of activities, with budget constraints already incorporated.

Outputs and Impacts:

The PRAs generated information on a wide range of ecodevelopment issues, as well as corresponding strategies, for minimizing problems and improving the interactions between the communities and the protected areas as suggested by the communities visited (see Attachment 2).

The task manager and Indian officials felt that the PRA work made preparation of this complex project an easier task by focusing on real and potential conflicts that would need to be addressed during implementation. The PRA work also sensitized local and state officials to the importance of working with tribals, women, the poor, and landless households in and around the protected areas. Substantively, the PRA results provided (i) an order-of-magnitude estimate for the level of investment needed to support alternative livelihoods for the affected populations; and (ii) reciprocal commitments with communities, based on planned and budgeted activities drawn up by the communities themselves during the PRAs.

The future use of PRA for micro-planning will have a major impact on the project design, as these PRA-generated micro-plans will each be tailored to the technical and social aspects of the community concerned. These micro-plans will include locally specific reciprocal commitments between park officials and communities on alternative livelihoods and resource uses. The preparations for this planned use of PRA in the project are outlined in Attachment 3. The task manager feels that if the project is subsequently expanded to other areas, there will be no need to repeat the initial PRA work for designing the project concept, since this has already been achieved through the earlier PRAs; and indeed that subsequent participatory planning in new areas should not be done until investments are likely to be forthcoming, to avoid raising expectations that can not be fulfilled in the near future.

Background Documentation:

World Bank, August 1996, "India Ecodevelopment Project," Staff Appraisal Report No. 14914-IN, South Asia Department II, Agriculture and Water Division, Washington, D.C. For more information contact Jessica Mott at jmott@worldbank.org.

Attachment 1

Summary of PRAs for Indicative Planning

From Staff Appraisal Report Annex 4: Notes on Project Preparation Process

Project Site, State	Number of Villages	Government/NGOs Conducting PRAs	Comments on Methodology
Buxa, West Bengal	2	Asst. Cons. of Forests (ACF) trained by Wildlife Institute of India	Tools used: mapping, matrices, seasonal calendar; held six village meetings
Gir, Gujarat	5	National Nature Education Foundation	Park ranger assisted in PRAs; used mapping, seasonal calendar, checklist
Nagahole, Karnataka	8	Society for Ecodevelopment Through Technology; Mysore Resettlement and Development Agency (MYRADA)	Retired forest officer and staff from MYRADA held village meetings; tools used: social mapping, transects, seasonal calendar, matrices, trees assessment; small-scale start-up activities done by MYRADA in 2 villages
Palamau, Bihar	10	Nature Conservation Society and park officials	20 of the 139 villages (including 10 with PRAs) interviewed by park officials using checklist format; tools used: social mapping, seasonal calendar, matrices
Pench, Madhya Pradesh	16	Indian Institute of Forest Management	Tools used: transect, social mapping, drawings, seasonal calendar
Periyar, Kerala	10	Land People, Trivandrum	Retired forester and an anthropologist from Peermade Development Society (a church-based NGO) used social mapping, focus group meetings, drawings, seasonal calendar
Ranthambhore, Rajasthan	15	Ranthambhore Foundation	Tools used: transect, social mapping, gender games, trees assessment, seasonal calendar

Attachment 2

Participatory Rural Appraisal Findings

From Staff Appraisal Report Annex 4: Notes on Project Preparation Process

ECODEVELOPMENT ISSUES	STRATEGIES
(1) LIVESTOCK GRAZING	
Livestock grazing within protected area (PA): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Livestock: Cattle 105,000/ha ◆ Fodder consumption: 10.74 t/family/yr 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Promote fodder production on village wastelands outside PA b. Reduce number of cattle per family c. Improve cattle breeds for high productivity d. Introduce stall feeding of cattle
(2) FUELWOOD COLLECTION	
Domestic fuelwood collection within PA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Fuelwood consumption: 3.6 t/family/yr ◆ Fuelwood species 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Develop fuelwood plantations outside PA b. Establish nonconventional source of energy (biogas, solar, wind) c. Introduce fuelwood saving devices (such as smokeless stoves) d. Increase sustainable access to fuelwood in forest reserves through joint forestry activities
(3) LOW AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTIVITY	
Rainfed monsoonal agriculture within PA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Marginal lands ◆ Small farm size ◆ Crops per year: One per monsoon, followed by fallow 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Provide small-scale irrigation schemes for farms around PAs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Tubewells and pipelines ◆ Impoundments on small streams with minor irrigation schemes b. Increase agricultural productivity on existing farms by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Providing inputs (seed, fertilizer) ◆ Encouraging use of biofertilizers and compost
(4) POACHING	
Poaching within PA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Location: Noninhabitants ◆ Animals: Mainly herbivores 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Induct local tribes into antipoaching squads b. Develop antipoaching campsites c. Solicit cooperation of communities near PA in antipoaching programs
(5) NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (NGOs)	
Lack of NGOs in vicinity of PA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ For undertaking ecodevelopment work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Involve and prepare local community groups for NGO tasks b. Persuade established NGOs at state level to assist in planning and implementing activities

Participatory Rural Appraisal Findings (*continued*)

(6) CROP DAMAGE	
Crop damage within PA: ♦ Mainly by elephants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Introduce crop protection measures, mainly electric fencing b. Promote participative patrolling of fields c. Promote crop insurance
(7) EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES	
Lack of employment opportunities within PA: ♦ 100 days employment/forest village family in forestry ♦ 1991: 277,500 person days/forestry work 1993: 594,000 person days/forestry work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Increase involvement of local community in management and environmental regeneration work within PA b. Employ local people in biomass regeneration and land improvement schemes in areas adjacent to PA c. Establish environmentally sustainable income generation activities
(8) TIMBER EXTRACTION	
Illegal timber extraction from PA: ♦ Due to establishment of wood veneer factories near PA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Discourage the establishment of wood-demanding industries in vicinity of PA b. Acquire boats and train antipoaching squads, involving the local community, to guard stream banks and thereby prevent timber smuggling
(9) FLOODING	
Flooding within PA: ♦ Especially in West Bengal and downstream of Bhutan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Increase studies to understand flooding within downstream PAs caused especially by human perturbations in upstream parts of the watershed b. Examine land use patterns in watersheds that prevent downstream floods

Source: India Institute for Public Administration, 1994, *Biodiversity Conservation through Ecodevelopment: An Indicative Plan*, New Delhi.

Attachment 3

Village Ecodevelopment

Excerpts from Staff Appraisal Report Annex 8

Overview:

Village ecodevelopment would reduce the negative impact of local people on protected areas and increase collaboration of local people in biodiversity conservation. Under this component the project would:

- ◆ Conduct participatory micro-planning and provide implementation support for contracted local NGOs, expert advisers, workshops, materials, training (of government officials, NGOs, and local people), protected area (PA) staff, and associated travel;
- ◆ Implement reciprocal commitments that foster alternative livelihoods and resource uses to be financed by a village ecodevelopment program and that specify measurable actions by local people to improve conservation;
- ◆ Conduct special programs to:
 - support additional joint forest management in reserve forests in the immediate vicinity;
 - develop the voluntary relocation option for people in the PAs in ways that are consistent with project objectives and World Bank policies; and
 - provide other supplemental investments through a discretionary reserve for PA managers to allocate to areas with special needs.

Participatory Micro-planning and Implementation Processes:

Micro-planning support teams composed of PA personnel, collaborating NGOs, and villagers (each team with at least one woman and with members able to communicate easily with tribals) would assist village communities to develop and implement site-specific reciprocal plans on a continuing basis throughout the project period. In order to ensure that these plans meet project objectives and embody the active commitment and participation of local people, focused guidelines, clearly determined investment criteria, supportive training programs, and carefully scheduled planning would be critical. Since this form of continuous and participatory planning represents a radical departure from current project practices, it would require sustained support throughout project implementation.

Methodology:

Key Elements. The project would develop and employ methodologies best suited to village ecocodevelopment through:

- ◆ **active participation of all segments of society** in plan formulation and decisionmaking through a community institutional framework that elicits the widest possible consensus;
- ◆ **Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA)** focused on the mutual interaction and reciprocal arrangements between the PA and people;
- ◆ **simplified micro-plan format** allowing the village group to be the author of the plans jointly with the PA authorities, directly incorporating the results of the focused PRA exercises, and summarizing the mutually approved investments, objectives, inputs, mutual obligations, schedule, and monitoring indicators that together form the reciprocal commitments;
- ◆ arrangements for **cost- and benefit-sharing** within all reciprocal commitments;
- ◆ **assessments of proposals** to determine whether they meet **eligibility and feasibility** criteria for project investment, and to incorporate lessons from ongoing monitoring;
- ◆ administrative arrangements to **simplify and speed fund allocations and community-led implementation**; and
- ◆ **community and support team capacity buildings** through on-going training and study tours.

Further Development of Methodology. Many elements of this methodology have already been developed during the preparation process. A national-level NGO would be contracted to refine these elements further to meet project needs. This refinement would be done in collaboration with local NGOs, project staff, and trainers, and would also produce guidelines for local adaptation and use in the field and for incorporation into training programs.

Protected Area Mutual Interactions Assessment

Focused Assessment. Sustained focus on PA relationships is necessary if PRA exercises are to lead to reciprocal commitments that meet project objectives rather than leading off into general rural development. This would require the use of what the Aga Khan Rural Support Program calls a “Topical PRA,” which is centered on the analysis of interaction between the PA and local people. Such a PRA could be termed a protected area mutual interactions assessment (PAMIA). Its constant objective would be to mediate disagreement or to find compensatory mechanisms. (See Box 1 for a list of possible PRA tools to carry out this planning.) The strength of a PRA comes in part from its holistic analysis of problems, needs, and opportunities and their inter-linkages. But both PA authorities and village communities must agree

that any proposed investment or action will result in measurable improvement to sustainable biodiversity conservation. Other issues in community development are only relevant if they contribute to project objectives; they can be eliminated from PRA and micro-planning exercises unless identified by the community as their highest priority for helping to conserve the PA. This focused approach reduces the amount of time and resources required to extend PRA-based micro-planning to each of the proposed Ecodevelopment Committees as well as increasing the potential for sustained mutual cooperation.

**Box 1: Protected Area Mutual Interaction Assessment (PAMIA)
Considerations for a Topical Ecodevelopment PRA**

Topic	Possible Tools
<p>Mutual Interaction Identification Project objectives and constraints</p> <p>PA resource use (by people)</p> <p>Private resource use (by PA wildlife)</p> <p>Other interactions</p> <p>Identification of Possible Solutions PA resource use</p> <p>Community resource use</p> <p>PA wildlife damage control</p> <p>Other interactions</p> <p>Other priorities</p> <p>Proposed Reciprocal Commitments Proposed activities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — flip chart for discussion of objectives, benefits, conditions, and constraints — map of resource use (grass, non-timber forest products, roads, temples, and so on), seasonal chart — ranking of resource importance (dependency) by subgroup — changes in use in relation to PA establishment — ranking of impacts of PA restrictions on income by group — sustainability of resources — map of crop depredation — seasonal chart — ranking of impact by species, crop, and affected households — map of livestock depredation areas — existing protection and compensation measures — ranking existing sources of PA employment by subgroup — Venn diagram of PA-people interactions — ranking of positive and negative interactions — potential for limited PA resource use, such as fire line grass — map of potential joint forest management in peripheral forests — within village area/farm resource creation potential — identification and ranking of potential protection measures — methods for targeting future Forest Department employment — methods for improving human interactions — identification of alternate income sources associated with PA — community investment priorities — ranking of existing government-sponsored development schemes of interest to community — identifying and ranking alternative individual income schemes — ranking of potential investments and activities by project criteria: conservation potential; willingness to cost-share; equity; incrementality; and social, financial, technical, and environmental feasibility

Case Study: Jamaica Urban Poverty and Violence Study

Key Features:

- ◆ Use of PRA methods in an urban context, such as Participatory Urban Appraisal (PUA)
- ◆ Research done in collaboration with a local university, serving the interests of the World Bank and the university

Context:

This participatory assessment of urban poverty and violence in Jamaica was undertaken as an integral part of the ongoing Jamaica Urban Poverty Study in the World Bank, as well as to assist the design of a World Bank-supported Social Investment Fund (SIF).

Objectives:

The study aimed to elicit community perceptions of: (i) the types of violence they encounter; (ii) the causal interrelationship among violence, poverty, and local social institutions; and (iii) the perceived means by which government and communities could work to reduce violence. The results were intended to:

- ◆ provide analytical data for the Jamaica Urban Poverty Study that illustrates how violence erodes both labor and social capital, which are assets of the poor;
- ◆ assist in the identification of the sub-project menu for the proposed Jamaica SIF, by highlighting the importance of interventions to increase “peace” and consolidate social capital;
- ◆ provide insights concerning the effectiveness of local social institutions with implications for implementation of the SIF; and
- ◆ develop the institutional capacity of the Center for Population, Community and Development, University of the West Indies (UWI), to utilize the PRA/PUA methodology.

Process:

The research was carried out by a team of 12 researchers, including graduate students of the UWI, NGO representatives, community leaders, university staff, and two World Bank social scientists. The UWI was the counterpart institution responsible for putting together the research team, arranging logistics and selecting fieldwork sites. An international PRA consultant was brought in to train the research team. The cost of the study was shared between the British Overseas Development Administration (ODA)

(with a grant of US\$50,000 to pay for the PRA trainer and the field expenses of the local team members) and the World Bank's Latin America and the Caribbean Region. Approximately 30 weeks of cross-support was provided by the two World Bank social scientists, with this cost being split between the Jamaica Urban Poverty Study and the Social Investment Fund.

The study began with a 10-day training workshop, including a short period of pilot fieldwork in one community. Then the team split into two subgroups (with regard to experience, gender and ethnic identity), each one visiting one urban community in Kingston and one other urban community over a period of two weeks. Following the fieldwork, the team spent an additional week finalizing their field notes, drafting synthesis reports, and participating in a final field workshop. A draft report of the PUA study was produced within two months of fieldwork completion by the World Bank social scientists on the research team. A separate report was produced by the university for their own research purposes. Findings were then reviewed at two half-day stakeholder workshops. The first was hosted by the UWI, with World Bank staff present as observers, to share the findings with the university's NGO network and academics. The second session, held the following day, was hosted by the World Bank and included 80 participants from government agencies, international agencies, NGOs, community representatives, and researchers.

The communities visited during the fieldwork were selected so as to be broadly representative of a range of poor community types in urban Jamaica. Each was known to have a credible "gatekeeper" who was willing to cooperate with the study and who could provide access, security, and trust for the researchers. The communities varied in their social and political makeup and their internal divisions and factions. Given the highly sensitive nature of the research topic, pseudonyms were used for the communities to guarantee their anonymity, and the named acknowledgement of community members for the visual outputs of the PUA (usually a ground rule of this methodology) was omitted for purposes of anonymity.

Techniques:

During preparations for the fieldwork, the research team identified key issues and hypotheses for investigation, and developed checklists of the techniques that could be used to address each issue. These checklists were aggregated into a field guide as an optional "menu" of techniques that the team could utilize. In the communities, the researchers started by asking people about their perceptions of poverty, and within this context, how the people themselves perceived violence. The PUA tools used included:

- ◆ **mapping** (for example, of poorer and not-so-poor neighborhoods, or of different gang territories)
- ◆ **wealth ranking**
- ◆ **time lines** (of changing social conditions and violence over the last 40 to 50 years)
- ◆ **daily and weekly trends** (for instance, of police harassment)

- ◆ **problem ranking** (of community problems in general, and specific types of violence)
- ◆ **causal flow diagrams** (for example, of domestic violence, or the impacts of unemployment)
- ◆ **institutional mapping** (of local organizations within or with links to the community)
- ◆ **preference ranking** (of types of local leaders)

Attachment 1 consists of a matrix showing the PRA tools used and some of the issues raised during their application in this study. Of these tools, causal flow diagrams, institutional maps (renamed “roti diagrams”), and ranking exercises were felt to provide the most insightful results. The team showed an initial reluctance to use some of the visual tools of PUA, as they felt them inappropriate to the topic of violence and the culture of Jamaica. One method that the team was particularly reluctant to use was community mapping, as this could be viewed as a means of helping to flush out those involved in crime and, therefore, could be dangerous to those participating in the mapping. Testing the different methods in the pilot fieldwork allowed the team to see which methods could in fact be used.

Limitations and Difficulties:

At the onset senior staff in the counterpart institution (with earlier Rapid Rural Appraisal experience) was not entirely convinced about the merits of the PRA methodology. During fieldwork, insufficient time was initially allocated for the subgroups to reflect and review their findings. This was rectified by scheduling early morning review sessions to compare notes and plan the day’s work.

Outputs and Impacts:

The study generated a high degree of interest and ownership among the SIF staff and the Resident Mission, and the UWI counterparts were also impressed with the quality of the findings. The study also served as a successful test of the applicability of the methodology and the capacity of the research team to undertake future research being planned by ODA.

Background Documentation:

Caroline Moser and Jeremy Holland, 1997, “Urban Poverty and Violence in Jamaica,” *Latin America and Caribbean Studies*, World Bank, Washington, D.C. For more information contact Caroline Moser at cmoser@worldbank.org.

Attachment 1

PRA Tools Used in the Jamaica Urban Poverty and Violence Study

PRA Tool	Examples of issues raised
TRANSECT WALKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Ice breaking: high-visibility systematic walk through community with gatekeeper(s), critically important to dispel suspicion of outsiders ◆ Encouraged participants to discuss and raise issues, both spatial (that is identifying gang “turf” boundaries) and nonspatial
PARTICIPATORY MAPPING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Spatial characteristics within the community of perceived importance highlighted and listed/ranked/discussed (for example location of police station; wealth of different households within a street)
LISTING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Types of problems perceived by different groups ◆ Specific types of violence perceived by different groups, aggregated to show the frequency with which each type of violence was mentioned ◆ Characteristics of wealth and well-being (those who “have it” and those who “don’t have it”) ◆ Characteristics of “good men” and “bad men” ◆ Dreams and solutions
RANKING AND SCORING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Prevalence and importance of: types of violence; types of weapons; types of employment ◆ Wealth or well-being ranking
SEASONAL MAPPING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Trend analysis of violence in general or specific types of violence ◆ Activity schedule-seasonal analysis of police harassment; of different sources of income generation
TIME LINES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Perceptions of significant changes within the community or of community characteristics—relating to different types of violence and its intensity
CAUSAL IMPACT DIAGRAMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Analysis of unemployment, area stigma, domestic violence, teenage pregnancy, and lack of education and their relationship to violence
INSTITUTIONAL VENN (‘ROTI’) DIAGRAMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Analysis of relative importance and nature of individuals and institutions within the community and their interrelationships, particularly important in identifying “good” social institutions and “bad/dangerous/violent” social institutions

Source: Caroline Moser and Jeremy Holland, 1996, “Can Policy-focused PRAs Be Participatory? Recent Policy-focused Research on Violence and Poverty in Jamaica Using PRA Methods,” World Bank, unpublished paper, Washington, D.C.

Case Study: Mali Livestock Development Strategy Formulation

Key Feature:

Development of a national subsectoral strategy using a PRA approach to seek the views of producer groups and other stakeholders.

Context:

Participatory techniques have been used extensively in Mali in the context of project interventions. This was the first time these techniques were used for policy design and in the livestock sector—where a high degree of technical expertise is involved and where the experts were not convinced that producers should be involved in the early stages of policy formulation. However, with livestock a key contributor to Mali's export earnings and with the generally poor performance of livestock development projects in the country (partly due to their failure to address the conditions and concerns of specific producer groups), the Mali government requested the World Bank's assistance in undertaking this study.

Objectives:

The objectives of the study were to develop a strategy for livestock development (specifically red meat production) through a process that (i) took account of the agricultural sector as a whole; (ii) was participatory with all stakeholders involved; and (iii) dealt with the key enabling environment factors for producers (supportive institutions and policies, relevant technologies, and access to financial resources).

Process:

The process consisted of three stages: (i) agreement on a work plan, recruitment of consultants, sampling of production systems to be covered, and design of the PRA methodology to be used; (ii) researcher training, organization of logistics, and consultation with producers using PRA methods in 10 herding communities; and (iii) analysis and processing of results, a wrap-up workshop and start of incorporation of results into an agriculture sector development strategy. The whole process spanned a period of three years beginning in early 1993, with the agriculture sector strategy still under development.

Preparations for the PRA consultations began with the identification and training of the research team. Twenty-five researchers were recruited, including 12 PRA practitioners from a World Bank-supported natural resource management project in Mali that utilizes PRA methods, and 13 technical field staff from the Livestock Department. Five national consultants were also recruited for their expertise in the key elements of the study (community goals and PRA; economic analysis of production systems; environmental sustainability; security of access to natural

resources; and marketing and export) to ensure that these topics were adequately covered and to help analyze these themes in the preparation of the PRA findings. Some of the consultants also accompanied the researchers in the field. All members of the research team were fluent in the local languages spoken in the communities selected. None of the technical staff or the national consultants had had previous experience with PRA methods, and the project staff had been accustomed to using PRA primarily for community-level mobilization and planning, not for information-gathering, as in this study. Thus, a three-week training was carried out, including some hands-on pilot tests with PRA methods in two villages.

The logistical organization prior to the consultations included informing local authorities of the study, and arranging transport, food, and lodging for the team. The consultations were carried out in 10 villages over a period of three weeks in early 1995. The research team split into four subgroups of five to seven members each. Following the consultations and after some preliminary processing of the results, a five-day wrap-up workshop was held for the whole research team to pinpoint the issues raised by the producers and to identify measures to address these issues in the form of an action plan. Finally, a month-long retreat was organized to ensure a better understanding and a sense of ownership of the process and its outcomes on the part of the Malian government and the donor community. As input to this retreat, 12 specialists were hired to synthesize the material produced in the wrap-up workshop into a draft document for participants at the retreat.

The total cost of the whole exercise, including hiring of all consultants and researchers, task manager's time, and the workshop and retreat costs, amounted to nearly US\$600,000. These considerable costs were shared by the World Bank, the European Community, two related World Bank-funded projects in Mali, the Norwegian Trust Fund, and USAID.

Techniques:

The PRA techniques used in the consultations included:

- ◆ Semi-structured interviews
- ◆ Social mapping
- ◆ Resource mapping
- ◆ Transect
- ◆ Seasonal calendars
- ◆ Historical profile
- ◆ Preference ranking
- ◆ Problem ranking
- ◆ Institutional mapping

Details on these techniques can be found in the Techniques section of this module.

Limitations and Difficulties:

The quality of the research results varied greatly among the four subgroups. Evidently the training, even though it had extended over three weeks, had not prepared the team adequately. Some subgroups were clearly not confident about using PRA methods at all, while others attempted to use the whole range of PRA techniques without selecting only those relevant to the topic. The quality of the reporting was also variable, and no funds were available for a second round of fieldwork to verify the information and obtain feedback from the respondents. The teams would have benefitted from closer supervision in the field to check the quality of their information and reporting.

The participants in the final retreat were mainly technical staff who had not been involved in the earlier stages of the process. Some of these staff felt threatened by the consultative approach and ignored much of the PRA findings, basing their recommendations on their own technical biases and an expert approach rather than the views from the field.

Outputs and Impacts:

The results of these consultations are now feeding into the identification of an Agriculture Sector Investment Program (ASIP), and will facilitate the incorporation of livestock development components into three other World Bank–financed projects in Mali in the near future. In conjunction with project launch activities, there will be a final workshop for those people involved in this exercise to present the livestock components of the ASIP for validation. The results have also established, for those communities visited, benchmark data for further monitoring of the program's impact.

The involvement of Livestock Development technical staff on the research team, while problematic, has helped raise their awareness about the value of participatory approaches; and although the research team as a whole had difficulties in using PRA in the context of national policy development, their present capacity can be strengthened by future training for subsequent work of this kind. Many of the methodological and logistical lessons learned will also be very valuable for planning future participatory studies in Mali.

Background Documentation:

World Bank, October 1995, "A Participatory Approach to Livestock Development in Mali: Use of Participatory Techniques with Producer Groups with a View to Defining National Subsectoral Policies," Western Africa Department, Agriculture and Environment Division, Washington, D.C. For more information contact John Hall at jhall2@worldbank.org.

Case Study: Zambia Participatory Poverty Assessment

Key Features:

- ◆ Use of qualitative and participatory PRA method to generate policy conclusions on a national level.
- ◆ Successful incorporation of PRA findings into overall Poverty Assessment.

Context:

PRA methods were used to conduct a Participatory Poverty Assessment (PPA) in parallel with a standard Poverty Assessment.

Objectives:

The objectives of the PPA were to:

- ◆ explore local conceptions of poverty, vulnerability, and relative well-being in poor and urban communities in Zambia;
- ◆ explore what the poor themselves see as the most effective actions for poverty reduction (by individuals, families, communities, government agencies, and other organizations);
- ◆ investigate what the poor see as their main concerns and problems and how these have changed over the last five to ten years; and
- ◆ investigate local perceptions of key policy changes related to economic liberalization.

It should be noted that, given these objectives, the use of PRA in this PPA was seen as a way of giving voice to the poor, rather than (as in some other PRA uses) ensuring that the information gathered was owned and used by the local people themselves.

Process:

The PRA activity made up the bulk of the PPA work, and was undertaken by two teams from the Rural Development Support Bureau of the University of Zambia. The work was commissioned by the Southern Africa Department of the World Bank to provide input to the Zambia Poverty Assessment. Training for the teams in PRA methods was provided by an international PRA consultant, funded by the British Overseas Development Administration (ODA). The teams' in-country costs were supported by the Swedish International Development Authority (SIDA). The overall cost for the PRA work (excluding World Bank staff time and travel

expenses) was about US\$95,000. The PRA was coordinated by a World Bank social scientist, and the overall research design was the responsibility of another social scientist working on secondment from ODA to the World Bank. Both of these social scientists had prior experience with PRA methods in World Bank work.

The PRA was conducted over a 10-week period in late 1993, divided between:

- ◆ a two-week training workshop;
- ◆ six weeks of fieldwork;
- ◆ a one-week review of fieldwork by the teams; and
- ◆ a one-week preparation of the draft report.

It took a further several months for production of a draft synthesis report, and a year after the fieldwork to produce the results of the PPA as a gray cover report.

A total of 10 sites were visited (six rural and four urban), with each site comprising at least one and often several rural villages, urban slums, or shanty compounds. These sites were selected to represent communities differentiated by: rural/urban characteristics, mode of livelihood, cultural/ethnic group, agro-ecological zone, access to infrastructure and services, and integration with markets. The sites were selected with the help of key informants and on the basis of the field team's prior knowledge (some communities had been visited previously by team members as part of a Beneficiary Assessment for the Social Recovery Fund).

Techniques:

The principal methods used were interviewing, either unstructured or semi-structured, and focus group discussions of open-ended questions using an interview guide. In addition, during these interviews and discussions, the following PRA techniques were used:

- ◆ participatory thematic mapping of, for example, village resources;
- ◆ wealth and well-being ranking;
- ◆ institutional mapping of agencies and organizations providing services to communities;
- ◆ seasonal diagramming of, for example, food security throughout the year;
- ◆ livelihood analysis of income-generating activities; and
- ◆ time lines showing, for example, key historical events in the development of a squatter settlement.

Team members were encouraged to use their own initiative and judgment in deciding which methods to use; and to assist their choices, a guide was prepared suggesting which method would be most appropriate to investigate each of the various issues under consideration.

Limitations:

The fieldwork was conducted over a relatively short period of time in relation to such a broad and cross-sectoral topic as poverty. The results, therefore, are more indications of what people see as the main trends in their lives, given that detailed quantification was not possible. In addition, the PPA consultations did not include service providers or other stakeholders outside of the communities. Also of note, wealth ranking proved difficult to carry out in some sites where people were reluctant to “label” their neighbors, but on the whole this technique worked in most communities.

The PPA generated a very large amount of information in the form of field notes. The analysis of these findings, and their incorporation into a World Bank report, proved to be a considerable challenge and took a full year.

Outputs and Impacts:

The findings of the PRA were written up (including several diagrams with accompanying analysis) as a volume of the Poverty Assessment gray cover report. This report also highlighted the conclusions reached from these findings and the priorities identified by the local people for government policy in the sectors of health, education, water and sanitation, transport infrastructure, agriculture and natural resource management, and so forth.

Background Documentation:

World Bank, November 1994, “Zambia Poverty Assessment Volume V: Participatory Poverty Assessment,” Report No. 12985-ZA, Southern Africa Department, Human Resources Division, Washington, D.C. For more information contact Steen Jorgensen at sjorgensen@worldbank.org.

Section 4: Suggestions for Seminars

This section includes a sample agenda for a one-day training seminar on PRA as well as suggestions for experiential exercises and discussion points for small group work during the seminar. These ideas are provided only as a starting point for trainers and seminar organizers. There are many alternative ways of designing these training events, and experienced PRA trainers will have their own style of working and their own preferences for the kinds of exercises to use. Ideally, of course, a training seminar would be much longer than one day. A one- or two-week training event, for example, would allow time for participants to practice PRA techniques in the field—which is by far the best way of learning about PRA.

SAMPLE AGENDA

9:00–9:30	Welcome and Introductions
9:30–10:30	Overview Presentation and Discussion
10:30–10:45	Break
10:45–11:45	Case Study Presentation and Discussion Presentation by an experienced PRA facilitator, describing the process and content of the work, and outlining follow-up activities. The video <i>Groundwork</i> (included in the compilation video in this kit) may be shown—in full as an additional case study, or in part to illustrate some PRA techniques not covered in the case study presentation.
11:45–13:00	Small Group Work: Experimenting with Some PRA Techniques Participants form small groups (preferably of three or four people) to have some hands-on experience with a few PRA techniques (see attached sheet for details). For this part of the agenda, one or two more facilitators will be required to work with the groups.
13:00–14:00	Lunch
14:00–14:30	Presentation of Participants' Cases Those participants who are currently planning or considering using a PRA approach in a project or study present very brief descriptions of the project background. These cases will form the basis of the small group work.

14:30–14:45	Formation of Small Groups Participants choose which case interests them most, and a facilitator makes any adjustments to the groups to ensure some mixing of participants and to avoid any groups being too large or small.
14:45–15:00	Break
15:00–16:30	Small Group Work: Designing a PRA Each group works on one of the real-life cases to identify the objectives of the PRA and consider some key elements in planning the work (see assignment sheet below). A facilitator, knowledgeable about PRA, will need to accompany each group.
16:30–17:00	Plenary Presentations of Small Group Work Brief reports from each group and discussion.
17:00–17:30	Wrap-Up and Evaluations

SMALL GROUP WORK: EXPERIMENTING WITH SOME PRA TECHNIQUES

Participants can work in teams of two or three people to try one or more of the following exercises. Each exercise can take from 20 minutes to one hour, depending on the interest of the participants. Some participants may choose to try out several techniques while others may prefer to focus on just one.

WEALTH RANKING OF THE WORLD BANK “COMMUNITY” (or other agency or community, as appropriate)

Using a pile of beans, seeds, pebbles, or similar objects to represent the entire World Bank “community” (all levels and categories of staff), divide the beans into a number of different piles, each representing a wealth group (that is, people with similar wealth/well-being status). Any number of piles can be created. The relative size of the piles should reflect the proportion of staff in the different groups. Make a note of the criteria being used when doing this ranking. List the criteria on a flip chart, and depict on the same flip chart the number and relative sizes of the piles.

SOCIAL MAPPING OF THE WASHINGTON, D.C. AREA (or location of Resident Mission, or other area as appropriate)

Sketch out two social maps of the area, one from the perspective of a wealthy member of the community and another from that of a homeless/poor resident. Each map should show the location of different social groups (based on whatever criteria the team chooses—wealth, race, and so on) and highlight important places for the rich or poor mapper. The maps should extend only to the areas familiar to the mapper, no matter how small that area may be. Then try to analyze the maps to see what the different perspectives can reveal and how these different perspectives would need to be taken into account in a project context.

PREFERENCE RANKING OF LUNCH VENUES (best done by individuals)

Rank the places you frequent for lunch according to your own preference criteria. Start by taking each venue one at a time and listing what it is you particularly like about it (quality of food, price, convenience, or whatever) and anything you don't like about it. Once you have gone through each venue like this, draw up a matrix, of venues versus criteria. Fill in the matrix by comparing the performance of each venue across the different criteria—for example, on the basis of cost, venue one may score highest (being the cheapest) and be allotted the maximum score, while venue four may be given the lowest score as it is the most expensive. Finally, look at the venue that you go to most often to see if it scores the highest overall. If not, which of the criteria do you inherently give most weight to when choosing where to eat?

MAPPING YOUR INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT (best done by individuals, or people working on same task)

Construct an institutional map for a task on which a team member is working. Draw or cut out circles to represent the different decisionmaking groups or powerful individuals that play a role (positive or negative) in your task. Don't limit yourself to the official institutional groups—include other informal groupings and networks, both in headquarters and in the field (if appropriate). The size of each circle should reflect the relative importance of the group/individual. Place the circles according to how involved they are in your task, with the amount of overlap reflecting the extent to which the groups work together. Once the institutional map is complete, highlight where you would like to see changes, for instance, in the extent to which some groups work together or to which some are involved in your project.

SMALL GROUP WORK: DESIGNING A PRA

If possible, each group should work on an actual study or project where a PRA activity is being planned or at least considered. Each group should include: at least one person familiar with the project/study, a facilitator who is experienced with PRA and can keep track of time, and a rapporteur who can report on the group's work in a follow-up plenary session. The groups can be given the following instructions to help them.

The participant whose case the group is focusing on should give a very brief (10 minute) introduction, outlining the stage at which the work is and what they would like to get out of a PRA. The group should then try to develop an initial plan of action for the PRA, considering:

- ◆ The objectives of the PRA;
- ◆ The main issues to be addressed in the PRA;
- ◆ The possible techniques that could be used to investigate each of the issues identified. This can take the form of a matrix:
 - Issues to be investigated
 - Possible PRA techniques to use.
- ◆ Some process issues:
 - Who could do the PRA? (What kind of institution?) What kind of training would be required?
 - What kind of scale would seem most appropriate for the PRA?
 - How long might the PRA take? What would be the best timing for the PRA?
 - How much might it cost?
 - What kinds of follow-up activities would be likely?

Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation

Module IV

Section 1: Overview

Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation

“is a process of collaborative problem-solving through the generation and use of knowledge. It is a process that leads to corrective action by involving all levels of stakeholders in shared decisionmaking.”¹

Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) is a collaborative process that involves stakeholders at different levels working together to assess a project or policy, and take any corrective action required. Monitoring is usually conducted as an ongoing activity throughout the life of a project, whereas evaluations are undertaken at certain times, such as at project mid-term or completion. In participatory M&E work, the distinction between monitoring and evaluation can often become blurred, as participatory assessments and feedback mechanisms are built-in to project design as a regular component of the work, rather than one-time events.

The stakeholder groups typically involved in a participatory M&E activity include: the end users of project goods and services, including both men and women at the community level; intermediary organizations, including NGOs; private sector businesses involved in the project; and government staff at all levels.

¹ Deepa Narayan, 1993, “Participatory Evaluation: Tools for Managing Change in Water and Sanitation,” World Bank Technical Paper No. 207, Washington D.C.

Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: Key Principles

- ◆ Local people are active participants—not just sources of information.
- ◆ Stakeholders evaluate, outsiders facilitate.
- ◆ Focus on building stakeholder capacity for analysis and problem-solving.
- ◆ Process builds commitment to implementing any recommended corrective actions.

Participatory approaches to M&E can take many forms and can involve different levels of participation, but the key principles remain the same. Most important is the emphasis placed on the active roles played by the local stakeholders. Conducting user surveys or asking community members to respond to questionnaires does not qualify as participatory evaluation. Instead, stakeholders at all levels are the main actors in the monitoring or evaluation process. They are responsible for collecting and analyzing the information, and for generating recommendations for change. The role of an outside consultant is to facilitate and support this learning.

Participatory M&E is very much action-oriented, and strong emphasis is placed on building the capacity and commitment of all key stakeholders to reflect, analyze, and take responsibility for implementing any changes they recommend.

Participatory and Conventional Approaches to Monitoring and Evaluation Compared

	Conventional M&E	Participatory M&E
Who	External experts	Stakeholders, including communities and project staff; outside facilitator
What	Predetermined indicators, to measure inputs and outputs	Indicators identified by stakeholders, to measure process as well as outputs or outcomes
How	Questionnaire surveys, by outside “neutral” evaluators, distanced from project	Simple, qualitative or quantitative methods, by stakeholders themselves
Why	To make project and staff accountable to funding agency	To empower stakeholders to take corrective action

Source: Adapted from Deepa Narayan, *Ibid.*

Participatory approaches to M&E differ from the more conventional methods in several ways. Traditional M&E tends to be a linear, predetermined, and extractive process to fulfill a management or financial accountability requirement rather than to identify and respond to a project’s changing needs. In conventional M&E work, an outside evaluator is considered necessary in order to maintain distance and independence from the project—and to provide a “neutral” view. Conversely, participatory M&E uses a more open-ended and iterative approach, whereby the stakeholders themselves conduct the research, analyze the findings, and make recommendations. Also in participatory M&E, an outside facilitator is employed to help guide the process and bring other perspectives to bear on the issues of concern. The actual topics of a participatory monitoring or evaluation activity will be decided *during* the process rather than *before*, and the work usually includes assessments of the quality of the *process* as well as the quality of the *outputs* of a project.

It should be noted that most participatory M&E work is done alongside more conventional evaluation methods to cross-check the findings and foster local-level commitment to action. For example, an evaluation survey assessing the economic and technical performance of a local housing project might be undertaken by outside evaluators, while a participatory evaluation of the same project might focus on how the project is perceived by the project staff and by the end users—the new housing residents.

The Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation Cycle

Source: From Jacob Pfohl, 1986, "Participatory Evaluation: A Users Guide," PACT Publications, New York, from an evaluation report by Ron Sawyer, Bangladesh, 1978.

For participatory approaches to M&E to be truly effective, they need to be incorporated into the overall project and be undertaken on a continuous and iterative basis. The results of an initial self-evaluation exercise, for example, can provide some preliminary findings that can be the groundwork for a follow-up assessment; these results, in turn, can be used to refine the key issues and generate new questions to address in subsequent rounds of monitoring. At the same time, the project may be developing new activities, and encountering new problems, which may affect the stakeholders' views of the operation. Communities may also be experiencing changes from other sources that may have an impact on the project, such as severe droughts or floods, or dramatic changes in earnings from crops or the prices of essential food items. The topics covered in subsequent monitoring will, therefore, need to be adapted to the changing conditions of the project and communities.

The implementing agencies involved need to be able to respond to the changing scenarios, too; and they need to be responsive to the recommendations that emerge from M&E activities. Flexibility, a quick response system, and client orientation are essential characteristics of an agency that is using participatory M&E approaches successfully. A well-developed program of capacity-building in these skills and attributes will need to accompany any efforts to institutionalize participatory forms of M&E.

Key Stages in Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation

- ♦ **Preparation:**
 - Deciding on the need for an assessment
 - Determining the cost and time available
 - Identifying a lead participatory monitoring/evaluation facilitator
 - Defining Terms of Reference for the monitoring/evaluation
 - Training the team of monitoring/evaluation facilitators
- ♦ **Participatory Assessments, Self-Evaluations, and Analysis**
- ♦ **Action Planning**
- ♦ **Dissemination of the Results**

A participatory monitoring or evaluation activity entails the above-listed steps, all of which should involve a collaborative effort by the various stakeholders. For example:

The initial decision to undertake a monitoring or evaluation activity should be taken jointly with stakeholders at the local level (for example, users of project goods or services), to ensure commitment among these stakeholders and to make sure they feel it will be a useful activity. Close collaboration with local people is also crucial at this early stage of the monitoring or evaluation work to ensure that the timing of the assessment does not conflict with major events, such as local elections or harvest time.

Defining the Terms of Reference—including which methods to use and what topics to cover—is ideally done in the field with a cross-section of stakeholders, including community representatives and project staff. A training program can then be designed to familiarize the local facilitators with the participatory methods to be used and the checklist of topics to be examined.

Data gathering and analysis using the selected participatory methods often involve a combination of field visits followed by workshops for the team of facilitators to review the results and do some on-the-spot analysis; more field visits may be needed to fill in any information missed in the first round.

Dissemination of the results of the assessment should include some form of feedback to the stakeholders involved at all levels, including perhaps a presentation in the field for community representatives, an informal review meeting with project staff, and a final workshop with senior government officials. The reporting of the process and results of the monitoring or evaluation work may include written reports, videos, photographs, visuals, and other means of communication.

Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: Some Practical Questions

- ♦ What background should the monitoring/evaluation facilitators have?
- ♦ How much will it cost to do a participatory monitoring or evaluation activity?
- ♦ How long will it take?

Selecting the facilitators: The lead facilitator usually has a background in the social sciences and is typically a researcher or a development practitioner. The person selected should be experienced in the use of qualitative and participatory methods and group dynamic techniques. The lead facilitator should be comfortable playing the role of a catalyst, rather than acting as the “expert” focal point of the evaluation. The lead facilitator is usually responsible for training and supervising a team of facilitators, which in turn facilitates the evaluation work with the various stakeholder groups. Members of this team should be selected on the basis of their experience in applying participatory development approaches, or their openness to using participatory approaches in the evaluation work. University students or field-level development workers have often been employed as facilitators.

Cost: The cost of a participatory monitoring or evaluation activity will vary from project to project. Base costs will include the professional fees of the lead facilitator, payment for the team of facilitators, travel, and materials. When calculating field costs, it is important to allocate sufficient time for preparation and introduction of the objectives and scope of the work to the various stakeholders. Also, more than one trip to the field may be required to consult stakeholders on the evaluation framework and for the collection and analysis of data.

Time: The duration of the activity will depend on the size and complexity of the project, the level and availability of local expertise, and the number of stakeholders to be involved in the work. It may be better to view the monitoring or evaluation as something that is done in phases rather than as one block of time. Usually, at least six to eight weeks of the facilitators’ time are required for preparation, training, fieldwork, and report writing.

Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: Some Methods

- ◆ Stakeholder workshops
- ◆ Participatory methodologies, including:
 - Participatory Rural Appraisal
 - SARAR (Self-esteem, Associative strengths, Resourcefulness, Action planning, Responsibility)
 - Beneficiary Assessment
- ◆ Self-assessment methods

Three types of methodologies have been used in participatory M&E work in the World Bank. A combination of techniques from these methodologies has proven most effective.

Stakeholder workshops have often been organized on: (i) a project-wide scale to bring together government officials, project management, and other stakeholders operating at this level; and (ii) a more local scale to bring together local organizations, local-level government officials involved in the operation, and field-level project staff. These workshops can provide a forum for the participatory evaluation sessions, or can be held to review the findings from the monitoring or evaluation work and to discuss how to take any recommended corrective actions.

Joint assessments of various kinds have been undertaken to involve stakeholders directly, and particularly those at the local level, who may not feel comfortable discussing their concerns in stakeholder workshops, particularly if project staff and government officials are present. A range of participatory assessment methodologies have been used, such as Participatory Rural Appraisal (as in the impact monitoring of the Structural Adjustment Credit in Zambia—which is included in this module's Case Studies section), SARAR (as in the Nepal Rural Water Supply and Sanitation project—see the Case Studies section of the SARAR module for details), and Beneficiary Assessment (as in the evaluation of the National Agriculture Extension project in Senegal—which is discussed in the Case Studies section of the Beneficiary Assessment module).

Self-evaluations by communities or project staff involve these stakeholders in conducting their own assessments of the operation. This approach, however, is still rare in World Bank-supported work. One recent example is the self-assessments by beneficiaries of the Women's Micro-enterprise Training program in India (see the Case Studies section of this module). Examples from other agencies include the self-evaluations by NGO staff in a livestock program in Bolivia and community-based monitoring of ecodevelopment activities in Sri Lanka (both of which are also in the Case Studies section of this module).

Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation

An Overview

Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation

“is a process of collaborative problem-solving through the generation and use of knowledge. It is a process that leads to corrective action by involving all levels of stakeholders in shared decisionmaking.”

Source: Deepa Narayan, 1993, “Participatory Evaluation: Tools for Managing Change in Water and Sanitation,” World Bank Technical Paper No. 207, Washington D.C.

Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: Key Principles

- ◆ Local people are active participants—not just sources of information.
- ◆ Stakeholders evaluate, outsiders facilitate.
- ◆ Focus on building stakeholder capacity for analysis and problem-solving.
- ◆ Process builds commitment to implementing any recommended corrective actions.

Participatory and Conventional Approaches to Monitoring and Evaluation Compared

Conventional M&E

- Who** External experts
- What** Predetermined indicators, to measure inputs and outputs
- How** Questionnaire surveys, by outside “neutral” evaluators, distanced from project
- Why** To make project and staff accountable to funding agency

Participatory M&E

- Stakeholders, including communities and project staff; outside facilitator
- Indicators identified by stakeholders, to measure process as well as outputs or outcomes
- Simple, qualitative or quantitative methods, by stakeholders themselves
- To empower stakeholders to take corrective action

The Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation Cycle

Source: From Jacob Pfohl, 1986, "Participatory Evaluation: A Users Guide," PACT Publications, New York, from an evaluation report by Ron Sawyer, Bangladesh, 1978.

Key Stages in Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation

- ◆ **Preparation:**
 - Deciding on the need for an assessment
 - Determining the cost and time available
 - Identifying a lead participatory monitoring/evaluation facilitator
 - Defining Terms of Reference for the monitoring/evaluation
 - Training the team of monitoring/evaluation facilitators
- ◆ **Participatory Assessments, Self-Evaluations, and Analysis**
- ◆ **Action Planning**
- ◆ **Dissemination of the Results**

Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: Some Practical Questions

- ◆ What background should the monitoring/evaluation facilitators have?
- ◆ How much will it cost to do a participatory monitoring or evaluation activity?
- ◆ How long will it take?

Section 2: Techniques

A participatory approach to monitoring and evaluation (M&E) will usually make use of a number of techniques and tools, selected and combined to suit the objectives of the M&E work and the resources available. Many of the techniques associated with Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA), Beneficiary Assessment (BA), and SARAR have been used in the context of monitoring or evaluation (see the Techniques sections of these modules). Some examples of these methodologies' trademark techniques and applications to M&E are highlighted below.

Participatory Rural Appraisal

Relevant Techniques: visual methods, often to analyze “before and after” situations, through the use of community mapping, problem ranking, wealth ranking, seasonal and daily time charts, and other tools.

Case Studies: (i) monitoring of structural adjustment impacts in Zambia from the perspectives of the poor, and (ii) community monitoring and evaluation of the impacts of ecotourism in Sri Lanka (both cases are in the Case Studies section of this module).

SARAR:

Relevant Techniques: interactive and visual-based methods to facilitate community discussion with such methods as pocket charts, three pile sorting, and “story with a gap.”

Case Studies: (i) community monitoring of activities and impacts of a water supply and sanitation project in Nepal (see Case Studies section of SARAR module for this case), and (ii) a hypothetical case of a project staff's self-evaluation of a roads project (see Suggestions for Seminars section of this module).

Beneficiary Assessment:

Relevant Techniques: conversational interviewing and focus group discussions on changes and impacts.

Case Study: farmers and other stakeholders' evaluation of agricultural extension program in Senegal (see Case Studies section of the BA module).

Additional Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation Techniques

In addition to using PRA, SARAR, and BA techniques, participatory monitoring and evaluation often entails development of other techniques that are designed to be used by community members and other local-level stakeholders as part of an M&E activity. This section will outline a few of these techniques, namely:

- ◆ Visual self-evaluation tools
- ◆ Testimonials
- ◆ Photographing the evidence
- ◆ Community records and indicators.

It should be noted that the techniques described here represent just a small sample of the vast range of participatory techniques that can be used for participatory M&E work. Readers can refer to the Resources and Contacts section of the Users' Notes booklet for a list of participatory monitoring and evaluation manuals for information on many more techniques.

Visual Self-Evaluation Tools

Visual-based techniques are especially powerful when M&E involves nonliterate stakeholders, as the pictorial nature of the tools enables everyone to join in the discussions. Care must be taken to ensure that the drawings are appropriate for the culture in which they are used. Many stories have been told of villagers interpreting visual materials in ways quite different from their intended meaning. For example, in a self-evaluation by women beneficiaries of an enterprise management training program in India (see case study in this module), a card showing a doctor holding a large bottle of medicine was mistakenly interpreted as a drunken husband brandishing a bottle of liquor! This led to considerable confusion before the problem was identified and the card redrawn.

Visual tools can also be prepared by community members themselves to avoid such confusion and to allow for a more open-ended identification of issues. In this case, the facilitators should encourage the use of whatever medium the people feel most comfortable with—be it scratching marks in the ground with sticks, or using stones, seeds, colored powders, and other materials to construct the visual. Insisting on the use of paper and pen can stifle the potential creativity of participants.

Box 1 offers some practical tips on how to use visual-based techniques for evaluation purposes. Boxes 2 and 3 illustrate two examples of how self-evaluations were facilitated by the use of prepared picture cards.

Box 1

Visual Self-Evaluation Tools: Tips

- ◆ If visual materials are prepared beforehand, do some preliminary field-testing to make sure their meaning is clear and culturally appropriate.
- ◆ Introduce prepared visuals by asking participants what they see in them. Make sure everyone present agrees on the interpretation before proceeding with the analysis.
- ◆ If visuals are being developed by the participants themselves, try to ensure that they are done in a “rough and ready” way, not as precise reproductions or works of art. This is particularly important if the drawings are to be used as the basis of discussion because participants need to feel comfortable with changing, correcting, or adding to the visuals.
- ◆ At the end of an exercise involving a group-produced visual, transfer the drawing to paper for a permanent record, and check with the group to verify that the paper record is true to the original.

Box 2

Pictures Facilitate a Village Group's Self-Evaluation in Indonesia

A village water user's group in Indonesia evaluated itself using seven pictures, each representing a group function or activity (such as group cooperation, money collection, dealing with angry members, and making future plans), or a person involved with the group (including a village leader and a field worker).

After the pictures were shown and discussed, the group was given three stars of varying sizes, representing excellent, average, and poor. By placing each picture under a star, the group rated their own performance in the different functions, and the performance and importance of the people represented. Once all of the pictures had been rated and some consensus reached, the group had to explain its ratings, which led to further discussion and revealed issues not talked about previously.

Source: Deepa Narayan, 1993, "Participatory Evaluation: Tools for Managing Change in Water and Sanitation," World Bank Technical Paper No. 207, Washington, D.C.

Box 3

Village Women Use Pictures to Evaluate Impacts of Training in India

A self-evaluation kit was developed as part of a women's enterprise management training program in India. The kit included simple matrices with pictures rather than text to help the women assess the impacts of the training on both themselves and their business ventures. Facilitators worked with the women in groups to make sure that they understood the meaning of the pictures. The women were then each given a workbook—which contained the pictorial matrices for them to fill in themselves—to keep a record of their own assessment. Subsequent ratings could also be entered in the workbook, allowing the women to see changes over time.

The self-evaluation dealt not only with the positive impacts of the training, but also with any psychological and social costs encountered by the women—such as conflicts with their husbands and increased pressure on their time.

Source: Udyogini, 1996, "Monitoring and Evaluation Kit, User's Handbook," New Delhi, India. For further description of this work, see the Case Studies section of this module.

Testimonials

Testimonials are a way of learning about a project or its impact through the voices of participants and stakeholders. Testimonials record firsthand a person's thoughts, feelings, and experiences. Testimonials can help reveal the degree of empowerment, the way in which income is used, and how decisions are made or issues tackled. Testimonials can help corroborate other sources of data, and can provide a more personal insight into a project's achievements. Usually, testimonials are taped and played back to the participant.²

While testimonials are usually gathered by outside facilitators, they can also be collected by the community members themselves. A simple tape recorder can be given to a group of villagers. After an initial training session, they can spend some time recording interviews with their neighbors, or songs and stories that illustrate a particular issue. The recordings can be done in the local language or dialect and then translated later. Copies of the edited tape can then be made and distributed to those involved.

When including testimonials in an evaluation report, the quotes selected should represent the range of views expressed by the different stakeholders. For example, the majority of local people may express satisfaction with the way a local organization is working, while a few people express some reservations about the degree to which the decisionmaking within the group was participatory; the quotes in the report should reflect both of these views, with a note that the positive comments were more common. Box 4 gives some tips on using this technique, and Box 5 includes some brief testimonials from a participatory assessment of health services in Lesotho.

Box 4 Testimonials: Tips

- ◆ If testimonials are to be taped, make sure to ask for permission to do so at the beginning of the interview.
- ◆ Keep a record of the topics covered in the testimonial so that subsequent monitoring efforts can address the same issues.
- ◆ If a verbatim quote is used in a report, cite the source by name unless their anonymity is necessary for cultural or safety reasons. Ask them if they wish to be quoted or if they prefer to be anonymous.
- ◆ If community participants are using equipment that is unfamiliar to them, train several people how to use it and allow time for them to practice.

²J. Campos and F. P. Coupal, February 1996 (draft), "Participatory Evaluation," United Nations Development Programme, New York.

Box 5

Testimonials Highlight Rude Treatment of Hospital Patients in Lesotho

As part of a Beneficiary Assessment (BA) of health and family planning services in Lesotho, participant observers gathered direct quotes, or testimonials, from local people regarding the quality of treatment they felt they received at the local clinics and hospitals. Almost without exception, people who used hospitals and clinics complained that the attitude of staff was “rude,” or “rough,” “impatient,” and “unsympathetic.” This attitude contrasted sharply with that of private doctors and nurses, whose income depends on making their patients feel welcome. To highlight the level of dissatisfaction with hospital staff, the BA report documented several anonymous testimonials, including:

“When you go to Scott Hospital you are not given the chance to explain all your health problems. As you are trying to talk, the nurse is already writing down what you say in your *bukana* and then the nurse rings the bell for the next patient to enter without bothering to see if you are finished or not. This is very discouraging and makes you afraid to express your problems. The nurses are rough and rush you, saying you should be quick and give others a chance. . . . One morning I arrived late for my injection because of the distance to travel. The nurse spoke to me in a bad way. She said she had no time to inject me, I should go home. She said she would inject me only when I arrived ‘on time.’ I tried to beg her and explain my transport problems, but it was no good. I now go to a private doctor in Maseru.”

“Nurses at hospitals are very young and this causes problems. According to Lesotho custom young people are not supposed to know about older people’s problems—like pregnancy—or talk about these. The nurses don’t respect patients; they don’t know how to talk to them. They treat them as if they were the same age group.”

Direct quotes such as these were used to complement the researchers’ own analyses, providing backup for the recommendations made to improve staff-patient relations.

Source: David Hall and Gwen Malahleha, 1989, “Health and Family Planning Services in Lesotho: The People’s Perspective,” report commissioned by the World Bank, Washington, D.C.

Photographing the Evidence

Photography is another powerful tool for enabling local people to record their perspectives as part of a participatory M&E activity. As in tape recording, this technique can be used by non-literate people and, with user-friendly equipment and some minimal training, is a medium with which many quickly feel comfortable.

Photographs can easily capture “before” and “after” scenes, such as a dilapidated school before and after rehabilitation, or a hillside before and after reforestation. Photography can also be used to record activities (such as community meetings) or dramatic situations acted out by members of the community to illustrate important problems (such as abusive husbands or teenage vandalism). Photographs complement well any written documentation of an evaluation, and are easily reproduced. One disadvantage of this technique is the cost involved in buying film, and in developing, printing, and reproducing the photographs. And in some cultures people are reluctant, or even fearful, to be photographed—and good judgment must be exercised regarding the appropriateness of the technique. Box 6 offers some tips on using photographs in participatory evaluations, and Box 7 shows an example from Lesotho of local people being given cameras to record impact indicators of a rural sanitation program.

Box 6

Photographing the Evidence: Tips

- ◆ Use the simplest equipment possible, with several back-up cameras in case of breakage. Polaroid cameras are easy to use and provide instant results, but reprints can be difficult to obtain.
- ◆ Give cameras to different groups, including men and women, and younger and older members of the community, to learn about what these different people see as important.
- ◆ If necessary, an experienced photographer can be directed by community participants, photographing what they feel is important.
- ◆ To capture gradual changes in landscape, crop production, and construction leave a camera with someone in the community who is trained and made responsible for taking photographs at regular intervals (every month or so).
- ◆ Make sure copies of all of the photographs are left with the community and obtain their permission to use them as part of the evaluation documentation.

Box 7

Local People's Evaluation Using Polaroid Cameras in Lesotho

As part of a participatory evaluation of a rural sanitation program in Lesotho communities were asked to assess the impacts of the construction of latrines. Small groups of community members were formed, including both men and women, and within five minutes the groups had been shown how to use simple Polaroid cameras. After a general discussion about indicators, each group was asked to take three pictures to illustrate some of the changes that had occurred as a result of the latrines being constructed.

The groups dispersed around the community and returned after one hour to show the photographs. The groups captured a wide variety of indicators on film — including healthy children running around; contrasting shots of a previously drunken husband now sober (some men in the village had been able to find employment in the latrine construction work); and a women with her newly-purchased chickens (women's income—and financial independence—had been increased as they too had been employed as construction workers).

Source: Deepa Narayan, personal communication with Jennifer Rietbergen-McCracken, January 1997.

Community Records and Indicators

Local people can monitor changes and record them in either written or visual form in record books, logbooks, or simple charts. Farmers' records are one such example, where farmers monitor and record the use and/or costs of inputs (seeds, fertilizer, tools) and outputs (crop yields and fodder). This is particularly useful when different cropping patterns or practices are being tested and compared. Other examples of locally kept records include: credit societies tracking loans and repayments; village health extension workers recording the number of vaccinations given, number of patients seen, and so on; and a community producers' group monitoring the attendance at meetings, the participation of women, the growth in membership, and expansion of activities. Box 8 gives tips on using community records for evaluation purposes, and Box 9 shows how some rural communities in Kenya recorded changes in their natural resource management over the years.

To be truly participatory, these records should be based on indicators selected by the local people themselves. Any indicators developed by project staff or other outsiders should be vetted by the local people to check whether they see them as relevant and measurable. Boxes 10 and 11 show some indicators identified by villagers for their own monitoring purposes.

Box 8 Community Records: Tips

- ◆ Discuss with the local people the purpose of keeping records; then help them identify the recording method, the changes to be monitored, the indicators to be used, and the frequency of the monitoring.
- ◆ Design with the local people a record-keeping book or logbook to meet their information needs. If literacy is low, use drawings and symbols rather than text or numbers.
- ◆ Produce the appropriate number of booklets and distribute them to the community participants in a brief session to familiarize them with the tool.
- ◆ Consistent follow-up and evaluation of the record system are necessary to encourage regular use and to check its usefulness.
- ◆ Meet periodically with the recorders to synthesize, compare, and discuss the results.

Source: Adapted from D. D. Case, 1990, "The Community's Toolbox: The Idea, Methods and Tools for Participatory Assessment, Monitoring and Evaluation in Community Forestry," Food and Agriculture Organization, Rome.

Box 9

Communities Record Changes in Natural Resource Management in Kenya

Several rural communities in Kenya, which had previously participated in participatory assessments with researchers from a local university, repeated similar assessments some four to eight years later. These more recent assessments evaluate changes in the communities' use of natural resources and progress in the implementation of the community action plans. The participants identified simple indicators and used a range of PRA tools to highlight changes—both positive and negative. For example, one community near a wildlife park chose to examine, among other concerns, changes in the seriousness of wildlife menace. Community participants selected “number of wildlife incursions” as an indicator of this problem, and drew a qualitative trend line to show that the situation had worsened since the last assessment. They also noted that, on the positive side, they had negotiated an off-take quota with the national wildlife service and had managed to reduce crop damage by fencing and other measures. In planning for the future, they discussed ways of managing the worst offenders—the wild buffalo.

All of the communities involved kept records of their analyses, including both baseline and follow-up results. The maps, rankings, charts, and so on were compiled into a community logbook for future reference and planning purposes.

Source: Richard Ford et al., 1996 (draft), “Conserving Resources and Increasing Production: Using Participatory Tools to Monitor and Evaluate Community-Based Resource Management Practices,” Clark University, The Program for International Development, Worcester, Massachusetts.

Box 10

Water Quality Indicators Identified by Villagers in Indonesia

Village women and men identified the following indicators to help them in measuring water quality:

- ◆ Does the source look clean? Are there any animals in it?
- ◆ Are insects breeding in it?
- ◆ Are there any leaves or sticks in it?
- ◆ Is there other rubbish in it?
- ◆ Is there human or animal waste nearby?
- ◆ Does it have any color?
- ◆ Does it smell bad?
- ◆ Does it taste bad?

Source: Deepa Narayan, 1993, “Participatory Evaluation: Tools for Managing Change in Water and Sanitation,” World Bank Technical Paper No. 207, Washington, D.C.

Box 11

Eco-Tourism Impact Indicators Developed with Villagers in Sri Lanka

Villagers living in the buffer zone of a protected forest area participated in the identification of a set of indicators to measure the impacts of eco-tourism activities in the reserve. Some 20 villagers were trained as “village ecologists” and assumed responsibilities for monitoring these impacts and for helping to analyze the data they collected. The indicators selected include:

- ◆ illegal infrastructure
- ◆ vending of crafts
- ◆ new encroachments
- ◆ trail erosion due to overuse or heavy rains
- ◆ litter
- ◆ noise, such as radios, loud singing, and talking
- ◆ soap and waste in waterways
- ◆ vehicle emission and dust along major access roads
- ◆ inscribing of names on rocks
- ◆ fires caused by visitors
- ◆ cutting down of live trees as walking sticks
- ◆ illegal collecting of flowers, foliage plants, butterflies, birds’ nests, and so on.
- ◆ feeding of wild animals, such as monkeys and birds.

Source: Harvard Institute for International Development and Brandeis Sustainable International Development Program, 1995, “Project Proposal: Ecodevelopment for Sustaining Biological Resources in the Sinharaja Forest Region of Sri Lanka,” available from Brandeis Sustainable International Development Program, Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts.

Section 3: Case Studies

Self-Evaluations by Implementing Organizations in a Livestock Development Program in Bolivia

Key Feature:

Institutional self-evaluations by NGOs and grassroots organizations responsible for implementing a livestock development program.

Context:

Heifer Project International (HPI), an international NGO, works with 10 local partner institutions (local NGOs and grassroots groups) in Bolivia to provide rural households with livestock as a means of generating income and improving their nutrition. Beneficiaries are trained in the necessary animal husbandry skills, including construction of sheds, growing fodder, and maintaining the health of the animals. Beneficiaries are also trained in other sustainable agricultural practices, such as soil and water conservation, composting, and tree planting. All beneficiaries are expected to care for their own animal and then to “pass on the gift” of the first female offspring of the livestock to another qualifying household. The same then applies to the household receiving this gift—it must, in turn, pass on the first female offspring to another qualifying household. Each donated animal represents a large injection of capital into the household and community. The pass-on mechanism ensures that the benefits are spread beyond the initial beneficiaries and promotes a sense of community cooperation and accountability.

As part of an overall evaluation of HPI’s work in Bolivia, a process of self-evaluation was recently started with five of the agency’s 10 local partner organizations, and plans are under way for similar self-assessments by the other five partners. The groups selected to participate in the first round of evaluations were chosen because they represented the range of organizations in the project and were identified as having the greatest need for assistance in this work

Objectives:

The five NGOs and grassroots organizations started the work by coming together in an evaluation launch workshop to discuss the objectives and scope of the assessment. They decided to focus on finding out the following:

- ♦ to what degree their own organizations and the beneficiaries were becoming *sustainable* and leading toward *self-sufficiency*;
- ♦ what benefits were being achieved in *nutrition and income-generation*;

- ◆ how effectively the organizations were addressing the issues of gender and participation in their activities;
- ◆ whether the work of the organizations was improving the environment; and
- ◆ to what degree the organizations were strengthening their *organizational capacity*.

Process:

The evaluation launch workshop was held in February 1996. In addition to identifying the above focus issues during this event, the partner organizations also agreed on which indicators to use and set out an implementation plan for the evaluation. An evaluation adviser from HPI headquarters assisted in this workshop. In addition, a locally hired evaluation expert co-facilitated the workshop and traveled to each organization and project site to facilitate the self-evaluations. The organizations tailored the evaluation to make it relevant to their own work, refining the issues, indicators, and techniques according to their needs. The entire process lasted five months. Follow-up workshops were planned for each organization to develop a plan of action based on the findings from their evaluations. An external donor evaluation took place in August 1996, just after the self-evaluations were completed, and essentially confirmed the findings.

Techniques:

The organizations gathered information primarily through group discussions with their staff. They also held semi-structured interviews with members of beneficiary households and local officials, and did some observations in the field. Where available, secondary data were also used, such as farmers' records of the number and health of their animals and project field reports.

Limitations and Difficulties:

No major problems were encountered during these self-evaluations. One of the five organizations was sensitive about the consultant facilitating their evaluation, so it was agreed that this group would work without the facilitator. The subsequent external evaluation revealed that this project had the most problems. The heavy workload and tight schedule of the self-evaluations were physically taxing for the consultant facilitator, and in the future a slower pace should be considered.

Outputs and Impacts:

The self-evaluations proved of immense value to both the local partner institutions and HPI. Through their assessments, the partners analyzed their own strengths and weaknesses, and highlighted the major challenges facing them. All five groups identified sustainability and self-sufficiency as the key priorities. The grassroots organizations, for example, faced a crisis as their memberships were dropping after initial pass-on obligations had been met. These groups felt they needed a larger purpose, better leadership skills, and improved capacities to plan and monitor their own affairs. They identified a need to integrate better livestock production

with agricultural systems, and to promote crop diversification and better marketing systems.

Based on the findings of these self-evaluations, HPI decided to revise its own strategic plan, strengthen its linkages with other organizations, and expand its expertise and action in crop diversification, marketing, and the environment.

Background Documentation:

For more information contact Heifer Project International, 1015 S. Louisiana St., Little Rock, Arkansas, 72203, USA.

Self-Assessment by Women Beneficiaries of Micro-enterprise Management Training Program in India

Key Feature:

A self-assessment by nonliterate beneficiaries of a women's micro-enterprise management training program to monitor the impacts of the training on their micro-enterprises and livelihoods.

Context:

The Women's Enterprise Management Training Outreach Program (WEMTOP), supported by the World Bank's Economic Development Institute (EDI), has been operating through Udyogini, a local NGO. The pilot project, which ran from 1992 to 1995, began in three states in India. As part of a broader program that sponsors Grassroots Management Training and Outreach (GMT) in five African countries and India, Udyogini was established by the WEMTOP Pilot Project to serve as the lead NGO in the training of local Indian voluntary organizations. The training program provides enterprise support (particularly empowerment and management training, as well as advice and referral services) to very poor women engaged in income-generating activities. Since the conclusion of the pilot project a series of monitoring and evaluation activities have been under way to review progress to date and to identify where changes are needed before the program is scaled up. As part of these monitoring efforts, a self-assessment method and kit were developed for the women themselves to evaluate the impacts—both positive and negative—of the training on their own activities and livelihoods.

Objectives:

The graphic-based self-assessment was designed primarily to enable the women involved in the training program to diagnose their own conditions—comparing their situation before and after the training—and to take action to improve their situation. In addition, the method was designed so that the enterprise support staff (the trainers) and staff of the lead agency (Udyogini) could monitor the impacts of the training program on the lives of the women whom they had trained. The impacts were measured not just in terms of increased control over their enterprises and income, but also with respect to any increased empowerment of the women and any social costs that they may have incurred by undergoing the initial and follow-up training.

Process:

This self-assessment is an ongoing activity, using a series of impact indicators and a system of graphic monitoring charts, called profiles, which had been developed over the course of three years. The system is supported by custom-designed database software for aggregating and analyzing the information generated (called PC/PME, for Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation). Field-testing of these

monitoring and evaluation tools was undertaken in 1995, involving some 308 women who had been trained in the pilot. The assessment methods are now being used by all of the women participating in the scaled-up project. Assessments are routinely undertaken at the start of the GMT curriculum as part of a Situation Analysis module. They are repeated at the end of the GMT course, and then on a regular basis every three to six months as the enterprise support staff conduct regular follow-up visits. The initial idea for using a participatory monitoring and evaluation system came from the EDI staff member involved in the WEMTOP program; and Udyogini was particularly keen to use graphic techniques so that the women could generate the information themselves. The self-assessments are conducted in a workshop setting, with the women filling in personal workbooks that mirror large pictorial displays prepared for the session. A fundamental principle of the approach is that the data is *generated, understood, and primarily used* by the women to monitor their own progress toward empowerment and increased access to and control over income. Individual responses are coded, entered into the PC/PME software, and analyzed by the enterprise support organization and Udyogini.

The total cost of developing and testing this self-assessment system for monitoring and evaluation was approximately US\$56,000—a relatively low sum due to the vast majority of the work being done by local NGOs. These costs were covered by EDI, drawing on Japanese and Norwegian trust funds.

Techniques

The self-assessment consists of a series of five pictorial profiles, covering different aspects of the training program's impacts on the women's lives:

- (i) an **enterprise** profile looking at the nature and performance of the actual enterprise in which they are engaged;
- (ii) a **capacity** profile examining the women's ability to undertake and manage the enterprise;
- (iii) a **resourcing** profile addressing the availability of and access to the necessary resources for the enterprise;
- (iv) an **empowerment** profile looking at the extent to which the women have gained more control over their livelihoods and the decisions that affect them; and
- (v) a **social cost** profile investigating some of the downsides of the changes that the trainings have catalyzed, including, for example, increased conflict with husbands or decreased time for other activities.

Each of these profiles is made up of a matrix of rows, representing questions on different facets of the issue. For example, the empowerment matrix includes: one row that addresses the question of "who makes the decisions about marketing the enterprise product;" and columns representing various respondents, including in

this case, the woman's husband, the enterprise support staff, the woman by herself, the women with her husband, and so forth. (see Attachment 1). The women then fill in the matrices according to how they see their current situation. The results of any one assessment are not as important as the shifts seen in the responses when women repeat the exercise after some time. Differences in responses may, for example, be noted before and after training, and when the women are trying to apply what they have learned.

Limitations and Difficulties:

This approach to participatory monitoring, while relatively cheap, has proven more expensive than was first envisaged, as the local enterprise support organizations have been unable to cope with the data analysis themselves, and centralized data analysis services are required. However, these costs are likely to diminish once capacity has been built up within the support organizations. Developing the actual visuals for the profiles—making them clear and culturally appropriate—has also been a challenge. Also difficult has been the development of a user-friendly but robust package of software. As of now, the software still contains glitches and is under development.

Outputs and Impacts:

A key impact of the methodology, and one that was not anticipated, is that it has served as an empowerment tool itself. The structured reflective exercise is generally enjoyed and appreciated by the women. It facilitates self-diagnosis and enables them to be part of the decisions regarding improvements and changes in the training program, and of the identification of actions that they can take to improve their livelihoods.

This participatory monitoring has been part of a larger monitoring and review effort, including: an internal mid-term review by Udyogini and the local enterprise support organizations involved; an external evaluation of the pilot; and an intensive "GMT Impact Survey," which is currently being commissioned to examine the impacts of the training program in quantitative terms. As such, the participatory monitoring effort has contributed an important element—the voice of the women targeted by the program—that complements the other evaluation methods and the perspectives of other stakeholders involved.

It is now hoped that this monitoring and evaluation method will be applied in other WEMTOP countries and in projects in other sectors.

Background Documentation:

For further information, and copies of the Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation kit and software, contact Udyogini, C4/54 Safdarjang Development Area, New Delhi, India 110 016, INDIA (email: udyami@udyogn.ernet.in). Or contact Jim Edgerton, at jedgerton@worldbank.org.

Monitoring Community Use of Project Goods and Services in Nepal

Key Feature:

Involvement of community members in the identification of indicators for, and the design and implementation of, a monitoring system to survey community utilization of ideas, skills, and assets provided by an NGO program.

Context:

ActionAid-Nepal (AAN) is an NGO with a wide range of community-based activities, including in the areas of agriculture, education, health, water supply and sanitation, and income-generation. With a strong concern for systematic monitoring and evaluation, AAN had already developed a number of “implementation indicators” to assess the program’s effectiveness in providing ideas, skills, and assets to communities. The monitoring effort described here was undertaken to get an understanding of how these activities had been used by the communities. The monitoring itself was done in a participatory manner. Communities were involved in deciding what information was to be collected, as well as in gathering the information, analyzing the findings, and using the information to improve the program.

Objectives:

The main objectives of this “utilization survey” were:

- ◆ to assess the extent to which the ideas and assets developed by the community with the support of AAN are being utilized and having an impact on the conditions of the community, as perceived by the community members themselves;
- ◆ to increase communities’ understanding and sense of responsibility for their own development;
- ◆ to deepen the understanding of the poorest people’s problems by both community members and AAN staff; and
- ◆ to examine the extent to which the AAN activities are benefiting and involving the poorest members of the communities.

Process:

Prior to the design of the utilization survey, a 10 day Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) training program was organized for 15 staff members, representing all sectors of AAN’s work. These trained staff then trained the field teams on the methods and procedures of the utilization survey, and became the principal facilitators in the communities visited.

The field teams then visited the Community Development Committees (CDCs) in the nine areas selected for the survey, and discussed with them the objectives of the survey. At least three teams were put together for each of the nine areas. Each six-member team consisted of four local people (three CDC members and one local teacher, selected by the CDC members) and two AAN field staff. One week was allocated for the survey work, with the first three days devoted to detailed training on survey methods and procedures for all of the teams. During this training the teams adapted a set of “key utilization indicators,” which had been developed earlier by AAN sectoral staff. For example, the indicators for the uptake of health services included the use of clean drinking water, the use of latrines, and the adoption of family planning methods.

The survey was conducted over the following three days, with more than 100 villages visited. The CDC members in each team were given a major role in the information-collection process. They took responsibility for questioning the villagers and for drawing maps. The local teachers were responsible for recording the information. The role of the AAN field staff was simply to coordinate and observe the group and to fill in any gaps in the information collected. After the field work, one day was set aside for all of the survey teams in each area to come together to discuss their findings.

With assistance from computers, the analysis of the data involved coding and tabulating the information, constructing household profiles for all of the villages covered, and mapping the data. The initial findings were then reviewed at a workshop with the principal facilitators, enabling them to identify any information gaps and plan how to provide the CDCs with feedback on the results. A second and more focused round of fieldwork was done to close the remaining information gaps.

Techniques:

The survey work was based on semi-structured interviewing of villagers. Several other PRA techniques were employed, including preference ranking, mapping, seasonal calendars, and time trends. The sequence in which these techniques were used was roughly the same in each community. The team began the process by asking a group of villagers to list all of the development activities being implemented in their community, and then to rank them in order of importance. Next, the villagers were asked to identify which agencies were responsible for these activities. Once those activities implemented by AAN were identified, this list became the focus of the survey. Any AAN activities not listed by the villagers were excluded from the monitoring effort, as they were assumed to be of low priority to the villagers.

After listing the activities, the villagers were asked to draw a map of their community—facilitated by the CDC members of the team—using sticks, stones, chalk, or other local materials. The map showed each household in the village, and the villagers were then requested to indicate which households were involved in the different AAN-supported activities, again using visual symbols or items such as grains, stones and so on. Questions were also asked and recorded on the map

(again, with visual symbols) regarding the households' use of the skills, assets, or ideas provided by these activities. This sequence of discussions was usually spread over the three-day visit in the community. A record of the completed map was then made on paper.

Limitations and Difficulties:

The survey suffered from a number of practical difficulties that are commonly encountered in this type of participatory work. On reflection, it was felt that inadequate time had been allotted to both the training and the fieldwork. The less experienced teams had actually used the lists of utilization indicators as a questionnaire, rather than as the basis for informal interviews and discussions. And, in some cases, the teams tried to complete the whole survey in a community in just one day rather than three. This meant that a very long village meeting had to be held to gather all the information in such a concentrated way—with, in some cases, the meetings lasting up to six hours.

Data analysis was a particularly difficult process. As the list of activities to be monitored was identified village by village, not all of the teams covered the same topics—making it impossible to compare fully the results. Moreover, it proved difficult to decipher the maps, given all of their visual symbols, and to make sense of the field notes. Therefore, it was recommended that in the future the field teams themselves conduct the data analysis.

Outcomes and Impacts:

The results of the utilization survey provided a detailed picture of the use of AAN-supported activities across the different communities. Data were disaggregated by ethnic group, revealing some disparities in the degree to which the different groups had used project services, particularly in the health field. This finding led the AAN staff to consider how they could better work with the different ethnic groups.

The survey results were fed back to the CDCs and used by the communities as input to their annual planning process. Also, there are plans to update the household profiles regularly as part of the ongoing monitoring by the agency's field staff.

Background Documentation:

ActionAid-Nepal, 1992, "Participatory Rural Appraisal Utilization Survey Report Part 1, Rural Development Area, Sindhupalchowk," ActionAid-Nepal Monitoring and Evaluation Unit. Available from ActionAid-UK Resource Centre. For more information contact Judith Roberts at judithr@actionaid.org.uk, fax: +44 171 272 0899.

Community-Based Monitoring in an Ecodevelopment Project in Sri Lanka

Key Features:

A comprehensive participatory monitoring and evaluation system of an eco-development project which assesses biological and socioeconomic impacts of eco-friendly enterprises, community awareness about conservation, and beneficiary satisfaction with the project.

Context:

Sri Lanka is at an important stage of redefining national forest and village development policies to counteract increasing threats to the Sinharaja World Heritage Site (WHS), a protected forest area. Some 1,000 households in 30 villages live in the buffer zone of the site. The need for subsistence and income among this rapidly growing local population has not only increased illegal extraction from the site, but has also spurred encroachment for cultivation of tea. The plantation crop has emerged as a lucrative enterprise, transforming village economies and attracting new immigrants to the area.

As a result of these developments, the government formed the National Ecodevelopment Steering Committee (NESC) to carry out a multisectoral program. The NESC joined with national NGOs and Brandeis University and Harvard University in the United States to initiate a systematic effort to reverse the erosion of biodiversity inside the WHS. The common objective of the agencies involved—to boost village-based economic development while strengthening conservation measures and increasing public awareness—evolved to include the creation of the Sinharaja Village Trust (SVT), which finances community-level activities within the buffer zone. The activities include: conservation education; social mobilization; economic planning for the buffer zone, including eco-friendly economic activities; applied research; and effective monitoring of ecological and socioeconomic changes.

Participatory monitoring and evaluation approaches were developed and tested in the early phase of the community activities, and are now continuing as the project expands. The project received initial support from USAID through the Biodiversity Conservation Network, which has been supplemented by USAID/Sri Lanka and the MacArthur Foundation; UNDP is also likely to provide support.

Objectives:

Continuous monitoring and periodic evaluations are being undertaken to ensure optimum conservation and resource use, and equitable distribution of economic opportunities and benefits. The project is also using monitoring as a learning vehicle to test the viability of the enterprise model of conservation. The learning process involves all levels of participants—from a cadre of “village ecologists” engaged in data collection to small-scale enterprise managers and high-level policymakers. Specific objectives of the monitoring and evaluation efforts include:

- ◆ to monitor the short-term effects of enterprises within the WHS and the buffer zone to ensure their protection and sustainable use, respectively;
- ◆ to establish a framework for long-term monitoring of the status of biodiversity by recording changes of population levels of key plant and animal species;
- ◆ to determine appropriate forest management regimes for optimizing the harvest of non-timber forest goods from the buffer zone;
- ◆ to monitor the socioeconomic impact of project activities for changes in household earnings, sources of income, quality of life, and attitudes toward conservation; and
- ◆ to ensure that new economic opportunities are accessible to all in the Sinharaja communities, and especially to the more vulnerable families.

Process:

The above objectives are being met through a system that includes enterprise, biological, and socioeconomic monitoring. Baselines were established through a combination of extensive use of Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) techniques, Geographic Information Systems (GIS), and more conventional data collection methods. An economic geographer, a biologist, and a social mobilization specialist coordinated the work, and a PRA was conducted with the active involvement of village youth. A PRA specialist from within the government of Sri Lanka, with long years of village experience, was hired for training the village youth, who became capable research assistants (or “village assistants”). The information collected was mapped with the voluntary cooperation of a GIS specialist from the Sri Lanka-based International Irrigation Management Institute and the GIS laboratory of the University of Colombo’s Department of Geography. Much existing data was available from nearly two decades of research on the biological and socioeconomic conditions of the area, and provided a valuable point of reference. Nevertheless, more attention was given to the PRA findings because the approach is based on participatory methods and can contribute more directly to the kinds of behavioral changes needed for reaching the goals of the project.

Two of the main interventions being monitored include the management of eco-tourism and the harvesting of non-timber species. During the planning phase, with guidance from the project biologist, village assistants competently carried out mapping and analysis of non-timber species’ availability. This information was fed into a database to inform the enterprise component of the project. Landscape-level data and information on selected species will serve as indicators of biodiversity trends and be processed separately and entered into the GIS database as appropriate. Twenty villagers have been trained as village ecologists and will carry out such monitoring on a regular basis throughout the life of the project. They will also monitor the impact on biodiversity of eco-tourism. Special efforts are being made to build the capacity of village participants to analyze the data they collect.

In addition to these monitoring activities by community members, other monitoring is being undertaken by local-level project staff. Using PRA and survey methods, they will evaluate the extent to which the enterprise activities are increasing people's incomes and quality of life, being shared equitably within the communities, and are providing sustainable alternatives to traditional forest product use. These local staff will also monitor villagers' attitudes toward conservation and tourism and the extent of community participation in the project.

Techniques:

As described, a combination of PRA and conventional methods are being used for participatory monitoring in this project. The main participatory tool being used is mapping. Various types of mapping exercises are under way, including:

- ◆ **resource mapping** to identify and record non-timber species' availability in the buffer zone as a resource for enterprise activities, and also to monitor the effects of proposed eco-tourism. These are mapped by village youth with the help of project biologists. The species are also analyzed by the youth to determine their potential for such products as medicinal herbs, rattan products, and jaggery (palm sugar) and treacle (syrup).
- ◆ **eco-tourism mapping** to provide precise details of tourist activities. Repeat inspections every two weeks will help to determine impact, using such indicators as: illegal infrastructure; roads; vending of crafts; new encroachments; trail erosion due to overuse or heavy rains; litter; noise such as radios, loud singing, and talking; soap and waste in waterways; vehicle emissions and dust along major access roads; inscribing of names on rocks; increase of domestic animals and urban insect pests; fires caused by visitors; cutting down of live trees for use as walking sticks; illegal collecting of flowers, foliage plants, orchids, butterflies, birds nests, and pebbles; and feeding of wild animals, such as monkeys and birds.
- ◆ **historical mapping**, by older members of the communities, to help define earlier forest boundaries, land use patterns, a listing of species present, and traditional uses of non-timber plants for medicines and other purposes. Present-day maps have also been developed covering the same issues. These contrasting maps have provoked a great deal of analysis, and have been used in communities to discuss the future, or "what they would like Sinharahja to be." Out of these efforts, enterprise options were identified and followed up by rigorous market studies.
- ◆ **Institutional maps** were also developed by villagers to show relations between outside agencies, local communities, and community-based organizations. Other PRA techniques used in the monitoring included ranking exercises and transects, the latter proving important in generating a baseline for monitoring changes in biodiversity, non-timber species, and habitats.

These participatory techniques are being complemented by other monitoring methods, including field trial plots of different cultivation regimes for rattan (a major non-timber forest product) and scientific tests of soil and water quality.

Limitations and Difficulties:

Initially, project leaders sought PRA specialists but found that many practitioners of PRA lacked depth in applying the work. PRA had become more faddish and static, with the techniques being used in a very formulaic and superficial way. The techniques were not being used to achieve a critical consciousness in the community, nor to learn about underlying causes and conflicts that affected local people's behavior. A nationwide recruitment process led to the hiring of an experienced rural development planner and PRA practitioner within the government service at the provincial level.

Local research staff, trained by the experienced PRA practitioner, were initially reluctant to adopt a learning approach, as they felt they already knew enough about participatory methods and about what solutions to propose for the community-level activities. Their role, therefore, had to be restricted initially to that of observers, and their skills gradually reinforced, to effect a change in their attitudes and behaviors. Gradually, under the guidance of the practitioner, they developed skills in using PRA to reach the more underlying issues in the community.

Another limitation was that the historic importance of this area meant that the people had been "overstudied." They were very skeptical of yet another participatory experience until they could be assured that this exercise was actually a follow-up project, and one that could meaningfully affect their lives. With the creation of the SVT, the first Sinharaja buffer zone NGO, and with the holding of local elections for community representatives, awareness of the merits of the program grew within the communities. As the pace of preparation for enterprise activity in a threatened environment is slow, the SVT began by making grants to communities for improving primary health care, which was seen as a high priority and provided a visible benefit of the process.

Outputs and Impacts:

During the planning and current implementation stages, the SVT continues to monitor progress in enterprise development, socioeconomic status, and changes in the buffer zone and protected WHS. It is clear that the process is beginning to have the intended impact of fundamentally changing the relationship between the community and the forest. The SVT has developed a built-in monitoring capacity. The village ecologists are becoming experts on local resources, and are defining and beginning to take on new careers such as forest tour guides. Also, the SVT is helping them and other community members to identify and start new enterprises in local products and other services that are beneficial to the environment.

Contacts/Background Documentation:

Harvard Institute for International Development and Brandeis Sustainable International Development Program, 1995, "Project Proposal: Ecodevelopment for Sustaining Biological Resources in the Sinharaja Forest Region of Sri Lanka." For more information contact Dr. Lawrence R. Simon at lrsimon@binah.cc.brandeis.edu or Ms. Neela de Zoysa at g6487ndezo@umbsky.cc.umb.edu.

Monitoring the Impacts of Structural Adjustment in Zambia

Key Features:

- ◆ Monitoring the impacts of adjustment measures using Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA); and
- ◆ Convening stakeholder workshops at district level with very broad-based participation.

Context:

A severe drought and the implementation of structural adjustment measures had caused a rapid decline in welfare, especially of the poor. The preparation of a Participatory Poverty Assessment (PPA) one year earlier made it possible to assess the extent of such worsening conditions. A participatory monitoring activity was developed, commissioned by the World Bank and undertaken by a local NGO, to investigate these changes.

Objectives:

The participatory monitoring exercise was conducted to:

- ◆ update the 1993 PPA findings; and
- ◆ monitor at the local level the impact of specific measures implemented under the Economic and Social Adjustment Credit (ESAC) as perceived by beneficiaries and service providers.

This case will focus on the second of these objectives. Please refer to the Case Studies section of the PRA module for details on the 1993 PPA.

Process:

The monitoring was undertaken by a nine-person interdisciplinary team of in-country researchers (five men, four women), all of whom are staff of the University of Zambia. They had been previously engaged in participatory work for the World Bank—including Beneficiary Assessment, PRA and the earlier PPA—and had recently formed an NGO, the Participatory Assessment Group. They were joined for this monitoring work by two World Bank social scientists—one from headquarters, and one from a regional field office. The latter had been actively involved in the earlier PPA work but now played a less prominent role as the local NGO team took over responsibility. As in the PPA, the Swedish International Development Authority contributed financial support for the field costs.

Given the objective of updating the information from the earlier PPA, the team attempted to visit the same 10 sites used in the PPA. They succeeded in reaching nine out of the 10. These sites included both rural and urban poor communities, and had been selected in the PPA on the basis of their representing different characteristics in terms of livelihoods, cultural and ethnic groups, agroecological zones, access to infrastructure and services, and integration into markets.

Given that the team was already experienced with the techniques (having used a similar set in the PPA work), no formal training was required. Instead, a brief induction course was conducted at the start of the study. The monitoring work consisted of: (i) PRA-based information-gathering in the field, and (ii) district-level workshops, which were held prior to, or in the course of, the fieldwork. Participants in the workshops included district-level officials, NGO and church representatives, managers of local projects, leaders of women's associations, local and small-scale businessmen and women, headmasters, teachers, medical staff, chiefs, village headmen, farmers, and traditional healers.

Techniques:

The team employed a set of participatory research methods that was similar to the one used in the PPA in order to provide a baseline for comparing changes related to policy-based lending. The fieldwork component used semi-structured interviewing, following an interview guide (or a checklist of issues) to direct the team's work, rather than a blueprint questionnaire for each interview. In addition, focus group discussions were held with members of the communities, and unstructured conversational interviews were conducted with key informants, such as local-level government service providers. In fact, local-level officials and service providers were specifically targeted during these consultations, although the earlier PPA had not included these stakeholders. Direct observations also made up part of the fieldwork in the communities. Other PRA techniques were used both in the fieldwork and in the workshops, including:

- ♦ **Problem ranking** of key problems in the communities, linked with identification of coping strategies being used to try to overcome these problems;
- ♦ **Preference ranking** of where to go for treatment of various illnesses;
- ♦ **Seasonal diagramming** of food security throughout the year;
- ♦ **Institutional mapping** of agencies and organizations providing services to the communities; and
- ♦ **Causal flow diagramming** of the causes and effects of poverty.

Limitations and Difficulties:

The team members had to return to the same communities they visited earlier to complete the assessment. This proved to be a difficult experience for both the community and the team members because conditions had deteriorated. The team concluded that communities that participate in welfare monitoring exercises need to see direct benefits from such efforts in the long run. Although it may affect the monitoring results, consideration should be given to integrating participatory monitoring work with community development activities when establishing a monitoring system.

The relatively small sample size also raised some questions—particularly among policymakers—about the representativity of the results.

Outputs and Impacts:

The findings from the fieldwork and workshops revealed a general deterioration in the social welfare in the country since the Poverty Assessment, with some problems seen as the direct results of adjustment-related impacts (such as job retrenchments and higher user fees for public health services). Community members were found to be engaging in a variety of coping strategies, including reducing food intake and increasing recourse to petty trading, petty thefts, and prostitution. Some positive changes were also identified by both community members and health service providers, including improved cleanliness in hospitals and clinics and better supply of fuel for ambulances. Suggestions were made as to what could or should be done to improve the situation. Solutions were categorized according to those responsible for implementing them: the government, donors, local authorities, and community members.

In terms of impacts on the World Bank, the results helped to convince the staff involved with the structural adjustment program that the economic reforms were not yet producing any benefits for the poor; nor were the health sector reforms involving decentralization achieving their desired impact. The study also focused attention on the fact that problems in poor urban areas were increasing at a rapid rate.

Background Documentation:

The Participatory Assessment Group, May 1995, "Participatory Poverty Monitoring in Zambia: A Report by the Participatory Assessment Group," Lusaka. For more information contact Jacomina de Regt at jderegt@worldbank.org.

Section 4: Suggestions for Seminars

This section includes a sample agenda for a one-day training seminar on Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation as well as suggestions for experiential exercises and discussion points for small group work during the seminar. These ideas are provided only as a starting point for trainers and seminar organizers. There are many alternative ways of designing these training events, and experienced trainers will have their own style of working and their own preferences for the kinds of exercises to use. Ideally, of course, a training seminar would be much longer than one day. A one- or two-week training event, for example, would allow time for participants to practice participatory M&E techniques in the field—which is by far the best way of learning about these tools.

SAMPLE AGENDA

9:00–9:30	Welcome and Introductions
9:30–10:00	Informal Exercise: Why People Resist Change (See attached sheet.)
10:00–10:45	Overview Presentation and Discussion
10:45–11:00	Break
11:00–12:00	Case Study Presentation and Discussion Presentation by an individual with experience in a participatory monitoring or evaluation activity, describing the process and content of the work, and outlining follow-up activities.
12:00–13:00	Lunch
13:00–13:45	Small Group Work: Sri Lanka Case Participants review and discuss a brief case study (See attached sheets.).
13:45–14:15	Plenary Presentations of Small Group Work Brief reports from each group and discussion.
14:15–14:45	Presentation of Participants' Cases Those participants who are currently planning or considering using participatory M&E methods in a project or study present very brief descriptions of the project background. These cases will form the basis of the small group work.

14:45–15:00	Formation of Small Groups Participants choose which case interests them most, and a facilitator makes any adjustments to the groups to ensure some mixing of participants and to avoid any groups being too large or small.
15:00–15:15	Break
15:15–16:30	Small Group Work: Designing a Participatory M&E System Each group works on one of the real-life cases to identify the objectives of the participatory monitoring or evaluation and consider some key elements in designing the system. A facilitator, knowledgeable about participatory M&E, will need to accompany each group.
16:30–17:00	Plenary Presentations of Small Group Work Brief reports from each group and discussion.
17:00–17:30	Wrap-Up and Evaluations

INFORMAL EXERCISE: WHY PEOPLE RESIST CHANGE

This exercise is a quick and fun way to generate a discussion on why people resist change and what kinds of resistance there may be on the part of different stakeholders to using a participatory approach for monitoring and evaluation. The exercise takes only about 10 minutes and requires no materials. The process is as follows:

1. Ask participants to pair off and face each other standing.
2. Ask them to observe each other for 20 seconds.
3. Ask them to turn around with their backs to each other and change one thing about their appearance (loosen tie, undo shoelace, remove jewelry).
4. Ask each pair to face each other and look for the changes in each other's appearance.
5. Repeat steps three and four, asking participants to make additional changes to their appearance.
6. Ask everyone to take their seats.
7. After about one minute, ask the audience what they are doing and what this exercise has to say about organizational resistance.

Note: At the end of the exercise it is important to let about a minute go by before asking the participants what they are doing. The facilitator will observe that participants start to put their clothes, jewelry, shoes and such back in place. The exercise shows how change can be difficult as we all have the habit of going back to what is comfortable and known.

SMALL GROUP WORK: SRI LANKA CASE

This exercise gives participants a chance to learn from the experiences of a participatory evaluation in Sri Lanka, and to suggest possible improvements in how it was conducted. A facilitator, knowledgeable about participatory M&E, will need to accompany each group. Allow 45 minutes for this exercise.

The following instructions may help the groups:

TASKS

- ◆ Read the case study.
- ◆ Select your group facilitator and rapporteur.
- ◆ Place your answers on the flip chart.

Questions for Discussion:

- How would you characterize the evaluation undertaken by this project?
- What lessons can be learned from this case study?
- How would you design the evaluation differently?

SMALL GROUP WORK: SRI LANKA CASE—BACKGROUND MATERIAL

Monitoring and Evaluating Popular Participation: A Sri Lankan Example

One problem with “objective” measures of organizational capacity is that they remain somewhat ambiguous. Moreover, they can be misleading, as we (the evaluators) discovered to our chagrin in Sri Lanka. The end-of-project evaluation concluded that farmer organizations had been well established in Gal Oya and were functioning effectively. However, the report also said that organizational capacity was declining. When we started our program, we collected data particularly on the frequency of two things: field-channel group meetings and channel maintenance work done by voluntary group labor (called *shramadana* in much of South Asia). The number of field-channel groups meeting at least monthly had declined from about 80 percent to about 50 percent in the past two years, and there was a similar drop in the proportion of channels being cleaned by *shramadana*.

Both farmers and organizers rejected the evaluation’s conclusion. They felt that their organizations were quite strong by 1985 and that field-channels had never been so well cleaned as before the 1985 season (when cleaning was estimated at 95 percent within the project area, compared with 20 percent to 30 percent before the project). Before the season, the top administrative officer for the district had ordered all farmers to clean their channels, threatening punitive action against any laggards. The evaluation team attributed the thorough channel maintenance to his show of “administrative will.”

The evaluation team acknowledged that the organizations were working well by all accounts, even if their performance was declining according to objective measures. Our inquiries with farmers found that they felt the field-channel groups did not need to meet regularly on a formal basis, since they all saw each other almost daily along the channel. Also, their group efforts during the first few years of the program had resolved most of their problems at the tertiary (local) level. Channel cleaning and water rotation had been routinized, and any disagreements were settled informally and usually easily.

What the evaluation team did not know was that the farmer organizations themselves had asked the district’s administrative officer to issue his threat, to strengthen their hand in dealing with any neighbors who might be uncooperative. The farmer organizations and organizers put up posters and distributed flyers announcing the ultimatum, and what looked like bureaucratic fiat was actually instigated and implemented through participatory channels. (In fact, for the individualistic approach to work successfully, there had to be a fairly high degree of solidarity behind it.)

Source: Summarized from Norman Uphoff, 1992, “Monitoring and Evaluating Popular Participation in World Bank–Assisted Projects,” in *Participatory Development and the World Bank: Potential Directions for Change*, B. Bhatnagar and A. C. Williams (eds.), World Bank Discussion Paper No. 183, Washington, D.C.

SMALL GROUP WORK: DESIGNING A PARTICIPATORY M&E SYSTEM

If possible, each group should work on an actual project where a participatory M&E system is being planned or developed. Each group should include: at least one person familiar with the project or study, a facilitator who is knowledgeable about PRA and can keep track of time, and a rapporteur who can report on the group's work in a follow-up plenary session. The groups can be given the following instructions to help them.

The participant with the project should give a brief (10 minute) introduction, outlining the stage at which the work is and what they would like to get out of a participatory M&E system. The group should then try to develop an initial plan for developing this system, considering:

- ◆ The objectives of the participatory M&E system;
- ◆ The main issues to be covered by the M&E work;
- ◆ Which groups of stakeholders to involve in the different stages of the M&E work, including:
 - identifying the indicators,
 - developing the overall framework of the system,
 - collecting the information,
 - analyzing the information,
 - reporting the information, and
 - incorporating the information and feedback into the project;
- ◆ How the participatory M&E system will fit within the:
 - organizational structure of the project, and
 - implementation schedule of the project;
- ◆ How to make the project responsive to the feedback obtained;
- ◆ What kinds of training would be required for those responsible for implementing the M&E; and
- ◆ What kinds of costs would be involved.

HANDOUT ON PARTICIPATORY EVALUATION USING SARAR TECHNIQUES

The following case study can be provided to participants as an example of how a participatory evaluation can make use of SARAR techniques in the context of a mid-term evaluation of a hypothetical World Bank–financed rural roads project. This case focuses on a self-evaluation workshop with project staff and representatives of intermediary organizations to highlight how participatory techniques can be used with these types of stakeholders as well as with communities. If participants have the chance to read this handout prior to the Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation seminar, it can be used as a basis of discussion on, for example:

- ◆ What other techniques could be used in the evaluation workshop with project staff?
- ◆ What problems might arise in evaluation workshops of this kind (including resistance by some staff, conflicting perspectives, dominance by certain participants, and so on)?
- ◆ What kinds of techniques could have been used for the community-level evaluations?
- ◆ How can the results of these types of participatory evaluations be integrated with the more technical evaluation of the same project?

A HYPOTHETICAL PARTICIPATORY EVALUATION WORKSHOP—SARAR TECHNIQUES FEATURE IN PROJECT STAFF'S MID-TERM REVIEW OF RURAL ROADS PROJECT

BACKGROUND

The government and the World Bank in collaboration with Swiss Development Corporation decided to use participatory evaluation methods for the mid-term evaluation of a five-district rural roads program. The World Bank task manager, familiar with the SARAR participatory approach, suggested its use as the main evaluation methodology. The following approach was used in all five districts by a team of local SARAR facilitators. The district results were presented by representatives of the stakeholders at a national workshop, which collectively negotiated and agreed upon changes and adjustments needed in policies and project design.

The roads project had been implemented by the local government and Public Works Ministry. To introduce a strong poverty focus and participatory orientation, NGOs had been brought in to help people with organizing themselves into groups, to provide skills training in construction and maintenance, and to signal the readiness of the groups to work with local government engineers. Project staff received orientation training in participatory approaches, and were directed to devolve decisionmaking to the communities on priority needs, location of structures (culverts and bridges) and roads, selection of contractors, and choice of labor and maintenance arrangements. Government engineers were made available to the communities to provide technical input on construction of roads and structures.

REACHING CONSENSUS ON THE PARTICIPATORY EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

A half-day workshop was conducted by the SARAR facilitator and World Bank task manager with representatives of key project stakeholders to hammer out the key issues, methods, and stakeholder groups of the project. Three key groups of stakeholders were identified and different approaches developed to involve them in the evaluation process. They were project implementers, community people, and private-sector operators, contractors, and transport operators.

The process used for involving project staff in the evaluation is described below. Similar SARAR techniques were also used in sample communities involved in the project, and focus group discussions were held with private sector stakeholders in a one-day workshop. The World Bank task manager participated in one district- and one community-level evaluation. Working with government counterparts and the facilitator, the task manager developed the framework for the national workshop in which he and the World Bank team played active roles as participants.

SELF-EVALUATION WORKSHOP FOR PROJECT STAFF AND INTERMEDIARY GROUPS

A four-day workshop was convened in a rural training center with comfortable residential and conference facilities. The workshop was led by two facilitators, one male and one female, and supported by a two-person secretariat to assist with copying, typing, and logistics. The participatory evaluation workshop was opened by the governor of the province, whose senior staff were invited to listen to the group presentations on the last day. The formal opening was followed by coffee, at which time the room was rearranged into six tables with six chairs each for work in small groups.

The 35 participants included the project directors, the chief and executive engineers, the district engineers, technical staff and trainers, the local government council members, the head and staff of the NGO group, project sociologists, and community organizers.

Day 1

Setting the Mood: Leveling the Playing Field

As participants returned from coffee following the governor's address, they saw five categories of professional people written on the board. The categories were engineers, technicians, sociologists, community organizers, and central office staff. Participants were told to find four to five people who have jobs different from theirs and form a group for the morning activities. The groups were then asked to choose an animal that comes closest to their view of evaluation. The groups discussed their choices and the parallels with their image of evaluation, and then introduced themselves to the other groups as their animal—with some even acting out their chosen animal. At the end the facilitator asked the groups for any additional comments or feedback on what they experienced during the process. The facilitator then gave a brief presentation on the principles underlying participatory evaluation and emphasized the importance of mutual respect and listening, the value of multiple perspectives, and the importance of confidentiality so that people feel free to speak.

Practice Tip: In many cultures, it is common to have a formal opening. Rather than resisting this, it is easier to have the official opening and then signal a change in learning principles by taking a break and rearranging the room. After the opening session it is important to break existing status barriers and to start the process of demystifying evaluation. Thus, rather than making formal introductions, the above activity helps to shake up power relations, is fun, and sets the stage for active participation. Setting a time limit to this activity can create excitement and generate laughter. It is important to encourage creativity and taking risks.

The fact that the small groups are self-selected begins the process of giving maximum control to participants. Nevertheless, it is important to ensure that the initial group work includes participants from a mix of disciplines to help prevent individual groups from becoming polarized.

At the end of the session, the facilitator should ask participants to agree on, and post on the wall, basic ground rules governing their participation in the workshop, such as: listening with respect to all viewpoints without interrupting, attending and participating fully in all sessions, and being on time.

Defining Indicators of Success and Participation

While staying in the same groups, participants worked individually to record what they perceived as the key indicators of project success for this particular project. Each indicator was written on a single piece of paper and placed in a pile in the center of the table. Then, working in groups, the indicators were sorted into sets of similar themes and prioritized by order of importance. This process lasted one hour. The groups then shared their selections in a plenary session and posted them on the wall. After each presentation the groups asked questions and commented on each other's work.

After the group presentations all of the participants voted on the four key indicators of success of the project. Each person was given four stickers to place on the indicators of their choice posted on the wall. Volunteers from among the participants counted and reported the tallies. This entire process took another hour.

Practice Tip: It is important to first draw out individual perspectives, and the initial writing task ensures that even the quietest or lowest on the “totem pole” have a voice. The subsequent examining of anonymously produced indicators from the heap ensures that the group can comment on the indicator without worrying too much about who wrote it. Since this is one of the first tasks, it is important to create an environment where people feel free to speak up in their small groups.

Agreement on priority indicators of success should not be forced but noted, as it is likely to come up over and over again. Resolution of differences should be left for the last session on the fourth day, which focuses on planning for the future.

In conducting this session, it is important for the facilitator to draw out people's perceptions of key indicators of success without getting into arguments about the indicators and objectives according to official documents. The first two days thus set the stage of collective learning about each other, differences within the team, and the different interests. This is crucial for the final stage, which involves the collective rating of project performance and, most important, reaching collective agreement on remedial action.

Drawing the Meaning of Participation

Since the project had devolved decisionmaking to lower government levels and community groups, it was important to assess what participation meant to project staff, and to what extent it was being achieved by the project.

The participants continued to work in the same groups and were given sheets of paper and markers. The facilitator asked the groups to take 15 minutes to draw their vision of participation, emphasizing that there was no right or wrong answer and that artistic talent was not required. Group members first drew their own visions and shared these with their group. Each group then developed a collective drawing or vision of community participation and these were shared at the plenary. The facilitator helped to draw out the issues, including similarities and differences, and the drawings were left on the wall for easy reference.

Practice tip: Together with the previous session, the discussion on participation is important because it forms the backbone of the project—even people within the same project can have very different understandings of what participation means. Drawing participation rather than asking people to define it helps people to get away from trying to remember textbook definitions; it also assists in the discovery process of learning and in uncovering people’s assumptions, which are often unstated.

In introducing the activity it is important to remind people that everyone is creative. What is important is their expression of ideas rather than the quality of the artwork. Encourage groups to choose different people from the small groups to share at the plenary. This exercise continues to highlight differences among staff in perceptions of participation—differences that will surface again in the more directly value-based and diagnostic activities ahead.

Although participants may make spontaneous comments that relate their vision of participation to the project, do not attempt to evaluate at this point the degree of participation achieved by the project.

Day 2

Project Activities, Role Perceptions, and Realities

Having drawn out the perspectives on indicators of success and of participation among the different levels of project stakeholders on the first day, the objectives of the second day were to build on these common perspectives and start examining the project’s performance. A major issue that had emerged during the participatory efforts of the project was the need to add expertise in conflict management and community organization to the more traditional technical engineering expertise.

Integration of Hardware and Software

The facilitator introduced the “hardware-software” activity, and assigned three groups as “hardware groups” and three as “software groups.” Each group was given lists of color-coded hardware and software activities. The hardware activities

involved technical inputs and physical infrastructure; and the software activities related to organizational and capacity-building efforts. The lists contained 25 activities written in a column on individual strips. The strips were partially separated (the left margin was left intact) and could easily be torn apart for purposes of rearranging. Examples of the activities included:

- ◆ selection of road to be constructed
- ◆ formation of community group
- ◆ training of community group in construction
- ◆ opening of bank accounts
- ◆ community contribution paid in full
- ◆ local council contribution deposited in World Bank account
- ◆ selection of structures to be constructed
- ◆ technical measurements
- ◆ technical design
- ◆ selection of contractor
- ◆ selection of labor

Two of the hardware groups and one of the software groups sequenced the activities as they were actually executed in the project. The remaining three groups arranged the activities in the ideal sequence, that is the sequence that would enable the project to have the greatest impact. At the plenary, the ideal scenarios were posted on one side of the room and the actual sequences were posted nearby. The two sequences were presented and discussed by all of the participants, with discussion focusing on differences between hardware and software, how close or far the project was from the ideal scenario, and why the “ideal” scenario could not be followed.

Practice Tip: The activity generates great discussion and argument. It is important to let this negotiation and discussion take place in the small groups. Once people have completed their final sequencing, have them glue the list on poster paper to put on the walls for sharing with the larger group. It is important that the writing on the strip is large enough for people to see.

Often participants place activities side by side to indicate measures that must be done in parallel. This is fine.

People should feel free to add or change any steps that they feel are not on the strips of paper exactly as they want them. The discussion that occurs between groups is important to start the process of understanding the differences in approaches and the constraints within which the project is operating. Eventually the process should include the negotiation of changes for the future.

Who Made What Decisions?

This activity was conducted in the same groups after a short coffee break. Groups worked with the list of actual sequencing of project activities from the previous session (during the break, workshop staff prepared additional copies of this list). The groups first selected and highlighted ten key decisions that were made in the project from planning to monitoring and evaluation. Once agreement had been reached, the group then began to work on a poster paper that contained a prepared pocket chart (of five columns and 10 rows, with pockets in each cell). Their 10 key decisions were listed on the left-hand side of the chart; and along the horizontal axis on top, the names and illustrations of five possible groups of decisionmakers (community groups, village elite, engineers/senior project staff, community organizers, and local councils) were added.

Each person received 10 matchsticks from a box given to the group. Everyone then voted, beginning at the top row, on which of the five decisionmaking groups made decision number one, number two, and so on. The pocket chart was turned away from the group so that members could vote independently without influencing each other. When the process was complete, one member from each of the groups counted the votes in the different categories and the groups shared their responses with each other. The larger discussion focused on comparing the groups' results, the differences from what was expected, and the groups' perceptions of what was achieved in terms of devolving decisions to lower levels.

Practice Tip: The pocket chart is a very versatile tool that can be used for a range of voting and ranking exercises. The debate and reflections that follow the voting is critical; let participants probe the differences, the unexpected outcomes, and figure out what happened. If participants express a desire, they can form small groups to pursue particular issues or decisions, or to discuss what changes are feasible.

Role Perceptions, Linkages, and Constraints

For this activity everyone worked individually. Participants first wrote down their understanding of the roles of the following groups: community groups, local council, community organizers, sociologists, engineers, and project directors. The descriptions of each group's roles were collected from everyone before participants moved on to the next job category.

Once this task was completed, participants returned to their groups and each group received one job category to sort out, synthesize, and report to the other participants. After each presentation, a representative of the different groups (engineers, sociologists, and so on) was given five minutes to explain what he/she actually does. This was followed by group discussion and comments.

Practice Tip: By this stage in the evaluation process it is already clear that staff at different levels have different perspectives and that the engineers are the most powerful group. Yet without teamwork, understanding, and empathy for each other's jobs, it is very difficult to support institutional change.

This activity moves very quickly, is very important for building teamwork, and is usually emotionally charged. However, the fact that misperceptions can emerge without being attributed to particular individuals allows for a more objective (and less personal) discussion of the issues. It is helpful to follow up the presentation of a group's perceptions of a job with a response by a person actually doing the job. This allows people to realize collectively the extent to which they are—or are not—informed on the various job responsibilities and tasks.

The discussion should also lead to an identification of the links between jobs and where there may be gaps that need to be addressed.

Resources and Constraints

The participants then split into five homogenous groups of engineers, technicians, community organizers, sociologists, and local councils. The project director sat out of this activity. The groups evaluated themselves on a five-point scale on five main tasks or activities that they are supposed to perform. In addition they gave themselves an overall rating.

The groups also listed the resources made available to the job, the constraints to their effective performance, and their priority recommendations for change. The groups' ratings, resources, constraints, and recommendations were then shared in a plenary session.

Practice Tip: This “force-field” analysis activity—in focusing on resource availability and the constraints affecting job performance—is very effective in helping people to identify realistic strategies rather than merely listing weaknesses or complaints. The facilitator should remind participants about the listening rules. After each presentation the participants raise questions and the group collectively notes the recommendations and issues that need further discussion. It is important to respect and support each group by clapping or any other method, irrespective of their self-rating.

It is usually appropriate at this time for the project director to give simple awards or certificates of appreciation. The awards should be given irrespective of whether the groups rate themselves low or high, or whether they have many or few suggestions for change. The process of openly evaluating themselves is of great value for the team, and can contribute to a more successful project in the future.

This is usually the most intensive exercise, so after-dinner entertainment helps people relax and build a sense of teamwork. In most cultures, variations of charades, role plays on simple themes related to the project, or “dos and don’ts during the visit to village groups” are not only enjoyable but reinforce learning.

Either at the end of the official session or before the evening entertainment, the facilitator should introduce the person responsible for the next day’s field trip, go over logistics, and explain the purpose and activities to be covered during the field trip.

Day 3

Hearing from the Communities, Field Visits

Even though some community representatives were part of the workshop and could share their perspectives on the project, it was felt that it would be useful for all of the participants to visit two villages in two small groups to see for themselves the reality on the ground. The villages were chosen with care to represent both well-functioning community groups and poorly functioning community groups and the selected villages were informed of the visits beforehand. The workshop participants attended community meetings and had an opportunity to ask questions and then follow up with smaller groups on issues of particular interest to them. For example, some of the workshop participants wanted to talk with local contractors, the village headman, and women’s groups . Participants returned to the workshop venue in the evening.

Just before leaving for the field, findings from the participatory evaluation conducted at the community level were shared with the group. A sociologist involved in conducting the community level participatory evaluation showed slides and summarized the key findings on how community groups evaluated themselves, their perceptions about the project and project authorities, and their recommendations for change.

Practice Tip: Even if the entire group is from the same country, local customs and ground rules for the field visit need to be discussed. Special emphasis should be placed on staying on schedule because it is impossible to keep a large group together if people wander away to do different things.

It is also useful to send the appropriate person out the day before to make sure that community leaders are aware of the visit.

The presentation of the community-level findings just prior to the field trip provides input to participants’ thinking on issues they might want to follow up themselves.

There is no particular time set aside for discussing the field trip findings, but it is an additional input that will inform discussions about overall performance and future directions.

Day 4

How Did We Do: Expert Input

Back in the workshop setting, three brief (20-minute) presentations were made by subject specialists. The first presentation was made by the senior project monitoring specialist, reporting on project achievements with reference to the annual targets for three years. This included kilometers of earth moved and paved, roads built compared to project targets, kilometers of roads repaired, number of structures and bridges built, percent of local and council contributions mobilized, number of community groups formed, number of contracts given to community groups, and number of destitute women employed in maintenance contracts.

The second presentation was by the senior financial/accounts officer. He presented the total project budget, the amount committed for each year and the amount spent per year on key expenditure categories (against budget), cost overruns, unit costs of different types of roads and structures under different contractual arrangements, and the total future budget per year.

The last presentation was by an external institutional expert who had been commissioned by the project to do an in-depth study on the project's institutional setup, compare it to other successful models elsewhere, and suggest recommendations for change.

Practice Tip: This session's facts and figures provide additional input to staff to help them make informed decisions. The sequencing of this information toward the end of the workshop is deliberate and important. The specialist inputs thus do not dominate people's thinking but can be factored into final decisions.

Participants' Perspectives: How Did We Do?

Each participant was given a sheet of paper with 10 key project components/activities listed on the left, and a rating scale on the right. Working individually and anonymously, they rated the performance of each component, and then gave an overall rating. The papers were then collected, and the results were tallied and reported back to the group after lunch.

Practice Tip: This activity combines personal expertise together with expert input. However, each participant makes an individual judgment about the overall performance of their project.

Action Recommendations for Change

Working in multidisciplinary groups, participants were given a copy from day two of the key project components and how the component was rated by the four occupational groups (engineers, sociologists, technicians, and community organizers).

From this list, and taking into account any issues raised by the experts, the groups chose five priority areas/components needing improvement. For example, they selected: maintenance arrangements; coordination of group formation with road construction; transparency in choice of contractors; revenue base of local councils for infrastructure, particularly roads; and incentives for staff performance.

Practice Tip: It is important to have the right combination of different specialists in each group. Also, each group will work at a different pace in their discussion of choosing priorities. As groups finish this exercise, introduce the next task without having plenary discussions.

The groups were then asked to focus on action recommendations for change. In cases where the groups felt that they could not yet make a recommendation, they were asked to identify the next steps, such as the need for additional studies by outsiders or by project staff, and to include draft Terms of Reference if appropriate.

Practice Tip: If particular groups are much slower than others, remind them of time constraints and facilitate with moving along the discussion. As groups make recommendations or draft Terms of Reference, make secretarial assistance immediately available for typing and copying. Simple as it is, having typed copies available for everyone reinforces teamwork and provides a written record for follow-up action by management.

The groups then presented their findings in plenary. This session was attended by the “expert” presenters as well. After a general discussion, the final wrap-up was done by the project director. He not only summarized some of the key findings, but thanked the staff for participating in such intensive and sometimes emotional discussions. He endorsed some action recommendations for change immediately. For others, he announced the strategy for follow-up, the next steps, and a time framework.

Practice Tip: Just after the final wrap-up meeting, pass out evaluation forms to the participants. Make sure evaluation forms are completed and collected. Thank each participant individually if possible.

Beneficiary Assessment

Module V

Section 1: Overview

Beneficiary Assessment Is:

“a qualitative method of information-gathering which assesses the value of an activity as it is perceived by its principal users.”

Beneficiary Assessment (BA) is a consultative methodology used in both project and economic and sector work (ESW) to gain insights into the perceptions of beneficiaries regarding a project or policy. The overall objective of a BA is to make the voices of beneficiaries and other local-level stakeholders heard by those managing the project or formulating policy. BA was developed as a distinctive methodology in the early 1980s during World Bank-supported studies of urban slums in Latin America, and is now widely used by the World Bank and its borrowers in a range of sectors and countries.

BA: Key Features

- ◆ Qualitative, but quantified
- ◆ Systematic, but flexible
- ◆ Action oriented
- ◆ Targeted to decisionmakers

The focus of BAs is on obtaining qualitative information, including subjective opinions, to complement the more easily accessible quantitative data on a development activity. However, recognizing the need to generate findings that will satisfy decisionmakers, who generally want to see “hard data” before they are convinced, BA results are quantified and tabulated wherever possible. In addition, sample sizes are selected with credibility in mind. Thus, while the results of BAs are not usually conducive to statistical analysis, they are based on more than just anecdotal information. The systematic nature of BAs also enhances the reliability of the findings due to the combination of techniques used to gather information. Such techniques allow for cross-checking of responses, and a reasonable assessment of the extent to which opinions expressed by respondents represent widely held views in their community. However, the actual techniques used and the BA process itself will depend on the topic and circumstances of the work.

Given that BAs are always undertaken in the context of a project or ESW, the results obtained must be of direct relevance to the activity. Thus, in addition to generating descriptive information, BAs are designed to produce recommendations, as suggested by those consulted, for changes to the current or planned policies and programs. This action-oriented nature of BA work requires that the results be produced with a minimum of delay after completion of fieldwork so that the necessary adjustments to projects or policies can then be identified and undertaken.

The primary audience of BA findings is decisionmakers and managers of the development activity—both within the government and the World Bank. For this reason, special efforts are made to seek the involvement of these decisionmakers in the BA process from the design stage to the review and final presentation of the results.

BA: Key Techniques

- ◆ Participant Observation
 - Two to three weeks or more in a community

- ◆ Conversational Interviewing
 - With representative sample of beneficiaries, program managers, field staff, community leaders

- ◆ Focus Group Discussions
 - Six to 12 people with common interests or characteristics

BAs make use of three principal techniques of information-gathering:

Conversational interviews provide the bulk of the findings. These interviews are conducted with the help of a thematic guide, which is developed specifically for each BA study. The guide is formulated with input from a range of actors and lists the topics to be investigated. This guide takes the place of a questionnaire, and the interviewers order the topics included in each interview according to the respondent's situation (an example of an interview guide is provided in the Techniques section of the PRA module). Note-taking is avoided during the interview itself (unless the interviewee is fully comfortable with this), and the interviewer records in detail the issues raised immediately following the conversation.

Focus group discussions are conducted to complement and cross-check the information from individual interviews. These discussions generally comprise six to 12 people with a common interest or characteristic (such as youth, young mothers, female entrepreneurs, cooperative members). Here the interviewer takes on a facilitative role, guiding the discussion to cover one or two key topics from the thematic guide, and ensuring that everyone present has an opportunity to participate. A researcher is also present to take notes on the discussion during the focus group session.

Participant observation entails a member of the research team living in a community during an extended period of time, with the visit lasting from a couple of weeks to several months. During this time the researcher tries to build up a rapport with the local people and become involved in their everyday activities. The researcher's observations and conversations pay particular attention

to the more sensitive topics of the thematic guide (which do not lend themselves to the visiting interviewer format) and to the overall sociocultural and political context of beneficiaries' lives. To learn about these contextual factors the participant observer conducts case studies of a number of households (usually five to 10), visiting them repeatedly during his or her stay.

The *sampling* methods used for selecting the interview participants should cover the target regions and incorporate some kind of stratification according to, for example, ethnicity, class or caste, income, and gender. As discussed further in the section on BA techniques below, the sample size should be large enough to ensure credibility of the findings.

BA: Range of Uses in World Bank Work

- ♦ **Stage:**
 - used in 80-plus projects since 1983 to assist with preparation, monitoring during implementation, and evaluation
- ♦ **Sectors:**
 - primarily in service delivery projects: health, population, education, agriculture, water supply, urban development, social funds
 - also in ESW (for example PPAs)
- ♦ **Outputs:**
 - level of beneficiary satisfaction with service delivery
 - reasons for dissatisfaction or low usage of services
 - local people’s perceptions and views on ESW topic
 - suggestions for change, reorientation of project/policies

Approximately 80 World Bank-supported activities have used BA methods in about 36 countries and across six sectors. The most common application of BA techniques has been in projects with a service delivery component and it is especially important to gauge user demand and satisfaction. BAs have been conducted throughout the project cycle. At the preparation stage, BAs can provide input into project design. During implementation, BAs can provide feedback for monitoring purposes and for reorientation of the project. Finally, BAs can complement technical and financial evaluations of projects with the views of the beneficiaries themselves.

BAs have been incorporated into the design of numerous social funds, in some cases as a program of repeated assessments (such as in Zambia, as discussed in the BA Case Studies section), rather than as a single, one-off activity. In addition, ESW is increasingly including BA methods, notably in Participatory Poverty Assessments where the views and voices of the poor are essential inputs into an assessment of poverty conditions. A number of projects and ESW activities have used BA methods in conjunction with other information-gathering methodologies, such as Participatory Rural Appraisal or quantitative surveys.

Typical outputs from BAs, as listed in the above box, provide valuable information that is often unavailable through more quantitative survey methods. The “value added” from BA studies can, therefore, be seen in terms of: better project design, with improved targeting and more effective programs; more informed policy decisions and policymakers; increased sustainability of project benefits, based on client feedback; strengthened dialogue between stakeholders at different levels; and a voice given to the poor in both project and policy-level interventions.

BA: Organizational and Logistical Issues

- ♦ **Who does a BA?**
 - directed by a social scientist in/outside the World Bank
 - team of local interviewers (male and female)
 - experienced participant observation researcher
 - training of researchers usually required
- ♦ **How long does it take?**
 - between three to five months
(range: two weeks to five years)
- ♦ **How much does it cost?**
 - average US\$35,000 to US\$40,000
(range: US\$2,000 to US\$1.2 million)

The role of a task manager rarely includes his or her direct involvement in the use of BA methods in the field. Rather, task managers have found it more useful and efficient to seek the help of a social scientist with experience in BA methods to direct the whole process. This social scientist can be given the task of working with in-country institutions, which in turn can take over a good deal of the logistical work and other arrangements, such as selection of researchers and sites to be visited. The institution involved can be a government agency, an NGO, a local university, or a local private consulting firm.

The researchers should be, at least predominantly, local people familiar with the language and culture of the sites selected, and with good listening, analytical, and writing skills. A gender balance should be maintained on the team, and the level of education of those conducting the conversational interviews can be high school graduates. Participant observers need to have a background in social science with experience in this type of fieldwork. Any BA study will generally need to begin with a period of training and orientation for the researchers, even if they are all highly qualified, to ensure that they are fully aware of the nature of the project or ESW, the objectives of the BA, the socioeconomic context in which the project is being designed or implemented, and the analysis and reporting that will be required. A single BA activity typically takes between three to five months and costs an average of US\$35,000 to US\$40,000; however, both time and cost can vary depending on whether an international consultant is hired, the amount of training required, the length of the fieldwork period, and the number of researchers involved.

BA: Some Limitations and Risks

- ◆ Information too descriptive, not quantified, or not relevant to project manager or policymaker
- ◆ Key decisionmakers not fully involved, so poor acceptance and ownership of findings
- ◆ Research team not sufficiently briefed before fieldwork
- ◆ Fieldwork not monitored sufficiently

The quality and effectiveness of BAs are both limited when insufficient attention is paid to the ability and performance of the researchers. Unsuccessful BAs have usually stemmed from inadequate training of the researchers or insufficient supervision and monitoring of the fieldwork. Where researchers are unclear about the kind of information required for the project or ESW, and particularly when they come from a social science background, the common tendency is to collect lengthy, descriptive and very detailed information on individual cases, rather than focusing on only the relevant topics. For this reason, there should be at least one opportunity to review the findings and methods, preferably midway through the fieldwork, so these kinds of problems can be addressed in time to reorient the researchers' work.

Another limitation seen in some BAs is the failure to ensure active participation by key decisionmakers throughout the process. In this case, even if the findings are of good quality and highly relevant, they are unlikely to generate much impact. Decisionmakers who have had an input into the design of the BA and the selection of topics to be addressed will be more likely to take an interest in the findings. Without this sense of ownership, they may not accept the findings, particularly if they are somewhat controversial and critical of the project or policy concerned.

Beneficiary Assessment (BA)

An Overview

Beneficiary Assessment Is:

“a qualitative method of information-gathering which assesses the value of an activity as it is perceived by its principal users.”

BA: Key Features

- ◆ Qualitative, but quantified
- ◆ Systematic, but flexible
- ◆ Action oriented
- ◆ Targeted to decisionmakers

BA: Key Techniques

- ◆ **Participant Observation**
 - Two to three weeks or more in a community
- ◆ **Conversational Interviewing**
 - With representative sample of beneficiaries, program managers, field staff, community leaders
- ◆ **Focus Group Discussions**
 - Six to 12 people with common interests or characteristics

BA: Range of Uses in World Bank Work

- ◆ **Stage:**
 - used in 80 plus projects since 1983 to assist with preparation, monitoring during implementation, and evaluation
- ◆ **Sectors:**
 - primarily in service delivery projects: health, population, education, agriculture, water supply, urban development, social funds
 - also in ESW (for example, PPAs)
- ◆ **Output:**
 - level of beneficiary satisfaction with service delivery
 - reasons for dissatisfaction or low usage of services
 - local people's perceptions and views on ESW topic
 - suggestions for change, reorientation of project/policies planning

BA: Organizational and Logistical Issues

- ◆ **Who does a BA?**
 - directed by a social scientist in/outside the World Bank
 - team of local interviewers (male and female)
 - experienced participant observation researcher
 - training of researchers usually required

- ◆ **How long does it take?**
 - between three to five months
(range: two weeks to five years)

- ◆ **How much does it cost?**
 - average US\$35,000 to US\$40,000
(range: US\$2,000 to US\$1.2 million)

BA: Some Limitations and Risks

- ◆ Information too descriptive, not quantified, or not relevant to project manager or policymaker
- ◆ Key decisionmakers not fully involved, so poor acceptance and ownership of findings
- ◆ Research team not sufficiently briefed before fieldwork
- ◆ Fieldwork not monitored sufficiently

Section 2: Techniques

Beneficiary Assessments (BAs) are characterized by three major techniques: conversational interviewing; focus group discussions; and participant observation. The latter two are briefly described in this section. For information on conversational interviewing, readers should refer to the description of semi-structured interviewing in the PRA techniques section, as these terms (and methods) are interchangeable in practice.

In addition, BA work often employs other techniques drawn from similar methodologies, such as Participatory Rural Appraisal and SARAR, and readers are encouraged to refer to the techniques sections of the PRA and SARAR modules for descriptions of some of these complementary tools.

Sampling

Perhaps more so than in PRA and SARAR, BA work emphasizes the need for a sample size sufficiently large enough to allow for quantification of the interview findings. While statistical sampling procedures can be used as a guide, these will suggest sample sizes greater than those needed for BA. The actual extent of coverage of the local population will depend on the BA manager's judgment and that of the decisionmakers for whom the BA is intended, the variability of the population concerned, and the complexity of the project. Sampling should also take account of cultural variables, and be stratified by ethnicity, class or caste, income, and gender to ensure that the people consulted comprise a representative cross-section of the population in the project area as a whole. While the one-on-one conversational interviews are meant to be quantified—and hence must be numerous enough to be considered significant by decisionmakers—focus group interviews and participant observation are done primarily for illustration and contextual background and need not conform to the same standards of representativity.

While most of the assessment will be conducted with community members, attention must also be given to the perspective of the other key actors involved—the project managers, field staff or extension workers, and the community leaders. Where any of these groups is numerous (field staff such as teachers, health workers, or farm extension agents), representative sampling should be carried out along the same lines as for beneficiaries and stratified according to key variables.¹

¹ Lawrence Salmen, 1995, "Beneficiary Assessment: An Approach Described," World Bank, Environment Department Paper No. 23, Washington, D.C.

Focus Group Discussions

Focus group discussions are facilitated discussions held with a small group of people who share common concerns.² The discussions usually last one to two hours and have many potential uses. They can serve as a forum for addressing a particular issue, in which case a series of focus groups with different interest groups can help highlight their various concerns, any conflicting interests, and potential common ground among the groups. Focus groups can also provide an opportunity to cross-check information that has been collected using other techniques, and can be used to obtain a variety of reactions to hypothetical or planned interventions. Box 1 provides key tips for organizing a focus group discussion.

Focus groups work best when they are composed of people with similar general characteristics and concerns. This does not mean that group members will put forth only one opinion or that they will agree on everything. But it is the similarity of the participants' orientation toward the issue at hand that allows for information to be shared freely and for deeper insight into the issue under discussion. Young mothers, widows, artisans, and farm laborers are examples of possible focus groups in a community; and, in an agency context, focus groups could be held with, for example, officers at a senior level in headquarters, mid-level in local offices, and fieldworkers.

Group size and the skill of the facilitator can determine the success or failure of a focus group discussion. Although it is possible to have as few as four or as many as 12 discussants, the seven to 10 range is generally the most successful. The person who guides the focus group—the facilitator—uses group process skills to ensure that all the participants can speak openly and to direct their discussion to the relevant topic. In addition to the facilitator, another member of the research team should be present to take notes on the discussion.

The topic of focus group discussions can be chosen from the range of topics included in the interview guide, which has been developed prior to the fieldwork, or may emerge as the fieldwork is under way as a priority concern worth investigating. Once the topic has been selected, participants of the focus group(s) can be selected, based on advice of local agency staff, community leaders, or other key informants. Alternatively, the groups can be formed on the basis of the results of earlier stages of the fieldwork. For instance, a wealth ranking exercise (see the Techniques section of the PRA module for details) can reveal groupings of households according to wealth, and focus group discussions can be held with some members from each of the wealth groups to learn about and compare the concerns of the wealthier and poorer members of the community.

The decision to use focus groups will be based on cultural and topical factors. In certain cultures and on certain topics, people are more disposed to express themselves freely in groups than on their own. In other cultures and for other topics, the reverse is true. It should be noted that focus group discussions do not lend themselves to quantification or aggregation of the results. The most useful outputs of these discussions are more commonly in the form of qualitative insights and direct quotes illustrating the concerns of the groups' members (see, for example, Box 2 and Box 3).

² This description is based on Sue Jacobs, forthcoming, "Social Assessment and Participation: Methods and Tools," Social Development Department, World Bank, Washington, D.C.

Box 1
Focus Group Discussions: Tips

- ◆ Have a clear purpose for the group discussion, based on a few key topics.
- ◆ Identify participants with the help of local leaders and key informants in the community. Beware of possible biases in their suggestions (such as favoring the more powerful, articulate, and active members of the community).
- ◆ After establishing a time when participants can attend, let people know well in advance.
- ◆ Ensure there is a comfortable and pleasant atmosphere. Arrange snacks or drinks when appropriate.
- ◆ Start the discussion with a brief introduction explaining the purpose of the meeting.
- ◆ Facilitate the discussion with enough authority to keep the meeting on track, but with enough sensitivity to include as many people as possible in the discussions.
- ◆ Try to identify which issues are of general concern to the group and which issues are more controversial or personal in nature.
- ◆ Look for potential “spokespersons” from different focus groups who could be asked to meet together to summarize the concerns of their groups and discuss differences among the groups.

Source: Adapted from D’Arcy Davis Case, 1990, *The Community’s Toolbox: The Idea, Methods and Tools for Participatory Assessment, Monitoring and Evaluation in Community Forestry, Food and Agriculture Organization*, Rome.

Box 2

Focus Groups Highlight Teacher Dissatisfaction in El Salvador

A recent Social Assessment in El Salvador made extensive use of focus group discussions to reveal the viewpoints of different stakeholder groups regarding the present basic education system and a proposed set of reforms. All in all, 24 focus groups were formed, which included parents and teachers, in both rural and urban areas, and in both traditional and community-managed school systems. The results of these discussions complemented well the information obtained from other techniques (in-depth interviews with government officials, school principals, NGOs, and others; and a case study of one school). Below is a summary of some of the concerns mentioned by teachers in the focus groups.

Why Teachers Are Unhappy

Lack of training

- “The training, as inadequate as it is, is given at the wrong time, in the middle of the school year without coordinating it with the distribution of books and materials.”
- “[The ministry] should see to it that we have better training which is more applicable to the problem and less theory.”

Lack of social standing

- “It is very clear that we don’t have a good place in society.”
- “The mystique surrounding the teachers had begun to fade.”
- “Even though teaching is what is most sacred, in El Salvador teachers are the ‘pobresores’ [poorfessors, or poor professors].”

Arbitrary allocation

- “Posts are assigned arbitrarily and under political criteria. . . merit has nothing to do with assignment.”

Long working day

- “From 7:00 to 12:00 I work at a private school, from 1:00 to 4:00 in a public school and from 5:00 to 8:00 in another school and on my nights off I’m working on a master’s in mathematics.”

Source: Valeria Junho Pena, 1995, “Social Assessment: El Salvador Basic Education Modernization Project,” World Bank, Latin America Technical Department, Environment Division Dissemination Note No. 13, Washington, D.C.

Box 3

Focus Groups Highlight Conflicts, Facilitate Agreements in Ethiopia

As part of a reforestation program in the highlands of Ethiopia, hillsides were fenced off and guarded by paid and armed members of the community to prevent human and animal intrusion. These hillsides had previously provided grazing, fuelwood, and other benefits to the local communities (or “Peasant Associations”), and their closing had led to a good deal of confusion about what level of resource use was permitted in the protected areas, and who was entitled to these benefits. Many people felt cheated by the loss of access to the hillside resources.

A participatory assessment in one Peasant Association involved focus group discussions with the main “interest groups,” including leaders of the Peasant Association (PA), community members employed as guards, women, old men, and livestock owners. These groups had very different views about the closures and how they could best be managed, and each group discussion served to clarify their concerns and elicit recommendations for resolving conflicts over the protected areas. Some of the perspectives are illustrated below:

Peasant Association Leaders:

“The closed areas will supply us with fuelwood, construction wood, grass for our animals from cut-and-carry, and they will stop erosion of the land. However, they also result in a shortage of grazing and farmland and hinder livestock rearing.”

Women:

“We are not allowed to go into the closed areas to get anything from there. I can not even take a stick for a toothbrush!”

Guards:

“Farmers come to cut the trees at night. We can hear them and see the remains of the trees in the morning. If we catch them and report them they will be our enemies and will threaten us and want to kill us. Sometimes we have to report our neighbors and friends.”

Livestock Owners:

“If you do not have enough grazing land, having cattle is like having a wife from a bad family.”

A final discussion group was then arranged for two or three representatives from each of the focus groups, where they exchanged their views and discussed differences of opinion. The end result of the meeting was a clarification on where the groups’ priorities overlapped and where they conflicted, and an agreement on what should be done next.

Source: I. C. Scoones and J. A. McCracken, eds., 1989, “Participatory Rapid Rural Appraisal in Wollo, Ethiopia: Peasant Association Planning for Natural Resource Management,” Ethiopian Red Cross Society, Addis Ababa, and International Institute for Environment and Development, London.

Participant Observation

Participant observation as used in BAs is the protracted residence of an outsider in a community of beneficiaries.³ During their stay, the participant observers aim to establish sufficient rapport and involvement in the everyday activities of the beneficiaries to develop an in-depth understanding of people's motivations and attitudes. Participant observers can also help reveal any inconsistencies between what people have said during interviews and discussions and the reality of their actions. For example, while interviewees may have identified the official procedures for marketing an agricultural product, the reality observed may be quite different, with informal arrangements being the norm.

Unlike participant observation in social anthropology, where residence in a community being studied may last two or three years, the participant observer in a BA generally resides in a community for a period of several weeks to two or three months. The interest here is focused on the same topics that make up the interview guide, and particular emphasis is placed on topics that may be too sensitive or pervasive to lend themselves to the visiting interviewer format. The emphasis in participant observation, however, is not only on the topics per se, but on how these issues are affected by the sociocultural and political context in which the beneficiary lives and works. To best illustrate this contextual dimension of the topics under study, the participant observers generally conduct case studies on a small number (usually five to 10) of beneficiary households, which are visited many times over the course of the residence in the community. By systematically documenting their direct observation, participant observers can provide quantifiable data, generate indicators and questions for further study, and complement the more systematic data collected from the broader sample of conversational interviews. Box 4 provides tips for using this technique in the field.

Participant observation is useful not only in community settings. As the example in Box 5 illustrates, participant observers can also spend time “residing” in organizations to get an in-depth understanding of how these groups operate. Such “institutional assessments” can be conducted for both formal and informal groups, at a national or local level. Also, participant observers may make use of other methods to learn about an organization's roles and reputation, and its level of efficiency and effectiveness.

³ The description in this section is based on L. Salmen, *op. cit.*

Box 4
Participant Observation: Organizing Tips

- ◆ Explain the reason for the stay to everyone at the outset.
- ◆ Strategically choose a residence among the beneficiary population.
- ◆ Cultivate a few close contacts from diverse and major segments of the population.
- ◆ Try not to be too closely identified with any one group, but be open and accessible to all.
- ◆ Choose between five to 10 households to visit on a regular basis during the fieldwork to construct detailed case studies.
- ◆ Inquire about issues of project concern with the residents, using some of the topics from the interview guide developed for the fieldwork.
- ◆ Participate in major organizations and activities of the community, sufficiently to be appreciated and identified as a participant but not so much as to become overcommitted.
- ◆ Retain independence, but demonstrate involvement.
- ◆ Systematically document all observations, interviews, and discussions with written records, diagrams, photographs, samples of objects, and so on.

Source: L. Salmen, *op cit*.

Box 5

Participant Observation Facilitates Institutional Reform in Pakistan

In the context of the Second Karachi Water Supply and Sanitation Project, both the government and the World Bank agreed that a large urban water utility was ineffective and in need of institutional reform. The utility was characterized by an emphasis on personal agendas, selective sharing of information, interpersonal and intergroup rivalries and power struggles, intimidation, and coercion. Given that these and other problems were fundamentally behavioral and attitudinal in nature, any institutional changes would have to be initiated at a behavioral level through involving staff in planning and implementation. A participant observer was placed in the utility. Their role was not only to determine how the organization functioned, but to serve as a “process consultant,” helping the staff examine and evaluate “what was being done, how it was being done, and by whom, against agreed action plans.”

To this end, the participant observer took part in a variety of tasks, including attending meetings, developing checklists, monitoring progress, identifying and clarifying problems, holding informal discussions, making sure information was being disseminated, facilitating communication, and building trust. Observation, for example, revealed that 174 clerical steps were required before any payment could be made to a contractor.

Client staff participated fully in the process, creating an increased sense of ownership of outcomes and decisions. Over time, defenses broke down and trust developed, with fewer and fewer attempts to “mask reality.” The participation of the local institutions and their staff in planning institutional reform resulted in the adoption of appropriately tailored solutions and improved communication with the World Bank. The process of change has already induced new behaviors of transparency and accountability at the individual level, and some similar changes are now being seen at the institutional level.

Sources: N. Boyle, 1994, personal communication; and Boyle and Wright, 1992, “Policy Reform: The Role of Informal Organizations,” World Bank, Infrastructure and Urban Development Department, Washington, D.C., cited in Deepa Narayan, 1996, *Toward Participatory Research*, World Bank Technical Paper No. 307, Washington, D.C.

Section 3: Case Studies

Case Study: Angola Water Supply and Sanitation Assessment

Key Features:

A Beneficiary Assessment (BA) that included local slum dwellers on the research team, and that resulted in immediate impacts on the design of several projects.

Context:

This BA was commissioned to provide information on two World Bank–financed water and sanitation projects in Luanda that were under implementation: the Emergency Program and the Urban Environmental and Sanitation Project. Two particular concerns that the study aimed to address were the lack of information on water distribution in the informal sector and the lack of previous consultations with residents of peri-urban areas, where the majority of Luanda’s population lives.

Objectives:

The overall objective of the BA was to initiate a process of community/client consultation in urban upgrading projects in Angola. The specific information-gathering objectives of the study were to: (i) describe the water distribution system in the peri-urban areas of Luanda by identifying the stakeholders and investigating the extent of their involvement; and (ii) provide baseline information on current water and sanitation practices, opinions on suggested improvements to the current situation, existing potential for community organization, and willingness to pay for improved services.

Process:

This study, undertaken in 1995, was coordinated by a Canadian NGO, Development Workshop, which had been operating in Angola since 1981 and specialized in the upgrading of human settlements. The study was divided into three separate phases with a time frame of six weeks for the entire exercise. Phase one involved the research team working with key informants in Luanda (including government and local NGO representatives) to map out the city for the purposes of sampling. Neighborhoods (“bairros”) were categorized according to the relative density of their populations, the existence of the formal drainage and sewerage infrastructure network, status of garbage removal services, ease of access for trucks during the rainy season, and main sources of water.

Phase two consisted of a detailed investigation of the existing water distribution system in peri-urban areas of Luanda. A total of 1,270 informal-sector water vendors (those people who sell water from storage tanks at their house) were

interviewed to learn about, for example, the source of the water, their profit margins, and their contacts with water trucks. A survey was also carried out at locations (both official and nonofficial sites) where the trucks fill up with water to learn about the costs and profits involved for both the drivers and the owners of the trucks and the characteristics of truck owners. Both these consultation activities used short questionnaires and were undertaken by staff of local NGOs and members of local community groups who were trained by the Development Workshop.

Phase three of the study, the community consultation phase, was designed to collect information on water and sanitation practices in peri-urban Luanda. Twenty researchers—including staff of local and international NGOs and of state institutions involved in water and sanitation—were trained in participatory tools for community planning and focus group techniques during a seven-day workshop. These researchers were divided into six teams for the consultations. Ten bairros were selected, based on the earlier mapping exercise, to represent the different categories identified. The fieldwork in this stage took the form of discussion groups using a discussion guide that had been prepared during the researchers' training workshop. A total of sixty discussion groups were held, including separate ones with men, women, and young people. The work was supported by a field manager who visited the bairros to explain the objectives of the discussion groups and who worked with a contact person (from a local NGO or community group) to decide on who would participate in the discussion groups. The groups normally met for one to two hours in the morning, with breakfast provided by the research team. The teams met together each day before and after the fieldwork to plan and review the day's work, and to rearrange the team composition on a daily basis. A final dissemination workshop was held immediately after the BA to present the results to a wide audience of government and nongovernment participants.

The overall cost of the BA was approximately US\$100,000, which was shared between the two World Bank divisions involved, with assistance from the Africa Region's Client Consultation Fund, and the Fund for Innovative Approaches in Human and Social Development.

Techniques:

As separate discussion groups were held on the topics of water and sanitation, separate discussion guides were prepared on each of the two topics. The research teams included: a team leader, who was responsible for ensuring that the discussion guides were followed; a facilitator, who conducted the discussion groups; and a reporter, who took notes during the discussion groups. A number of visual tools, drawn by a local artist who attended the training workshop, were used to help facilitate the discussion groups:

- ♦ **Photo parade:** a series of 20 photographs on water and sanitation themes, taken in the peri-urban areas of Luanda, and used as discussion starters;
- ♦ **Who does this job?** a series of nine drawings, used to identify perceptions of roles in the community and what kind of people were considered appropriate for specific jobs;

- ♦ ***What are our priorities?*** a series of seven drawings used to facilitate groups through the discussion of priority needs for their communities;
- ♦ ***Good and bad:*** a card sorting exercise used to help groups categorize current hygiene practices and help researchers identify community knowledge of disease transmission routes; and
- ♦ ***Mapping:*** a drawing exercise used to identify stagnant water pools and current areas of garbage disposal in the bairro.

Limitations and Difficulties:

The mapping of Luanda in the first phase of the study, on which the sampling of bairros was based, had to rely on data that in some cases was not disaggregated beyond the municipal level. In addition, the population figures for each bairro were based on a previous election register and resulted in an underestimation of the population in many bairros. Phase two of the study used close-ended questions to interview the water vendors, preventing the interviewers from raising more qualitative issues with this group. And the qualitative research techniques used in phase three were new to all of the researchers, leading to a number of problems, especially during the first discussion groups before the teams became familiar with the open-ended, facilitatory approach.

Outputs and Impacts:

The BA had some important and immediate impacts on the design of the projects. A number of assumptions regarding the priorities of bairro residents and the present water and sanitation situation were reversed by the BA findings. For example, residents of several very poorly serviced bairros were not willing to support immediate short-term improvements (as they had assumed to be) and preferred to save investment for standpipes attached to a piped network. In addition, the primary constraint to lower water prices in the informal water truck market was not storage capacity, as had been assumed. Therefore, a plan to invest up to US\$1 million in building standpipe-equipped storage tanks was reversed in favor of support for increasing the availability of water to the trucks.

The BA also generated considerable confidence among the participating government officials to work with NGOs, and provided an important capacity building experience on BA techniques for those involved in the research.

Background Documentation:

Development Workshop, June 1995 (draft), "Water Supply and Sanitation and its Urban Constraints: Beneficiary Assessment for Luanda," Luanda, Angola. Prepared for the World Bank. For more information on the Beneficiary Assessment contact Larry Salmen at lsalmen@worldbank.org.

Case Study: Senegal National Agricultural Extension Project

Key Features:

A Beneficiary Assessment (BA) was conducted on a national scale to evaluate the impact of the agricultural extension system on the intended beneficiaries.

Context:

The National Agricultural Extension Project, which was based on the Training and Visitation System and under implementation since 1990, was evaluated after four years to assess the effectiveness of the project in providing farmers with relevant and timely information and advice. In the Training and Visitation System, Contact Groups consisting of six to 10 members are formed to interact with and learn from extension agents. The group members are also responsible for disseminating the information received to other farmers. The BA methods were used in the evaluation to supplement other more quantitative methods.

Objectives:

The BA was used to complement previous evaluations by systematically emphasizing the beneficiaries' point of view regarding the project's effectiveness.

Process:

The BA took approximately one year from the initial selection and training of the interviewers to production of the final report. Two World Bank experts provided support on methodology, and the BA was conducted by a local team, including a study director (who was the head of the monitoring and evaluation unit of the project), a scientific adviser (from a local university), and a team of 28 interviewers. Twenty-four of these interviewers were new recruits for the project's monitoring and evaluation unit, and the other four were recruited from outside the project. None of the interviewers were identified either in their own minds or in the minds of the farmers with the agricultural extension agency.

The BA began with the development of the study design, in which the country was divided into nine agro-ecological zones to provide a framework for the sampling. A total of 10 villages was selected from each zone for inclusion in the study through a collaborative process with the regional offices of the government agencies involved in the project. Guidelines for selecting respondents within the villages were also developed: 10 interviews were to be held in each village selected, of which two-thirds of the respondents were to be men, and one-half would include members of the Contact Groups. During the BA, the interviewers adapted the guidelines to fit with local realities.

The study design incorporated 10 themes, including, for example, the operation of the Contact Groups, people's perceptions of project benefits, the relationship that the farmers have with the extension agents, and suggestions for improvements in

the project. Interview guides (as opposed to questionnaires) were then developed to cover the 10 themes.

Prior to the fieldwork, a week-long training workshop was held and 31 potential interviewers attended. The workshop's purpose was to familiarize the participants with BA methods and the focus of the study, to field-test the methods, and to select the best performers among the participants. In practice, only three interviewers were dropped from the study. Eleven of the 28 interviewers who went on to conduct the BA were women. Following the training session the interviewers were divided into six teams and assigned to the different zones according to their fluency in the local dialects. The fieldwork itself lasted about two and a half months and was supervised by the study director and scientific adviser, as well as by World Bank BA experts. Halfway through the data collection phase all of the interviewers met for a brief review workshop, where they discussed their initial findings and any difficulties they were experiencing in the work.

The bulk of the data analysis took two and a half months, and consisted of thematic tabulation of the findings by village, zone, and between zones. Individual quotes from farmers were also extracted from the field notes for inclusion in the report. Interviewers as well as study leaders analyzed the data, which added considerably to the quality of the results.

Techniques:

The BA took the form of conversational interviews, primarily with individuals, based on an interview guide that listed the topics to be addressed under each of the 10 themes identified. As is usual in BA work, this guide took the place of a questionnaire, and allowed for more open-ended investigation of the relevant topics. A total of nearly 2,500 individual interviews were conducted, as well as 150 focus group interviews.

Although participant observation was intended to be incorporated into the study, this technique was used in only one of the nine zones. This was due to the fact that the interviewers had some difficulty in using this technique during the initial field testing, and they had further difficulties in processing the information gathered during the actual fieldwork.

Difficulties and Limitations:

One of the problems encountered by the BA was the difficulty in finding Contact Group members. A significant number of farmers who were listed as members of a Contact Group did not in fact consider themselves to be, and had little or no knowledge of the existence of these groups. The interviewers found it increasingly difficult to maintain the sampling ratio of 1:1 for Contact Group members and nonmembers. It was, therefore, agreed during the mid-term review that the interviewers should count anybody listed as a Contact Group member as such, and to highlight the issue of poorly functioning or nonexistent groups that had less than five members, for example.

Several limitations arose from the organization of the training. The male interviewers had been hired before their female counterparts, and consequently received substantially more training. The performance of the female interviewers was, therefore, not of the same quality. Also, the training workshop was held during the fasting month (Ramadan), so the training sessions were reduced and the attention spans and energy levels of participants were lower. It became clear during the data collection phase that the training should have allowed more time for interviewers to become familiar with the interview guide. Also, data analysis suffered from poor writing and reporting skills.

Outputs and Impacts:

The BA found a number of positive features of the extension system as expressed by the farmers, including their appreciation of several technical messages, such as the application of fertilizer or the introduction of improved seeds. Such information had proved useful—when it had been communicated effectively. However, the BA also revealed a number of important weaknesses: many of the Contact Groups functioned poorly or were nonexistent, and, consequently, the number of farmers reached was very low. Also, women in particular were not being informed by the extension program.

These findings were shared with project management and the extension agency is now making major changes in its operating procedures as a result of these findings. Such reforms include integrating the Contact Groups into existing village associations, training extension workers in how to communicate effectively to women farmers, recruiting additional female extension workers, changing the institutional arrangements for delivering extension recommendations, and fostering closer working relations between farmer organizations and NGOs.

Background Documentation:

World Bank, March 1995, "Beneficiaries' Evaluation of the National Agricultural Extension Program," Washington, D. C. For more information contact Larry Salmen at lsalmen@worldbank.org or Franz Schorosch at fschorosch@worldbank.org.

Case Study: Turkey Basic Education Project

Key Feature:

A Beneficiary Assessment (BA) involving systematic consultations with a wide range of stakeholders on the issue of girls' participation in basic education.

Context:

World Bank staff and the government of Turkey wanted to gain a better understanding of the reasons why children, particularly girls, were not attending primary and middle schools in certain areas of the country, notably in the southeastern provinces and in the low-income areas of the two major cities, Ankara and Istanbul. A BA was, therefore, conducted on this topic as part of the preparation of a Basic Education Project.

Objectives:

The main objective of the BA study was to identify the underlying factors influencing school attendance in basic education in Turkey, with special emphasis on girls' participation. It was hoped that the BA would also generate some suggestions for increasing school attendance of boys and girls in areas with low attendance records.

Process:

The BA was carried out in 1991 by a 16-member multidisciplinary team of researchers recruited from local universities, and included educators, anthropologists, psychologists, and sociologists. Twelve team members were women, due to the focus on girls' education. The team was divided into four groups for the fieldwork, with each group also including two local interpreters and guides. Prior to data collection, a three-day training and orientation session was held for the researchers to familiarize them with the BA research methodology, provide them with a chance to test the methods in a short trial field visit, and to develop the field guides.

The fieldwork was conducted over a three-month period, and five cities were visited (chosen to represent low, medium, and high female participation in education) in addition to Istanbul and Ankara. In both Ankara and Istanbul, two slum areas with the lowest level of school attendance were selected and 50 households within these slum areas were visited for in-depth interviews, the sampling being based on household lists where these data were available. In each of the other five cities, five neighborhoods were selected on the basis of stratified random sampling, and 15 households were visited in each neighborhood for the in-depth interviews. In addition, four of the sites selected for interviewing were also visited by a participant observer for a period of one month.

Two separate World Bank missions linked up with the BA work. One mission visited at the launch of the study to undertake some initial field supervision. Another mission arrived near the completion of the fieldwork to meet with a wide range of stakeholders (governors, directors of education, school administrators, teachers, village heads, parents, and school children) in two cities to discuss the issues of school attendance and the probable implications of the proposed project.

The BA took about four months from the time of selecting the researchers to submission of the final report. The total cost of the BA was approximately US\$50,000.

Techniques:

The BA consisted largely of in-depth conversational interviews with a total of 543 households based on an interview guide developed during the training workshop. Interviews were also conducted with local religious and secular leaders and teachers. In addition, informal focus group discussions were held with, for example, gatherings of men in coffee shops and women's tea groups. The participant observation component of the BA involved a researcher living with local families with school-age daughters who did not attend basic education schools. The visits involved watching the people in their own settings and having in-depth discussions on the reasons for nonattendance. A separate guide was developed for the participant observers to record the characteristics of the village or slum area in which they were living, and the characteristics of the girls' environment.

An elaborate coding system was developed to process the large number of interview notes and forms, and this coding was done by some members of the research team after the fieldwork period. A quantitative aggregation of the results (essentially tabulation of frequency of findings across the different sites) was complemented by a qualitative analysis by the team, based on their own impressions and interpretations of the consultations in the field.

Limitations and Difficulties:

The timing of the study, in the summer months, was not ideal because schools were not in operation and some of the families were either working in the fields or had moved to their summer locations.

No major problems were encountered in the use of the BA methods, although completion of the fieldwork was delayed by several months when the work of one of the participant observers was found to be faulty and had to be repeated.

Outputs and Impacts:

The BA revealed a number of unexpected findings, including a gross overstatement of the number of girls attending schools in the official statistics for the southeastern provinces. In general, the official number of girls said to be in school was at least twice as high as the number of girls actually attending classes.

The BA findings also influenced several aspects of the project design. For instance, the project's emphasis was changed from increasing school coverage to improving school quality and strengthening parents' participation in the school system (which was revealed as a major factor influencing their children's attendance). In response to the identified need for financial support for students, a fund was established for parents and teachers to improve schools and promote increased enrollment of girls. And, in response to the parents' dissatisfaction with the physical appearance of the schools, more support was provided to improve the school buildings and the sanitation systems. Increased funding was also provided for school lunches.

Background Documentation:

Niyazi Karasar, November 1991, "Factors Influencing School Attendance in Basic Education in Turkey with Special Emphasis on Female Participation," World Bank, Washington, D.C. For more information contact Michael Mertaugh at mmertaugh@worldbank.org.

Case Study: Zambia Social Recovery Fund

Key Features:

- ◆ Extensive use of Beneficiary Assessment (BA) methods at a very early stage of project implementation, with significant impacts on project design at the community level.
- ◆ Focus on capacity-building of local research team, which has since supported similar participatory assessment work for the World Bank and other agencies in Zambia.

Context:

A World Bank–funded Social Recovery Fund, which began implementation in 1992, followed a similar effort by the European Community (EC). The BA methods were first employed by the World Bank to learn some lessons from the EC microprojects, and later to provide early feedback on the initial World Bank–funded microprojects.

Objectives:

The objectives of the BA exercise as a whole were to provide project managers with information on: (i) beneficiary populations—their perspectives, their socioeconomic situation, and their capacity to contribute to project implementation; (ii) the impact of the drought ongoing at the time; and (iii) efficiency and effectiveness of project implementation and any problems in community-based implementation (including the level of women’s participation, the role of local institutions, and project accountability and sustainability).

Process:

The BA was undertaken in two separate phases. The first phase of consultations took place at a time when the Social Recovery Fund had just started implementation and only a few micro-projects were under way. These consultations therefore focused largely on the EC-funded micro-projects in order to learn from this more established experience. A total of 1,620 people were consulted, and 60 micro-projects were visited—including 44 EC-funded micro-projects (reflecting a 25 percent sample of the total number of EC micro-projects), 10 of the early World Bank–funded micro-projects, and an additional 6 projects financed by communities with no external financial assistance. Two-thirds of the micro-projects visited were in rural areas, and one-third in urban areas. The sampling also incorporated the full range of sectors, with the proportion of micro-projects completed in each sector reflected in the sectoral mix of the micro-projects visited. The geographic element of the sampling was based on a zoning of the country into three areas based on clusters of ethnic groups and the presence of a significant number of micro-projects in each zone.

This first phase of consultations was carried out by a team of 10 professional researchers (most with master's or doctorate degrees), largely from the Rural Development Studies Bureau of the University of Zambia, and some recruited from other institutions in the country. Special efforts were made to maintain a gender balance on the team. The team was comprised of one coordinator, whose job it was to make preparatory visits to some of the sites and to supervise the research throughout the fieldwork. The other team members were divided into three sub-teams of three researchers each, with each sub-team visiting one of the three zones identified in the sampling.

The first phase of these BAs took about six months, including (i) a nine-day induction course for the team on the issues to be investigated and the research methods to be used; (ii) five months of fieldwork, with an average of nine days spent visiting each micro-project; and (iii) one month of data analysis and report writing, finishing with a three-day debriefing session by all researchers involved.

The second round of the BA took place about one year later, when a substantial number of World Bank-funded micro-projects were then under way. This time, 24 micro-projects were visited (and 1,121 people consulted), including 20 that were World Bank-financed (of which 9 had been visited in the first phase), 2 EC funded, and 2 community funded. Again, a team of 10 researchers was employed, with similar qualifications as before. To speed up the analysis and report production in this phase, one difference was that one researcher was given the task of coding the BA data as it came back from the field. Thus, in addition to the coordinator, two sub-teams of four persons each were formed for the actual fieldwork. The costs of both phases of the work were covered by the Swedish International Development Authority.

Techniques:

The vast majority of the consultations with beneficiaries took the form of conversational interviews. The interviews were based on an interview guide from which the researchers selected a few topics to cover with each beneficiary. Note-taking during the interviews was discouraged, and the researchers recorded the information immediately after each consultation. For 9 percent of the interviews, a short questionnaire was also used to obtain quantitative information on household incomes and expenditures. The second phase of the work also included some focus group discussions and participant observation in the communities visited.

Project officials were consulted in more formal interview settings, and other people closely associated with some micro-projects provided written submissions on their perspectives. In addition, the researchers observed the physical infrastructures being built or rehabilitated, and also observed some meetings of the community-level project committees. Each sub-team split up for the beneficiary interviews and met at the end of each day to review notes and discuss their findings.

Limitations and Difficulties:

The largest difficulty in the first phase of the work was the lack of adequate transport. Only one vehicle was available for use by all three sub-teams and the coordinator, who was expected to be supervising their fieldwork. Thus, the teams had to select more easily accessible communities—resulting in more visits than had been planned to micro-projects in urban areas or near major road and rail routes. The lack of transportation was also partly responsible for the need to increase the length of the fieldwork period (however, another factor affecting the schedule was the expansion of the scope of the research to examine the effects of the drought). Meanwhile, the lengthened period of fieldwork meant that a number of the researchers hired from outside the university had to return to their regular occupations before the fieldwork was completed. Finding replacements took some time; and the new members of the team had not had the benefit of the initial training, and the quality of their work tended to be lower. The large sample size of the first phase of this BA work also caused some difficulties in terms of quality control and analysis of the massive amount of information collected.

Outputs and Impacts:

The findings from the BA had very significant impacts on the design of the Social Recovery Fund as a whole and the manner in which the micro-projects were implemented. For example, the BA found that in nearly one-third of the microprojects visited (mostly EC funded), funds had been misappropriated by community leaders or contractors. This led the World Bank to institute tighter supervision of funds in the program. Another key finding related to the relative strengths of the different kinds of NGOs involved in the project activities: some, for example, were more paternalistic than participatory but managed public works well; and others were good at fostering participation but less competent in good quality construction or repair work. This finding led to a decision to pair NGOs to bring out their complementary skills.

One other important impact of the work has been the capacity-building of the research team involved. The university researchers have gone on to form their own NGO (Participatory Assessment Group) and have undertaken similar research for subsequent World Bank-funded projects and ESW, as well as for USAID and UNICEF. In this way, an institutional capability has been formed in-country for BAs and other participatory assessment work in Zambia. This NGO will need to be supported with ongoing capacity-building to ensure that the quality of the participatory work is maintained at a high level.

Background Documentation:

J. T. Milimo et al., March 1993 and November 1993, "Report on the Beneficiary Assessment Study, Phase I and Phase II." University of Zambia, the Rural Development Studies Bureau, Lusaka, Zambia. For more information contact Alan Dock at adock@worldbank.org or Larry Salmen at lsalmen@worldbank.org.

Section 4: Suggestions for Seminars

This section includes a sample agenda for a one-day training seminar on Beneficiary Assessment (BA) as well as suggestions for experiential exercises and discussion points for small group work during the seminar. These ideas are provided only as a starting point for trainers and seminar organizers. There are many alternative ways of designing these training events, and experienced BA trainers will have their own style of working and their own preferences for the kinds of exercises to use. Ideally, of course, a training seminar would be much longer than one day. A one- or two-week training event, for example, would allow time for participants to practice BA techniques in the field—which is by far the best way of learning about BA.

SAMPLE AGENDA

9:00–9:30	Welcome and Introductions
9:30–10:30	Overview Presentation and Discussion
10:30–10:45	Break
10:45–11:45	Case Study Presentation and Discussion Presentation by an experienced BA facilitator, describing the process and content of the work.
11:45–13:00	Small Group Work: Experimenting with Interviewing Role plays of interviewing (see attached sheet).
13:00–14:00	Lunch
14:00–14:30	Presentation of Participants' Cases Those participants who are currently planning or considering conducting a BA present very brief descriptions of the project or study background. These cases will be the basis of the small group work.
14:30–14:45	Formation of Small Groups Participants choose which case interests them most, and a facilitator makes any adjustments to the groups to ensure some mixing of participants and to avoid any groups being too large or small.
14:45–15:00	Break

15:00–16:30	Small Group Work: Designing a Beneficiary Assessment Each group works on one of the real-life cases to identify the objectives of the BA and consider some of the key elements in planning the work (see small group assignment sheet below). A facilitator who is knowledgeable about BA will need to accompany each group.
16:30–17:00	Plenary Presentations of Small Group Work Brief reports by each small group and discussion.
17:00–17:30	Wrap-Up and Evaluations

SMALL GROUP WORK: EXPERIMENTING WITH INTERVIEWING

To illustrate the key technique of Beneficiary Assessment—conversational interviewing—participants can work in small groups of four or five people to develop and perform brief (five-minute) role plays of good and bad interviewing styles. Ask half of the groups to develop an example of a “bad” interview and the other half to develop a “good” interview. Let the groups decide if they want to show an individual interview or a group interview, and let them decide how many interviewers should be involved. Allow about 20 minutes for the groups to prepare and rehearse the interviews, and to select any props they may want to use. Then ask each group to perform their plays, starting with the “bad” interviews.

Once all of the “bad” interviews have been performed, ask the participants to identify the worst aspects, including, for example, the asking of leading or insensitive questions, the adopting of an official interrogating stance, forgetting to introduce the purpose of the interview and so forth. Also ask participants to point out any good points about the interviews. Ask if any of the participants have seen (or been part of!) a disastrous interview. What went wrong and why?

Once all of the “good” interviews have been performed, ask participants to point out what makes a good interview (including verbal and nonverbal behavior). Could the interviews have been better in any way? What have participants learned from their own experiences with interviewing community members?

SMALL GROUP WORK: DESIGNING A BENEFICIARY ASSESSMENT

If possible, each group should work on an actual project or study where a BA is being planned or at least considered. Each group should include: at least one person familiar with the project/study; a facilitator who is knowledgeable about BA and can keep track of time, and a rapporteur who can report on the group's work in a follow-up plenary session. The groups can be given the following instructions to help them.

The participant whose case the group is focusing on should give a very brief (10-minute) introduction, outlining the stage at which the work is and what they would like to get out of a BA. The group should then try to develop an initial plan of action for the BA, considering:

- ◆ The objectives of the BA;
- ◆ The main issues to be addressed in the BA; and
- ◆ The possible techniques that could be used to investigate each of the issues identified. This can take the form of a matrix:

Issues to be investigated	Possible BA techniques to use

- ◆ Some process issues—
 - Who could do the BA? (What kind of institution?)
 - What kind of training would be required?
 - What kind of scale would seem most appropriate for the BA?
 - How long might the BA take? What would be the best timing for the BA?
 - How much might it cost?
 - What kinds of follow-up activities would be likely?

SARAR

Module VI

Section 1: Overview

SARAR


“A participatory methodology for empowering stakeholders at different levels to assess, prioritize, plan, create, and evaluate initiatives.”

Based on:

- ♦ **Self-esteem**
- ♦ **Associative strength**
- ♦ **Resourcefulness**
- ♦ **Action planning**
- ♦ **Responsibility**

SARAR is a recognized education/training methodology for working with stakeholders at different levels to engage their creative capacities in problem solving and planning. The acronym SARAR stands for the five attributes and capacities, listed above in the box, that are considered the minimum essentials for participation to be a dynamic and self-sustaining process. Human growth approaches in psychology and education provided the foundations for the methodology's development by Lyra Srinivasan in Asia in the mid-1970s. SARAR can be used in (i) a broad-based community development context to help generate awareness of particular problems and a commitment to try to address these problems; and (ii) an agency context to facilitate a joint analysis by staff at all levels, and to help reorient and train staff in the adoption of more participatory approaches in their interactions with other stakeholders. SARAR methods have also been used to help communities develop their own action plans as part of project planning, and to help them organize to implement these plans. In addition, the techniques have been used to evaluate existing activities at the local level.

The SARAR methodology has been applied extensively within the development activities of various United Nations agencies, including UNDP and UNICEF, as well as of many NGOs worldwide. In the World Bank, SARAR methods have been the principal community participation mechanism used in the PROWESS program (Promotion of the Role of Women in Water and Environmental Sanitation Services), which is managed jointly by the World Bank and UNDP. SARAR is also being applied increasingly in other World Bank-financed projects and economic and sector work (ESW).



Within World Bank–financed operations, the methodology has been applied at several action and management levels. In some instances, especially in the health and sanitation field, SARAR has been used to increase community awareness about problems and their underlying causes, and to encourage communities to organize and plan how to address these problems. This participatory education and mobilization focus is one of the proven strengths of SARAR. In other projects, such as in the Nepal Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Project (see Case Studies section of this module), SARAR has been used as the vehicle for creating widespread awareness of the benefits of participatory approaches to decisionmaking among project management and technical staff, field personnel, and community-level stakeholders. This has greatly facilitated multilevel collaboration during the planning, implementation, and evaluation of projects.

SARAR has, therefore, contributed to the empowerment of stakeholders at different levels. At the local level, SARAR aims not prescriptively to change behaviors within communities but to stimulate fresh thinking processes. It also aims to enable community members to transform themselves into more capable managers of their lives, and to take responsibility for project activities at the local level. Similarly, at an agency level, SARAR facilitates nonhierarchical collaboration, involving junior and senior project staff in analysis and problem solving.

SARAR: Key Principles

- ◆ Self-Esteem
- ◆ Associative Strength
- ◆ Resourcefulness
- ◆ Action Planning
- ◆ Responsibility

The acronym SARAR stands for:

S elf-esteem:	a sense of self-worth as a person as well as a valuable resource for development;
A ssociative strength:	the capacity to define and work toward a common vision through mutual respect, trust, and collaborative effort;
R esourcefulness:	the capacity to visualize new solutions to problems even against the odds, and the willingness to be challenged and take risks;
A ction planning:	combining critical thinking and creativity to come up with new, effective, and reality-based plans in which each participant has a useful and fulfilling role; and
R esponsibility:	for follow-through until the commitments made are fully discharged and the hoped-for benefits achieved. ¹

SARAR is based on the principle of fostering and strengthening these five attributes among the stakeholders involved. Such a process will enable the development of those people's own capacities for self-direction and management and will enhance the quality of participation among all of the stakeholders.

¹ Derived from Lyra Srinivasan, 1992, "Options for Educators: A Monograph for Decision Makers on Alternative Participatory Strategies," PACT/CDS Publications, New York.

SARAR: Categories of Techniques

- ♦ ***Creative:***
to promote fresh viewpoints, new ideas/solutions, and to build confidence and the capacity for self-expression;
- ♦ ***Investigative:***
to demystify research, to involve participants in data gathering and processing, and to increase local control over information;
- ♦ ***Analytic:***
to engage participants in assessment, prioritization, and resolution of problems;
- ♦ ***Planning:***
to develop skills in systematic action planning, monitoring, and evaluation in an inclusive manner, involving the creativity of the whole group; and
- ♦ ***Informative:***
to gather information in an enjoyable way and to use it for better decisionmaking.

The various SARAR techniques can be grouped into five categories according to how they are most commonly used. While there is no set order in which these techniques are used, the five types of techniques are often applied progressively, having a cumulative effect. At the outset, participants are involved in using their creativity to look at situations in new ways and to build their capacity for self-expression. Then they gain tools for investigating and analyzing reality in more detail. Finally, they develop skills in gathering information, making decisions, and planning initiatives.

Creative techniques involve the use of open-ended visual tools (such as mapping) to encourage participants to break out of conventional ideas and routine ways of thinking. *Investigative* techniques are designed to help participants do their own needs assessment by collecting and compiling data on problems and situations in their community. *Analytical* techniques enable participants to prioritize problems and opportunities and to examine a problem in depth, allowing them to better understand its causes and identify alternative solutions. *Planning* techniques are used to simplify the planning process so decisions can be made, not only by the more prestigious and articulate participants (such as community leaders or senior staff), but also by the less powerful, including nonliterate community members. In the course of planning, as the need arises, SARAR facilitators use *informative* techniques to provide information or educational materials that are requested by the participants.

SARAR: Some Key Techniques

- ♦ ***Creative:***
 - Nonserial posters
 - Mapping
- ♦ ***Investigative:***
 - Pocket chart
- ♦ ***Analytic:***
 - Three pile sorting
 - Gender analysis
 - Access to resources
- ♦ ***Planning:***
 - Story with a gap
 - Force-field analysis
 - Software-hardware exercise
- ♦ ***Informative:***
 - Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Management Game

SARAR offers a range of techniques, of which some of the most commonly used are listed above and described in further detail in the Techniques section of this module. A set of nonserial posters or photographs are prepared that represent dramatic human situations (such as a family tragedy or a quarrel between husband and wife) and that are open to many different interpretations. Participants are then asked to sequence the pictures to create a story, evoking real-life issues. Mapping of a community or institution by groups of participants can reveal different perspectives and can highlight, for example, conflicts over access to particular community resources.

Pocket charts are used for collecting and analyzing data. On a large poster, pockets are created (using paper or cardboard) in a matrix of rows and columns. Participants “vote” by placing tokens in the pockets and the results can then be tabulated and analyzed. Three pile sorting involves participants in sorting out sets of picture cards into three piles that identify, for example, potential solutions according to whether they require community, government, or joint action. A gender analysis tool enables participants to manipulate small cards to analyze who works with particular physical and community resources and who owns or makes decisions about them. Story with a gap consists of two contrasting pictures of “before” and “after” situations, with participants identifying the steps and resources needed to move to the “after” scenario. Force-field analysis is a parallel technique that is more appropriate for use with project staff and decisionmakers. In the software-hardware exercise, both technical and social steps in planning and implementing a water project are sequenced by a group of participants by arranging these steps (written on cards) in the order they feel is appropriate. Finally, games can be used to inform decisionmaking in a project. For example, a simple Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Management board game enables participants to get acquainted with the responsibilities and actions needed to develop and sustain water and sanitation facilities.

SARAR: Uses in World Bank Work

- ♦ **Stage:**
 - primarily during project implementation
 - also for project planning, needs assessment, and evaluation
- ♦ **Scale:**
 - often as part of initial pilot project, then scaled up to entire project
- ♦ **Sectors:**
 - primarily in water supply and sanitation projects, but has been applied in many sectors
 - also used in ESW
- ♦ **Outputs:**
 - increased local awareness of health and sanitation issues
 - development of community-level implementation plans
 - strengthened capacity for community-level management
 - project agencies share control with communities for planning and implementing project activities
 - local people's perspective

SARAR applications in World Bank–financed operations have for the most part focused on community awareness raising and public education in the field of health and sanitation in, for example, rural water supply projects in Indonesia, Mongolia, and Bolivia. In these cases, SARAR techniques were used to support implementation of project activities at the community level. Also of note, the approach has generally been started on a pilot scale and then expanded in a follow-up project, or institutionalized in the relevant division of the Ministry of Health.

Other SARAR applications in World Bank work include: a rural water supply and sanitation project in Nepal, where the techniques have been used to assist communities in planning and organizing their involvement in the project, and to enable them to monitor the project's impact at the local level; and a Participatory Poverty Assessment in Tanzania, where poor communities were actively involved in an assessment of the country's poverty (for a discussion of both of these projects, see the Case Studies section of this module).

A major feature of these applications has been the way in which SARAR methods have helped to reorient the work of the implementing agencies (government or NGO) from a top-down approach to a facilitatory one. This empowers the communities to play the lead role in identifying and analyzing the issues, and planning any follow-up they wish to undertake at the local level. Another common feature has been the use of SARAR techniques in combination with other participatory assessment techniques, including, for example, methods used in Participatory Rural Appraisal and Beneficiary Assessment (see modules on these two complementary methodologies).

SARAR: Some Limitations and Risks

- ◆ Insufficient time invested in field-based training of facilitators/researchers
- ◆ Overemphasis on using a particular set of techniques, rather than on overall participatory approach
- ◆ Loss of flexibility in process, tendency to develop blueprint
- ◆ Weak follow-up in communities after initial awareness raising, mobilization
- ◆ Credibility of results and resistance to use of visual-based techniques

Less successful applications of SARAR in World Bank work have usually been traced to insufficient training of the SARAR facilitators. Without adequate preparation, facilitators will not feel comfortable experimenting with the different techniques, and may be more inclined to adopt a blueprint approach, that is, always using the same set of techniques in a predetermined way and not being responsive to the differences among communities or the various groups of stakeholders.

In other cases, problems have arisen when the use of SARAR techniques has been considered an end in itself, rather than a means to support the development and implementation of project activities. This problem can occur when SARAR activities are not linked to concrete follow-up activities, such as the construction of water points or the start-up of health education efforts. In such cases communities eventually see no benefit in being involved in the SARAR sessions and the whole process begins to break down.

The effectiveness of SARAR, like that of similar participatory techniques, can also be limited by a general resistance—usually by higher level managers and decisionmakers rather than field workers or community members—to the use of qualitative, informal, and visual-based techniques. This can lead to problems if these skeptics obstruct the SARAR process by dismissing the results as unscientific or the participatory process itself as inefficient.

SARAR: Organizational and Logistical Issues

Whom to involve?

- ◆ SARAR facilitator (within or outside the World Bank)
- ◆ Selection of local team:
 - institutional “home” for SARAR applications
 - trainers
 - facilitators and researchers
 - artist

Where to run the SARAR sessions?

- ◆ In community applications—public space,s such as meeting rooms or open areas
- ◆ In agency applications—informal workshop setting, away from participants’ offices

Cost and time—allow for:

- ◆ Training workshop of 10 to-12 days
- ◆ Production of visual materials by local artist
- ◆ Field testing/piloting of techniques
- ◆ Conducting community-based SARAR sessions in several field visits
- ◆ Review workshop and follow-up activities

Task managers who have used SARAR methods in their work have generally found it useful to seek the assistance of an experienced SARAR facilitator, either within or outside the World Bank, to help set up the process and work with the local counterpart institutions and facilitators. This facilitator can also be given the task of in-country training of trainers, and of initial supervising of subsequent training sessions by the newly trained trainers. This whole process can be quite challenging, especially if there has been no prior exposure to SARAR-type approaches in the agency(ies) involved. A significant amount of time may be required to convince government officials and other stakeholders of the value of the participatory approach. This may involve organizing planning and review workshops for these stakeholders in order to involve them directly in deciding how SARAR is to be used. When there is true commitment and ownership on the part of the implementing agencies, the likelihood of SARAR producing sustainable impacts is much increased.

The logistical arrangements for using SARAR techniques are best undertaken by a local institution in consultation with an experienced SARAR facilitator. Among other tasks, arrangements must be made for production of the SARAR visuals, the training workshops, and any community visits. The cost and time required for SARAR activities will vary, depending on whether the approach is being used for a one-time consultation (such as in a piece of ESW) or on a continual basis as part of project planning or implementation. The initial training of SARAR facilitators for ongoing work requires at least one 10 to 14 day field-based session. An agency-level workshop can take several days, and community-based applications can be conducted during several separate visits over a period of months. Time and funds should also be set aside for refresher training for the SARAR facilitators to ensure adequate quality control and adaptation of the techniques to local situations as well as a continuous learning attitude.

SARAR

An Overview


SARAR

“A participatory methodology for empowering stakeholders at different levels to assess, prioritize, plan, create, and evaluate initiatives.”

Based on:

- ◆ **Self-esteem**
- ◆ **Associative strength**
- ◆ **Resourcefulness**
- ◆ **Action planning**
- ◆ **Responsibility**

SARAR Methodology: How Participatory?



info. sharing → **consultation** → **collaboration** → **empowerment**

← | **typical use of SARAR** → |
in World Bank work

SARAR: Key Principles

- ◆ **S**elf-Esteem
- ◆ **A**ssociative Strength
- ◆ **R**esourcefulness
- ◆ **A**ction Planning
- ◆ **R**esponsibility

SARAR: Categories of Techniques

- ◆ **Creative:**
to promote fresh viewpoints, new ideas/solutions, and to build confidence and the capacity for self-expression;
- ◆ **Investigative:**
to demystify research, to involve participants in data gathering and processing, and to increase local control over information;
- ◆ **Analytic:**
to engage participants in assessment, prioritization, and resolution of problems;
- ◆ **Planning:**
to develop skills in systematic action planning, monitoring, and evaluation in an inclusive manner, involving the creativity of the whole group; and
- ◆ **Informative:**
to gather information in an enjoyable way and to use it for better decisionmaking.

SARAR: Some Key Techniques

- ◆ **Creative:**
 - Nonserial posters
 - Mapping
- ◆ **Investigative:**
 - Pocket chart
- ◆ **Analytic:**
 - Three pile sorting
 - Gender analysis
 - Access to resources
- ◆ **Planning:**
 - Story with a gap
 - Force-field analysis
 - Software-hardware exercise
- ◆ **Informative:**
 - Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Management Game

SARAR: Uses in World Bank Work

- ◆ **Stage:**
 - primarily during project implementation
 - also for project planning, needs assessment and evaluation
- ◆ **Scale:**
 - often as part of initial pilot project, then scaled up to entire project
- ◆ **Sectors:**
 - primarily in water supply and sanitation projects, but has been applied in many sectors
 - also used in ESW
- ◆ **Outputs:**
 - increased local awareness of health and sanitation issues
 - development of community-level implementation plans
 - strengthened capacity for community-level management
 - project agencies share control with communities for planning and implementing project activities
 - local people's perspective

SARAR: Some Limitations and Risks

- ◆ Insufficient time invested in field-based training of facilitators/researchers
- ◆ Overemphasis on using a particular set of techniques, rather than on overall participatory approach
- ◆ Loss of flexibility in process, tendency to develop blueprint
- ◆ Weak follow-up in communities after initial awareness raising, mobilization
- ◆ Credibility of results and resistance to use of visual-based techniques

SARAR: Organizational and Logistical Issues

Whom to involve?

- ◆ SARAR facilitator (within or outside the World Bank)
- ◆ Selection of local team:
 - institutional “home” for SARAR applications
 - trainers
 - facilitators/researchers
 - artist

Where to run the SARAR sessions?

- ◆ In community applications—public spaces, such as meeting rooms or open areas
- ◆ In agency applications—informal workshop setting, away from participants’ offices

Cost and time — allow for:

- ◆ Training workshop of 10 to 12 days
- ◆ Production of visual materials by local artist
- ◆ Field testing/piloting of techniques
- ◆ Conducting community-based SARAR sessions in several field visits
- ◆ Review workshop and follow-up activities

Section 2: Techniques

SARAR techniques enable participants to develop their own learning for problem-solving and planning purposes.² At the village level, the methods are not only used to enable villagers to conceptualize and carry out projects, but also for specific problem solving and planning by both men and women community members. At organizational levels, the approach enables professionals to deal with situations in which detailed assessment, critical data analysis, and creativity are needed for problem solving and planning. SARAR techniques have been found to be effective with a large variety of groups—from community-based women’s groups to groups of staff working in an organization, and from inner-city neighborhoods in developed countries to senior development professionals responsible for projects. The strength of SARAR lies in its widespread applicability, with the visual-based techniques enabling nonliterate stakeholders to participate fully in the analysis and associated decisionmaking.

Sequencing and Appropriate Combinations of Techniques

The success of SARAR applications relies on the ability of the trained facilitators to choose among existing techniques—and to develop new ones—that are most appropriate to the changing needs of the participants involved. There are five types of SARAR techniques, grouped according to the ways in which they can be used. Creative techniques enable participants to look at situations in new ways. Investigative and analytical techniques can facilitate identification of problems and an analysis of the causes and effects of these problems. Informative techniques can be used to provide participants with additional information to assist in making decisions; and planning techniques can help develop skills in systematic action planning. These techniques are also supplemented by the use of human development activities for motivational purposes, such as the use of team-building techniques and simple self-organizing exercises. As participants work through a series of SARAR techniques, there is always an end product in mind, such as a community action plan or consensus on an agency-level strategy.

The SARAR techniques described in this section represent examples of the many that have been developed. SARAR has often been combined successfully with other participatory techniques, such as Participatory Rural Appraisal and Beneficiary Assessment.

² Fuller descriptions of the techniques and tools of SARAR can be found in the following publications: Lyra Srinivasan, 1990, “Tools for Community Participation: A Manual for Training Trainers in Participatory Techniques,” PROWESS/UNDP, New York; and Lyra Srinivasan, 1992, “Options for Educators: A Monograph for Decision Makers on Alternative Participatory Strategies,” PACT/CDS Publications, New York.

Pocket Charts

Pocket charts are used during group discussions to gather information on a wide range of topics. The poster-size charts contain “pockets” of cloth, paper, or cardboard inserted in each of the cells of a matrix, and with simple drawings identifying the subject of each row and column. Participants “vote” on various topics by placing counters in the pocket that indicates their situation or preference. By changing the symbols on the headings of the matrix, the same chart can be reused to investigate any number of issues.

For example, a chart could be constructed with symbols representing different water sources in a community (open well, river, standpipe, and so forth) along the top of the matrix, and symbols representing different uses of water (cooking, washing, drinking, and so on) along the vertical axis. Participants place their counters in the appropriate pockets to show where they get water for each of the different uses. The votes are then counted and the findings can be discussed immediately with the participants. The facilitator might, for instance, ask why so many people prefer one source of water for washing over another. Also, the participants might discuss whether there are any seasonal variations or gender differences in the use of different water sources.

Pocket charts are particularly useful in cases where most of the participants are nonliterate, or may feel inhibited to speak freely—as the visual-based exercise aims at enabling everyone to have a “say” in the discussions. Box 1 provides tips for using pocket charts, and Box 2 highlights the use of the tool in a rural water supply project in Indonesia.

Box 1 Pocket Chart: Tips

- ◆ Create the pocket chart using diagrams, pictures, or photographs to represent the alternative options or situations being discussed.
- ◆ The number of rows and columns will depend on the complexity of the situation and the level of detail required. Ideally, there should be no more than four to six rows and six to 10 columns.
- ◆ Where local material to create the pockets is not available, improvise by constructing the matrix on the ground, using cans or pots to hold the counters. The counters can be slips of paper, leaves, pebbles, and so on.
- ◆ Provide each participant with enough counters so they can “vote” for all of their preferences or activities.
- ◆ Demonstrate the voting procedure and then place the pocket chart in a location where voting can be done confidentially.
- ◆ When the voting is complete, ask for volunteers to remove the counters and tabulate the results.
- ◆ Discuss the results with the group, and inquire about whether the findings are representative of the whole community. Who would have voted differently?
- ◆ Once the activity is understood, the pocket chart can be left with the community for further use.

Source: Based on Srinivasan, 1990, op. cit.

Box 2

Pocket Charts Reveal "Who Decides What?" in a Rural Water Supply Project in Indonesia

In a project in Indonesia, the participation of women in decisionmaking was measured using a cloth pocket chart hung on a fence or wall. The pictures depicted different potential decisionmakers, such as an "ordinary" woman and man, a female and a male leader, the local water users group, and a field worker from the external agency.

Each person in the group was given seven small paper disks and asked to select the most important decisionmaker for seven different issues by placing a disk in the corresponding pocket. Group members turned their backs during the voting process so that each could vote in private. Everyone participated enthusiastically, even older women who, at the beginning, wanted to leave because they could not read. At the end of the process, the votes were counted and discussed. The results are given here.

<i>Who Decides What?</i>	Ordinary Woman	Ordinary Man	Female Leader	Male Leader	Water Group	Field Worker
1. Decisions within groups	7%	5%	19%	12%	29%	29%
2. Group Leaders	3%	11%	30%	20%	10%	26%
3. Group Activities	9%	13%	16%	23%	27%	12%
4. Size of Monthly Contributions	8%	13%	32%	10%	17%	20%
5. Need for Sanctions	5%	6%	22%	39%	13%	15%
6. Location of Pumps, Taps, Tanks	1%	13%	16%	16%	14%	40%
7. Repairs	4%	5%	9%	18%	21%	43%
OVERALL SCORES	6%	9%	21%	21%	19%	24%

Source: Deepa Narayan, 1993, "Participatory Evaluation: Tools for Managing Change in Water and Sanitation," World Bank Technical Paper No. 207, Washington, D.C.

Three Pile Sorting

Three pile sorting can be used to assess participants' knowledge and perspectives on a given issue.³ The tool features a set of cards (each about 5 x 7 inches) depicting behaviors or village conditions that can be interpreted as good, bad, or in-between (usually due to special circumstances). In the case of community health issues, for example, participants place each card in one of three piles, representing good hygiene or health practices, bad hygiene or health practices, and in-between or ambiguous practices. Common behaviors that can be illustrated on the cards include children playing around a water source and damaging it, washing hands with soap, leaving food uncovered, filtering water, taking a bath under a tapstand, swimming in a dirty pond, burning trash, and planting trees or shrubs.

Alternatively, the cards can depict a set of problems previously identified by a community. In this case the cards can be sorted according to whom the group feels has responsibility to address or solve the problem, such as (i) the household, (ii) the local government, or (iii) both together. Many other adaptations of this tool are possible. The exercise can also provide a starting point to further the participants' analysis. For example, the facilitator might ask which of all of the bad practices identified are commonly found in the community, and what might be done to mitigate their effects. Or in cases where a behavior is not seen as either good or bad, the group might discuss why. Taking a bath under a tapstand, for example, might reduce contact with pathogens, but if there is only one tap it might get muddy and leave puddles, which can increase contamination around the tap. The facilitator could then inquire what might be done in this situation. Box 3 provides tips for using the tool, and Box 4 illustrates a village-level application.

Box 3

Three Pile Sorting Cards: Tips

- ◆ Organize participants into groups of no more than seven and ask each group to form a circle.
- ◆ Invite two or three volunteers to come to the center of the circle. Give them the sets of cards to study and divide into three piles—good, bad, or in-between—using good health, sanitation, water supply, or other development conditions as criteria.
- ◆ After the cards have been sorted, arrange them in three rows so each card is visible to the whole group. Encourage participants to reconsider their choices in consultation with other members of the group.
- ◆ If some aspect has been missed, feel free to raise questions that would help the group think further, and if necessary, change their classification of the cards. The trainer is not seeking absolute right answers but rather thoughtful analysis of all of the aspects of the situation.
- ◆ Review neutral or “in-between” activities to help participants better understand why a particular practice may be a better or worse solution in a given situation, and to see the tradeoffs between different options.
- ◆ Ask the group to identify which of the practices, especially the problematic ones, are occurring in their own village or setting. Use this as a take-off point to identify a priority problem, and to pose potential solutions or steps to be taken.

³ Summarized from Srinivasan, 1990, op. cit., from a technique developed by Jacob Pfohl.

Box 4

Three Pile Sorting of Problems in a Haryana Town, India

In Hodal, Haryana, a community was disinterested in participating in a low-cost sanitation project that aimed to introduce pour-flush latrines and improve local sanitation. The project team could not understand why the “beneficiaries” even went to the extent of destroying demonstration latrines. A SARAR process was initiated by a visiting team. In one of the early sessions they asked community members to identify local sanitation problems as they saw them. Almost 20 problems were identified, including: trash-strewn streets, roaming animals, a leaking water tower that was built by corrupt contractors and flooding the streets, box latrines and carrying of night soil, broken terraces dropping debris on the streets, open drains overflowing, ponding of stagnant water, animals in local eating places, dirty household entrances and stoops, and more. An artist drew illustrations of these problems on small cards. In subsequent sessions, participants were asked to divide the cards into three piles, identifying which was responsible for solving these problems: the household, local government, or both together.

Carried out in eight wards, the exercise evoked a strong response. At first, some participants said officials from the state government should do everything because they had all of the control—even over cleaning household doorsteps. As the participants worked their way through the cards and their frustrations, however, others disagreed. Many stated that most of the problems were a joint responsibility. Amid a great deal of anguish, it emerged that the community was angry that the project had been planned without their input, and they particularly pointed out the card where a corrupt contractor built a water tower that was broken and leaking into the streets. Now they felt forced to build latrines in their households using government contractors over whom they also had no control. The exercise helped the community vet these issues and bring them to light. By the end of the sessions, community members started providing ideas on how they could carry out the project, identifying the alternatives of hiring their own contractors or doing the work themselves.

The sorting process became a basis for systematic action planning in the community, leading to the development of a new strategy to execute the project. At the end of the three-week SARAR intervention, the project was renamed the People’s Latrine Program of Hodal, and the state government agreed to let the community try their own approach. More than 500 applications for loans for the latrines were received within three weeks after the SARAR sessions ended.

Source: Jacob Pfohl, personal communication with Jennifer Rietbergen-McCracken, September 1996.

Story with a Gap

The story with a gap exercise is particularly useful for generating community awareness about a problem, and stimulating discussion about how to achieve solutions. This technique makes use of a pair of pictures, illustrating a “before” situation and an improved “after” scenario. For example, the “before” drawing might show a mother preventing her young child from using an improved latrine, and the “after” with the same mother helping her child into the improved latrine (see Box 6). Participants then discuss both drawings and “fill the gap” by identifying the steps that would need to be taken to achieve what is represented in the improved picture.

Alternative interpretations and suggestions can be gathered by dividing the participants into several small focus groups (for example of women and men, young and old people, or other categories) and giving each the same set of pictures. After analyzing the drawings, the focus groups can come together to report on their discussions and compare their views. Tips for using this method are listed in Box 5.

Box 5 Story with a Gap: Tips


- ◆ Divide the participants into several small groups.
- ◆ Present each group with the same set of “before” and “after” pictures.
- ◆ Ask each group to begin by considering the “before” picture and discussing why the situation has deteriorated to this point. For example, in the “before” scene of a broken pump, participants might suggest that: there are other water sources, no pump caretakers, community members lack knowledge for proper maintenance, the pump has been vandalized, or nobody owns the pump.
- ◆ Next, ask each group to discuss the “after” scene of the improved situation. Ask the groups what steps they think the community might take to achieve this scenario (that is how they would “fill the gap”), what obstacles they foresee, and what resources they would need.
- ◆ Bring together the different groups and ask each to tell the “stories” they have created. Encourage the groups to weigh the benefits of and obstacles to the various suggestions.

Source: From Srinivasan, 1990, op. cit.

Box 6
Story with a Gap Reveals Fear of Latrines in Lesotho

In Lesotho, extension workers felt that young children were being discouraged from using latrines. A simple “story with a gap” exercise was conducted to learn more about the problem. Two contrasting pictures were drawn and pasted onto a large sheet of paper, one showing a mother refusing to let a child enter a latrine and another in which the mother was encouraging the child to use the latrine. Two separate groups—one of extension workers and one of fourth grade children—were given the pictures. Each group was asked to write or draw, first, why the mother did not allow young children to use the latrine, and second, what could be done to persuade mothers to encourage young children to use the facility.

The drawings and discussion with the children revealed that most children under seven years of age were not encouraged to enter the latrine because of the fear that they might fall into the latrine, a fear of darkness and snakes, and a concern that the children would soil the facility. This was spontaneously followed by suggestions and drawings by the children of changes in seat design. Solutions suggested by the extension workers focused primarily on the need for health education.



Source: Narayan, 1993, op. cit.

Force-Field Analysis


This is another visual technique based on “before” and “after” scenarios. Force-field analysis has proven particularly useful in workshops with project staff or senior officials as a way of generating a shared vision of a future goal and an agreed strategy for achieving the goal. The technique also facilitates the identification of potential barriers to change. To stimulate discussion of the possibilities and constraints to improving agricultural production, for example, a “before” scenario that illustrates a field of very low quality and a diseased maize crop could be contrasted with an “improved” picture of a healthy crop. (Box 7 lists some tips on using the method with project staff; however, it can be adapted for use with communities, using pictures instead of text.) Figure 1 shows the framework visual for this technique, and Box 8 provides a brief example of its use in practice.

Box 7 Force-Field Analysis: Tips (for use with agency staff)

- ◆ Divide participants into small groups.
- ◆ Draw a force-field chart (see Figure 1) on a large piece of paper and explain the diagram as follows:
 - the left-hand box indicates a current situation (“where we are now”);
 - the right-hand box indicates the same situation that has been improved at some time in the future (“where we want to be”);
 - the central arrow (the “critical path”) emphasizes that the direction of movement is from the “now” to the “future”;
 - the arrows pointing diagonally downward represent constraints or forces that are in the way of achieving desired goals; and
 - the arrows pointing diagonally upward represent resources that can assist in moving forward.
- ◆ Ask the groups to discuss the current situation and summarize the “problem” in the left-hand box, and then to visualize the “improved situation” and summarize this vision in the right-hand box. Then ask the groups to identify the resources and constraints involved in moving to the improved scenario.
- ◆ Bring the groups back together to discuss the diagrams and brainstorm on how to build on the existing resources and counter some of the constraints identified.

Source: Deepa Narayan and Lyra Srinivasan, 1994, *Participatory Development Toolkit: Training Materials for Agencies and Communities*, World Bank, Washington, D.C..

Figure 1
Force-Field Analysis Diagram



Box 8
**Teacher Trainers' Force-Field Analysis for Expanding
a Rural Nonformal School Program in Bangladesh**

An evaluation of a primary school program run by Concern Worldwide, an NGO in Bangladesh, revealed a pressing need for more nonformal education schools to reach poorer families not being served by existing government schools. The NGO was already operating five pilot nonformal education schools and was considering expanding this program. The five teacher trainers involved in the program came together to discuss how best to plan such an expansion. They constructed a force-field analysis diagram to examine some of the negative and positive factors involved. At the end of the exercise, which lasted about two hours, it was clear that a major task lay ahead. The challenge of the expansion was to make the schools less costly by recruiting more local people as teachers, while absorbing the existing, more qualified, and better paid teachers into other positions. The trainers concluded that this was possible as long as some changes to the program were made. They recommended ways to accentuate the positive factors and counter some of the negative ones, helping to ensure that the expansion would not compromise the quality and effectiveness of the program.

I will paste up this figure
when it is ready to send to
print shop

Source: Richard Montgomery, 1995, "Force-Field Analysis: Identifying Forces For and Against Change," International Institute for Environment and Development, PLA Notes No. 23, London.

Gender Analysis—Access to Resources

Gender analysis concepts tend to be abstract and can often be controversial because they raise sensitive issues.⁴ Visual tools have been found to be very effective in getting both men and women to focus on gender concerns without feeling threatened.

This particular gender analysis technique provides insights into how access to and control of domestic and community resources varies according to gender. The process of conducting the exercise with community members also helps to raise their awareness about these issues. The technique can be used as part of a group discussion involving both men and women. If the women are to feel comfortable and express themselves freely, however, in many cultures it will be preferable, and perhaps even necessary, to meet separately with the women and men.

The technique uses three large drawings of a man, a woman, and a couple as well as a set of cards showing different resources and possessions owned by people in the community, including, for example:

- ◆ cattle
- ◆ currency
- ◆ furniture
- ◆ radio
- ◆ fruit
- ◆ vegetables
- ◆ bags of maize
- ◆ chickens
- ◆ trees
- ◆ huts
- ◆ donkeys
- ◆ bicycle
- ◆ jewelry
- ◆ horse and cart
- ◆ water pots

Participants then assign the resources to the man, woman, or couple, depending on the patterns of ownership (as distinct from use) in their community. Box 9 provides tips for using this technique, and Box 10 highlights the results of a gender analysis exercise in Kenya.

⁴This description is based on Deepa Narayan, 1996, *Toward Participatory Research*, World Bank Technical Paper No. 307, Washington, D.C.

Box 9
Gender Analysis Tips

- ◆ On the ground or a table, place large drawings of a man, a woman, and a couple in a row. Underneath these drawings, scatter at random the “resource” cards depicting key local resources and possessions. Include some blank cards.
- ◆ Ask the participants to sort the cards into three columns according to who owns or controls the resources. If important resources or possessions are missing from the cards, ask the participants to draw them.
- ◆ Facilitate discussion among the participants on why they made the choices they did. Make sure women are included in the discussion; or organize the exercise into separate activities for each gender, and let the two groups share the results of their activities.
- ◆ Next, ask participants to focus on women’s access to resources, even if they are owned and controlled by men. Give people colored stickers to mark the resources that men own but women can use. Focus the discussion around the use of these resources.
- ◆ Ask participants to discuss what happens to women’s access and control over resources in cases of divorce or separation. Ask participants to move the cards or introduce another colored sticker to mark the resources that move out of a woman’s control when she is divorced or separated.

Source: Ibid.

Box 10
Gender Analysis of Resources in Kenya

As part of the Participatory Poverty Assessment in Kenya, group discussions were held with men and women to explore women's property rights and discuss how property is divided when a marriage breaks down. As this is a culturally sensitive issue, the visual technique of gender analysis provided a less threatening means of raising this topic. The technique, used as described above, generated much discussion by participants and revealed the vulnerability of women, and particularly divorced women. The results from Kisumu district, shown below, are typical:

Possession	Man	Woman
Household furniture, radio	#	
Animals (sheep, oxen, donkey, and so on)	#	
Farm implements/tools	#	
Kitchen utensils	#	
Foodstuffs	#	
Ornaments		#
Fly whisk	#	
Babies and children	#	
Land	#	
House		#

The results that emerged from using this technique across the country showed that men are the winners and women are the losers once a marriage breaks down. While married and with the husband alive, women have access to every item on the asset cards, except the fly whisk. Once the couple divorces or separates, the true ownership of items becomes apparent. Those items that were "jointly owned" suddenly become the sole property of the husband. Except for the house (local culture dictates that a house belongs to the woman), ornaments, and young children (until age six), the woman is left with nothing. Even the babies go to the father when they are no longer dependent on the mother's care for survival.

Source: D. Narayan and D. Nyamwaya, 1996, "Learning from the Poor: A Participatory Poverty Assessment in Kenya," World Bank Environment Department Paper No. 34, Washington, D.C.

Nonserial Posters

This technique makes use of a set of poster-size pictures showing dramatic human situations. Used in the context of group discussions, the posters are provided to participants in no particular order and each group is asked to choose a limited number of the posters, usually four, to construct a story about an issue of concern to them. In this way, the tool encourages an atmosphere of creativity and discussion of important community concerns.

In order to be successful as a creative exercise, the scenes represented need to be truly evocative and open to many interpretations. If different groups are working with the same set of pictures, it can be interesting to have them share and compare their stories. For tips on and an example of this technique, see Boxes 11 and 12, respectively.

Box 11 Nonserial Posters: Tips

- ◆ Divide participants into small groups and give each a full set of pictures.
- ◆ Ask each group to choose any four pictures and weave them together into a story, giving names to the characters and to the community where the story takes place. Encourage them to develop a plot that has a beginning, middle, and end. Allow 15 to 20 minutes for this task.
- ◆ Invite the groups to come together to tell their stories using the pictures they have chosen. Groups may choose similar pictures but compose very different stories, or they may choose different pictures but compose similar stories. The reasoning behind the differences and similarities in the stories should be thoroughly discussed by the group.
- ◆ Allow time for the groups to tell as many stories as they want. Have one member of each group record the themes, issues, and notable points raised in the stories.

Source: From Narayan and Srinivasan, *op. cit.*

Box 12

Use of Nonserial Posters to Assess and Resolve Water System Problems in a Nepali Village

A trained SARAR community facilitator shared with a group of village women a series of posters depicting typical scenes from local hillside lives. A few men observed the session. The scenes depicted family life, the death of a child, poor sanitation conditions, a festival, a broken water tap, and similar situations. A number of the characters featured in the posters were repeated.

Participants came up with many stories. The first story, on sanitation, was of a child who had gotten cholera and passed away. In fact, there had been many cholera deaths the previous year in the village, despite the newly built water supply system. No one in the village, however, used latrines. One woman said, “We know about latrines, and the need to build them. But we never felt capable to do so.” Later she said, “Maybe now, if we work together, we can do something.” Three or four other stories emerged, most on similar themes. Another participant made up a story about how teenagers in the village kept throwing rocks in the reservoir tank of the water system, and how others had cut the distribution lines. Everyone agreed this was the major problem with the new project, and the first problem that they needed to address. The facilitator asked the group how they might deal with the problem of teenagers damaging the water system. The group discussed a number of alternatives, and came up with a penalty system in which the families of these youth would be fined for any interference with the system by their children. The men, who were some of the members of the Water Users Committee, concurred with this decision and it was agreed upon later in a formal vote.

Source: Jacob Pfohl, personal communication with Jennifer Rietbergen-McCracken, September 1996.

Software-Hardware Game

This technique provides the basis for discussion between project staff and local people about the necessary components of project planning: both “hardware” activities (that is, those related to technical inputs and the physical infrastructure of the project) and “software” activities (or those related to organizational and capacity-building efforts).⁵ In participating in the game, participants are made aware of the value of integrating software concerns into hardware plans and vice versa, which can help to reconcile the need to promote people’s participation with the need to meet hardware deadlines.

⁵ Description of this technique based on Srinivasan, 1990, op. cit.

When used as a means of bringing project staff and community members together to discuss these issues, the technique can also generate a mutual understanding of each others' needs and a shared vision of what will be required to integrate software and hardware components. Discussion can also identify which activities are the responsibility of community members, which are to be done by the project agency, and which require close collaboration.

The game itself requires some preparation to list all the software and hardware components of the project involved (Box 13 provides some tips on using this technique and Box 14 highlights one application of the game in Kenya). Participants then rearrange these components in the sequence in which they will need to be carried out. A list of possible components for a game involving a rural water supply project might include:

Hardware

- ◆ Arrange supply of spare parts
- ◆ Conduct geological survey
- ◆ Hold planning meetings
- ◆ Select a village
- ◆ Brief the hydrologist
- ◆ Plan use of area around pump
- ◆ Establish drilling
- ◆ Compile village files
- ◆ Purchase drills, vehicles, and other supplies
- ◆ Ensure delivery of pumps
- ◆ Do aerial photo study of the area
- ◆ Conduct pump trials
- ◆ Plan drilling campaigns
- ◆ Map the selected village
- ◆ Select site for a pump

Software

- ◆ Create a village fund
- ◆ Promote women's participation
- ◆ Evaluate use of water source
- ◆ Hold community meetings about the project
- ◆ Discuss agency and community roles in the project
- ◆ Evaluate project impact
- ◆ Meet with local leaders
- ◆ Train trainers
- ◆ Register the water committee
- ◆ Help community open a bank account
- ◆ Make informal contacts between project staff and community members
- ◆ Conduct participatory needs assessment
- ◆ Form water committees
- ◆ Collect money within the community
- ◆ Plan training activities
- ◆ Select and train new water source caretakers
- ◆ Train village committee members
- ◆ Conduct hygiene education

Box 13
Software-Hardware Game Tips

- ◆ Prepare for the game by typing lists of hardware and software separately on standard-size paper, and also copy the hardware and software lists separately on large sheets of newsprint. Starting from the right margin, cut both the typed and newsprint lists horizontally so as to partially separate each of the items (but leaving the left margin of the paper intact) The individual strips can then be easily detached and regrouped into a new sequence.
- ◆ Divide participants into four groups, of which two are composed of people knowledgeable about “hardware” and the other two about “software” activities. Distribute the typed lists to the groups and explain the nature of the game.
- ◆ Explain that the two hardware groups should cut apart and work from only the typed hardware list and the software group only from the software list. Ask them to rearrange the items sequentially as they would be undertaken in an actual village setting.
- ◆ Have the two hardware groups meet and reconcile their sequence of steps to produce one hardware sequence. Software groups should do the same.
- ◆ Ask the groups to paste the larger newsprint strips of hardware and software components on the wall in the same order in which they arranged their smaller strips.
- ◆ Then form two teams, with hardware and software sections on each, to integrate the hardware and software sequences.
- ◆ Facilitate a plenary discussion in which both teams’ lists are compared and integrated as much as possible. Finally, ask participants to identify those items that they believe would be appropriate for planning (i) jointly with community members and agency officials, (ii) primarily by the community alone, or (iii) primarily by the agency alone. This usually gives rise to much heated discussion and can result in useful insights for policy and management.

Source: From Srinivasan, 1990, op. cit.

Box 14

Software–Hardware Game Helps Reorient a Water Supply Project in Kenya

A rural water supply project in Kenya was suffering from a rush to install the infrastructure in the communities before the necessary steps had been taken to prepare the communities for their role in operating and maintaining the equipment and organizing its use. To address this problem, a workshop was held to bring together senior planners and extension workers. The facilitator divided the participants into mixed groups and introduced the software-hardware game. General lists of software and hardware steps—not specific to the project—were cut into strips, shuffled, and given to the groups. As the planners and extension workers discussed an appropriate sequence to integrate the software and hardware activities, they found they could negotiate in a nondefensive way, as the game did not focus on the project's particular problems.

The presence of extension workers, who had seen firsthand the problems of a hardware-driven sequence, meant that the groups produced a more balanced hypothetical sequence, which tried to ensure that the software was in place before hardware was delivered. As the game progressed, the attitudes of the planners visibly changed as they realized the importance of community mobilization and capacity-building activities. This change was reflected in a subsequent reorientation of the project, with more resources going to community preparation. In the reoriented project, the arrival of the drilling rigs in the villages was dependent on a signal from the extension workers that the communities were organized and ready.

Source: Deepa Narayan, personal communication with Jennifer Rietbergen-McCracken, January 1997.

Section 3: Case Studies

Case Study: Bolivia Water Supply and Sanitation Project

Key Feature:

SARAR methods were used to support different phases of a demand-based rural water supply project.

Context:

The poor state of water and sanitation services in Bolivia is responsible for endemic waterborne diseases, which remain the most frequently reported and widespread illnesses in the country. To help address this situation the Yacupaj Pilot Project was designed in 1990 to develop and test strategies of providing water and sanitation services to dispersed populations in the Altiplano region. The project was implemented in Potosi from 1991 to 1994 at a cost of US\$2.8 million. It was funded by the government of the Netherlands, and the UNDP–World Bank Water and Sanitation Program served as the executing agency. The project operated in more than 520 communities, and served approximately 60,000 beneficiaries. SARAR methods were used to help determine the demand for water and sanitation services, and to help communities study, analyze, and plan solutions to their problems. The project has since been used as the basis for the development of a World Bank–financed program to expand the program nationally.

Objectives:

SARAR techniques were used in the Yacupaj pilot phase to:

- ♦ train project staff and field workers;
- ♦ generate community participation in the identification of existing demand for project services, and provide information on project rules and conditions;
- ♦ help strengthen women’s organizational capacity, and to encourage their participation;
- ♦ change behaviors in hygiene and sanitation practices;
- ♦ help communities plan for the implementation and management of community projects; and
- ♦ conduct participatory monitoring and evaluation at both the community and agency level.

Process:

The central training unit of the pilot project received SARAR training from an international SARAR consultant, and this unit then produced, with the help of local artists, a SARAR toolkit with locally adapted visuals. The toolkit and associated SARAR training was then provided to the field staff of NGOs participating in the project, and they in turn used the SARAR techniques in their community facilitation work.

In the early phase of the pilot project, the trained community facilitators made informal visits to explain the project and its policies, and used several SARAR techniques to facilitate self-investigation and analysis of problems in the community. Subsequently, a series of health education activities were undertaken, also using a variety of SARAR techniques, along with other media and tools. SARAR techniques were then employed to assist in community organizing efforts and to enable villagers to plan project activities at the community level. The whole project, therefore, used a SARAR approach to systematize the interactions between the NGOs and the different communities. In the follow-up project, SARAR is one of several methodologies being used to guide these interactions.

Techniques:

In all, 43 different support materials were developed and provided as a resource for the project. A few of these tools proved particularly effective, however, and became more widely used. Mapping was found to be an especially useful exercise for providing simple data (about the community, its population, sources of water, and so on), and for helping villagers assess their own problems, build rapport, and determine demand for project services. Another tool highlighted by observers as popular was “Higinia” (or Hygiene), a female fictional character who captured the imaginations of the people in Potosi. She was depicted in maxiflans (or flannel boards illustrating an open-ended story), a tool that provoked much discussion and self-analysis on such topics as mortality in the community, how to improve living conditions, migration from the area, and nutrition. The method was widely used by many community and health workers and teachers, and was well liked in all levels of its application. Another very successful tool was “Sources and Uses of Water,” which was utilized for research purposes. Of note, the SARAR methods also served to promote good relations between the facilitators and community members.

Limitations and Difficulties:

In the early stages of the pilot project many techniques were developed without adequate regard to the desired outputs. The use of SARAR methods was left fully open ended, to allow for experimentation at this early stage. Later on, and especially in the follow-up project, the use of the techniques was streamlined to ensure they were linked to clear objectives and outputs, and were not used as ends in themselves. A degree of tension arose in the pilot phase, and that is still present in the follow-up project, between the use of SARAR techniques to encourage community participation and the need to provide information (for example, for the health education component). A problem in the follow-up phase has been the

absence of a functioning training unit to ensure quality control in the use of SARAR techniques. Some NGOs have been hired to train others, but there is no oversight of the NGOs' capacities in the SARAR methodology. It was found to be important in the pilot stage to work very closely with the community facilitators in the field.

Outputs and Impacts:

The major conclusion about the use of SARAR in Yacupaj, and in the follow-up World Bank–assisted project, is that the methodology has been an essential and successful vehicle for determining demand for project services and for engaging the participation of the community in all project phases. These benefits have been achieved with respect to both water supply and sanitation services.

With a major emphasis placed on community-level capacity building, the Yacupaj project helped form 209 water committees, at least one for each system constructed, and a total of 4,200 community development activities took place with more than 125,000 participants. The SARAR techniques most commonly used in the project were incorporated into a mass-produced “toolkit,” which the project distributed to institutions throughout Bolivia.

Background Documentation:

Jennifer Sara, Alexandra Gross, and Caroline van den Berg, May 1996, “Rural Water Supply and Sanitation in Bolivia: From Pilot Project to National Program,” UNDP–World Bank Water and Sanitation Program, New York and Washington, D.C.

Case Study: Indonesia Water Supply and Sanitation Project

Key Feature:

The use of the SARAR approach is becoming institutionalized in the Ministry of Health's education programs on health and sanitation.

Context:

The World Bank–financed Water Supply and Sanitation for Lower-Income Communities project, under implementation since 1993, complements a national health and hygiene campaign, known as the Clean Friday Movement. Initially, both of these initiatives focused more on the construction of physical infrastructure than on health education and awareness-raising activities. The national campaign has generated a good deal of community interest in improving hygiene conditions, but mechanisms to channel this interest into community-level actions have been lacking. The recent adoption of a SARAR approach in both the World Bank–supported project and the national campaign provides an opportunity to build community awareness and to develop local capacity to plan and implement health and sanitation initiatives.

Objectives:

SARAR methods are being introduced into the project and the campaign as: (i) awareness-raising tools to strengthen the components of initiatives that require behavioral change and participation by beneficiary communities; and (ii) a means to facilitate community-led identification, planning, and monitoring of health and hygiene activities.

Process:

The introduction of a SARAR approach has been a joint initiative of the World Bank, WHO, UNICEF, and the Ministry of Health. An artist from Java produced the SARAR visual materials to ensure that they were appropriate to local realities and cultural norms. At a September 1995 training workshop in Java, provincial-level project staff pretested the materials in the field. The tests showed that most of the tools were useful, not only in stimulating community discussion on sanitation issues, but also in promoting positive interactions between project staff and community members.

The Ministry of Health is now training key decisionmakers, implementers, and facilitators of health programs in the use of SARAR techniques. One training effort focuses on government decisionmakers, project staff, and NGO representatives at the provincial and district levels. During one or two days of training on a variety of SARAR activities, they receive a general orientation in the SARAR approach and a very brief opportunity to use some SARAR techniques in the field. A number of the

participants from these training events are in turn conducting separate training efforts, of two to three days each, targeted at local-level facilitators and trainers, including subdistrict-level project staff, NGO representatives, religious women leaders, teachers, and village midwives. These local-level training sessions are designed to provide trainees with tools for enabling the communities to identify hygiene and sanitation problems, their underlying causes, and possible solutions, and to undertake simple monitoring of the impact of any new initiatives. The SARAR training events and subsequent uses of SARAR in communities are being piloted in selected districts within the project area; and, if successful, the Ministry of Health has very ambitious plans to expand the use of SARAR methods to some 1,400 villages.

Methods:

The SARAR methods that are being used in the training programs and piloted in selected communities include:

- ◆ critical incident analysis
- ◆ mapping
- ◆ three pile sorting of hygiene practices
- ◆ contamination routes
- ◆ understanding the decisionmaking process
- ◆ monitoring forms

See the Techniques section of this module for details on some of these techniques.

Limitations and Difficulties:

Among other difficulties encountered in the various training workshops, the participants bring with them very different notions and experiences of community participation, often equating it with cheap labor or cost-sharing rather than with community decisionmaking. The training sessions have, therefore, devoted considerable time to discussions and awareness raising on how the decisionmaking capacity of local people, and women in particular, can be strengthened.

Other problems include a lack of funds for the reproduction of SARAR visual materials and for hiring local artists.

Finally, there are risks involved in the Ministry of Health's ambitious plans for a rapid expansion of the SARAR approach in terms of the quality of the work and the level of meaningful participation that will be achieved.

Outputs and Impacts:

This initiative is proving to be an effective means of exposing government officials, project staff, NGOs, and local-level stakeholders to the SARAR approach. On the part of the government, the Ministry of Health has now drawn up, with the assistance of staff from the World Bank's Resident Mission, detailed plans for

future SARAR training and piloting over the next 18 months within the context of the existing World Bank project. The SARAR activities have also contributed to the adoption of a comprehensive participatory approach in the World Bank project as a whole, including the establishment of community-level user groups to help clarify the specific responsibilities for hygiene and sanitation activities at this level. It remains to be seen whether the use of these tools will have an impact on the hygiene and sanitation conditions in the communities, or on the level of community awareness and motivation.

Background Documentation:

For more information contact Ms. Ratna I. Josodipoero at rjosodipoero@worldbank.org.

Case Study: Nepal Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Project

Key Feature:

SARAR methods were used to develop Community Action Plans (CAPs) as part of project preparation.

Context:

The preparation of the pilot phase of this project has been a highly participatory process, with the first phase involving some 14 support organizations (local NGOs, community-based organizations, and private firms) working as facilitators to enable communities to plan and organize for water supply and sanitation activities. SARAR methods have been used extensively, and in conjunction with PRA and other techniques, to assist this community-led process. Subsequent expansion of the project is being planned based on continuation of the SARAR approach.

Objectives:

SARAR techniques were used in the pilot phase to:

- ◆ enable communities to develop CAPs with detailed plans for their water supply schemes;
- ◆ help strengthen women's organizational capacity, and encourage their participation in Water User Committees;
- ◆ provide some of the participatory tools for monitoring and evaluating the project;
- ◆ ensure that the activities are community led, with the support organizations playing a facilitatory role; and
- ◆ help resolve community-level disputes over water.

Process:

The pilot phase of this project was headed by an experienced SARAR facilitator who trained a cadre of local Nepalese SARAR trainers over the previous 10 years. Some of these trainers were involved in the project, training staff of the various support organizations in SARAR techniques. The trained staff of the support organizations in turn utilized the techniques in rural communities—through training of community facilitators in SARAR and the development of CAPs. In each of the 129 communities covered in the pilot phase, a CAP was defined over a period of three to six months, involving some six to 15 sessions of SARAR

activities and with each session lasting several hours. The number of sessions held depended on the needs of the community and the skills of the support organizations. In typical sessions, participants from each household were first invited to a meeting in their cluster (or neighborhood). As the participatory sessions progressed, all issues at the cluster level were resolved and tap-stand groups formed. Final planning sessions were held at the community level, with elected cluster representatives forming a Water Users Committee. The larger community (Water Users Group) also participated in critical sessions where final plans were drawn and agreed for the design, implementation, and operations and maintenance of the system. Nonformal Health Education Sessions, also using SARAR methods, continue to be held at tap-stand level throughout implementation and post-implementation phases.

The direct costs of using SARAR methods were approximately US\$150 per community, including the training of community organizers and production of SARAR materials. This represented less than 10 percent of the total costs of the initial phase in each village (which included the technical design of the water scheme, formal registration of the Water Users Committees, nonformal literacy training for women, and so forth).

Techniques:

A total of 24 techniques were developed by the pilot project staff to assist the CAP process. Two-thirds of these techniques were actually used in the communities, some more often than was envisaged. The techniques were a mixture of SARAR and PRA tools, with the PRA ones being utilized for generating data with community members. Both contributed to enhancing community members' sense of control and ownership of the project. SARAR methods were used for analysis of water and sanitation-related problems and developing CAPs. The support organizations also frequently used folk and mass media methods, such as posters, songs, and audiovisuals. These combinations were found to be very effective in enhancing community awareness and participation.

Of the tools employed, the story with a gap, involving participants in identifying actions required to move from a current set of problems to an improved situation in the future, was the most effective and well-used tool in the CAP process. Other methods that proved useful include:

- ♦ ***nonserial posters***: local residents construct their own stories from drawings of dramatic human situations (for example, a family tragedy or a quarrel between a husband and wife);
- ♦ ***pocket charts***: participants analyze different options or assess different practices;
- ♦ ***three pile sorting***: people choose among different practices or assign responsibilities to different actors;

- ♦ **maxiflans:** people analyze an open-ended story depicted with cut-out figures and often related to conflict resolution;
- ♦ **Rural Water Supply and Sanitation (RWSS) Management Game:** participants become acquainted with the steps involved in managing and sustaining RWSS projects; and
- ♦ other tools for planning pit latrine construction and for learning about the maintenance of latrines.

The Techniques section of this module provides more information on most of these techniques.

Limitations and Difficulties:

The major constraint on the effectiveness of the SARAR methodology was the low levels of familiarity of the community organizers with the different SARAR techniques and their various applications. Some of the community organizers became too focused on the use of specific ready-made tools, rather than with the participatory approach and process of SARAR itself. More refresher training of these organizers will be necessary to overcome this limitation, and the CAP sessions may also need to be simplified accordingly. SARAR methods were found to be highly useful by field-level practitioners, and credited by senior planning officials in the government with fostering high degrees of local participation and cash and in-kind contributions, even among the poorest members of the community. Nevertheless, some consultants and visiting World Bank staff were more skeptical of SARAR's benefits and of rural people's capacities.

Outputs and Impacts:

The use of SARAR methods had a significant influence on the dynamics of the community action planning process, with the members of the communities playing the lead role facilitated by the community organizers. The SARAR sessions also generated high levels of staff and community enthusiasm and helped to resolve disputes, enhance decisionmaking, strengthen the role of women, and increase the communities' cash and in-kind commitments to the project activities.

Background Documentation:

For further information on this SARAR work, contact Deepa Narayan at dnarayan@worldbank.org or Xavier Legrain at xlegrain@worldbank.org.

Case Study: Tanzania Participatory Poverty Assessment

Key Feature:

A Participatory Poverty Assessment (PPA) was conducted in Tanzania with two additional elements: (i) exploring the “value added” of participatory research methods to the results of national expenditure surveys; and (ii) measuring the contribution of social capital to household welfare. Social capital is defined as the network of connections among people and their institutions that leads to mutual commitment, trust, and accountability, and enables institutions to function.

Context:

The PPA was designed to complement a national Human Resources Development (HRD) survey in 1993 by focusing on gathering information on poverty as defined by local people in their own terms.

Objectives:

The objectives of the PPA were threefold:

- ◆ to understand poverty from the perspective of the poor;
- ◆ to address the issue of “value added” of the PPA approach to understanding poverty; and
- ◆ to examine the role of social capital as a determinant of wealth or prosperity.

Process:

The PPA fieldwork was undertaken during March and April 1995 by six teams of Tanzanian researchers, each team made up of a senior social scientist and five junior field-workers. The researchers were given intensive training for three weeks in a range of data collection tools. The fieldwork was coordinated by the University of Dar es Salaam under the supervision of a World Bank sociologist and with financing from the British Overseas Development Administration (ODA) and the World Bank. To ensure that the study focused on issues of policy relevance, senior government officials, NGO representatives, World Bank staff working on Tanzania, and selected donors were asked, “What do you want to know that you don’t already know?” From their responses, six themes emerged that defined the terms of reference for the PPA. These themes were: (i) local perceptions of poverty; (ii) effects of trade liberalization and devaluation of the shilling; (iii) prevalence and use of savings and credit institutions; (iv) role of culture in poverty; (v) role of the natural environment; and (vi) nature of poverty in Dar es Salaam.

To be statistically representative, a sample of 100 rural villages throughout the country was selected, and of these some 85 were visited (the others were inaccessible due to washed-out bridges or dropped because they had been taken

over by refugees). The teams spent two days in each village, and used a combination of PRA and SARAR techniques as well as a two-part household questionnaire. Subsequent to the fieldwork, a three-month period of data analysis included: (i) aggregation of the findings from the participatory research methods to identify the national pattern, and (ii) statistical analysis of the household survey data, first by a private firm in Nairobi and then by the World Bank. A film crew followed the whole process and produced a video on the PPA, showing the techniques in action and commentary by participants and government officials on the impact of this type of work.

Techniques:

A wide variety of PRA and SARAR techniques were combined and used during group discussions with both women and men. The tools included:

- ◆ **mapping** of the communities;
- ◆ **wealth ranking** of community members;
- ◆ **seasonal calendars** of agricultural changes and coping strategies;
- ◆ **trend and price analysis** over the last 10 years;
- ◆ **institutional mapping** of village-level groups and institutions;
- ◆ **problem identification** at the community level by groups of men and women separately;
- ◆ **ranking of preferred attributes** of savings and credit institutions;
- ◆ **story with a gap** to discuss what changes would be necessary in turning a poor and unproductive farm into a prosperous one;
- ◆ **gender analysis** to discuss ownership of assets by men and women and what happens if the couples divorce or the husband dies; and
- ◆ **key informant interviews** with village leaders, school teachers, and other residents in the communities.

Further information on these techniques can be found in the Techniques sections of the PRA and SARAR modules. Additional techniques were used, including giving some villagers Polaroid cameras and asking them to photograph their key problems. A two-part household questionnaire was also developed. The first part focused on social capital issues, agriculture, savings and credit, environmental issues, and four different measures of poverty. The second part of the questionnaire consisted of the expenditure and consumption part of the earlier HRD survey, and households selected for this survey were the same ones as participated in the earlier HRD survey.

Limitations and Difficulties:

The pressure to complete the PPA work quickly in order to include the findings in the overall Poverty Assessment meant that the research teams had to be pulled together on a rather ad hoc basis. As such, a focused effort was not made to build local institutional capacity to conduct this type of research in the future. The rush also made it more difficult to ensure a sense of ownership on the part of government decisionmakers of the PPA process and results. In addition to logistical and transportation problems affecting the fieldwork, there were also problems in

the disbursement of the ODA funds for the work. The World Bank's procedures for receiving the funds proved too complex, and the money was instead channeled through the British Council to the study coordinator. Finally, due to an unfortunate misunderstanding, the household expenditure section of the questionnaire was administered in only half of the villages.

Outputs and Impacts:

The findings of the PPA were integrated into both the World Bank's analysis of the Tanzanian economy and the Poverty Assessment for Tanzania. Interestingly, the collated results from the wealth rankings in the PPA were very similar to the results obtained in the HRD survey—with the PPA wealth rankings classifying 50.3 percent of the people as poor or very poor, and the HRD survey estimating rural poverty at 49.7 percent. One important area in which the two studies differed dramatically was the situation of female-headed households. The HRD survey found no difference in the relative poverty of female- and male-headed households in rural areas, and in fact found female-headed households to be better off than male-headed households in urban areas. By contrast, the PPA revealed that female-headed households were consistently worse off, and were twice as likely to be in the "very poor" category, compared to male-headed households. The differences in the findings can be explained partly by the fact that more female-headed households have to engage in petty trading and piece work, which was regarded by the people consulted in the PPA as a sign of their vulnerability and dependency on others, rather than as an indicator of wealth as the HRD survey results suggest. This important "new" finding was incorporated into the Poverty Assessment. The process of undertaking the PPA also had important impacts, especially in a change of attitudes among some government officials involved who realized the value of listening to the poor. In fact, similar participatory work is now being undertaken by various ministries in Tanzania, particularly in the education and finance sectors.

Background Documentation:

For further information on this work, and a copy of the report, contact Deepa Narayan at dnarayan@worldbank.org.

Section 4: Suggestions for Seminars

This section includes a sample agenda for a one-day training seminar on SARAR as well as suggestions for experiential exercises and discussion points for small group work during the seminar. These ideas are provided only as a starting point for trainers and seminar organizers. There are many alternative ways of designing these training events, and experienced SARAR trainers will have their own style of working and their own preferences for the kinds of exercises to use. Ideally, of course, a training seminar would be much longer than one day. A one- or two-week training event, for example, would allow time for participants to practice SARAR techniques in the field—which is by far the best way of learning about the approach.

SAMPLE AGENDA

9:00–9:30	Welcome and Introductions
9:30–10:30	Overview Presentations and Discussion
10:30–10:45	Break
10:45–11:45	Case Study Presentation and Discussion Presentation by experienced SARAR facilitator, describing the process and content of the work, and outlining follow-up activities. The video <i>The Poverty Experts</i> (included in the compilation video in this kit) may be shown—in full as an additional case study, or in part to illustrate some SARAR techniques not covered in the case study presentation.
11:45–13:00	Small Group Work: Experimenting with Selected SARAR Techniques Participants form small groups (preferably groups of three or four people) to have some hands-on experience with a few SARAR techniques (see attached sheet for details). For this part of the agenda, one or two more facilitators will be required to work with the groups.
13:00–14:00	Lunch
14:00–14:30	Presentation of Participants' Cases Those participants who are currently planning or considering using SARAR in a project or study present very brief descriptions of the project background. These cases will form the basis of the next round of small group work.


14:30–14:45	Formation of Small Groups Participants choose which case interests them most, and a facilitator makes any adjustments to the groups to ensure some mixing of participants and to avoid any groups being too large or small.
14:45–15:00	Break
15:00–16:30	Small Group Work: Designing a SARAR Each group works on one of the real-life cases to identify the objectives of the SARAR application and consider some key elements in planning the work (see assignment sheet below). A facilitator, knowledgeable about SARAR, will need to accompany each group.
16:30–17:00	Plenary Presentations of Small Group Work Brief reports from each group and discussion.
17:00–17:30	Wrap-Up and Evaluations

SMALL GROUP WORK: EXPERIMENTING WITH SELECTED SARAR TECHNIQUES

Participants can work in teams of two or three people to try one or both of the following exercises. Each exercise can take from 20 minutes to one hour, depending on the interest of the participants.

FORCE-FIELD ANALYSIS

Force-field analysis involves an assessment of a current situation, a vision of how this situation could be improved in the future, and the identification of forces that help move the current situation toward the ideal and of forces that hinder progress in this direction. Begin the exercise by selecting a subject for analysis—for example, the current institutional culture of the agency in which the participants work, or the current state of a program in which a participant is involved. Then draw a force-field chart, similar to the one below, on a large sheet of paper. Note key characteristics of the current situation in the left-hand box. Discuss how the participants would like to see the situation improve, and list the ideal situation in the right-hand box. Next, identify the positive forces (resources and actions that exist or that will be needed) and negative forces (constraining factors and sources of resistance) at work. Finally, reflect on the completed diagram. How easy will it be to improve the current situation? How long is it likely to take before real improvements are seen? What are the dominant forces?



SOFTWARE-HARDWARE GAME

This technique is designed to facilitate discussions between project staff and local people about the necessary components of project planning. The discussions should examine both “hardware” activities, those related to the technical preparations for the physical infrastructure of the project, and “software” activities, involve organizational and capacity-building efforts to ensure that the “social infrastructure” is in place. Begin the exercise, which in this case focuses on a water and sanitation project, by writing each of the following hardware and software components on pieces of paper or cards. Divide the participants into two teams, asking one team to sequence the hardware activities; and the other, the software activities. Then bring the two teams together and ask them to combine the two lists to make a single integrated sequence of activities. Finally, ask participants to identify which activities would be appropriate for planning by the community alone, by the project staff alone, or by both community members and project staff.

HARDWARE

- ◆ Arrange supply of spare parts
- ◆ Conduct geological survey
- ◆ Hold planning meetings
- ◆ Select a village
- ◆ Brief the hydrologist
- ◆ Plan use of area around pump
- ◆ Establish drilling
- ◆ Compile village files
- ◆ Purchase drills, vehicles, and other supplies
- ◆ Ensure delivery of pumps
- ◆ Do aerial photo study of the area
- ◆ Conduct pump trials
- ◆ Plan drilling campaigns
- ◆ Map the selected village
- ◆ Select site for a pump

SOFTWARE

- ◆ Create a village fund
- ◆ Promote women’s participation
- ◆ Evaluate use of water source
- ◆ Hold community meetings about the project
- ◆ Discuss agency and community roles in the project
- ◆ Evaluate project impact
- ◆ Meet with local leaders
- ◆ Train trainers
- ◆ Register the water committee
- ◆ Help community open a bank account
- ◆ Make informal contacts between project staff and community members
- ◆ Conduct participatory needs assessment
- ◆ Form water committees
- ◆ Collect money within the community
- ◆ Plan training activities
- ◆ Select and train new water source caretakers
- ◆ Train village committee members
- ◆ Conduct hygiene education

SMALL GROUP WORK: DESIGNING A SARAR APPLICATION

If possible, each group should work on an actual study or project where a SARAR activity is being planned or at least considered. Each group should include: at least one person familiar with the project/study under consideration, a facilitator who is knowledgeable about SARAR and can keep track of time, and a rapporteur to report on the group's work in a follow-up plenary session. The groups can be given the following instructions to guide their work.

The participant with the case should give a brief (10-minute) introduction, outlining the stage at which the work is and what they would like to achieve by using SARAR. The group should then try to develop an initial plan of action for using the SARAR approach, considering:

- ♦ The objectives of using SARAR;
- ♦ The main issues to be addressed by the SARAR activity; and
- ♦ The possible SARAR techniques that could best be used to address each of the issues identified. This can take the form of a matrix:

Issues to be investigated	Possible SARAR techniques to use

- ♦ Some process issues—
 - Who could conduct the SARAR activity? (What kind of institution?) What kind of training would be required?
 - How would the SARAR activity fit within the project's implementation schedule?
 - How would the SARAR activity fit within the project's organizational structure?
 - How much might the use of SARAR cost?
 - What kinds of follow-up activities would be likely?

