

4. Existing Approaches and Tools of Social Science Analysis

Development of the newly-independent countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America gained increasing attention from researchers, administrators, and the global community after the end of the Second World War. Ever since, a series of development paradigms have evolved and debates have raged over their appropriateness in dealing with the ever-increasing impoverishment of the so-called developing countries. The early thinking on development was dominated by what we may call the 'technocratic' paradigm calling for construction of infrastructure and industries which would be the motive force of (economic) develop-

ment in backward societies. Disenchanted with this approach, because of its negligible impact on improving growth rates and incomes, and as a result of the growing food shortages, an agriculture-led strategy established itself in the sixties.

Combined with new and path-breaking research in high-yielding technologies, the 'Green Revolution' took a hold in vast areas of the so-called Third World. However, by the late 1960s disparities among communities and countries, as a result of the new strategy, gave cause for alarm. A nationalistic resurgence, combined with the revival of the somewhat forgotten Marxist-Leninist tradition, led to newer paradigms of development. Paradigms and perspectives, such as the 'Dependency Theory', 'Underdevelopment Perspective', and 'Unequal Trade', had a powerful influence on development thinkers, challenging the conventional 'Neo-classical' orthodoxy of the 'trickle down' approach, 'Monetarist Theory', and the erstwhile 'Infrastructure' paradigms. A blend of structural, populist, and Marxist ideas flourished under the 'Dependency and Underdevelopment' school of thought which argued that the development of underdeveloped areas was only possible if these countries could thwart the exploitation of international capitalists and their national agents. Armed with new datasets and case studies outlining the exploitation by Multi-national Corporations (MNCs) and their support for oppressive regimes in the Third World, development scholars coined terms with global implications, such as 'Core-Periphery', which can even be applied within nation states. Thus, the idea of Uneven Development among and within nation states found its way into development paradigms. The tricky questions of balanced, regional development, a safety net for the left-outs, and targeted programmes for backward groups and others, increasingly became part of development theory and practice in the period commencing in the 1970s.

Interestingly, the same questions and problems are continuing to be important issues even today. Within nation states, there are communities and regions who have not benefited from mainstream development efforts. They are the peripheral groups of today who deserve a safety net if we are to follow a human-centred development programme. Many of these peripheral groups and regions are isolated or inaccessible, their populations eking out a subsistence on the margins, with access to few resources and little information. Often, these groups are minorities within their nation states, because they are socially and culturally different from the majorities, and they inhabit remote inaccessible areas which are not usually coveted by the prosperous. However, these areas are rich in bioresources and, hence, are an increasing attraction for outsiders. Mountain communities are perfect examples of such peripheral groups within nation states. Because of their conditions and unique characteristics, their development and well-being can be fostered with approaches that suit their livelihoods and niches. Paradigmatic orthodoxies need to give way to an integrated approach that values their social/cultural world, their comparative advantages, and their environmental imperatives. In the rest of the paper, I argue that such an approach must embrace the centrality of social and cultural factors and their roles in the

socioeconomic development of these peripheral communities (mountain people of the HKH areas).

In the pursuit of social and economic development, policies and interventions are developed and implemented with goals and objectives backed by economic, technical, and often environmental and social analysis. Although there has been a long tradition of financial, macroeconomic, and technical analyses, environmental and social analyses are rather new additions to project formulation and design steps, and they are still evolving. The impetus for social analysis largely comes from the realisation that several projects and activities, despite their sophisticated designs and ample investments, often fail to deliver their objectives and result in unintended social consequences, much to the chagrin of project planners and administrators. Many of these unintended social consequences have been brought to light by undertaking various forms of impact assessment and ex-post evaluation. Academic and professional social scientists have always called for more attention to social issues in project design and have demonstrated the consequences of socially ill-conceived projects (Freeman et al. 1983; Cernea 1985). Having access to a plethora of materials and stung by critiques for not foreseeing the unintended and negative social consequences of development projects worldwide, some of the main international development and financial institutions have hired in-house expertise on social analysis and developed a variety of analytical methods and tools.

This change was also part of the shift in the dominant development paradigm over time. The rise of the economic paradigm in the 1960s and 1970s, displacing the engineering paradigm of the previous decades, led to the centrality of the macro-programmatic approach, in which the entire investment portfolio was assessed rather than single projects, as the key to the development of underdeveloped areas (Sirageldin 1994). Subsequently, the dominant economic paradigm was confronted with the predicament of an unprecedented and somewhat unpredicted debt crisis in the 1980s, widespread degradation of natural resources and the biosphere, and unintended social and economic consequences of technology-led development initiatives. All these changing circumstances compelled researchers, policy-makers, and administrators to return to the basics, i.e., the 'look at and listen to people' approach, which was advocated by social scientists even before and during the time when the dominant economic paradigm took root.

Rural sociologists and applied (development) anthropologists have been in the forefront in promoting the role of these non-economic disciplines in the process of development. They also exhorted their fellow professionals to define their professional practices, especially to outsiders and more traditional disciplines, e.g., engineers and economists engaged in the theory and practice of development (Coward 1985; Whyte 1982; Rhoades 1983; De Walt 1985). Although there is no one sociology and anthropology, rural sociologists and applied anthropologists have employed several key concepts and constructs in analysing the social and

cultural issues affecting the process of development (Sadeque 1992). The **household-gender dimension** is one such concept in which social scientists study the structure, role, needs, and aspirations of household members. This is then linked to their perceptions, interests, and abilities to participate and benefit from development activities. The **social organisation-institution complex** is another such concept which provides information on social groups, interactions, hierarchy, and class, as well as the complex rules and systems known as institutions around which community life revolves. The most recent addition to this gamut of concepts is the **empowerment-participation interface** which is critical in ensuring involvement in decision-making of the project affected people or the expected beneficiaries and their participation in the ownership and implementation of project activities. Experience suggests that this is critical in ensuring delivery of project objectives and sustainability of the project itself.

The foregoing discussion provides a short summary of the evolution of the various paradigms and social science perspectives on the process of development. It is, however, important to keep in mind that competing paradigms and ideas in development have evolved precisely because no particular viewpoint could hold sway for a period of time. As circumstances change and intended results fail, dominant orthodoxies have to be shed and thus newer ideas and paradigms have emerge. To recapitulate, the dominant **technocratic** or **infrastructure** or **industrial model** was displaced by the **economistic model** which gave way to the **agriculture-led model**. The **economistic** and **agriculture-led models** were also challenged by a variety of neo-Left and dependency perspectives. The free market philosophies of the 1980s are increasingly being supplemented by an emphasis on transparent and accountable governance, public-private partnership, globalisation of economies, and investments in human development and poverty reduction strategies. Historically, the social science perspective has always provided a sobering influence and called for an integrated approach to development, raising its voice against prevalent orthodoxies. The recent emphasis on human development, social sector investment, and so on, which has found its way not only to researchers but also to governments and major national and international management and financial institutions engaged in development planning and management, demonstrates the increasing acceptance of social and cultural perspectives in development paradigms.

One of the limitations of sociological and anthropological research and approaches has been their inability to develop analytical tools and frameworks. This has undervalued the utility of the discipline to practitioners and other disciplines engaged in development activities and theory. From the last decade onwards, applied social scientists at universities, institutes, and international development agencies have addressed this lacuna. As a result, several approaches of and tools for social analysis are now available for incorporating social science perspectives into development planning and management. However, it must emphasised that these tools have emerged from a more pragmatic approach with the view of pursuing development of underdeveloped areas and

disadvantaged sections of society. Therefore, they are inherently loaded with the values of the organisations or people subscribing to a particular paradigm and school of thought. Much work needs to be done to assess the impacts of new global beliefs and convictions, e.g., liberalisation and market orientation, and their resultant impacts upon marginal populations of the Hindu Kush-Himalayas; as well as the utility of uncritically applying these tools with those theoretical underpinnings. However, such a task is beyond the scope of the present paper, and we give a note of caution and point out the caveat before we describe these tools. A few representative ones are discussed in the following pages. These analytical approaches and tools provide the essential elements for sociocultural appraisal which could be used by project planners and specialists engaged in project implementation to incorporate the much-needed social perspectives into development research and programme planning.

Social Assessment

The World Bank, as one of the premier development finance institutions in the world, by virtue of its global experience and for enlisting non-economic social scientists in its core staff, has very recently (1994) developed a social analysis perspective as a part of its sector work, country assessments, and lending activities. Although a comprehensive framework for incorporating social (development) issues into the Bank's activities is yet to be formulated and is still evolving, the Bank Group's concern with social issues has already resulted in a number of commendable developments. One such very recent (1996) development is a Social Screening Data Sheet that is filled in by the activity's Task Manager at a very early stage of Project Formulation, i.e., the concept paper stage. It is a planning tool comprised of a checklist of critical social information. It includes social screening criteria for the project (Types A to D depending upon the significance of the impact) for gender, social impact, and resettlement issues. Indications of stakeholder participation at all levels impacts upon various stakeholders and the types of social issues to be analysed (gender, ethnic groups, indigenous peoples, poverty, and stakeholder analysis), and mitigation plans. This instrument is a spinoff from the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) tradition and is built upon the EIA format. Having conducted a social analysis at such an early stage, it becomes easier, at least from a management perspective, to carry out the task in subsequent stages.

The World Bank approach to dealing with social issues has largely been motivated by the operational point of view, and that is how it is structured. Further, the Bank's concern with participation has also shaped its social analysis methodology. Indeed, social assessment is one of the methods in what the Bank Group loosely defines as Participatory Development.

The Social Assessment (SA) method developed by the World Bank Staff provides a framework to incorporate social analysis as well as stakeholder participation into operational and analytical work performed by the Bank's staff. The

SA, due to its linkage with operational activities, is highly purposive in selecting the social variables to focus upon. Those variables that have most relevance to operational activities are selected for analysis in terms of their criticality in project impact and success. Therefore, the SA is essentially a project-oriented, decision-making tool. Its objectives are as follow (Box 2).

Box Two

- Identify key stakeholders and establish an appropriate framework for their participation in project selection, design, and implementation.
- Ensure that project objectives and incentives for change are acceptable to the range of people it is intended to benefit and that gender and other social differences are reflected in project design.
- Assess the social impact of investment projects and, where adverse impacts are identified, determine how they can be overcome or at least substantially mitigated.
- Develop ability at the appropriate level to enable participation, resolve conflict, permit service delivery, and carry out mitigation measures as required.

Source: The World Bank 1996.

In the context of the project, the stakeholders occupy a very prominent position in the SA. The stakeholders may include the government (the borrower) and its line agencies; directly affected groups, including people and organisations; and at-risk groups such as the poor, children, women, indigenous people, minorities, and marginal communities. Indirectly affected groups are comprised of other vested interest groups, including donors, NGOs, the private sector, and other religious and community groups.

SAs are carried out by social scientists at any stage of the project, but they are recommended at the identification stage to allow maximum incorporation of social issues in project design and implementation. This is an outcome to follow after the Social Screening Data Sheet, if SAs are recommended. The SA, as already noted, are a highly focussed instrument concentrating on key variables thought to be pertinent to operational activities. The following are a sample of common questions investigated in the SA process (Box 3).

From the foregoing account, it is rather clear that the SA as a methodological tool is overly concerned with stakeholders and their participation. For the Bank, lending is critical and portfolio management is the obvious yardstick. Therefore, stakeholder participation (particularly the client, borrowing government)

Box Three

- Who are the stakeholders? Are the objectives of the project consistent with their needs, interests, and capacities?
- What social and cultural factors affect the ability of stakeholders to participate or benefit from the operations proposed?
- What is the impact of the project or programme on the various stakeholders, particularly on women and vulnerable groups? What are the social risks (lack of commitment or capacity and incompatibility with existing conditions) that might affect the success of the project or programme?

Source: The World Bank 1996

Box Five

is of immense importance. That is why the whole SA is tilted towards that objective. As it has been developed and structured with operational activities (lending and, to some extent, impact) in mind, it is narrowly focussed or rather underdesigned. It is very purposive and strives to identify issues directly related to participation of project beneficiaries and the impact on targeted groups. While in general that is a valid objective and consistent with the institution's (The World Bank) functions, it precludes several key areas and thus becomes a tool only to serve certain needs and not a method to guide scientific investigation. One of the key areas the SA does not foray into is the social organisation of the stakeholders' community and their traditional management systems/knowledge (where applicable). This has been found to be a key element in project success if properly understood and incorporated into project design (Coward 1985, Pollnac 1985, Noronha and Spears 1985), especially in agricultural and natural resource fields. Moreover, despite recognising the centrality of participation, the target group is provided the same or less weightage than other stakeholders. Therefore, people are not necessarily at the centre of the assessment. And lastly, although it is commendable that the largest and most influential development institution in the world has rather belatedly instituted some element of social analysis into its operational and sectoral work, comprehensive compliance with such procedures is far from assured as the Sector Operating Divisions (the project people) and their national counterparts are still far more important in the operations of the institution, characterised by its lending fetish.

However, despite its limitations, it is a welcome addition to the body of management tools for decision-making. When applied along with other tools, such as Gender Analysis, Beneficiary Assessment, and others, the SA can be a powerful tool for providing critical information on social issues.

The Social Soundness Analysis

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) can be credited with the pioneering effort for incorporating social issues into their programme cycle ever since the early eighties. USAID calls the approach 'Social Soundness Analysis', and it is duly incorporated into Handbook 3, one of their operational manuals. The Social Soundness Analysis (SSA), described in Handbook 3, Appendix 3F, PP.1-12, and 'Sociocultural Considerations at Programme Identification Document (PID) Stage', described in the same Handbook, Appendix 2C, P.1-5, provide the procedures and process the agency must employ in identifying and designing a project (technical assistance, investment, or a combination of both). The Social Soundness Analysis has three interrelated components: (A) sociocultural feasibility, (B) spread effect, and (C) social consequences and benefit incidence.

A. Sociocultural Feasibility

The sociocultural feasibility of a project/activity begins with learning about the social and cultural landscape of the country or project area. For this, an assessment of prevailing values, beliefs, social structure, and organisation needs to be studied. This would then lead towards the contextualisation of the project, and therefore would hopefully result in least social disruption in the given project area — an important criteria for project success. In addition to an understanding about values and beliefs, which will help design the project in a socially benign way, exposition of the social structure will provide crucial information on existing groups and power relationships in the society and the nature of the desired structure, if deemed necessary. The sociocultural feasibility approach is sufficiently broad-based and includes the following categories of information (Box 4).

Box Four

- | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Who lives where? | • How are they Organised? |
| Allocation of Time | • Motivation |
| Minimum Participator Profile | • Matching Participators and Projects |
| Obstacles | • Communication Strategies |

Source: USAID 1982

B. Spread Effects : The Diffusion of Innovation

Spread or multiplier effects are critical in ensuring return on development expenditure, as well as for promoting equitable distribution of development benefits. Also, in the case of working with technological innovations or policy re-

forms, the spread effects can bring significant value to allocated resources. Therefore, it is critical to look into the demonstration effect upon indirect beneficiaries of the project, which ultimately ties into project or strategy goals or vision. However, spread effects cannot be achieved automatically, and the success of spread effects hinges upon the willingness and ability of the target beneficiaries and other indirect groups to participate in the project. Achievement of spread effects is a multidisciplinary and multi-sectoral issue that must transcend mere economic incentives and consider geographical and social dimensions as well. However, the concern here is more sociocultural than technical and the project must demonstrate that the possibilities of spread effect are not constrained by sociocultural variables present in the society in which the project will operate. The spread effects' component of SSA should look into the following variables (Box 5).

Box Five	
Initial (Project) Setting and Broader Population Patterns of Mobility Maximum Information and Resource Distance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership/Authority • Previous Project Design and Execution
Source: USAID 1982	

C. Social Consequences and Benefit Incidence

The impact of any project and its spread to a wider population is likely to affect different groups in different ways. This differential impact raises the question of equity and impact upon vulnerable groups, particularly the poor, women, and other marginalised groups. The increasing concern with providing benefits to the poor, often bypassed in development projects, flags the importance of studying carefully the differential impacts and their possible social consequences. It is essential to bear in mind that provision of goods and services by a project is not a sufficient condition for accrual of project benefits to intended beneficiaries, because benefits can be expropriated by untargeted intermediaries or other powerful forces present within the community. Furthermore, it needs to be carefully observed whether gains achieved through project activities can result in unintended social consequences, contrary to local values, or whether they could negatively affect the social integration of the target groups. The social consequences and the Benefit Incidence Component should look into the following issues (Box 6).

The SSA is once again a project-oriented tool for social analysis. It has been organised and structured to meet the social data needs of USAID project prepa-

Box Six

Access to Resources and Opportunities
Displacement, Migration, and
Urbanisation

- Employment
- Changes in Power and Participation

Source: USAID 1982

ration. The guidelines are quite comprehensive and thorough and, if employed to the fullest potential, SSA can yield substantial information that could be used to develop projects that are socially sensitive and sustainable. The data needs of SSAs can be met through secondary sources, field surveys, and qualitative techniques. A rational combination of these sources and techniques can yield the desired database for the analysis. Overall, SSA is a comprehensive tool and, depending upon priority, it can be creatively employed. However, as with SA, it is also a purposive tool developed for a better project design and, therefore, critical lacunae exist. One such omission is the institutional and policy interface which is very important for understanding societies prior to interventions. The other problem with such approaches is the *a priori* assumption about the need for such interventions. People might be poor, but their social and cultural aspirations might prioritise other than project-oriented objectives. It could be erroneous to assume that people want a certain type of development project as opposed to anything else. Finally, having an operational tool of this nature is not always a necessary condition for having sound social analysis prior to project preparation as, often, SSA is not accorded due importance in the project, thus undermining the efficacy and potentials of SSA in project design and implementation.

Both the SA and SSA were developed by international development agencies for their particular objectives and mandates. For this reason they are tied to projects, instead of being a complete framework in themselves. Nonetheless, they can be used, with modifications, by others as practical tools or guidelines for social analysis. Furthermore, it should be noted that these institutions, despite having access to such tools, do not always use them to the fullest extent, for, sometimes other overriding interests or preoccupations abort or cut short the social analysis process.

Human and Social Capital Formation

During the 1980s, economic growth theorists were beginning to be disillusioned with the prevalent neo-classical orthodoxy which emphasised economic growth as a result of accumulation of physical capital and expansion of the labour force, along with technological progress. Growth was being experienced in many parts of the world, but poverty, inequality, and degradation of the environmental and

natural resource base often accompanied economic growth. Such growth, instead of improving people's lives, was dehumanising human existence and was aptly called 'ruthless growth', 'rootless growth', 'voiceless growth', 'futureless growth', and so on and so forth by a global concern group of leading economists and planners. This group was assembled by the UNDP to devise an alternative development strategy, beginning in 1990. The collective effort of this distinguished group resulted in the publication of the Human Development Report annually since 1990. This group can be credited with developing alternative and more rational measures of progress of nations, e.g., 'Human Development Index (HDI)', 'Real GDP per capita (PPP\$)', and the 'Capability Poverty Measure' abandoning conventional and misleading estimates such as GDP and GNP per capita indicators. The increased attention and focus on human development as the primary goal of growth and vice versa have been largely influenced by the works of Amartya Sen and his concept of 'human capabilities'. By human capabilities, the Oxford and Harvard Economics' professor, Sen, postulates that, in choosing the lifestyle its people values, a society's standard of living can be better judged than by income indicators. He also emphasises freedom of choice as the core of human well-being. Economists such as Paul Romer and Robert Lucas also promoted the human development position by pointing out that the real motive force of economic progress is people (UNDP 1996). People's productive capacities were tested as the important factor in long-term economic growth rates. Thus came human capital theories in economic growth and progress.

Some of these new models argue that as 'human behaviour,' reflected by accumulation of productive factors and knowledge, can be changed by policy, it is essential to place an emphasis on human capital. Human capital development is essentially broader than human resource development, and the two should not be confused. Human resource development essentially refers to improvements in the productive capabilities of human beings through education, training, and so on, while human capital formation, by contrast, identifies the well-rounded development of people as the end. Improvement of human capabilities is an essential component of human well-being, whether that results in economic returns or not is a moot point.

Very recently, a new term 'Social Capital' has been formulated to advance the emphasis on human and social development issues in the process of economic growth. The arguments follow that a common identification of people with shared norms and values (social cohesion and integration), with institutions having legitimacy to mediate conflicts and competing claims, and a system of governance that promotes an enabling environment for all these, form social capital. If, social capital is in short supply, then sustainability, economic growth, and even social stability will be hard to attain. Examples are "*all too painfully evident from Somalia to Yugoslavia to Rwanda*" (Sirageldin and Steer 1994: 31). The functioning of social and economic order that we often take for granted is impossible to imagine without this social capital. However, we have to remind ourselves that these are path-breaking ideas and not yet fully tested empiri-

cally. Nevertheless, efforts are underway to demonstrate the crucial linkage. Professor Robert P. Putnam and his associates have convincingly shown that existence of civic society is the precursor and guarantor of good governance and economic growth. Preponderance of voluntary horizontal associations in contrast to hierarchical vertical associations has made the difference for northern Italy in rapid development and welfare compared to southern Italy, which has just the opposite (Putnam 1993 as quoted in Sirageldin and Steer 1994). People acting as a strong cohesive community can achieve more than individuals in an atmosphere of trust and long-term vision, reducing transaction costs and promoting sustainability. In such an environment, transparency is evident, reducing corruption and inefficiency (UNDP 1996). This is the enabling environment that growth of social capital can promote and nurture for sustainable economic development and welfare.

Despite the linkage between democratisation of societies and economic development, in recent years the world has witnessed remarkable economic growth under authoritarian regimes. Mostly concentrated in East Asia, these countries have benefited from a combination of a fortuitous global economic situation and pragmatic policies orchestrated by export-led development strategies. However, many of these miracles were underwritten by a great deal of external financial and administrative support and may go down in history as exceptions. It is important to note also that, whenever these societies were exposed to a downturn in the global economy, they were often plagued with violence and socially disruptive action, as the mediating force within was hardly present because of the lack of democratisation and eminence of values espoused by civil society.

Participatory Rapid Appraisal

Large-scale surveys often precede development project formulation in order to collect the required database, or are employed to evaluate or monitor on-going projects. Large-scale sample surveys or surveys based on total enumeration are useful for providing the wealth of information necessary for decision-making in project appraisal and evaluation. However, the down side is that the requirements of such exercises, in terms of resources and time, often render them too costly and time-consuming to be justifiable. Additionally, these surveys often collect far more data than are needed or definitely used for the purposes stated. Furthermore, such surveys designed and carried out by outsiders are often highly subjective and miss critical insights and useful information, because the methods employed in data gathering can result in response or sample error and bias. Realising these limitations of survey research, during the late 1970s social scientists and other applied field researchers developed several variants of rapid appraisals based on local knowledge, that were undertaken in a participatory mode by experts and beneficiaries or by local people. 'Participatory Rapid Appraisal (PRA)' is one such tool. Evolving from 'Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA)' and

'Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA)', with initial emphasis on fields such as rural development, the new Participatory Rapid Appraisal, henceforth referred to as PRA, can be undertaken in any community or region expending far less time and resources, and it introduces the participatory process at a very early stage of the programme or project cycle. The key tenets of PRA are as follow.

- A. **Participation:** Local people are key actors in the exercise, both for its value for indigenous knowledge and perception as well as to introduce local participation in development.
- B. **Teamwork:** The PRA Team consists of local people representing segments of the population and national and/or international experts representing the various disciplines essential for the particular project or activity. Well-balanced teams are critical for the success of the method as it depends largely on informal data gathering within a limited timeframe.
- C. **Flexibility:** PRA does not follow any particular given structure. Techniques to be followed depend upon the size and the skill of the PRA Team, topic and location of study, and the time and resources available.
- D. **Selectivity:** For the sake of efficiency, the PRA Team gathers just enough information necessary for devising recommendations or action plans. This is also referred to as 'optimal ignorance'.
- E. **Validity:** As PRA gathers largely qualitative data, triangulation for assessing the validity and reliability of data gathered is always followed.

PRA is a shared learning process whereby outsiders (experts) have a facilitating role rather than being in control of the process. It uses simple techniques that can be comprehended and employed by the local people whose knowledge is an essential component of the learning process. It also requires transparency and, therefore, strives to take the local people into confidence. For this reason, a series of open meetings involving local residents is part of the process. Although flexible in approach, PRA uses a number of tools to gather the necessary information.

- Semi-structured Interviewing
- Key Informants
- Mapping and Modelling
- Seasonal and Historical Profiles
- Focussed Group Discussion
- Preference Ranking
- Case Studies
- Observations

Although PRA is largely carried out through informal discussion modes, discussion with officials or NGO-CBO workers and use of official records are not precluded from the exercise. Attention to details and sensitivities in dealing with local people, community workers, and government officials are critical to the success of PRA exercises. Finally, establishing rapport with the local people is crucial and team-building has to be well thought out.

As PRAs are more informal and less structured, it is crucial that they are organised well and rather intensively. Typically, the PRA organising process involves logistical arrangements, training of team members, sorting out expectations from and outputs of the exercise, and strict adherence to the time frame, which is inevitably short (from days to months). Furthermore, the reporting structure of PRAs is also different from standard survey-based approaches. Consequently, reports should be short, highlighting people's needs and matching options developed on the basis of a consultative process. Social Mapping, Ranking, and Modelling exercises are common PRA outputs.

Gender Analysis

Over the last few decades, women's issues have gained increasing attention from wide-ranging groups and constituents: from feminists to development theorists, policy planners, legislators, and various other civic groups. In the 1970s, widespread inequality between men and women brought forth the issues and concerns about women within various circles. Policy and programme responses to such concerns translated into concepts such as Women in Development (WID). The earlier notions of the concept had a rather limited meaning and were primarily aimed at reducing the inequality between men and women. This approach soon identified WID with the likes of a special interest group. WID programmes were developed and thought of as an add-on sub-project to main development activities. Subsequently, further research and conceptualisation on the issue led to a dramatic shift in the prevailing thinking. It was shown convincingly that much of the inequality was rooted in the dominant patriarchal nature of societies and due to differential access to resources (on a gender basis). Differential achievements were due to purposive or insensitive policies favouring men and the entire problem was structural in nature. Furthermore, it was noted with increasing alarm that, unless there was substantive reorientation of existing development policies and programmes, half the world's population would not benefit from progress and growth, and, without half of the population moving ahead, societies as a whole could not improve their standards of living or quality of life. Development expenditures, instead of making people's lives better, would only exacerbate inequality between men and women and, consequently, the entire development process would grind to a halt. Acceptance of such a premise led to the development of what is now known as Gender Analysis. Subsequently, Gender Analysis (GA) was linked to development and the term 'women' was substituted by Gender in the reformulated Gender and Development (GAD) framework (Box 7).

Contrary to the misconceptions about or limitations of WID or GAD, what the framework today represents is a much broader and more integrated analytical approach and development paradigm, which has also been operationalised systematically through checklists and questions. The following major issues summarise what can be described as the Gender Framework (Box 8).

Box Seven

- WID or GAD is not a special interest.
- It is not a women-only project.
- It is not a sub-project attached to the main one.
- It is not merely concerned with 'traditional' women's concerns (health, nutrition, education).
- It is not only an equity issue.
- It is not only beneficiary-oriented.
- It is not merely social analysis.

Source: Adapted from a USAID internal note (undated)

Over the years, gender concerns have been systematically factored into methodological tools and analytical frameworks. Several source books, handbooks, and training materials have also been developed. In fact, most multilateral and bilateral development agencies have gender units or focal persons and have their own generic or sectoral training materials. The

World Bank has also developed a systematic Gender Analysis Framework based on its country and sector work experience. The Gender Analysis Framework contains the following key concepts and principles (Boxes 9 and 10).

Box Eight

It is a cross-cutting issue
It is an economic variable

- It is an integrated development approach.
- It is aimed at increasing women's productive capacity

Source: USAID internal document (undated)

Box 9: GAD Key Concepts

- | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Practical Gender Needs | • Strategic Gender Needs |
| Intra-household dynamics | • Inter-household dynamics |

Source: The World Bank 1996

Box 10: GAD Key Principles

- | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| Planning as a process | • Gender diagnosis |
| Gender objectives | • Gender strategy |
| Gender monitoring and evaluation | |

Source: The World Bank 1996

The Gender Analysis (GA) framework as described is a summary of existing approaches and provides a comprehensive overview of how they may be undertaken in an area or project context. GA essentially comes up with appropriate data and information on incorporating women's concerns and mainstreaming women into development activities.

The preceding discussion on various approaches and tools of Social Analysis points out that these put together form a powerful method for undertaking comprehensive Social Analysis. Some of the tools, particularly SA, SSA, and GA, were developed with projects in mind. Therefore, they have their limitations and are essentially narrow in focus. However, emerging concepts, such as 'Human and Social Capital Formation', PRA, and the general framework of social science concepts referred to earlier hold far greater potential for conducting comprehensive analysis on social issues and development.