



Analyzing the Social Impacts of Disasters

Volume II: Tools

World Bank/GFDRR

World Bank
Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery

February 2015

Table of Contents

<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	<u>4</u>
PURPOSE & AUDIENCE OF TOOLS	5
HOW TO USE THESE TOOLS	5
<u>KEY CONCEPTS IN SOCIAL ANALYSIS</u>	<u>7</u>
KEY CONCEPTS	8
<u>SAMPLE RESEARCH TOPICS</u>	<u>10</u>
<u>SAMPLE FIELD GUIDE OUTLINES</u>	<u>34</u>
<u>SAMPLE DATA FORMATS</u>	<u>42</u>
1. VILLAGE DATA SHEET	44
2. VILLAGE SUMMARY SHEET	52
3. FGD & INTERVIEW NOTES	58
4. SITE REPORT	65
5. INSTITUTIONAL REPORT	66
6. SOCIAL RISK ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK	58
<u>ADMINISTRATION</u>	<u>73</u>
1. SAMPLE TERMS OF REFERENCE	74
2. BUDGETS & FINANCE	76
3. CONTRACT & GRANT MODALITIES	79

INTRODUCTION

Purpose & audience of the tools

These tools provide guidance on conducting post-disaster social impact analysis. They are aimed primarily at early recovery and reconstruction actors from governments, the international community and civil society who participate in the PDNA and longer-term post-disaster monitoring. They are also intended as a resource for government institutions and other actors who wish to conduct post-disaster social impact analysis outside the PDNA framework, for example in countries where the government has not requested the support of the international community to manage its disaster response.

How to use these tools

The tools are in two volumes.

Volume I: Methodology

Volume I is aimed primarily at teams conducting social impact analysis and local research partners, but also has guidance for PDNA coordinators and government.

Chapter One, 'Why Analyze the Social Impacts of Disasters', introduces social impact analysis, outlines the rationale for analyzing the social impacts of disasters and presents case studies from the Philippines and Myanmar.

Chapter Two, 'Getting Started', outlines the overall steps and decisions involved in post-disaster social impact analysis.

Chapter Three, 'Research Design', identifies the steps involved in research design. It provides guidance on scope and sampling, introduces the main research instruments, and identifies key research domains.

Chapter Four, 'Fieldwork', identifies the steps involved in conducting fieldwork. It guides the local partner on preparing a field guide and on fieldwork procedures, including detailed guidance on interviewing, conducting focus groups and surveys, managing and storing data, and research ethics and safety.

Chapter Five, 'Analysis' identifies the steps involved in synthesizing, analyzing and presenting data. It highlights common issues that may arise and presents experiences of conducting post-disaster social analysis from Myanmar and the Philippines.

Volume II: Tools

Volume II is aimed at teams conducting social impact analysis and local research partners. It contains further practical and operational resources.

Chapter One introduces some background concepts in social analysis.

Chapter Two is a more detailed overview of the research domains and includes an overview of the main findings of the second round of social impact monitoring in Myanmar.

Chapter Three is a sample outline for a research field guide and includes additional guidance on how to implement some of the basic qualitative research tools.

Chapter Four contains sample data formats for conducting fieldwork.

Chapter Five contains a: (i) sample terms of reference and budget and information on contract and grant modalities; and (ii) sample terms of reference for the contracting of a gender specialist to support the analysis.

CHAPTER ONE:

KEY CONCEPTS IN SOCIAL ANALYSIS

Key concepts

In order to conduct social impact analysis, it is useful to understand some basic concepts in social analysis and how they relate to disaster recovery. Definitions and approaches to some of the concepts vary. These tools thus take a simplified approach:

Social capital refers to the networks and norms of trust and reciprocity among people that enable them to act collectively to pursue shared objectives.¹ After disasters, people rely on social capital to help one another rebuild their lives and communities: for example, they may offer one another shelter, look after one another's children, volunteer their free time to rebuild community infrastructure, or organize themselves to advocate for their community's needs among aid providers. Research on disasters has shown that the level of social capital is one of the strongest predictors of the speed and effectiveness of post-disaster recovery.² Social capital can, however, be damaged by certain types of aid interventions, such as those in which people are resettled into disparate communities where they know few people or where some social groups are perceived to be unfairly benefiting over others.

Social cohesion refers to the nature and extent of social and economic divisions within a particular society.³ It is closely related to social capital. Socially cohesive communities tend to be ones whose members feel some sense of belonging and community, and either share values or a tolerance for one another's differences, but do not need to be homogenous or always harmonious. They usually have low levels of perceived social and economic inequity. After disasters, socially cohesive communities may find it easier to face the collective challenge of rebuilding. The aid effort may, however, damage social cohesion by creating perceived inequalities among groups, which can lead to wider social problems.

Collective action refers to people acting together to pursue a shared end. This, however, can be hard to achieve: it can be difficult to get individuals to join others in providing a good the entire community can use, such as a public road or bridge, because doing so costs time, money or energy and people may be tempted simply to benefit without contributing. If enough people make this calculation, it can mean the good is not provided. However, this is less likely in small or socially cohesive communities where people know and trust each other, feel some social obligation to contribute, and expect that others will reciprocate. After disasters, affected communities face the collective challenge of rebuilding their physical infrastructure and other aspects of their communities. They may be asked to contribute their labor and time to this effort. People are more likely to do this in communities with higher levels of social capital and cohesion.

Social inclusion/exclusion refers to the extent to which people have equitable access to the things that benefit their communities, including markets, public services, decision-making processes and community life.⁴ Socially inclusive societies tend to be ones whose members feel valued and respected. Conversely, social exclusion can mean people are shut out of the social, political, economic and cultural systems that make up the social fabric of their communities. After disasters, aid interventions may increase social inclusion by ensuring that all community members, not simply elites, are able to participate in aid decision-making and benefit from aid programs. They may also, however, unintentionally create social exclusion by promoting the needs of certain groups over others. If the wider community is not involved in these decisions, this can lead to social cleavage and division. Programs targeted at particular groups may promote social inclusion along some dimensions but promote social exclusion along others.

Social risk focuses on the aspects of social capital, cohesion and inclusion/exclusion which are

¹ A distinction is usually made between 'bonding' social capital, which links similar individuals, and 'bridging' social capital, which links dissimilar individuals, crossing social boundaries such as ethnicity, income or religion.

² See Daniel P. Aldrich. "The Power of People: Social Capital's Role in Recovery from the 1995 Kobe Earthquake" *Natural Hazards* (2010) and Daniel P. Aldrich, *Fixing Recovery: Social Capital in Post-Crisis Resilience* June 2010

³ See Easterly, W., Ritzan, J., & Woolcock, M. *Social Cohesion, Institutions and Growth*. Washington DC: Center for Global Development Working Paper no. 94, August 2006.

⁴ See Asian Development Bank. *Handbook on Social Analysis*. Manila: Asian Development Bank, 2007.

associated with an increased risk of crime, violence and social unrest. Specifically, it looks at the mechanisms through which disasters, and the quality of disaster response, can give rise to: a) increased crime and violence connected to a breakdown in law and order, a weak institutional framework, and increased destitution or deprivation among disaster victims; and/or b) social protests and civil unrest, including low level violence and political protests.

Social unrest refers to protests in the form of peaceful as well as violent demonstrations and strikes, as well as acts of civil and political violence (OECD, 2011: 18). The forms of violence considered include: collective violence and interpersonal violence. *Collective violence* refers to violence committed by larger groups of individuals (social, political or economic); *interpersonal violence* refers to violence between individuals including family/intimate partner violence (eg child maltreatment; partner violence, elder abuse) and community violence (property crimes, youth violence, assaults by strangers, workplace violence, etc (WHO, 2002).

Participation refers to people taking part in decisions about the things that affect them. Disaster recovery involves a number of decisions, including about what to rebuild where and in what order, what kinds of targeting methods should be used, which community members are able to benefit from aid programs and how aid programs are run. If affected community members are able to participate in those decisions, it makes it more likely that the programs will meet local needs and fit with local realities. It is important, however, that projects make an effort to ensure that community elites do not dominate decision-making. Poorer community members may lack the time, ability or information necessary to participate in such projects and represent their interests effectively, as more of their time is taken up trying to make ends meet.

Institutions refer to the formal and informal rules and norms that govern how people behave. These 'rules of the game' are distinct from, but underpin, **organizations**, which are groups of people who organize themselves for some purpose, such as prayer groups, farming cooperatives, credit unions, sporting clubs, schools and village councils. The strength of local institutions and organizations are an important determinant of how well communities are able to recover from disaster, organize themselves and represent their needs, but they can also serve as a mechanism for social exclusion. Local institutions and organizations may also be affected by the disaster and aid effort. For example, young people may be extremely active in the aid effort, which may affect the wider 'rules of the game' and give them a more prominent position in their communities.

Gender analysis looks at the relationships between females and males. It examines their roles, their access to and control of resources and the constraints they face relative to each other. **Gender-sensitive/awareness** is the ability to recognize different perceptions and interests arising from different social location and gender roles. Gender awareness is the ability to identify problems arising from gender inequality and discrimination, even if these are not very evident on the surface.

CHAPTER 2:

SAMPLE RESEARCH TOPICS

Objectives

This chapter outlines in detail some of the research topics that can be included in a social impact analysis study. It is important to note that:

- Not all research topics are expected to be included in each study. The social impact task team and local partner should decide which to include when determining the scope of the study.
- This is not intended as an interview guide. Instead, during training, the research team should devise a questioning strategy to enable them to get the information outlined in the research topics. This strategy will differ by context and according to cultural norms and therefore cannot be pre-determined by this guidance note. After researchers and the local partner have devised a questioning strategy, the **question probes** they identify should be included in the revised field guide.⁵
- The data formats for the study should be designed once the research topics have been selected. It is important that they are consistent with the research topics. The sample data formats included in this guidance note are for a specific social impact study so should be used as a rough guide only.

I. Socioeconomic Impacts

FOCUS AREA: SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACTS

1. Socioeconomic composition

- Livelihood groups
- Wealth categories
- Vulnerable groups

2. Livelihoods recovery

Impacts on assets, livelihood strategies and outcomes for key groups, such as:

- Farmers
- Fishers
- Casual laborers
- Traders
- Commerce & industry

3. Local economic structure

- Markets
- Debt & credit
- Land & property rights

4. Household coping strategies

- Reducing expenditure
- Internal displacement, migration & resettlement
- Remittances

This focus area analyzes how the disaster and relief and recovery effort affect the assets, capabilities and ability to recover of men and women from different socioeconomic groups within the affected communities. This includes: how different socioeconomic groups are progressing in recovering their livelihoods; why they are progressing the way they are, including impacts on markets, debt and credit, and land; and what households are doing to cope with the disaster's impact, including reducing expenditure and migrating in search of work. It also includes impacts of the disaster and relief and recovery effort on vulnerable groups.

⁵ An example of how to tailor the research domains to suit context and devise a questioning strategy, complete with 'question probes' for each research domain, can be found in the field guide for the social impact assessment conducted in the Philippines. It can be downloaded at <http://www.pdf.ph/downloads/PDNA/PDNA-Social Impact Assessment FINAL 20100725.pdf>.

1. Socioeconomic composition

This topic examines how the disaster and relief and recovery effort have altered the socioeconomic composition of affected communities. It aims to map the primary livelihoods and different wealth categories as a starting point from which to examine impacts on livelihood recovery, the local economic structure and household coping strategies.

1.1 Livelihood groups

- *Livelihood groups in affected communities.* The aim here is to identify a breakdown of these groups both before and after the disaster. Combined with the wealth categories outlined below, this information will be used as the basis for examining the livelihoods recovery ability and coping strategies among different socioeconomic groups. It outlines the main livelihood activities of different groups of women and men over the course of the year, the proportion of women and men seeking their primary livelihood through that activity, and the basic details of that activity.⁶ Guidance on how to gather this information is given in the annexes.

1.2 Wealth categories.

- *Wealth categories.* The aim here is to identify a wealth breakdown of different groups in affected communities, both before and after the disaster. What are the different wealth categories within that community? What does it mean to be 'rich', 'medium' or 'poor'? What differentiates people in those categories? What kinds of houses do they live in, what clothes do they wear and what food do they eat? Guidance on how to gather this information is given in the annexes.

1.3 Vulnerability

- *Vulnerability.* The aim here is to identify a 'vulnerability map' in affected communities before and after the disaster, in order to identify which are the most vulnerable groups in a way that is not pre-determined. Who do community members believe are the most vulnerable or marginalized in their communities? Why are they considered vulnerable? Has this changed since the disaster and if so how?

2. Livelihoods recovery

This topic uses the socioeconomic groups identified above to identify the impact of the disaster on the ability of men and women to recover their livelihoods. For each of the main livelihood & wealth groups identified in a particular community, the aim is to understand the impact of the disaster and relief and recovery effort on:

- *Men's and women's assets and resources* (human resources such as labor, physical resources such as livestock, boats, farm equipment, tools and stock to run small businesses or trades; financial resources such as savings and credit; and natural resources such as land, which may be depleted by the disaster but partly replaced by appropriate livelihoods aid).
- *How men and women use* those resources to earn a livelihood (what strategies they employ and how they are able to use their assets, for example, the number of acres of farmland they plant, which is affected by the price of *inputs* and the availability of resources; or how they re-establish damaged small businesses in badly-affected urban neighborhoods).
- *What men and women are able to earn* from their use of their assets (for example, the amount of profit a farmer makes, which is affected by the price of her inputs, her production yield, her access to markets, the cost of transport, how much she is able to sell and what price she is able to get for her products).

Sex-disaggregated information should be collected for all sub-topics to the extent possible. This is especially the case for poor households, which often rely on a number of economic survival strategies and not only on one occupation or bread-winner. It is important to explore secondary occupations and/or supplementary income earning strategies in poor households and how these have been affected by the disaster. This includes probing on the economic contributions of women and obtaining an understanding of the gender division of labor within households (eg where women play ancillary roles in cash crop production or fish processing to their husbands, produce food for home consumption in vegetable gardens, run informal home-based businesses

⁶ E.g. in Village 1, 50% of people seek their primary livelihood through farming of rice and cassava.

such as snack production, etc). Additionally, female household members in a number of countries may initially respond to questions regarding their economic roles: "I am just a housewife." It can be helpful in this situation to ask women to describe what tasks they perform in a typical day.

It also is useful to obtain information regarding the impact of the disaster on youth employment/livelihoods, along with any other serious recent economic shock or downturn (eg high inflation affecting prices of essential goods), as these can be potential factors in present or future coping capacity and social risk.

The sub-topics will depend on the livelihood groups that exist in the community. Some common livelihood types are listed below, along with associated research areas:

2.1 Farmers

For different kinds of farmers, differentiated by wealth:

- *Productive assets:* How have the disaster and relief and recovery effort affected the assets of farmers? Have they lost family members who work the farms, livestock, farm equipment, access to arable land or their savings or loans? To what extent has the relief and recovery effort helped replace these assets? Are farmers in debt? (Debt and credit are examined in further detail separately). Has the kind of livelihoods aid provided to farmers helped them?
- *Livelihood strategies:* This aims to understand how the disaster and relief and recovery effort have affected how farmers are using their existing assets. Are they planting less of their key crops because the price of seed, fertilizer or labor has gone up? Is this normal and seasonal, or only since the disaster? Are they planting less because they have to spend money to service their loans? Key quantitative information to get is the price of producing their crop (fertilizer, seed, labor and land use).
- *Earnings.* This aims to understand how the disaster and relief and recovery effort have affected farmers' livelihood outcomes. Have farmers' yields gone down? Are they making less profit because the price of transporting their goods to market has increased, because they have less of their crop to sell or because the price of their crop has decreased in the market? Key quantitative information to get is the total yield for their main crops, the costs of selling it (e.g. transport) and the price they are able to get for it.

2.2 Fishers

For different kinds of fishers, differentiated by wealth:

- *Productive assets:* How have the disaster and relief and recovery effort affected the human, physical, natural and financial assets of fishers? Have they lost boats, motors, fishing nets and cash? Has the disaster affected their access to streams and rivers? Has fishing-related livelihood aid been effective?
- *Livelihood strategies:* Have fishers changed how they put their assets to use? Are they catching different kinds of fish? Have they shifted from catching fish to trawling for crabs and mussels (in seaside locations)?
- *Earnings.* This aims to understand livelihood outcomes. Are fishers earning less, and why? Have fishing yields dropped? Are they selling lower-cost types of fish? Has the price of the fish they are selling dropped?

2.3 Laborers (agricultural and non-agricultural)

- *Assets:* How have the disaster and relief and recovery effort affected the human, physical, natural and financial assets of laborers? Have they been injured by the disaster? Have they had less time to work because they are too busy trying to repair their homes or fear theft of their remaining possessions during their absence?
- *Employment:* Have laborers been able to find as much work since the disaster? Have farmers affected by the disaster been able to afford fewer laborers? Have factories, construction sites or other commercial enterprises damaged by the disaster reduced their hiring or been permanently closed?
- *Earnings.* Have the earnings of laborers changed? Has the price of their labor gone up or down? Have their transport costs to/from work increased? How has this affected their earnings?

2.4 Petty traders/micro-enterprises

- *Productive assets:* How have the disaster and relief and recovery effort affected the human, physical, natural and financial assets of traders and women/men who run micro-enterprises? Has the disaster damaged their stock of goods? Has it damaged the place where they sell their goods or, if they sell in different places, how they get their goods to market? If they run a micro-enterprise, for instance making fish paste or soybean cakes, has any of their equipment been destroyed? Have their savings been destroyed? Has livelihoods aid helped them sufficiently?
- *Livelihood strategies:* Have petty traders and people who run micro-enterprises changed their livelihood strategies? Do they have the same access to supply that they did before the disaster? Have the prices of wholesale goods or their raw materials gone up? Has the cost of transporting goods changed? Have they changed what they sell or produce? Why and how?
- *Earnings.* Are petty traders and owners of micro-enterprises making less profit than before? Have prices of their goods changed? Are they selling less than before?

3. Local economic structure

This topic examines how the disaster and relief and recovery effort have affected wider aspects of the local economic structure, including markets, debt and credit, and land. This enables researchers to understand how different parts of the local economy interact and why different socioeconomic groups may be affected in different ways by the disaster and relief and recovery effort.

3.1 Markets

- *Impact on markets.* This aims to understand the impact of the disaster and relief and recovery effort on how markets function. Where and how do producers in communities (farmers, fishers, small business owners) typically sell the things they produce? Has their access to these markets been reduced, for instance because the road to the market is destroyed? Has the cost of transporting goods to markets changed? Has the disaster or relief and recovery effort changed the way that producers get information about prices, for instance by destroying telecommunications infrastructure or by providing producers with new types of information technology? Have prices in the market for key goods changed?

3.2 Debt & credit

This examines the impact of the disaster on the indebtedness of different livelihood and wealth groups and on the availability and cost of credit. It covers such topics as:

- *Purpose of borrowing.* This examines why different groups borrow and the impact of the disaster and relief and recovery effort for this. Are women/men borrowing for food, education, health, housing, and working capital or to repay previous loans? Has this changed? How? Are women/men borrowing to repair their houses? Are they borrowing more to meet basic food needs?
- *Sources of borrowing.* This aims to understand where people are borrowing from and whether this has changed since the disaster. Are women/men borrowing from friends? Relatives? Pawnshops? Informal moneylenders? Shops or small businesses? Traders in the market? Banks and other formal moneylenders? NGOs or other relief and recovery providers?
- *Terms of borrowing and cost of credit.* This aims to understand the terms of borrowing for different kinds of loans. What are the interest rates? Do these differ according to the size of the loans, and how? Do these differ if borrowers have collateral? What are the usual loan terms and implications of default? Do people have to repay daily, weekly, monthly, yearly, seasonally or with some other method? Do the terms of borrowing differ by type of borrower or creditor?
- *Loan sizes and indebtedness.* How much do different livelihood and wealth groups borrow? Has this changed since the disaster? What is the typical loan size? What is the total indebtedness of different groups?
- *Consequences of default.* What happens if borrowers default on their loans? Does their land and other collateral get seized? Are creditors flexible with the loan terms? Do borrowers know their creditors? Do social relations among borrowers and creditors affect how flexible creditors are?

- *Availability of credit.* Have the disaster and relief and recovery effort changed the availability of credit? Are creditors less able to offer loans because their borrowers are less able to repay previous loans? Are relief and recovery programs offering loans? Do the criteria for borrowing exclude or disadvantage any groups (eg those without legal title to land or property, those without collateral, male heads of households only, young adults, etc)
- *Coping with rising debt.* If borrowers are having difficulty with rising indebtedness, how are they coping with this? If creditors are having difficulty, how are they coping?

3.3 Land Use and Property Rights

This aims to understand the impact of the disaster and relief and recovery effort on the use, access and management of land and property (eg houses). It includes topics such as:

- *Land condition.* What is the condition of land normally used for farming? Is it still possible to farm it? Have some people stopped using their land because of its condition?
- *Land yields.* Have yields from the land decreased because the soil quality has decreased? If so, how are farmers coping with this?
- *Land use rights.* Have farmers retained their right to use land? Has land been taken from smaller farmers and given to bigger farmers, companies or business-people? Have the families of farmers who died retained their land-user rights? Have there been any disputes?
- *Housing.* Is legal land or property title normally in the name of husbands or male household members or are female and/or joint titles common? Are people worried they will lose their land or property rights (including those widowed or orphaned by the disaster)? Have there been any disputes? Do post-disaster compensation or livelihood restoration programs require formal land or house ownership among the eligibility criteria or are groups such as renters, squatters and tenant farmers - and women without formal title - included? Do legal and/or working definitions of land/house ownership and inheritance rights recognize widows, orphans or ethnic groups with matrilineal inheritance rights?
- *Relocation/resettlement.* In situations of permanent displacement and resettlement, how have land governance and property rights systems responded to the situation of the affected people (discriminatory or fair resettlement policies and practices)? What is the risk or incidence of manipulation of land and property rights to gain control over/re-develop land owned or occupied by those who are currently temporarily displaced?

4. Coping strategies

This aims to understand how different livelihood and wealth groups have coped with the impact of the disaster and relief and recovery effort on their households, disaggregated by gender whenever possible. It includes such topics as:

4.1 Reducing household expenditure & other coping strategies

- *Household expenditure.* Have different groups reduced their household expenditure as a result of the disaster? How? Have they reduced their food intake? Have they tried to cope in other ways, for instance by selling livestock, taking children out of school or borrowing more money?

4.2 Internal displacement, migration & resettlement

- *Internal displacement.* Are substantial numbers of people having to shelter temporarily in displacement camps, with host families or elsewhere? Will transitional shelter arrangements have to be in place for an extended period (ie from several months to two-three years)? Do the disaster-affected communities include pre-existing encampments or settlements of refugees from other countries? What coping strategies are the IDPs (and refugees, where applicable) using? What relief and recovery assistance have they received?
- *Resettlement & relocation.* Have people had to be permanently resettled because of disaster damage (other than for work)? If so, what resettlement assistance have they received? Do they prefer the current location? Are men and women able to pursue the same livelihoods as before, and what changes to employment and livelihoods have they received? How do they feel about safety and security in the new location? If community members have moved with them, has community cohesiveness changed?

- *Migration.* Have people left the community in search of work elsewhere? If so, have they gone far? Have they found work? Are particular kinds of people leaving, such as men or women, young or old, skilled or unskilled? Have people taken jobs that may put them at risk?
- *Remittances.* Have the remittances that households are receiving changed (increased or decreased)? What are their sources? Do remittances now form a higher proportion of household income?

II. Impacts on Social Relations & Cohesion

This focus area analyzes how the disaster and relief and recovery effort affects social relations at the community level and among communities. This includes the impact on the social composition of affected communities, impacts on the roles of and relations among different social groups, and impacts on social capital, cohesion, and risk.

FOCUS AREA: IMPACTS ON SOCIAL RELATIONS AND COHESION

1. Social composition, roles & relations

- Gender
- Age
- Religion & ethnicity
- Caste
- Immigrant/temporary worker status

2. Social capital & cohesion

- A. Social capital
- B. Social cohesion

1. Social composition, roles and relations

This topic examines the impact of the disaster and relief and recovery effort on the social composition of affected communities and the social roles of and relations among different groups. These groups can be differentiated in several ways, including along gender, age, class, religion, and ethnic and caste lines. However, not all of these categories will be relevant in all post-disaster settings. Although gender and age are usually salient, it is unnecessary to explore caste in societies without a caste system. In religiously or ethnically homogenous societies, it may not be necessary to explore religious or ethnic impacts - or social risk issues - in much depth, though they should still be covered at least briefly to allow any changes in perceptions of religion, ethnicity and/or social risk to be monitored.

1.1 Gender

Gender composition. This aims to understand the impact of the disaster on the gender composition of affected communities. Were disproportionate numbers of women or men killed by the disaster? Has the number of households led by widows or widowers increased? Have marriage patterns changed? Has the disaster affected ages and rates of remarriage or divorce? Has the disaster led to disproportionate migration of women or men out of the community in search of work or spouses outside the community? *Gender roles:* This aims to understand the impact of the disaster on social and economic gender roles, both within households and outside the home. Are men and women taking on different roles within the household? For example, are men taking on what are traditionally thought of as 'women's' duties? Has the disaster and relief/recovery effort affected men's and women's roles outside the home? Are men and women seeking new forms of work, and if so, does this put them at risk of gender-based exploitation? How has the disaster affected young adult men and women, in terms of their livelihoods and social status/roles within communities? Has the role of women and men in the relief and recovery effort affected wider gender roles?

- *Gender relations:* This aims to describe changes in gender relations since the disaster took place and the relief and recovery effort commenced. Do men and women report any changes in gender relations as a result of the relief and recovery effort?
- *Gender-based violence:* This aims to understand how the disaster and relief and recovery effort have affected Gender-Based Violence (GBV) levels. Has the disaster or relief and recovery effort led to an increase in GBV violence (eg domestic violence, sexual assault, etc)

as a result of the exacerbating impact of psychosocial trauma, economic hardship or other factors ?

1.2 Age

- *Age composition.* This aims to understand the impact of the disaster on the age composition of affected communities. Did disproportionate numbers of children or the elderly die (disaggregated by gender and other social groupings where possible)? Were disproportionate numbers of children or the elderly left without caregivers? If so, how are communities coping with this? Have disproportionate numbers of working-age adults left their communities in search of work? What has been the impact of this on the families they have left behind?
- *Age roles:* This aims to understand the impact of the disaster and effort on the social roles of different age groups. Has the change in the age composition of affected communities led younger or older people to take on new tasks? Have younger or older people played a more prominent role in the relief and recovery effort than they might do otherwise?
- *Age relations.* Have changes in the age composition and age roles affected the way that different age groups relate to one another?

1.3 Religion

- *Religious composition.* This aims to understand impacts on the religious composition of affected communities. Did disproportionate numbers of members of one religion die or suffer serious injury (disaggregated by gender and age, where possible), for example because they lived in a different part of the community than others? Have there been any other changes in religious composition as a result of the disaster and relief and recovery effort? Have people increased their level of religious observance as a result of the disaster or converted to other religions after seeing members of those religions participate in the relief and recovery effort? Has there been an increase in inter-religious marriage?
- *Religious roles.* Have there been any changes in the roles of religious figures within the community as a result of the disaster and relief and recovery effort? For example, are religious figures spending a greater proportion of their time on aid-related and community affairs?
- *Religious relations.* Have there been any changes in relations among religious groups as a result of the disaster or relief and recovery effort? Are religious groups active in providing relief and recovery assistance? Have they provided relief and recovery assistance to affected people regardless of religion? Are some religious groups receiving more relief and recovery assistance than others, and if so, how has this affected relations among religious groups? Have people from different faiths been helping one another?

1.4 Ethnicity

- *Ethnic composition.* This aims to understand the impact of the disaster and relief and recovery effort on the ethnic composition of affected communities, including legal and illegal migrants. Did disproportionate numbers of members of one ethnic group die or become seriously injured (disaggregated by gender and/or age where possible)? Have there been any other changes in ethnic composition as a result of the disaster and relief and recovery effort? For example, has there been an increase in inter-ethnic marriage?
- *Ethnic roles.* This aims to understand the impact of the disaster and relief and recovery effort on ethnic roles. Have members of one ethnic group been particularly active in the relief and recovery effort? Have there been any changes in the roles of different ethnic groups as a result of the disaster or relief and recovery effort: for example, are different ethnic groups doing jobs they might not normally do?
- *Ethnic relations.* This aims to understand the impact of the disaster and relief and recovery effort on relations among ethnic groups. Do community members report any positive or negative changes in inter-ethnic relations? Has relief and recovery assistance been provided to all people regardless of ethnicity or migrant status? Are some ethnic groups perceived to be unfairly benefiting over others? If so, what is the impact of this?

1.5 Caste⁷

- *Caste composition.* This aims to understand the impact of the disaster and relief and recovery effort on the caste composition of affected communities. Did disproportionate numbers of particular castes die or suffer serious injury (disaggregated by gender and/or age where possible)? If so, which ones? Has the disaster affected marriage patterns among members of different castes?
- *Caste roles.* This aims to understand the impact of the disaster and relief and recovery effort on caste roles within affected communities. What role have members of particular castes played in the recovery effort? Have people been playing roles they would not normally play? If so, how? What do community members think of this? Do people think any changes will persist?
- *Caste relations.* This aims to understand the impact of the disaster and relief and recovery effort on relations among different caste groups. Have the men and women of certain caste groups been particularly active in the relief and recovery effort? Has relief and recovery assistance been provided to all people regardless of caste? Do community members think certain caste groups are unfairly benefiting over others, or that particular caste groups are neglected? If so, what is the impact of this?

1.6 Immigrant/Temporary worker status

- This aims to understand the impact of the disaster and relief and recovery effort on both legal and illegal migrant populations within the affected communities. Did disproportionate numbers of migrants or temporary workers from other countries die or suffer serious injury (disaggregated by gender and/or age where possible)? If so, from which migrant groups?
- What role have members of migrant/temporary worker groups played in the recovery effort? Has relief and recovery assistance been provided to all people regardless of migrant status? Do community members think certain migrant groups are unfairly benefiting over others, or that particular caste groups are neglected? If so, what is the impact of this?

⁷ This should be investigated if relevant to context.

1.6 Disability

- This aims to understand the impact of the disaster and relief and recovery effort on the forms and levels of disability within affected communities. Did disproportionate numbers of people with disabilities die or suffer serious injuries (disaggregated by gender and/or age where possible)? How many men, women, boys and girls have become permanently physically or mentally disabled as a result of the disaster?
- This aims to understand the impact of the disaster and relief and recovery effort on people with disabilities. Have men and women with disabilities been particularly active in the relief and recovery effort? Has relief and recovery assistance been provided for all people with existing disabilities and those newly disabled as a result of the disaster? Do community members think people with disabilities are unfairly benefiting over others, or that they are neglected? If so, what is the impact of this?

2. Social capital and cohesion

This topic examines the impact of the disaster and relief and recovery effort on social capital and cohesion. It aims to understand whether changes wrought by the disaster and relief and recovery effort have altered either the norms and networks of trust among community members or the level of community and social tension, and is closely related to the sub-topic on inter-group relations above.

2.1 Social capital

- *Strength of social capital:* This aims to understand the strength of social capital in affected communities. Since the disaster, have women and men been helping one another to rebuild their lives, and in what ways? Have people shared their shelter and food with one another and lent their money, time, labor or equipment to the recovery effort, or is there a sense that people are 'in it for themselves'? Have people helped rebuild community infrastructure? Have people worked together to provide assistance for those who are particularly vulnerable? If refugees or displaced people have arrived in the community since the disaster, have they been welcomed into the community?
- *Changes in social capital:* This aims to compare the strength of social capital in affected communities before and after the disaster. Has the experience of going through the disaster together, and participating in rebuilding, changed the norms and networks among community members that enable them to get things done? If people have acted collectively to rebuild their communities, has this approach to solving problems spilled over into other areas of community life? Do men and women belong to more associations, organizations and other groups than they did before the disaster? Has the access of marginalized groups to decision-making roles or bodies changed? If the affected communities suffered from elevated levels of social tension or unrest prior to the disaster, has the experience of the disaster and rebuilding improved or worsened this situation?
- *Social capital and displacement.* If people have been displaced by the disaster or have had to migrate in search of work, has this affected social capital? Do men and women find aspects of their lives harder because they can no longer rely on friends and neighbors to help them? What is the impact of this on their wellbeing?
Where IDPs have to live near to, or within, host communities, have there been any social tensions or unrest in relation to sharing essential resources (eg fuel, food water) or key services (eg sanitation, health, education)? Is there a risk of such tensions arising in future?

2.2 Social cohesion and social risk

- *Impacts on inequality.* This aims to understand if the disaster or relief and recovery effort have increased or decreased wealth disparities in affected communities. How many people have regained their previous economic position? Have people been able to recover their livelihoods at the same rate? Are there now greater or fewer disparities among social groups? How does this manifest itself?

- *Deprivation.* This aims to understand the impact of the disaster and relief and recovery effort on hardship and deprivation. Are some groups struggling considerably compared to others? Have they experienced a persistent lack of food, shelter and other basic goods?
- *Conflict, crime & violence.* This aims to understand the impact of the disaster and relief and recovery effort on conflict, crime and violence. Have the levels and/or types of crime, violence or conflict changed since the disaster? If so, why? Has aid inequality caused social tension or unrest? Has deprivation caused some people to loot or steal from one another? Have levels of violence risen, due to frustrations (eg with a slow aid response or real/perceived inequity in aid distribution) or post-traumatic stress disorders or other psychosocial conditions? Has there been any increase in youth violence or gang activities, particularly in lower income affected urban areas?

Social protection/law & justice.

This aims to understand the response - and the capacity to respond - of post-disaster aid providers to the social risks that have been created or increased as a result of the disaster. Which disaster-affected groups are most exposed to risks of abuse or exploitation? Which have been identified by state and/or local authorities as being most in need of social protection? How have formal and informal social protection and law & justice institutions been affected by the disaster? How active have they been in the relief and recovery effort. How functional and active are civil society organizations in supporting social protection initiatives for vulnerable groups?

III. Relief, Recovery & Accountability

This focus area analyzes the recovery effort as experienced by the men and women of affected communities. It examines how those affected by disaster perceive, participate in and negotiate their interests regarding the aid effort. The underlying aim is to identify any emerging aid-related issues and enable the aid effort to be more responsive to local circumstances. This involves understanding the following topics:

FOCUS AREA: Relief, Recovery & Accountability

1. Overall patterns of relief and recovery assistance

- Levels and types of relief and recovery assistance
- The impact of aid on recovery
- Needs and shortfalls
- Contributions, aid dependency and burden
- Relief and recovery assistance & disaster risk

2. Relief and recovery targeting

- How relief and recovery assistance is targeted
- Aid equity and access
- Vulnerability and marginalization

3. Process of relief and recovery assistance

- Aid decision-making
- Aid distribution
- Aid information
- Aid negotiation

1. Overall patterns of relief and recovery assistance

This topic describes: what and how much relief and recovery assistance has been delivered; the available capacity and political will to deliver this assistance effectively and equitably; the impact of this on recovery and social risk; remaining needs and shortfalls; community contributions, dependency and burden; and the relationship between relief and recovery assistance and disaster risk.

1.1 Levels & types of relief and recovery assistance

- *What relief and recovery assistance has been received:* The aim is for researchers to list all relief and recovery assistance that affected communities have received and classify it into types such as 'health' and 'education'. During the first round of monitoring, researchers should list all relief and recovery assistance communities have received since the start of the relief and recovery effort. During subsequent rounds, researchers should list all relief and recovery assistance received since each previous round of monitoring. A sample relief and recovery assistance matrix can be found in the annexes to this guidance note.
- *How much relief and recovery assistance has been received:* The aim here is for researchers to classify communities into those that have received 'low', 'medium', or 'high' levels of relief and recovery assistance to enable later analysis. In order to do this, researchers need some way of quantifying relief and recovery assistance received. If each aid provider has shared information on the value of their relief and recovery assistance to affected communities, it may be possible to attach a monetary value to the total relief and recovery assistance received in each community. However, this is rare and so usually a proxy must be found. Often affected communities keep records of the *types* of relief and recovery assistance received. In contexts where the levels of relief and recovery assistance received within each type vary little among affected communities, adding up the *number of types of relief and recovery assistance* received can thus often be a useful proxy for assessing how much relief and recovery assistance has been received and thereby classifying affected communities into those that have received 'low', 'medium' and 'high' levels of relief and recovery assistance. If the levels of relief and recovery assistance received within each type *do* vary significantly among communities, researchers should note as much detail as possible about relief and recovery assistance received and later make a judgment call about how to classify communities.

1.2 The impact of relief and recovery assistance on recovery

- *How relief and recovery assistance has affected recovery:* The aim here is for researchers to gather enough information so that they can later assess whether relief and recovery assistance has been a strong determinant of recovery. To do this, researchers will need information on not only how much relief and recovery assistance has been received, but (a) how fast communities are recovering and (b) other factors that might help determine the speed of recovery, namely the level of damage and remoteness from urban centers. The speed of recovery is hard to measure objectively, so researchers will have to note as much detail as they can about recovery signs (such as the number of houses rebuilt) and come to a perceptions-based judgment about how to classify communities into 'slow', 'medium' or 'fast' recovery once they have visited other research locations. Classifications about the level of damage can also be perceptions-based, but ideally will be made based on a proxy. The number of deaths and injuries can be a proxy where this correlates with the overall scale of damage. Where it does not, the proportion of dwellings destroyed can be used.

1.3 Community needs & shortfalls

- *Community needs and priorities:* The aim here is to understand what affected communities themselves feel they need. The easiest way to do this is to ask a socially and economically representative cross-section of female and male community members to rank the top three community priorities and needs. During the first round of research, researchers should ask community members to rank the top three priorities and needs both immediately after the disaster and at the time of the research. During subsequent rounds, researchers should ask community members about current priorities and needs. If affected communities cannot agree on community needs, researchers should note such disagreement.
- *Needs & shortfalls:* The first round of research should explore whether both the amount and type of relief and recovery assistance received has matched community priorities and whether there are any shortfalls in relief and recovery assistance. Subsequent rounds of research should focus on changes since the previous round.

- *Community preferences over the form of relief and recovery assistance:* The aim here is to understand whether and why different community members (eg men, women, those with mobility constraints, etc) prefer cash, credit or in-kind relief and recovery assistance.

1.4 Community contributions, aid dependency & burden

- *Community contributions to the relief and recovery effort:* The aim here is to understand the nature and extent of community contributions to the recovery effort. Are community members expected to contribute their money or labor to rebuilding projects that benefit their communities, such as public roads or bridges? Do certain social groups contribute more than others (eg as a proportion of their total household income or available labor base)? If so, why?
- *Aid burden:* If community members do contribute to relief and recovery projects, what are their feelings about this (disaggregated by gender and other social groupings where possible)? Are they happy to contribute, or do they feel it places undue burden on them? Does the method of decision-making over who contributes what affect how positively or negatively they view their contributions?
- *Aid dependency:* The aim is to understand the extent to which community members are dependent on relief and recovery assistance for survival, including any differences by gender or other social groupings, or whether they fear this taking place over the course of the relief and recovery effort.

1.5 Relief and recovery assistance and reducing future disaster vulnerability

- *Emergency preparedness:* The aim here is to assess how relief and recovery assistance has affected community disaster preparedness. Did affected communities have disaster preparedness plans in place before the disaster? Has this changed? What is the role of men and women in disaster preparedness decision-making and response mechanisms? How sensitive are these mechanisms to different roles and needs by gender, age, disability, ethnic/language group and other social characteristics?
- *The impact of relief and recovery assistance on disaster risk:* Has the community managed to build back in ways that reduce their vulnerability to future disasters? What do they feel would reduce their vulnerability in future?
- *The impact of relief and recovery assistance on the wider environment:* The aim here is to understand if the relief and recovery effort has positively or negatively affected the community's social environment in ways that might alter future vulnerability to disaster, including the potential for increased or decreased risk of social tensions or unrest.

2. Aid targeting

This topic examines what mechanisms are used to target relief and recovery assistance, whether this excludes particular groups, how community members feel about any perceived inequalities in aid provision, and whether the targeting methods used have had any unintended consequences.

2.1 Mechanisms for targeting relief and recovery assistance

- *What targeting mechanisms are used:* The aim is to list and describe the different targeting mechanisms used by relief and recovery projects. For instance, do the projects target all community members, or particular sub-groups, such as women, widows and widowers, or those below a certain income bracket? Who decides on these targeting mechanisms, and how do they differ by project and by village? Do the targeting or eligibility criteria inadvertently or intentionally exclude any vulnerable groups, eg requiring ownership or land, houses of other assets that may exclude poorer people, women and/or tenants; requiring national identity cards for registration which may not be available to some informal settlers or migrant/minority groups; directing assistance at male heads of households which may miss some extended family members or female headed households; etc)
- *Access issues:* Are there any difficulties in accessing some targeted communities or groups, such as security issues, legal status (g illegal informal settlements or illegal migrants), difficult

terrain, or physical/socio-cultural mobility constraints (eg people with disabilities, societies where women do not often leave the home).

- *Community perceptions of targeting mechanisms:* The aim is to understand what community members think of the targeting mechanisms used. Do they believe the mechanisms are fair? Which mechanisms do they prefer and why? Do different groups within the community prefer different kinds of methods? What has been the impact of the targeting mechanisms used?

2.2 Aid equity within communities

- *Equity of aid distribution within communities:* The aim is to describe how relief and recovery assistance has been distributed within communities (this is closely related to relief and recovery assistance targeting, but describes how relief and recovery assistance has actually been distributed, rather than how relief and recovery assistance has been intended to be distributed: corruption or other problems with relief and recovery assistance may mean there is a difference). Who has benefited from relief and recovery compensation schemes and/or projects? Have some people not benefited, and why? Have some groups received significantly more than others? Have those who have received more relief and recovery assistance shared it with those who received less? Has any relief and recovery assistance been targeted to particular groups but actually distributed to others? Why? Has some relief and recovery assistance only gone to certain social groups, such as those of a particular ethnicity or gender?
- *Aid distribution & displacement:* This aims to understand how displacement affects aid distribution. Are there permanently displaced people in the community? Have they been relocated by their government or has relocation occurred spontaneously? If relocated by their government, has the relocation process been forced or voluntary? If so, has special relief and recovery assistance been allocated for them? Does this assistance include appropriate support to rebuild or develop new livelihoods sources? Does the assistance include support to host communities to compensate for increased pressure on local resources (eg fuelwood, water, etc) or other issues arising from co-location? How has this affected relations between the displaced group and the host community?
- *Community perceptions of aid distribution:* The aim is to understand the range of community views concerning aid distribution, including by gender, age and other key social and economic groupings within communities. What do community members feel about the way relief and recovery assistance has been distributed? Do they feel it has been fair? If so, why? If not, why not? If community members disagree, why?
- *Consequences of aid targeting and distribution:* The aim is to understand whether the distribution of relief and recovery assistance has had any intended or unintended consequences. For example, has it brought community members closer together or created any kind of unintended social cleavage? Are there cases of people who have received disproportionately high levels of relief and recovery assistance sharing it with those who are equally needy? Conversely, are there cases where aid distribution has caused social tension or unrest? If so, how?

2.3 Aid equity between communities:

- *Equity, perceptions & consequences of aid distribution among communities:* This aims to understand how relief and recovery assistance has been distributed across the communities studied, what community members think about this (for instance, do they feel they have received less relief and recovery assistance than neighboring communities and why?), and whether there have been any intended or unintended consequences to such distribution.

2.4 Marginalization and vulnerability

- *Community perceptions of marginalization and vulnerability:* The aim is to understand whom community members feel are the most marginalized and vulnerable groups within their community, both before and after disaster. For example, do people commonly perceive widows, widowers, orphans, women, young people, the elderly, the disabled or the displaced to be 'marginalized' or 'vulnerable', or do they think of vulnerability differently?

- *Sources of vulnerability.* This aims to understand some of the sources of marginalization and longer-term vulnerability in affected communities and the extent to which the disaster represents an opportunity for empowering vulnerable groups.
- *Marginalization and the relief and recovery assistance effort:* This aims to understand whether the relief and recovery effort has met the needs of the more 'marginalized' members of communities. Have such community members received any special relief and recovery assistance? Do they want special relief and recovery assistance? Has the provision of any special relief and recovery assistance had unintended consequences, for instance by making marginalized groups feel more socially isolated? Do community perceptions of what it means to be 'marginalized' differ from the understandings of aid providers?

3. The process of relief and recovery assistance

This topic examines the process of aid delivery. It examines how relief and recovery assistance is being delivered and who is involved; whether aid information is made available and how; who participates in what kinds of decisions about relief and recovery assistance; and how affected communities and aid providers deal with aid-related complaints and problems.

3.1 Aid decision-making

How aid decisions are made: The aim is to understand how aid-related decisions are made. Are affected communities involved in making decisions about the relief and recovery assistance they receive, including about how to allocate resources, identify aid beneficiaries, decide what kinds of targeting methods should be used, and decide where, when and how to rebuild roads, bridges, schools and other community infrastructure? If not, how are those decisions made?

Who participates in aid decisions: If community members participate in aid decision-making, the aim is to understand who within a particular community participates. Do all community members participate, or are some kinds of community members more active than others? Do particular social groups, such as men or women, youth or the elderly, ethnic, religious and racial groups or poor or rich people, dominate decision-making? Are some social groups excluded from decision-making? What role have formal leaders, such as local government officials, had in the process?

Have there been cases of decision-makers, or individuals/groups with influence over decision-makers, seeking to manipulate relief and recovery assistance to advantage certain groups or individuals over others? Have external aid donors positively or negatively influenced the type, level or distribution of relief and recovery assistance?

3.2 Aid management & distribution

- *How aid is managed and distributed:* The aim is to describe how relief and recovery assistance is managed and distributed. Is a local committee set up to manage relief and recovery assistance coming into the community? If so, do aid providers each set up their own committees? How does the process work?
- *Who participates in managing and distributing relief and recovery assistance:* The aim is to describe who within a particular community participates in managing and distributing relief and recovery assistance. Which actors have played the main role? Do particular social groups participate more than others? What has been the role of women, young people, community elders, people with disabilities, minority groups, religious leaders or newly formed local relief and recovery assistance committees? What has been the role of formal leaders, including local government officials?
- *Government capacity.* What is the level of capacity of the state and local authorities to effectively and equitably support the recovery needs and preferences of all people within affected communities? Have there been gaps in human, physical or financial resources provided to the relief and recovery effort to date? How are these gaps in institutional capacity, or the shortfalls in the post-disaster response to which they have led, been perceived by community members? Has the government's response increased or decreased public confidence in its leadership?

3.3 Aid information

- *Aid information & transparency:* The aim is to understand how affected community members get information about aid. Do relief and recovery providers make information about aid publicly available, and how? Have information campaigns been designed with sensitivity to the different methods and channels of communication normally used by, or most accessible to men, women and the various other social groupings within communities. To what extent do different community members have and understand aid-related information? Do people know how decisions about relief and recovery assistance, including who is able to benefit, are made? Do they receive information about aid-related financial flows? Do they know where to find information if they do not already have it, and what happens when they look for it?

3.4 Aid negotiation

- *Advocacy & representation:* The aim is to understand how affected individuals, households and communities as a whole, advocate for themselves and represent their interests relating to the relief and recovery effort. For example, what do people do if they feel their community needs a well or a school? Do they organize themselves to advocate for their needs with local government or aid providers? Are there differences in the ability of different social groups to advocate for themselves?
- *Complaints and problems:* The aim is to understand how affected community members deal with any aid-related problems that arise. Have there been any aid-related problems? If so, what has the community done to deal with them? Has the problem been resolved? Has the problem spilled over into other areas of community life? For example, if one group feels that another group is unfairly benefiting from aid, has it affected social relations among those groups?

4. Other issues

4.1 Other issues

- *Other issues:* The aim is to capture any other issues that may arise that are not captured in the list of topics above. For example, have affected communities experienced any special problems related to the aid effort? How have these been resolved?

IV. Community & Institutional impacts

This focus area examines how the disaster and relief and recovery effort have affected the wider 'rules of the game' within communities and the impact on community leadership. This includes impacts on relations among community members and leaders and the impact on community and inter-village organizations.

FOCUS AREA: COMMUNITY & INSTITUTIONAL IMPACTS

1. Organizations & institutions

- Organizational & institutional mapping
- Role of organizations and institutions in disaster recovery & aid
- Organizations, institutions & social groups

2. Leaders & institutions

- Leadership profiling
- Relations among leaders
- Institutional change: voice & accountability
- Background & potential of leaders

1. Organizations

1.1 Organizational and institutional mapping

- *Mapping and profile of organizations and institutions.* The aim here is to identify the key social, religious, political, economic and other types of organizations active in the community, as well

as the broader institutions and traditions that exist. Which of these are formally recognized organizations, and which are 'informal' or traditions? Which are more important? Is there any competition or conflict among them? Which institutions or organizations are linked to institutions and organizations outside the village, and how?

1.2 Role in disaster recovery

- *Role of organizations & institutions in disaster recovery.* The aim is to understand what role these organizations and institutions have played in disaster recovery, in order to understand whether this has changed their role in the community and their importance relative to other organizations. This should include the role of local authorities in the recovery effort.

1.3 Organizations, institutions & social groups

- Are some organizations and institutions more important to certain social groups within communities? Do some social groups have greater access to organizations or institutions that enhance their assets and enable them to recover more quickly from the disaster? For example, are richer members of the community members of credit unions that offer cheaper credit than is available for poorer people? Do women have access to NGOs or community-based organizations with a focus on women's needs/priorities or gender issues?

2. Leaders & institutions

This topic examines the importance of leadership in aid effectiveness and social life at the community level, and the impact of the disaster and recovery effort on community leadership. Good leaders have the capacity to 'activate' or undermine social capital, and disasters may affect community leadership through the impact of *aid* (the increase in contact with external institutions and increases in resource flows that may follow after a disaster); *socioeconomic changes* (the impact of livelihood and economic changes on the community leadership profile) and *social changes* (the impact of the possible increased role of community leaders in mediating and handling aid-related social tension, post-disaster trauma, aid dependency and other issues).

2.1 Leadership profiling

- *Leadership profiling.* This aims to understand what the different types of leaders in villages are, such as political, social and religious, and what role they play (delivering and accessing aid, resolving social disputes, linking to higher level leaders). This includes formal and informal leaders. In conducting leadership analysis, the guiding principle is to focus on actual power and influence on an individual, rather than the formal title they hold. Who are the most important leaders in the community?
Is community leadership or authority weak or contested (eg by rival groups or gangs)? How has this affected the relief and recovery effort?

2.2 Relations among leaders

- *Leadership relationships.* Are some leaders more 'senior' or important than others, do leaders have followers? Are there any conflicts between leaders? How are the community's leaders links to higher levels of administration or other communities? Are formal or informal leaders more important?

2.3 Institutional change: community members & leaders

- *Community members and leaders.* How do people demand things from their leaders? Are women/youth more aware and active in village development? Are new leaders emerging? What has happened to the old leadership? Are the village leaders capable of playing the role that is expected of them? Has the relationship between community members and local authorities changed, and how? What do people do when they are dissatisfied with their leaders?

2.4 Background of community leaders & ability to play a more active role

- *Background of community leaders.* What is the social profile of community leaders? Are the rich the main leaders, or are there leaders from other groups, such as laborers, women, or youth?

What do people think are important qualities in a leader? Do different groups rely on different leaders?

Experience from previous social impact analyses

The table overleaf illustrates some of the topics that were examined during the second round of social impact monitoring in Myanmar. It highlights in detail the conclusions reached by researchers and the analysis process used to reach those conclusions.

Domain	Key findings	Analysis
Socioeconomic impacts	<p>Assets, capabilities & livelihoods recovery of different socio-economic groups: Farmers, fishers, casual laborers and micro-enterprises were struggling to recover livelihoods. Farming yields had dropped, paddy prices had decreased, prices of farm inputs had varied, & livelihoods aid had been helpful but insufficient. There was some progress with restarting fishing, but less with fishing as a means of livelihood.</p> <p>Women became more independent economically in several villages due to the incorporation of a gender focus in many of the aid projects; this had increased their self-confidence (round 3)</p>	<p>Researchers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyzed data from interviews & FGD with farmers • Compared acres sown, yields per acre & total yields of monsoon & summer paddy across villages • Compared the level of damage to the drop in farming yields • Analyzed changes in farm gate prices of the two most common types of paddy grown • Analyzed wage rates for casual labor (one day and seasonal) and other inputs, e.g. the most common types of seed & fertilizer • Detailed livelihoods assistance received by farmers & reported on community perspectives on this assistance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyzed data from interviews and FGDs with fishers • Analyzed the proportion of fishing households being able to restart fishing • Analyzed changes in fishing yields and prices of common types of fish ('hilsa' and 'shrimp') <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyzed data from interviews and FGDs with casual laborers • Case study of casual laborer • Analyzed wage rates & employment for casual laborers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyzed interviews with small enterprises, e.g. village grocery stores

Domain	Key findings	Analysis
	<p>Indebtedness of different socioeconomic groups: Villagers across socioeconomic groups faced the risk of a debt trap, which different groups being affected in different ways. Total indebtedness for farmers rose sharply; interest rates remained extremely high; and the credit supply had dwindled. Many farmers faced the risk of a debt trap. Fishers usually borrowed for working capital. Their debt totals had risen. Interest remained high but had changed little. Fishers were finding it difficult to cope with debt. Casual laborers borrowed primarily for food. Their debt totals & loan sizes had increased sharply. They faced higher interest rates for fishers and farmers. Small and medium sized enterprises also faced debt problems.</p>	<p>Researchers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyzed data from interviews and FGDs with farmers, fishers, laborers and small enterprises Compared the reported purpose of borrowing, total levels of indebtedness, the average smallest and largest total debt & average, minimum & maximum interest rates with and without collateral across different occupational and socio-economic groups Highlighted a case of a rice miller having to stop lending to show the impact of the disaster on the credit supply Highlighted the cases of a farmer and fisher facing a debt trap Highlighted a case showing occupational 'downsizing' shifts, with a shopkeeper becoming a casual laborer
	<p>Land ownership, land use & the occupational mix: Debt problems were beginning to cause a shift in livelihoods: farmers had begun to lose or sell land; fishers had begun to lose boats and engines to creditors; farmers & fishers were often 'downsizing' and becoming casual laborers. This was causing a knock-on effect on casual labor and increasing the risk of land conflict.</p>	<p>Researchers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyzed interviews with different socioeconomic groups Analyzed changing land tenure patterns across households Traced the perspectives of community members on land use Highlighted cases of losing farm land because of debt and of fishers changing their occupation
	<p>Migration: Little change in migration patterns</p>	<p>N/A: Little reported migration in research sites</p>

Domain	Key findings	Analysis
	Credit market analysis: Researchers conducted a separate township-level study of credit markets showing that the credit supply had dwindled massively since the disaster. Money-lenders faced high levels of default and could no longer lend, which led to a decrease in credit supply	Researchers analyzed interviews with gold shops, pawnshops, informal moneylenders, credit unions and other credit suppliers at township level.
Social impacts	Social capital, collective action & conflict. Social capital was still strong, but was getting weaker in a few villages	Researchers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyzed interviews with villagers capturing perspectives on community relations • Highlighted cases of mutual participation in the aid effort contributing to improved social capital • Identified reported levels of psychosocial wellbeing & stress & community perspectives on the causes of stress
	Gender: Gender relations remained good but widows, widowers and orphans face the greatest challenges. Widowers remarried, often to widows, but many poor female-headed households remained who are dependent on support from families and charities (Round 3)	Researchers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyzed notes capturing community perspectives on gender • Compared changes in reported relations among villagers & women's groups • Identified themes of an increase in women's awareness of aid affairs & a double burden for orphans, widows & widowers across villages • Acknowledged a limitation in the data on gender-based violence, which was hard to gather data on
	Age: Relations among age groups continue to be strong	Researchers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compared young people's involvement in the aid effort across villages • Compared changes in reported relations among young people & the elderly since the disaster

Domain	Key findings	Analysis
	Religion & ethnicity: The roles of religious leaders in the aid effort have changed somewhat	<p>Researchers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledged data limitations on inter-ethnic and inter-religious villages: there were too few heterogeneous ones to draw patterns • Analyzed notes from interviews & FGDs on the role of religious leaders in the aid effort & highlighted a case of religious involvement in aid for disaster survivors • Identified and highlighted a case of faith-based targeting causing social tension
Aid effectiveness	Aid received. Aid levels had dropped & were too low to enable disaster survivors to recover their livelihoods adequately. There had been a shift from emergency to longer-term assistance.	<p>Researchers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compared changes in levels & types of aid across villages • Compared levels of aid with levels of damage & loss, proximity to urban centers, levels of aid received immediately after the cyclone, and speed of recovery
	Aid & recovery. The link between how damaged villages were and how fast they were recovering had weakened. Analysis suggested the level of aid was not the most important determinant of the speed of recovery.	<p>Researchers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compared the level of aid with the speed of recovery.
	Priorities & shortfalls. Disaster survivors continued to prioritize livelihoods aid. Disaster survivors usually preferred cash or credit to in-kind assistance	<p>Researchers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tabulated the top three reported village priorities • Identified the number of villages in which certain needs were identified as a top three priority • Analyzed changes in priorities from interview notes and FGDs • Compared levels of damage with reported needs and priorities • Identified preferences over cash, in-kind assistance and credit & why
	Aid & DRR. Increase found in the number of villages taking disaster risk reduction measures.	<p>Researchers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tabulated the types of disaster risk activities adopted by villages • Compared the level of damage to the number of disaster risk measures taken

Domain	Key findings	Analysis
	Decision-making & targeting: Aid providers rather than aid recipients continued to make most aid decisions. Aid distribution was mostly through formal leaders and village emergency committees.	<p>Researchers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyzed interview & FGD notes to understand the range of community views on aid decision-making and targeting • Tabulated which actors were making aid decisions across villages (e.g. religious leaders, formal leaders, aid providers) • Tabulated & analyzed which actors were managing & distributing aid across villages • Created a typology of targeting mechanisms • Analyzed community views on vulnerability and marginalization • Highlighted case studies of the relationship between aid targeting, social tension & the existence of consultation • Highlighted a case study of participation in targeting & beneficiary selection
	Transparency, equity & complaints Levels of information shared about aid varied. A lack of clear information led to some cases of perceptions of misuse or aid conflict.	<p>Researchers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyzed interview & FGD notes to understand villagers' views on equity, transparency & complaints • Tabulated & created a typology of information & transparency measures by village • Highlighted case studies showing the link between the lack of transparency and misuse, and the lack of transparency & social tension • Highlighted an outlier: 'good practice' in complaints resolution
	Community contributions & perceived burden. High level of community involvement in aid effort but low reported burden.	<p>Researchers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyzed interview & FGD notes to understand range of community perspectives • Created a typology of different forms of community contribution (e.g. cash, labor, materials, operations & maintenance) and compared this to the reported level of burden across villages

Domain	Key findings	Analysis
Community & institutional impacts	<p>Institutions & leadership: Relations among villagers and their leaders are similar to before</p> <p>Women's involvement in village affairs increased, particularly as a result of the requirement by many aid providers to include women in aid-related committees and for women to take part in aid-related decision-making. Men appeared to accept, and be satisfied with, women's local committee membership (Round 3)</p>	<p>Researchers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyzed notes from interviews & FGDs discussing villagers and leaders • Compared the roles of formal leaders, religious leaders and village elders in the aid effort across different villages to identify patterns in roles • Compared changes in reported relations among villagers and formal leaders, religious leaders & village elders across villages, noting limitations in data • Analyzed the link between villagers' perceptions of the aid effort & villagers' perceptions of their leaders • Identified case studies of elite capture of aid and of transparency measures improving relations between villagers and formal leaders
	<p>Inter-village interaction: Inter-village interactions had increased.</p>	<p>Researchers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compared changes in the frequency of inter-village interactions in business, administrative, social, religious, resource sharing and community infrastructure arenas • Explored links between perceived aid inequity & inter-village linkages

CHAPTER 3:

SAMPLE FIELD GUIDE OUTLINES

Objectives

This chapter provides some sample outlines for a field guide. Field guides are aimed at researchers. They provide an overview of the research design and detailed guidance on fieldwork.

Box: Outline for Field Guide for Philippines Social Impact Assessment Conducted as Part of PDNA

Social Impact Assessment Sample Field Guide Outline

1. Introduction (explains overview of study)
2. Objectives
3. Work Plan
4. Outputs
5. Methodology
6. Site Selection
7. Qualitative Research Methods (Participation Observation, FGDs, Interviews)
8. Main Themes
9. Suggested Questions (including question prompts for researchers)

Box: Outline for Field Guide for Myanmar Social Impact Monitoring Round 3

Part I. Introduction (*explains overview of study & timeline*)

- Background
- Objectives
- Work Plan

Part II. Assessment Topics (*explains research domains*)

- Focus Area 1: Aid and Delivery
- Focus Area 2: Socio-economic Challenges
- Focus Area 3: Social & Institutional Dynamics
- Focus Area 4: Leadership at the Village Level

Part III. Methodology (*explains methodology & gives guidance on fieldwork*)

- Site Selection
- Village Procedures
- Research Instruments
- Research Ethics
- Safety

Part IV. Fieldwork Outputs (*explains what fieldwork outputs are expected*)

- Village Data Sheet
- Village Summary Sheet & Case Studies
- Village Report
- Institutional Case Study
- Case Studies

Part V. Analysis & Final Report (*explains what analysis is expected & gives outline for report*)

Appendix A. Detailed Research Questions (*derived from research domains*)

Appendix B: Interview Strategies & Tips (*gives detailed interview guidance*)

Appendix C1: Village Data Sheet (*pre-prepared data format*)

Appendix C2: Village Summary Sheet (*pre-prepared data format*)

Appendix C3: Interview Notes Form (*pre-prepared data format*)

Appendix C4: FGD Notes Form (*pre-prepared data format*)

How to conduct in-depth interviews

Choosing an interview approach

There are several choices involved in conducting in-depth interviews. These include how structured to make the interview, and whether to have many shorter interviews or a few in-depth interviews. The capacity of the research team affects the suggested approach to interviewing. Capable researchers should use a semi-structured approach, where they have familiarized themselves with a list of guiding questions but do not have to cover all ground and are free to pursue particular issues in depth as they arise. Capable researchers should use a more structured approach to ensure that they gather at least the minimum required information.

Usually, conducting a few in-depth interviews yields richer information than conducting several short, 'shallow' interviews. However, because time is limited, the research team should ensure that they are conducting enough interviews or focus groups to cover a good cross-section of the community.

Research teams should avoid interpreters if possible. The pauses necessary for translation limit the natural feeling of an interview and can make respondents feel awkward and formal, which may prevent them from offering new insights. It is usually better to train someone who speaks the local language to conduct the interview than to do it through an intermediary. However, if this is not possible, time will need to be spent carefully orienting the interpreter to the interviewing context and requirements, including research ethics (eg confidentiality, neutrality, etc). When conducting separate male/female focus group discussions, the interpreter should be the same gender as the interviewer.

Conducting the interview⁸

Interviews should be conducted at a convenient time for respondents and in a neutral, private environment in which the respondent feels comfortable. Often this is in people's' homes. Interviews with women should be conducted when their partners are not home, ideally by a female researcher. It is also best not to let the community leader or his/her spouse arrange interviews, as this may introduce perceived bias.

⁸ Good advice on conducting in-depth interviews can be found in Weiss, Robert. *Learning from Strangers: The Art and Method of Qualitative Interview Studies*. New York: Free Press, 1995.

Box: Interview tips for social impact monitoring⁹

	Tip	Description
1.	Ask open-ended questions	Ask open-ended questions (that usually begin with “How”, “Could you tell me about”, “What did you think”) rather than questions that require a yes or no response.
2.	Ask follow-up questions and probes to get more information	This enables participants to provide the complete set of information on each question. Direct probes include “Could you tell me more”, “How did this happen?” “How do you feel about?” “Could you give me an example?” Indirect probes include neutral expressions such as “I see,” and “Interesting....”; and repeating what participants have said.
3.	Get concrete incidents, not theories	Ask for a specific incident rather than a generalization. Stories and ‘cases’ enable researchers to understand the underlying community dynamics. Use phrases such as “Could you talk me through what happened” and “Think back to...”
4.	Keep questions ‘neutral’	Do not lead the respondent to a certain answer or put words in her mouth. E.g. instead of saying “Do you think some families did not want to be relocated because there are no services in the new area?” ask, “Why do you think some families did not want to be relocated?” The respondent should speak far more than you.
5.	Let respondents bring up for the issues you are seeking to explore	In most cases, do not ask directly about what you want. Ask more general questions that give an opportunity to talk about what you want to hear.
6.	Do not assume what you are hearing is always true.	Verify information you hear from multiple sources (triangulation). Get perspectives from all sides
7.	Take time ...	A first meeting is partly about establishing an interviewing partnership & building trust. Time spent talking about ‘unimportant’ things is never wasted.
8.	... But keep focused	You are not writing ethnography about all elements of culture. Selectively record relevant information
9.	Interview a cross-section of the population	Often you get the best information from the most unexpected source. Be wary of turning to authorities and ‘experts’—ordinary people are usually more helpful
10.	Record respondents’ own words	They are probably more revealing (and more powerful) than your own. This is especially true when writing mini-case studies/boxes.
11.	Keep the analysis separate	Do not mix analysis and evidence taking in notes. Developing theories and typologies is for later.
12.	Write-up notes as soon as possible	Take good notes during the interview or straight after. Always write up your notes on the same day. If you work in pairs, one person asks questions while another takes notes.
13.	Do not ask specifically about tensions and conflicts.	Instead, ask about difficulties and challenges in the community. Tensions and conflict are normal, and are present in every society. Paint things in a positive way—do not make it seem like you are making judgments. The focus is on how issues are dealt with and how groups relate to each other, not on particular disputes or problems.
14.	Quality not quantity	A few good interviews are better than several poor ones. Take time to write up everything relevant
15.	Work as a team	If you are working in pairs, decide who is leading the interview (take it in turns). Never interrupt each other.

⁹ Taken from Field Guide for the second round of Social Impact Monitoring in Myanmar, 2009

Authority figures should not be present when researchers are interviewing ordinary community members: this can prevent respondents from being frank about issues facing their communities. Sometimes this is difficult: authority figures may feel obliged to show researchers around and may not be aware of the impact their presence can have on the interview. If researchers cannot directly explain their need to have one-on-one interviews (for example, if they feel it would lessen trust or put respondents in a difficult position), they can try various other techniques to ensure privacy. A common one is for the research team to split up and for some researchers to hold discussions with authority figures while others walk independently around the community to interview other respondents. Another is to conduct interviews in places where few people are likely to visit. For example, in one village in Myanmar, researchers were able to hold a sensitive in-depth interview in the local burial ground, which the respondent herself suggested would give them privacy because other community members feared ghosts.

The interview should be conducted naturally. Typically, the best way to do this is in pairs, with one researcher conducting the interview and the other taking notes. This ensures that the flow of the interview is not disrupted. Researchers should be sensitive to any social and cultural differences between themselves and respondents. Building a good rapport with respondents is essential. Sharing some personal information at the start of the interview is often a good way to do this. Researchers should be open, humble and natural in their attitude. In post-disaster contexts where people may be living with little, it can be easy to see disaster survivors simply as 'poor people', defined only by their poverty, marginalization or status as disaster survivors, and when there is pressure to obtain good data, it can be easy to see respondents merely as instruments for obtaining data rather than as people who have been generous enough with their time and energy to participate in the research. Researchers should avoid this.

Before starting the interview, researchers should familiarize themselves with their field guides so that they understand the research topics and guiding questions. In the interview, they should try to put the field guide away so that the interview can take place in a relaxed atmosphere. They should think about what topics the respondent might know about, and have a plan of what they want to cover in the interview, but with enough flexibility to be able to amend the questioning line if the respondent starts offering unexpected insights.

How to record and write up an in-depth interview

Researchers have to make a choice about how to take notes during an interview. Some people prefer to take extensive notes during the interview, which enables them to remember everything that is said and record the respondent's actual words. This, however, can add an element of artificiality: rather than giving the impression of a conversation, it reminds respondents that they are being interviewed, which may prevent them from talking about sensitive issues. Others often take no notes at all during the interview, leaving the note taking and write-up until later. The advantage of this is that informants are most likely to be at ease; the disadvantage is that it is easy to forget key elements of the interview.

Experience suggests that an in-between approach, in which one researcher interviews and another takes notes, ideally on pre-prepared data formats, is likely to work best. If this is not possible, the researcher can take some notes and write them up fully after the conversation. Researchers should in either case write up a more detailed account of the interview as soon as it is concluded. If for some reason this is not possible, they should complete their write up at the end of the day or, if the interview is at night, the following morning. Note-takers should try to record as much of what respondents are saying directly as they can. This will help in later analysis and in separating quotes, facts and conclusions.

If interviews have to be conducted individually, the interviewer may want to use a tape-recorder. Tape recorders, however, should be used responsibly and with discretion. Researchers should always ask the permission of respondents before using one, should explain clearly how the data will be used and stored, and should only continue using the tape recorder if they feel the respondent is comfortable.

Conducting interviews on sensitive subjects

If the topic being discussed in the interview is sensitive (such as discrimination or conflict issues), and/or the respondent comes from a socially marginalized group or party to the conflict, privacy and confidentiality considerations take a heightened importance. The interview should not take place, or be stopped, if the respondent feels in any way at risk of repercussions or shows signs of reliving trauma. Note-taking should be minimized, or not done, during the sensitive parts of such interviews. Researchers also should be very careful not to identify the person in the notes taken and to store them in a safe place where they cannot be read (and potentially misinterpreted) by others. Daily debriefings also should be carried out by the team in private places, where there is no risk of others overhearing the conversation.

How to conduct focus group discussions

Putting together a focus group

Shortly after arriving in the village, the research team should decide which focus groups to prioritize. They should do so using basic community data to try to ensure that the major groups are covered. For example, at least one focus group should be held with landless laborers if they comprise over half of community members. Similarly, if the community has a significant number of resettled people, focus groups should be held both with original residents and recent arrivals. Researchers should usually plan to conduct at least four focus group discussions in each research site. It is essential for focus groups to have homogenous respondents, such as all medium farmers, all landless laborers or all women, and for no significant power differentials to exist among those in the group.

Researchers should identify the discussions they want to organize towards the beginning of their site visit and arrange them directly or through a trusted key respondent. A good way to do this is to use an existing network. For example, if researchers need to hold a focus group with poor women and most poor women in the community are members of savings and loan groups, they may invite the whole savings and loan group. In subsequent rounds of research, researchers should try to do focus groups with the same groups that were interviewed in previous rounds.

Six to eight people are ideal: large groups become difficult to handle. A good FGD may take two to three hours. Researchers should conduct the FGD at a convenient time for respondents: this will vary, depending on the responsibilities and types of occupations of the respondents. For instance, day fishers will likely prefer evenings while factory workers on night shifts may prefer mornings; women may wish to avoid timings that coincide with meal preparation. Focus groups should be held in a neutral location, usually in the house of one of the respondents or a community building.

The researchers should have a list of questions prepared to help structure the discussion. Usually about ten to twelve questions works best: many more can make the focus group become more a 'ticking the box' exercise rather than a genuine discussion.

How to conduct a focus group¹⁰

Researchers should conduct the focus group in pairs, with one moderator and one note-taker. It usually works best for a woman to moderate discussions with women's groups. In highly gender-segregated societies, it may be necessary for both the moderator and note-taker to be female. Before beginning, the moderator should have a questioning route prepared and ensure that all necessary supplies, such as water, large sheets of paper and pens, are available. It usually works best for people to sit in a circle or some other informal arrangement.

The moderator should open by introducing herself, explaining the purpose of the research and explaining any focus group procedures. She should address openly any expectations from participants that the research might lead to additional resources to avoid creating expectations that the research team cannot fulfill. Building some rapport can also help, such as sharing some personal information about or showing a photo of your family. Usually, it works best to start questioning with general, neutral questions to help build trust and create a natural atmosphere.

¹⁰ Detailed advice on preparing for and conducting focus group discussions in social analysis can be found in Krueger, M. and Casey, M., "Designing and Conducting Focus Group Interviews" in Krueger et al. *Social Analysis: Selected Tools and Techniques*. Washington, DC: World Bank, Social Development Paper Number 36, June 2001.

As the discussion proceeds, the moderator should try to steer the discussion to keep on topic and ensure that a range of views are heard. Many of the interview techniques for focus groups are the same as those for in-depth interviews: moderators should use open-ended, neutral questions, ask probing questions, and focus on concrete incidents. However, because focus groups involve several people, the moderator's task is more complex: she has to observe group dynamics, try to draw out all group members, ensure that the main subject areas are covered, and maintain a conversational atmosphere and comfortable pace.

How to record and write up a focus group

At the beginning of the focus group, the note-taker should record who is present and the location and atmosphere of the focus group, taking down as many details as possible. The note-taker should mark who has said what in response to each question. It is helpful for the note-taker to have pre-prepared data formats on which to record information.

The note taker should also record overarching topics during the session on a large sheet of paper. In literate groups, this enables participants to check that the researchers have understood their information. It is usually better not to record names on this paper, as it may make people nervous. The note taker can also use maps, drawings and other visual aids that do not require literacy. Note takers should write up their notes immediately after the focus group or as soon as possible afterwards.

How to conduct participant observation & informal discussions

Researchers are always working while doing fieldwork: observation and discussion continues even if they are not doing formal interviews. Informally talking to women, men and youth/children, as well as observing relations within the community are a less structured but equally important way for researchers to increase their understanding of the assessment focus areas. These are particularly important methods of learning more about sensitive social risk issues in a community, especially where the level of trust in 'outsiders' is low

Box: Tips on conducting participant observation and informal interviewing

- **Stay alert.** Constantly think of how what you see relates to what you want to find out.
- **Build relationships**—Build trust with community members. This is vital to get good information.
- **Spend time with community members**—eat with them, talk with them in the evenings—and you will learn a lot. The evenings, in particular, are a key time to have long informal talks with people.
- **Walk around**—do not just go straight from interview to interview. Take a walk around the village. Record what you see and, if doing more than one monitoring round, how things have changed.

Participant Observation

Whereas the other research tools rely on spoken answers as a source of data, participant observation derives insight from observed actions. Researchers should notice the different informal relationships and structures of the communities they are in. They should observe people's attitudes and ways of acting. These are all key sources of data. The following are suggestions for things to observe:

- The physical setting
- Human and social environment
- Activities and behaviors
- Informal interactions
- Forms of non-verbal communication

These techniques should be used at all times but are especially useful for getting information from ‘marginalized’ and ‘silenced’ groups, who may not feel confident being formally interviewed, but may be happy to chat informally.

Researchers should record their observations and notes. Some people find it useful to keep a short daily diary recording their observations, which can be a useful reference point for future rounds of research. However, in situations where social tensions are high, a careful judgment will need to be made as to whether to take notes while conducting the observation, as the researcher’s intent may be misinterpreted.

Informal interviews & discussions

During fieldwork there will also be opportunities to conduct informal group discussions. In these casual discussions, participants tend to be more relaxed, which can help in obtaining information. Opportunities for conducting such interviews include:

- Talking to one’s hosts in the evening after dinner
- Talking to people while helping them prepare food
- Talking to people while being shown around the community
- Going to the market and talking to shoppers and traders
- Talking to farmers and laborers in the field
- Talking to boatmen on the docks or while being ferried down rivers
- Talking to people while eating or having a drink at the local tea-shop

When a significant amount of information is obtained through informal discussions, it usually works best for researchers to record the results using the FGD data format. Otherwise, they should keep a separate record of what they have learned.

How to conduct simple surveys

The local partner should design the survey with guidance and support from the social impact task team. The objectives of the survey should determine the sampling method and survey method, but in general a simple or stratified random sample of the affected community, combined with a simple response format composed mostly of structured response options (in which respondents have a limited choice of answers, such as choosing ‘yes’ or ‘no’ or choosing to put themselves within a particular range of household income) will suffice. If being conducted at the household level, the survey should be targeted at both male and female household heads - not only male heads of households to avoid missing the inputs of women.

Those designing the survey will need to take care to avoid bias in designing the questions, and should place the order of questions carefully to avoid one kind of question unduly influencing the other. It is critical that any survey instrument be pre-tested and refined—though during the PDNA stage this may take place in real-time due to time pressures.

CHAPTER 4:

SAMPLE DATA FORMATS

Objectives

This chapter provides some sample data formats for a social impact study; this includes samples adapted from social monitoring in Myanmar and a framework for social risk analysis. It is important to note that the local partner should design data formats once the research topics have been finalized. The data formats should match the research topics provided, and may be modified once researchers have completed the pre-test of the research. It is very important that data collection sheets include specific instructions or reminders to disaggregate information by sex, age and other key social groupings to the extent possible.

1. Data formats: social monitoring in Myanmar

The sample data formats that follow are adapted from one of the rounds of social monitoring conducted in Myanmar. Researchers were asked to complete the following fieldwork outputs for each research site:

	Type of format	Number
1.	VILLAGE DATA SHEET	1 per village
1.1	Background information	
1.2	Current situation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demographic, ethnic & religious breakdown 	
1.3	Facilities in village: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Basic information on health, education, religious buildings, distance to market 	
1.4	Occupational profile: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breakdown of households according to primary occupation 	
1.5	FGD/key informant interview summary sheet	
1.6	Case study summary sheet	
1.7	Aid & Development Matrix <ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of all development assistance in the village since the last monitoring round (1 year) 	
1.8	Village institutions matrix <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of all different institutions, organizations and associations that are recognized in the village 	
2.	VILLAGE SUMMARY SHEET & CASE STUDIES	1 per village
2.1	Needs & priorities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Top five priorities of different social and occupational groups 	
2.2	Livelihoods recovery <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Differentiated by livelihoods group: farmers and fishers 	
2.3	Debt & sources of credit <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summarized data from FGDs of farmers and other groups 	
2.4	Case studies	3-4 per village
3.	FGD & INTERVIEW NOTES	
3.1	Focus Group Discussion Notes Form <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Including detailed information on debt & credit 	1 per FGD
3.2	Key Informant Interviews	1 per interview
4.	VILLAGE REPORT	1 per village
	Short narrative report	
5.	INSTITUTIONAL CASE STUDY	1 per village
	Institutional report & schematic map	

1. Community data sheet

Community Location: Village/Urban Neighborhood name:
 Village/Urban Neighborhood code :
 Location (sub-district/municipality/town/city/province/state):

1.1 Background Information (to be filled from previous rounds of monitoring)

(If rural): Level of remoteness from urban center: (High/Low/Medium):

(If urban): Distance of neighborhood from town center:

Main sources of livelihood/primary livelihoods:

Level of affectedness by disaster (none, low, moderate, high):

Approximate death toll (by sex and age):

Approximate injury toll (by sex and age):

1.2 Current situation:

Population (by sex and age):

Number of households:

Average household size:

Proportion of house owners/renters/other (by sex and age):

Main ethnic group:

Other ethnic groups (%): (list all)

Main religious group:

Other religious groups (%): (list all)

Number of orphans:

Number of permanently disabled before and after disaster (by sex and age):

Number of single parent-headed households (by sex):

Number/proportion of households who have left to resettle elsewhere:

Number/proportion of households who have arrived (resettled from elsewhere):

1.3 Facilities in the community

Religious building:

School or health facilities:

Other (e.g. water purifiers, hydroelectric systems):

Distance to nearest market:

1.4. Occupational profile (current):

Primary Livelihood (disaggregated by sex)	Approx number of Households
Large farmers (+ 20)	
Medium (10-20)	
Small farmers (10 and less)	
Landless Laborers	
Commercial fishers (Medium as well as big)	
Subsistence Fishers (Small Fishers)	
Factory workers	
Petty traders	
Home-based small/micro-businesses (eg tailoring, vehicle repair, weaving, cake production, charcoal-making etc)	
Other occupations (list) 1. 2. 3. 4.	

1.5 Focus group discussions/key informant interviews in the village

Types	FGD (No of men/women)	Key informant (Who)
By economic category:		
1. Large Farmers		
2. Medium Farmers		
2. Small Farmers		
3. Landless/labor		
4. Commercial (large) fishers		
5. Subsistence fishers		
6. Factory workers		
7. Petty traders/operators of home-based small or micro businesses		
By social group:		
8. Women		
9. Youth		
10. Ethnic groups		
11. Migrants		
11. Other, eg older persons, disabled, etc (details)		

PLEASE NOTE: The recording of discussions by economic category should identify the sex of the participants and other social distinctions in the composition of the group and the inputs made by participants. It may be necessary to hold separate focus group discussions on economic roles and contributions with a cross-section of male and female household members to obtain information on the gender division of labor and the gender-differentiated impacts of the disaster (for example, if men fish buy women process the fish, what are the implications and needs of both have lost their tools?)

1.6 Case study summary sheet

Issues and discussant group	Case study
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	

1.7 Aid and Development Matrix

Name of the scheme/program	Scheme 1	Scheme 2	Scheme 3	Scheme 4	Scheme 4	Scheme 5
Types of Scheme						
When started and finished						
Supporting organization (give details):						
Patterns of delivery (give details, coded if possible)						
Local implementation organization, committee or persons						
Level of assistance (external)						
Community contribution: who mobilizes, who is responsible & how						
Intended beneficiaries						

How decisions are made (beneficiary selection, project designs, inputs) details						
Any other notes						

Patterns of aid Delivery:

Donor to committee to villagers

Donor to committee (via village leader) then to villagers

Donor to village elder then to villagers'

Donor to village leader, then to villagers

Donor to committee via village tract leader = then to villagers

Donors to religious leader then to villagers

Donor to committee via religious leaders – then to villagers

Donor to villagers

Other

1.8 Village Institutional Matrix

A. Name of Committee/Organization					
Type of organization: (brief description)					
Main roles					
Currently active or inactive					
Link outside the village (is the organization linked to others outside the village e.g. a national network or township level association?)					
Composition (no. of members) by gender A. Committee members B. Total member (if relevant)					
Group leaders (e.g. president, chairperson) by gender					
Other office bearers by gender E.g. General secretary, treasurer...)					

Leader selection (Is leader or president nominated, selected and if so by whom)					
When established? (When did the committee or group first come into existence)					
When was the leader of the committee selected					
Who does the group represent? Women, whole village, students...					
How decisions are made (monthly meeting, committee meeting or informal meeting, are any records kept?)					
Any notes					

2. Community summary sheet

This summary sheet aims to capture some of the key issues in the community, record some basic data, and to ensure that the team has covered all the main aspects of the SIAM during their time in the village.

2.1 Needs & Priorities (disaggregated by gender and age group to the extent possible):

	Needs identified by leaders	Farmers (small and medium; specified as tenant or owner)	Fishers (small and medium)	Day Laborers/factory workers	Informal sector (eg petty traders, etc)	Other (Specified) eg 'vulnerable or socially marginalized groups'
1.						
2.						
3.						
4.						
5.						

2.2 Livelihoods recovery

(Add pages for different livelihood groups using this as a sample. Identify whether there are any key gender differences)

	Farmers	Factory Workers
Inputs/costs	Fertilizer price: (bag) Labor: (day rate) Diesel: (Gallon) Seeds: (Basket)	Labor Transport Uniform (where applicable)
Outputs & price/earnings/salary	Yield Monsoon: Summer: Price Monsoon: Summer:	<i>Average daily, monthly or annual wage/salary</i>
Key Constraints	List in order of importance e.g. access to credit and markets, crop disease, soil deterioration, decline in product prices	Increase in post-disaster transport costs Income losses from temporary closure of factory Job loss from permanent closure of factory If a petty trader: loss of tools, stock, temporary loss of markets eg for 'luxury' items like cakes, snacks, etc

2.3 Debt & Sources of Credit

2.3.1 Borrowers: Use this table as a sample for different livelihood & wealth groups who borrow. Identify whether there are any gender differences, if applicable. For example, the table for farmers might look like this:

Livelihood group	(e.g. Small Farmers)	(e.g. Medium Farmers)	(e.g. Big Farmers)
Interest rates			
Level of Debt Maximum			
Minimum			
Sources of credit (From whom)	Male: Female:		
Number of creditors			
Average level of debt			
Purpose of loan			
Required amount (working capital)			
Maximum loan size			
Repayment methods (seasonal, monthly, daily, other)			
Repayment methods (Cash, in kind, both)			

2.3.2 Lenders

Use this sample table for different types of institutions who lend, e.g. for big farmers, rice millers, banks, private lenders.

Lender Category:	(e.g. Bank)	(e.g. Moneylender)	
Purpose of Lending (E.g. food, working capital, health, education, social, religious)			
Main customers (E.g. farmers, fishers, laborers, small businesses, others)			
New customers since the disaster? (Types)			
(%) of new customers since the disaster?			
Source of capital (E.g. friends, relatives, banks, pawn shops, other)			
Interest rates (with Collateral)			
Interest rates (without collateral)			

Interest Rate for small loans (define first)			
Interest Rate for large loans (define first)			
Maximum loan amount			
Minimum loan amount			
No. of customers			
Money in Circulation			

As part of the community summary, the team should provide the following:

- KI interview notes
- FGD sheets
- Case studies
- Summary of issues relating to 1) socioeconomic impacts 2) social impacts, 3) relief, recovery and accountability, and 4) community and institutional impacts
- Summary case of community institutions

2.4 Case studies

The team will also be required to select and document any important case studies in the community. The team leader will be responsible for the selection of case studies and the allocation of responsibilities to members of the groups for documentation. Attention needs to be given to ensuring that direct quotations are used where relevant and highlighted appropriately.

Steps in writing a case study:

- Make a list of what you want to convey to your reader. What information should be at the beginning and end? Keep in mind that the final report includes all the responses to the research questions.
- Think of the story in terms of “chapters”.
- Sort key material into blocks and organize the blocks in a sequence.
- Diagram the pattern of the story.
- Write an outline. Draw a tree and fill in the branches.
- Seek a natural order for the story: narrative, chronological, pyramid, problem and solution...
- Give yourself a specified amount of time to write. When your time is up, assess where you are headed with the story.
- When writing the text of the report:
- Give information in the lead that will make the reader ask a question. Answer with information that sparks a new question. Continue until all questions are answered.
- Provide evidence for every assertion or statement you write by putting in the basis of that statement (e.g., direct quotes, statistics).
- Write headings for each section and sub-section. Choose headings that are precise, and descriptive of the contents.
- Hold the reader by the hand by writing a short introduction (e.g., a 2-3 sentence introduction) to each section.

Present your findings along the focus areas of the research project and other themes that may emerge during the research. This way, concepts and empirical data complement each other.

3. FGD & interview notes

3.1 Focus Group Discussion Cover Sheet:

- Code No:
- Researchers present:
- Interviewer(s):
- Note-taker(s):
- Date:
- Time:
- Length (hours, minutes):
- Where held: Village:
- Township

Location/Place:

- Type of FGD : (Women, large farmers, small farmers, laborers, other occupations, etc.)
- Number of participants (by sex and key social characteristics)
- Others present who did not participate:

	Identity	Age	Gender	Ethnicity	Religion	Current livelihood (landholding, assets and other secondary occupation)	Any changes in livelihood over the last year (increased, decreased of land or assets)	Current HH debt (cash and in kind)	Creditors (list all in order of debt size)	Purpose of borrowing
1										
2										
3										
4										
5										

Credit source table

Type of lenders	Interest rate	Repayment (seasonal, monthly)	Repayment type (cash or in kind)	Is collateral required	Note (any extra money to get loans?)

FGD CODE:

Speaker (M/F)	Content	Topic AD/SE/SI	Notes/ Comments

--	--	--	--

3.1 Interview information:

Code No:

Researchers present:

Interviewer(s):

Note-taker(s):

Date:

Time:

Length (hours, minutes):

Where held: Village:
 Township:

Location/Place:

People present:

Respondent:

Occupation/identity (if applicable):

Age:

< 15		41-50	
15-21		51-60	
22-30		> 61	
31-40			

Gender:

Ethnicity:

Religion:

INTERVIEW CODE:

Speaker	Content	Topic	Notes/ Comments

4. Site report

At the end of the fieldwork in each community, teams should meet to discuss the key issues in the community related to the research questions. This short narrative report can use bullet points or detailed notes to highlights the major issues for analysis. This report should be attached to the Community Summary Sheet.

5. Institutional report

In each village, the team will produce an institutional report discussing:

- Which of the institutions in the village are the most important and why?
- Are different institutions involved in social and aid related issues?
- How do different institutions relate to each other?
- Are some institutions more important to different social groups?
- What are the critical events that have influenced the current institutional profile in the village?

As part of the report, the team should include a schematic map on institutions in the village.

6. Social risk analysis framework

As vulnerability to both disaster impacts and violence is dynamic and shaped by interconnected shocks and stresses (Duijsens 2010), every post-disaster situation generates a unique and evolving combination of social risks and opportunities. This context, and the inter-relationships between these risks and opportunities, need to be well understood, in order to identify appropriate follow-up actions. To do so requires a sound contextual analysis informed by a political economy approach that helps to identify the combination of assets, power and institutions that contribute to social risk.

Table 1 outlines a political economy framework to facilitate the analysis of post-disaster social risk. It includes:

1. Specification of the type(s) and frequency of natural disasters to which the country is exposed.
2. Specification of the type(s) of violence occurring;
3. Determination of the stresses a disaster-affected country/area faces that increase the risks of violence occurring or reoccurring;
4. Identification of the stakeholder groups that are crucial to reducing these stresses and their roles in creating or facilitating opportunities to reduce social risk and build social cohesion;
5. Ascertaining the key institutional challenges to reducing social risk; and
6. Identification of the opportunities to reduce social risk and build social cohesion through the recovery and rehabilitation process.

Table 1 Post-disaster social risk: spectra of challenges and opportunities

Type of natural disaster	Earthquake, flood, drought, tropical storm, landslide, tsunami, etc
Type of violence	Nature and extent of civil, criminal and/or political violence
Key stresses	Economic; health (physical/psycho-social); social or political divisions among groups
Key stakeholders	State vis non-state actors; lower income vis higher income
Institutional challenges	Low or high capacity; low or high accountability; exclusion or inclusion (eg access to relief/recovery assistance, social justice)
Opportunities	Through recovery initiatives in livelihoods, social protection, governance reform/capacity building, etc

Source: Adapted from World Bank 2011 and Kostner and Meutia 2011

There are a number of constraints that may be experienced when conducting social risk analysis. Firstly, political and/or social sensitivities to these issues may be high. The participation of the government agencies responsible for social welfare, law and justice, and security in planning and implementing the assessment process should be actively encouraged to the extent that is practical and appropriate.

Secondly, the constraints of the time limits for conducting the PDA, the availability of secondary data, the context of the disaster, and the degree of access to the affected areas and people (in terms of both the physical and psychological impacts of the disaster) will all be determinants of whether and how much of this information can be collected. The SIA team should follow the 'good enough' principle - that is, to make a realistic determination of the minimal amount and types of information that are required in order to make a reasonable initial assessment of the key post-disaster social risks and initiatives to reduce these risks.

The research team also should coordinate with the other key humanitarian and developmental actors involved in the disaster response, such as the UN-IASC protection, camp management and health clusters. In addition, UN agencies, international organizations, bilateral donors and local/international NGOs and CBOs may be able to contribute specialist expertise on specific subjects, such as gender-based violence and urban youth issues. In fragile- or conflict-affected states, prior conflict analyses may be available to support the social risk analysis; for example, a multi-sectoral, multi-agency Post-Conflict Needs Assessment (PCNA) was available to agencies working in fragile areas of Pakistan following major floods in 2010.

Table 2 outlines the key research questions that may be incorporated into an SIA when conducting a full social risk analysis. However, this should only be used as a guide and adjusted to the specific local context. The

questions also should be used in conjunction with the broader guidance on SIA research topics found in volumes 1 and 2.

The World Bank's SIA field guide for the PDNA for the 2011 Thailand floods also provides an example of an SIA that has incorporated some social risk questions.

Table 2: Key Areas for Social Risk Analysis

Thematic Area	Pre-disaster: baseline	Post-disaster: what has changed?
Disasters & Shocks	<p>What types of disasters and economic shocks have been experienced in the past 3-5 years?</p> <p>To what extent have these events contributed to social tensions in the past or placed stress on the coping capacities of lower income households ?</p>	<p>To what extent has the disaster impacted on urban/rural areas with high poverty levels? high crime levels? law and order problems?</p> <p>To what extent has the recent disaster contributed to competition over scarce natural resources such as water or grazing land?</p>
History/Types of Violence	<p>What were the levels and forms of inter-personal, community and collective violence prior to the disaster (eg domestic violence, GBV, youth violence, child or elder abuse, organized crime, violent civil protests etc)?</p> <p>Have men, women and/or children been socialized to cultural norms that support violence or violent crime?</p> <p>Is there a history of social tension or violence within or between groups/communities in the affected area?</p> <p>Has the disaster occurred in a fragile or conflict-affected state?</p>	<p>What levels and forms of violence are being experienced post-disaster?</p>
Key Stresses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Livelihoods • Housing & land (including displacement) • Health & social Services 	<p>Livelihoods:</p> <p>Is there a high number of unemployed workers within the affected population (particularly young males)?</p> <p>Are there vested interests in exploitation of the poor for financial gain in the affected area? Are illegal activities, such as people trafficking or organ harvesting, prevalent in the affected area?</p> <p>Housing and land:</p> <p>What are the legal and traditional land and property ownership and inheritance rights of men and women in the disaster-affected area?</p> <p>Are there any discriminatory practices in land and property rights or access to credit?</p> <p>Were refugees or internally displaced people (IDPs) living in the affected area prior to the disaster?</p> <p>Health and Social Services:</p> <p>What was the prevalence of drug/alcohol abuse and mental illnesses in the affected area prior to the disaster?</p> <p>What are the country's main social protection</p>	<p>Livelihoods:</p> <p>Has livelihoods support been appropriate/sufficient for the local context?</p> <p>Are any economic coping strategies creating potential social stresses/risks (eg taking children out of school; migration; early marriage of girls; etc)?</p> <p>Have there been cases of exploitation of vulnerable people (eg landlords taking compensation intended for tenants; rent-seeking behavior, etc)?</p> <p>Housing and land:</p> <p>What is the proportion of affected households (tenants, informal settlers, and homeowners) made homeless by the disaster?</p> <p>How many people have been temporarily and/or permanently displaced by the disaster? What support is being given to them and to the host communities in the areas where they have relocated? Is post-disaster relocation voluntary or involuntary?</p> <p>Are the living conditions crowded or insecure in displacement settings?</p> <p>What post-disaster policies have been put in place to protect the land and property rights of homeless and displaced households?</p> <p>Health and Social Services:</p> <p>How are affected men/women/children coping with post-disaster stress or trauma (eg family support; counseling; higher drug or alcohol use; etc) ?</p> <p>What vulnerable groups have specific health and social service needs,</p>

	<p>policies/laws? What health/social services were available in areas such as: family/sexual violence; drug/alcohol/anger counseling; mental health; youth; etc?</p>	<p>including those with new needs as a result of the disaster? What resources are available to support them post-disaster? Are these resources accessible to marginalized groups?</p>
<p>Institutional Challenges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity • Decision-making • Social inclusion • Rule of law & judiciary • Communications & social accountability 	<p>Capacity: Are essential public institutions perceived by important groups of society as ineffective or broken down?</p> <p>Decision-making on resource distribution: Do state or local leaders/authorities distribute resources equitably or manipulate resource distribution for the benefit of certain groups? Is there a history of state abuse of power or corruption? Are there alternative political structures/leaders (ie where existing leadership/authority structures are contested)?</p> <p>Social inclusion: How socially inclusive are state and local level decision-making structures and processes? Are gender and socio-economic inequalities challenged or reinforced by the state's institutions? Are there discriminatory laws or employment practices against certain groups?</p> <p>Rule of law & judiciary Is the state or local security apparatus trusted? Is the application/enforcement of law unbiased and effective? Is there a presence of organized criminal elements exploiting a breach in legal or judicial systems?</p> <p>Communications and social accountability: What are the mains means through which citizens, including marginalized groups, access information? Do the mass media exploit existing preconceptions about particular groups? What outlets are available for citizens to voice their needs or concerns?</p>	<p>Capacity: What is the capacity of state and local authorities to effectively and equitably respond to the recovery needs of all disaster-affected people? How is the government's performance perceived? Are external aid providers replacing or bypassing existing functioning structures/systems or influencing resource distribution? How effective are the authorities at coordinating with external aid providers?</p> <p>Decision-making on resource distribution: What roles do leaders/citizens from the affected communities play in the disaster response? Are there gaps in their participation? What access have affected communities had to relief/recovery assistance to date? What are the perceptions of men/women in these communities regarding the equity of assistance provided?</p> <p>Social inclusion: Has social cohesion grown in the aftermath of the disaster, and are there ways to reinforce this through the recovery effort? What institutional, cultural, security-related and practical obstacles do women/men face in accessing recovery assistance?</p> <p>Rule of law & judiciary: How have formal/informal law & justice institutions been affected by the disaster? What have been the consequences? How safe and secure do disaster-affected men/women/children feel?</p> <p>Communications and social accountability: Are the communication mechanisms being used to provide information on relief and recovery assistance accessible to all in the disaster-affected areas, including socially marginalized or conflict-affected groups? Is the media portrayal of the disaster's impacts and relief/recovery response accurate and balanced? Are sufficient social accountability mechanisms in place?</p>

Stakeholders	<p>Who are the key state and local leaders/authorities in the disaster-affected area, including those who may operate outside of accepted authority (eg from urban gangs, political opponents, etc)?</p> <p>What other formal/informal actors serve community needs in the affected areas? What proportion represent or serve needs of marginalized groups?</p> <p>Who are respected figures in the affected areas (eg entertainers, sports or religious figures, business leaders, etc)?</p>	<p>Have any key stakeholders died or been seriously injured as a result of the disaster? Who has taken their place or is there a gap?</p> <p>Which stakeholders are supporting or undermining recovery efforts? How are they doing this?</p> <p>Can effective partnerships or coordination be created between government-civil society-private sector? between government and external aid providers?</p>
Recovery Opportunities		<p>What institutional capacity building activities could be carried out to contribute to reducing tensions and building social cohesion?</p> <p>What livelihoods and job creation initiatives could be supported that build longer-term resilience to social risk?</p> <p>How can key social protection & social justice functions be utilized, restored or strengthened as part of the recovery effort?</p> <p>How can vulnerability targeting, grievance, social accountability and communication mechanisms for recovery programming be designed or improved to remove biases in aid delivery or maximize outreach to all disaster-affected groups?</p> <p>Are there opportunities to introduce reforms to areas like land governance and gender equality?</p>

CHAPTER 5:

ADMINISTRATION

1. Sample terms of reference

Context

This describes the disaster and outlines some of the social impacts that may be emerging. It outlines what happened, where and when, and how many people died or were injured (by sex, age and social groups if data is available), lost their homes, were temporarily or permanently displaced (if known) or otherwise affected. It describes some of the immediate social impacts that may be apparent. These may include the loss of family members and friends; loss of housing, property and other assets; loss of livelihoods; and exposure to increased risk for vulnerable groups, such as women, children, displaced people and persons with disability. It may also include positive stories, such as of communities coming together to help each other, a spirit of volunteerism, and generous participation by civil society and the private sector.

The section explains that analyzing how the disaster and aid effort have affected local patterns of life and livelihoods, social structures and institutions is vital to develop plans to deliver post-disaster assistance effectively, and point out that the success of early and longer-term recovery will depend on the extent to which programs fit with the needs and institutions of affected areas. Well-designed programs that draw on local capacities and are built on an understanding of local realities not only help to address key needs but can also strengthen local institutions and practices in ways that enhance development and social cohesion.

Objective

This explains that the objective of the assessment is to analyze the direct and potential longer term social impacts of the disaster and recovery effort at community level to inform: (i) early recovery efforts, (ii) and the development of longer term public policy and reconstruction interventions.

Implementation Arrangements

This describes the implementation of the social assessment, identifying who will lead the assessment (e.g. which government department) and with whom they will coordinate. It also identifies other stakeholders that have a mandate to conduct related work and who will therefore be consulted. This section also describes which local partner will carry out the assessment, and with whom they are collaborating to do so, if relevant. It describes how the research teams will be composed, including a requirement to achieve a representative balance by sex and social groups to the extent possible. Where social risk assessment will be a key research theme, the political neutrality and conflict analysis skills requirements of the research partner/teams will be specified.

Activities and time-line

This describes the timing and steps involved in the assessment. A sample timeline is as follows:

Date	Activity
October 23-29	Briefing on PDNA Preparation of field instruments and field guide, report templates/guides Orientation/Workshop of Research Teams Coordination with NGO-field partners Initial site visits/Courtesy calls
October 29-30	Testing of field instruments
November 2 - 7	Fieldwork: key informant interviews, focus group discussions, walkthroughs Write-up interview reports, FGD highlights Field documentation
November 9 – 20	Write-shop of research teams Consolidation and analysis of data
November 20	1 st draft of the social impact report and field site report 5-6 PowerPoint slides and 5/6 page summary for PDNA

November 23	Final summary report (5/6 pages for PDNA)
December 4	Final Social Impact Assessment Report

This section also identifies the methods of data collection to be used, for example key informant interviews with individual households, government officials, civil society representatives and other stakeholders, focus group discussions, informal discussions and participant observation. It explains that implementation of the assessment will be guided by a field guide, and list the main components of the field guide. The requirements for sex- and age-disaggregated data collection and gender-based analysis are specified. Any requirements for social risk assessment also are identified.

Budget

This gives basic details of the proposed budget.

Deliverables

This identifies key dates and deliverables. For example:

Date	Deliverable
October 28	Detailed work plan, including final field site selection and revised field guide
November 20	Individual field site reports Draft social impact assessment report PowerPoint presentation and draft of summary report for inclusion in PDNA
November 25	Final summary report for inclusion in PDNA
December 4	Final social impact assessment report

Reporting Arrangements

This describes the person to whom the local partner will report.

2. Budgets & finance

Table: Sample budget lines for social impact study

ITEM	NUMBER	UNIT	UNIT COST	UNIT TOTAL	AMOUNT
SALARIES AND HONORARIA					
Project Director					
Project Manager					
Research Assistants					
Editor					
Team Leaders					
Field Researchers					
Field Researchers with additional survey work load					
Field Researchers with additional translation work load					
Total					
RESEARCH EXPENSES AND OFFICE SUPPLIES					
<i>Research Supplies and Equipment</i>					
Paper, ink, interview notebooks, folders, pens					
Digital recorders					
Rechargeable batteries and chargers					
Reproduction of research instruments					
Production of materials for public dissemination					
Software					
<i>Meals</i>					
Consultations with civil society on research design					
Training (for research teams)					
Pre-test for focus groups (if participants are given meals)					
Focus groups (if participants are given meals)					
Community feedback sessions					
Presentation of preliminary findings					

ITEM	NUMBER	UNIT	UNIT COST	UNIT TOTAL	AMOUNT
Presentation of final research findings					
Research meetings					
<i>Tokens (if given to participants)</i>					
Pretest key informant households, focus group discussions and survey participants					
Key informant households					
Focus group discussions					
Survey					
<i>Field allowances</i>					
Recruitment					
Pilot testing					
Site visits					
Fieldwork					
Survey					
Training					
<i>Transportation</i>					
Fieldwork					
Recruitment/training/pre-tests/site visits					
<i>Accommodation</i>					
Fieldwork					
Recruitment of team/site visits					
Training of field researchers					
<i>Communications</i>					
Office phone bill					
Mobile phones:					

ITEM	NUMBER	UNIT	UNIT COST	UNIT TOTAL	AMOUNT
• Project Director					
• Project Managers					
• Team Leaders					
• Field researchers					
Internet					
• Team Leaders					
• Field researchers					
Courier					
<i>Insurance</i>					
Insurance					
Subtotal					
ADMINISTRATIVE COST					
Project administration					
Bookkeeping & account services					
Office space					
Other					
Subtotal					
TOTAL					

3. Sample Terms of Reference for a Gender Specialist to support the analysis

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

[Insert background information about disaster]

SCOPE OF WORK

The main responsibilities of the consultant will be to:

- a) Provide technical assistance to the affected country's government and PDNA partners to mainstream gender into the design, implementation and reporting of the PDNA;
- b) Deliver gender analysis orientation/training as a component of PDNA training;
- c) Provide technical assistance to the sectoral/thematic/social impact assessment teams in conducting sex-disaggregated data collection and gender analysis, including advice on mainstreaming gender throughout the written analysis and recommendations;
- d) Review the overall draft PDNA report and provide technical advice on mainstreaming gender throughout the analysis and recommendations; and
- e) Provide feedback on how the process could be improved upon for future PDNA processes.

TIMEFRAME

The consultant will be contracted for XX days to work with the PDNA team (The consultant will work closely with the PDNA coordination team to be able to review sectoral reports and overview section of the PDNA documents).

REPORTING

The consultant will discuss roles and responsibilities with the PDNA Coordinating and Social Sectors/Social Impact Assessment Teams, as well as the agency responsible for gender or women's issues in the affected country's government. The Consultant will report to xxxxxxxx, the contracting agency.

OUTPUTS

- a) Orientation/training module and supporting learning/information material
- b) List of key gender-related recommendations
- c) Reviewed PDNA report
- d) Feedback report

QUALIFICATIONS

- At least ten years experience in gender analysis and gender-sensitive programming, preferably in a post-disaster context
- Demonstrated high level inter-personal, teamwork and advocacy/influencing skills
- Demonstrated high-level spoken and written communication skills

4. Contract & grant modalities

A technical proposal for a social impact analysis study varies according to what is required by the institution funding the study. Typically, however, it will include the following kind of information:

1. Technical Proposal Submission Form

This usually takes the form of a cover letter from the local partner to the institution funding the research.

2. Consultant's Organization and Experience

2.1 Consultant's Organization

Here the local partner should describe their organization and its aims.

2.2 Consultant's Experience

Here, the local partner should describe its experience in conducting similar research projects. This should include a narrative description of the project and its research domains and a description of the services provided by the local partner.

3. Description of Approach, Methodology and Work Plan for Performing the Assignment

3.1 Technical Approach and Methodology

The local partner should describe here the research objectives of the study, the proposed focus of the research, the research domains and data sets that will be collected, the framework and research methodology for the study, the proposed approach to site selection, the sites to be included in the study, the research instruments to be used, the approach to sampling respondents in research locations, and the deliverables to be prepared. The local partner should outline the composition of the research teams and the methods of documentation that will be used.

4. Team Composition and Task Assignments

Here the local partner should list the proposed staff members who will work on the study, including the firm to which they belong, their areas of expertise, their gender, the position to which they will be assigned, and their responsibilities.

5. Curriculum Vitae (CV) for Proposed Professional Staff

Here the local partner should provide curriculum vitae details for professional staff members who will work on the study. This should include the project director, project managers and editor, but does not have to include support staff, such as clerical staff.

6. Staffing Schedule

Here the local partner should present a staffing schedule showing the number of staff hours that will be contributed by month. For professional staff, this should be indicated individually; for support staff it should be indicated by category (e.g. field researchers, clerical staff).

7. Work Schedule

Here the local partner should provide a proposed calendar. This should include the key deliverables and steps involved in the study, including delivery of reports and other benchmarks. The local partner should also indicate the key deliverables and a payment schedule.

8. Vendor Eligibility Certificate

This is for the local partner to indicate their eligibility for the contract (e.g. that they have not been disbarred).

The contract should be signed and dated.