



---

MANUAL

# **Social Cohesion Integration Diagnostics Tool (SCIDAT)**

A USER'S GUIDE





# Table of Contents

- INTRODUCTION TO THE USER'S GUIDE ..... 1
- WORKSHOP 1..... 5
- WORKSHOP 2..... 7
- SCIDAT QUESTIONNAIRE.....11
  - PRINCIPLE 1..... 11
  - PRINCIPLE 2..... 12
  - PRINCIPLE 3..... 14
  - PRINCIPLE 4 ..... 16
  - PRINCIPLE 5..... 17
  - PRINCIPLE 6..... 19



# Introduction to the User's Guide

This user's guide is a strategic tool designed to help senior management teams, and program officers and managers better understand the potential of their country program (CP) to integrate social cohesion activities into core program areas. The guide features a simple questionnaire that can be administered by a peacebuilding specialist or an office's head of programming. It is intended to be used by CRS and partner agency staff interested in integrating social cohesion approaches, concepts and tools with humanitarian and development activities in their CP. Any staff member involved in a project can be invited to complete the questionnaire. Accomplishing social cohesion integration goals will depend greatly on involvement of each agency's country representatives and heads of programming. Achieving readiness and follow through with the integration of social cohesion ideally requires the commitment from the CP as a whole.

The questionnaire was inspired by experiences of CRS in Central African Republic (CAR), where the CP began integrating social cohesion activities with emergency shelter and Savings and Internal Lending Communities (SILC) programs in 2015. The questionnaire was designed and reviewed in April 2015 by the Africa Justice and Peacebuilding Working Group (AJPWG) along with the CRS office in CAR. Subsequently, the tool underwent revision during the annual AJPWG Institute for Peacebuilding in Africa (IPA) in June 2015. Further revisions were undertaken following discussions during CRS' Inter-Religious Action and Social Cohesion workshop held in Naivasha in October 2015. Final vetting of this first edition took place in 2016 and early 2017 in CAR.

The SCIDAT is meant to assist CPs that have considered or would like to consider stand alone or integrative social cohesion activities. The tool comprises questions that are organized according to CRS's six peacebuilding integration criteria. By conducting the survey, CPs can initiate and engage introspection, reflection, dialog and analysis around social cohesion programming. Using the tool may also have spillover effects such as helping to identify conflict sensitivity gaps and opportunities, and "do no harm" programming.

## WHAT IS SOCIAL COHESION AND WHY IS IT IMPORTANT?

CRS' working definition of social cohesion closely approximates that of the World Bank. It emphasizes strong social bonds, trust and norms, and reciprocity between and among civil society groups and citizens, and between citizens and the state. The essence of a socially cohesive society is one where there is an "abundance of associations that bridge social divisions" and where robust civic institutions exist to make democracy more responsive, inclusive, transparent and accountable<sup>1</sup>.

According to this definition, a socially cohesive society will have vibrant, horizontal bridging mechanisms that reinforce social organization across income inequality, development disparities, ethnic divisions, religious divisions and other socio-cultural-economic divides. It will also demonstrate reciprocal, vertical linkages between

---

<sup>1</sup> "Violent Conflict and the Transformation of Social Capital: Lessons from Cambodia, Rwanda, Guatemala, and Somalia." Colletta, Nat J. and Michelle L. Cullen. The World Bank, Washington, D.C.: 2000.

citizens and their state, and between consumers and markets. The stronger and more numerous these horizontal and vertical ties, the more likely that societies and polities will possess the tools and capacities necessary to mediate and mitigate conflict. Because fragile states tend to be socially fragmented, they also exhibit high levels of exclusion, inequality, low consensus and uneven development. States characterized by poor governance are at higher risk for violent conflict, and therefore could be priority targets for social cohesion strengthening.

Within the context of social cohesion and the principle of “do no harm,” “dividers” and “connectors” are commonly used terms that can be explained as follows:

**Connectors** – issues, structures, systems and policies that increase shared participation around norms, values, needs, and events while building solidarity among various interest and identity groups. Connectors catalyze factors that bring identity groups closer to each other and contribute to peaceful outcomes.

**Dividers** – issues, structures, systems and policies that separate, marginalize or discriminate against segments of the population. Dividers deepen and widen the gaps that separate identity groups and cause unhealthy opposition.

## WHERE DOES THE SCIDAT FIT WITHIN A JUSTICE AND PEACEBUILDING INTEGRATION TOOLBOX?

The SCIDAT complements a growing set of CRS tools that advance the integration of justice and peacebuilding with CRS’ core programming areas: health, agricultural livelihoods and emergency response. While the SCIDAT focuses on each country program’s readiness to integrate social cohesion and other programs, CRS’ Peacebuilding Integration Course and The Ties that Bind: Building Social Cohesion in Divided Communities provide practical guidance for integrating justice and peacebuilding with other sectors, as well as for the training of trainers in social cohesion strengthening. Additional CRS integrative tools include a field guide on water and conflict, and a social cohesion barometer. Application of the SCIDAT would ideally precede use of these social cohesion integration tools.

## ADMINISTERING THE SCIDAT: WHY, WHEN, WHO AND HOW?

### WHY?

Opportunities to engage in social cohesion may arise either from a business development forecast, or from a portfolio assessment where a CP feels that social cohesion integration would make sense, respond to a need, or make good on a commitment in their strategy. For example, a donor releases a call for expressions of interest regarding an integrative program with shelter, food security, and social cohesion. Alternatively, a CP with a social cohesion stand alone program may be looking for ways to make it more integrative, or having adopted an integrative approach, may want a check up or a tune up.

## WHEN?

An ideal time to apply the SCIDAT is during a CP's portfolio design process or project concept phase so that social cohesion becomes part of the overall relief and development approach. The SCIDAT can also be utilized during performance monitoring, review or evaluation when, in the judgment of program staff, the integration of social cohesion components makes good sense. At the discretion of the CP, the diagnosis could be updated if and when the CP undertakes a subsequent strategic planning process.

## WHO?

The SCIDAT is a strategic, qualitative survey and does not require expertise in statistical regression and analysis. It can be administered by anyone with basic knowledge of and modest familiarity with the concepts and components of social cohesion. Ideally, a Head of Programs or someone familiar with social cohesion principles and integration can facilitate the exercise.

An exchange with CRS' STA for Peacebuilding, a member of the AJPWG or with another CP that has done the SCIDAT before can be helpful to anticipate questions, and to understand and apply the results. For consultative and analytical purposes, it is advisable that the results of the survey be shared with justice and peacebuilding advisors.

There is no recommended minimum number of people who can take the survey, but the strength of the results will be enhanced by larger numbers. Country representatives, heads of program, business development specialists, program and project directors and managers, technical advisors and other staff whose work impacts social cohesion can be invited to take the survey.

Erring on the side of inclusivity may produce more "don't know" results; but it can also raise awareness, invite curiosity about conflict sensitivity and lead to greater sustainability in sector activities.

## HOW?

The survey is ideally administered, and then results analyzed and discussed, in two, half-day workshops. During the first workshop, the facilitator can recap the reasons for holding the workshop, engage participants in a brief discussion of social cohesion, explain the purpose of the exercise and administer the questionnaire to selected CP participants.

In the second workshop, the facilitator can review and discuss the survey results, implications and next steps with the respondents.

If desired, the first workshop could be truncated or eliminated by explaining the purpose of the exercise online and sending the survey questionnaire by email to the participants. Alternatively, one could assemble the participants, explain the survey and ask them to complete it on their own. CPs with ICT4D capability may wish to administer the survey electronically using I-Forms, IPADs, etc.

## SUGGESTED STEPS:

1. Hold preliminary discussions regarding justice and peacebuilding integration within the CP and with an advisor, e.g., a member of the AJPWG.
  - A. CP engages its staff regarding interest in taking the SCIDAT;
  - B. CP engages with the AJPWG or with someone familiar with the tool to discuss preliminaries, requirements and technical assistance (if needed).
2. Prepare, organize and schedule two, half-day workshops.
3. During the first workshop:
  - A. Establish and explain the objectives of the workshop, which may include:
    - To increase awareness of social cohesion integration with program activities and projects;
    - To prepare participants to integrate social cohesion into development and emergency programming;
    - To understand the purpose and advantages of using the SCIDAT.
  - B. Administer the questionnaire:
    - Explain how the questionnaire is organized;
    - Answer questions regarding terminology, etc.
4. After the first workshop: Tabulate, aggregate, analyze and report on the results.
5. During the second workshop:
  - A. Establish and explain the objectives of the workshop, which may include:
    - To present, explain and understand the results of the survey;
    - To conduct a brief SWOT analysis for integrating social cohesion activities into other sectors;
    - To develop a blueprint for moving forward with social cohesion integration based on the results of the survey.
  - B. Review the results of the survey.
  - C. Conduct action planning for social cohesion integration: Produce a blueprint or roadmap for moving forward based on the results of the survey and discussions.



# Workshop 1

## SESSION OVERVIEW (ESTIMATED 2.5 HOURS)

SESSION	TOPIC/ACTIVITIES	TIME
1.0	Review and discuss social cohesion concepts and terminology including its practice in the organization	60 min
2.0	Introduce and complete the Social Cohesion Integration Diagnostics Tool (SCIDAT) Questionnaire	60 min
3.0	Discussion and questions related to completing the SCIDAT Questionnaire	30 min

## HANDOUTS AND MATERIALS

- Handout (if being used as a hard copy only) – SCIDAT Questionnaire

## TRAINER PREPARATION (PRIOR TO THE SESSION)

1. Gain familiarity with the SCIDAT – prepare for discussion and anticipate questions;
2. Study the activities for the day and know how each session is organized;
3. Carefully review the handouts listed above.

## ACTIVITIES

### SESSION 1.0 | Brief review of social cohesion including its practice in CRS (60 min)

The facilitator will go through CRS' working definition of social cohesion to refresh participants' memories and ensure they have a foundation on which to answer questions in the SCIDAT questionnaire. To add context, the facilitator should provide examples where CRS implements social cohesion programs, such as Central African Republic and the Philippines. Where possible, examples should be taken from the CP in which the workshop is taking place.

### SESSION 2.0 | Complete the SCIDAT questionnaire (60 min)

If there are no further questions regarding terminology, participants will use this time to complete the SCIDAT questionnaire. Although 60 minutes is allocated, most participants will be able to complete the survey in less time. The facilitator should be available to respond to questions that participants might have while they fill out the questionnaire. The facilitator should emphasize that responses will be confidential.

### SESSION 3.0 | Discussion and questions related to completing the questionnaire (30 min)

When all the participants have completed the questionnaire, there could be a brief, general discussion about the process. The facilitator can use this time to explain how results will be processed and analyzed as well as the next steps of the diagnostics process.



# Workshop 2

It is critical at this stage that the head of programming and other country program leadership are present at this workshop as it entails country-level planning.

## SESSION OVERVIEW (ESTIMATED 3.5 HOURS)

SESSION	TOPIC/ACTIVITIES	TIME
1.0	Sharing of results and analysis from the SCIDAT Questionnaire	30 min
2.0	Exploring possibilities of integrating social cohesion in emergency and development assistance in the CP	90 min
3.0	Action planning for social cohesion integration: SWOT and Blueprint for moving forward based on results	90 min

## HANDOUTS AND MATERIALS

- Handout – Summary report and analysis of SCIDAT questionnaire

## TRAINER PREPARATION (PRIOR TO THE SESSION)

1. Facilitator processes results and prepares a brief report (with external assistance from AJPWG or other source if desired);
2. Identify head of programming and other CP leadership for the second workshop;
3. Organize the session for optimal contributions;
4. Develop and summarize ideas on possible next steps;
5. Indicate integration tools that appear to have already emerged as necessary throughout the workshop.

## ACTIVITIES

### SESSION 1.0 | Sharing of results and analysis from the SCIDAT Questionnaire (30 min)

Provide summary of cumulative findings and analysis. Compare results to a cumulative database of SCIDAT results as possible. Allow participants to make comments, give inputs and ask questions.

### SESSION 2.0 | Explore possibilities for integrating social cohesion with emergency and development assistance in the country program (90 min)

Explore practical actions for integrating social cohesion in emergency assistance and development programs with focus on activities and indicators.

**SESSION 3.0** | Action planning for social cohesion integration: Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) and blueprint for moving forward based on results (30 min)

Discuss with participants the ideal process for development of a detailed action plan based on the analysis of the survey results. Conduct a SWOT analysis.

## GROUP WORK:

### SWOT ANALYSIS (45 minutes)

Divide the participants into small groups and conduct a SWOT analysis addressing the following questions:

- What has to happen for social cohesion to be practically integrated into new and existing programs and activities?
- What tools may we want to apply?

## PLENARY:

### DEVELOP A BLUEPRINT/ROADMAP ON THE WAY FORWARD (45 minutes)

- Develop a strategy/process and team to develop a blueprint, roadmap or an action plan based on the survey results;
- Identify inputs needed to move forward;
- List steps to accomplish the task;
- Agree upon a timeline to complete the blueprint.

## EXPECTED OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES

The responses in the SCIDAT Questionnaire aim to gauge the extent of social cohesion integration in the CP as well as potential readiness for integration. Some questions in the survey capture the intensity of social cohesion integration in development and humanitarian programming. The data set produced by the survey should help guide the country program to devise and implement a plan for socially cohesive integrative programming. The outcomes of the exercise may include:

- Increased staff knowledge and awareness of:
  - Social cohesion concepts, principles, approaches and tools
  - How social cohesion strengthening can enhance multisectoral results and impact
  - Ways and methods to integrate justice and peacebuilding more widely into core programming areas and other sector programs

- A preliminary audit or diagnosis identifying a CP's gaps and readiness to conduct social cohesion integrated programming. A high score could mean that significant gains could be obtained with a small investment. Conversely, a low score could prompt discussion that could result in a "no go" or postpone action decision.
- A blueprint for next steps and further action. Next steps will vary depending on the analysis of the SCIDAT results and the discussion of the senior management team in-country. Holistic thinking is encouraged. The range of response options is quite broad, including but not limited to:
  - Supplementing additional human resources
  - Seeking external, additional learning opportunities
  - Looking for potential business development opportunities
  - Engaging new partners experienced in this integrate theme, or identifying ways internal or partner staff can become experienced
  - Identifying fellow CRS CPs with experience in social cohesion with whom to engage for learning and information sharing
  - Integrating social cohesion operationally into the CPs activity matrix.



# SCIDAT Questionnaire

**TARGET GROUP:** The SCIDAT tool is intended for use by all humanitarian and development staff in country programs, including those indirectly involved in integrating social cohesion into other core programming areas.

**METHODOLOGY:** Qualitative survey with the possibility of assigning scores/ratings per the six justice and peacebuilding integration principles.

**WHEN TO USE:** Prior to or during the design of the country program portfolio, new programs and projects so that social cohesion activities can be integrated into existing or proposed activities. The tool can also be used during a portfolio review and following monitoring and evaluation (M&E) exercises where it is determined that justice and peacebuilding integration into other sectors is desirable and feasible.

Please mark, or where relevant, write the number for the responses that most accurately reflect your answers to the following questions and statements, organized under six guiding principles for peacebuilding or social cohesion integration:

## PRINCIPLE 1. THE SOCIAL COHESION COMPONENTS SHOULD BE IMPORTANT AND CLEARLY RECOGNIZABLE AMONG OTHERS

**1.** At what level is social cohesion included in the results framework or priority areas of the country program (CP)?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> goal                | <input type="checkbox"/> intermediate objective |
| <input type="checkbox"/> strategic objective | <input type="checkbox"/> intermediate results   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> activities          | <input type="checkbox"/> none of the above      |

**2.** In your opinion, are there clearly recognizable activities or other elements in the CP's portfolio that contribute to social cohesion?<sup>2</sup>

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> no, not at all       | <input type="checkbox"/> to a limited extent |
| <input type="checkbox"/> to a moderate extent | <input type="checkbox"/> to a great extent   |

**3.** If social cohesion elements exist in country programming, were they intentionally included in project designs?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> no, not at all       | <input type="checkbox"/> to a limited extent |
| <input type="checkbox"/> to a moderate extent | <input type="checkbox"/> to a great extent   |

**4.** In your opinion, is CRS known within the country program's context as an actor engaged in social cohesion, whether internationally or locally?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> no, not at all       | <input type="checkbox"/> to a limited extent |
| <input type="checkbox"/> to a moderate extent | <input type="checkbox"/> to a great extent   |

---

<sup>2</sup> Questions 3-11 adapted from CRS' "Integrating Peacebuilding into Humanitarian and Development Programming"

5. Has stakeholder analysis for your core programming areas taken social cohesion factors such as connectors and dividers into account?

no, not at all  to a limited extent

to a moderate extent  to a great extent

6. Identify existing or foreseen obstacles to practical integration of social cohesion in project planning, implementation and evaluation in your CP. Please check all that apply.

organizational size

lack of peacebuilding integration tools

organizational culture

national culture

lack of financial resources for social cohesion

lack of staff training on social cohesion

low donor priority for social cohesion issues

lack of support from senior management

low organizational priority for social cohesion issues

limited staff capacity

low country program priority for social cohesion issues

other, please specify below:

---

---

## PRINCIPLE 2. INTENDED CHANGES IN UNJUST STRUCTURES OR POLICIES OR IN A CONFLICT (VIOLENT OR LATENT) SHOULD BE SPECIFIED

7. Are the activities in your CP's project implementation plans inclusive? i.e., do they provide diverse and marginalized community members with equitable access to project resources, services and decision making (across religious, ethnic, gender, age, and economic strata)?

no, not at all  to a limited extent

to a moderate extent  to a great extent



**8.** Are there specific activities, indicators or other elements in projects that will contribute to peace writ large? I.e., changes in unjust structures or policies or in the relationships between different identity groups which, if left unaddressed, contribute to violent conflict?

- no, not at all  to a limited extent  
 on an average level  to a great extent

**9.** To what extent do written CP strategies emphasize issues and values related to social cohesion?

- not at all  to a limited extent  
 on an average level  to a great extent  
 not sure

**10.** Is the commitment to social cohesion in any way a criterion in your CP's selection of implementing partners?

- no, not at all  to a limited extent  
 on an average level  to a great extent

**11.** Would you characterize the CP's relief and development context as receptive to social cohesion activities?

- no, not at all  to a limited extent  
 on an average level  to a great extent

**12.** What is the probable impact of your CP's projects on existing dividers in communities?

- likely positive impact  probable positive impact  
 no positive impact  don't know

How? Why? Please explain.

---

---

---

---

**13.** What is the probable impact of your CP's projects on existing connectors in communities?

likely positive impact

probable positive impact

no positive impact

don't know

How? Why? Please explain.

---

---

---

**14.** To what extent is your country program taking advantage of opportunities to strengthen existing connectors?

not at all

to a limited extent

to a great extent

fully

How? Please explain.

---

---

---

---

### **PRINCIPLE 3. THERE SHOULD BE PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCY IN SOCIAL COHESION AND ITS INTEGRATION**

**15.** Is there a person, unit or department responsible for social cohesion programing in your country program?

yes

to a limited extent

no

to a large extent

**16.** If not, is there a person, unit, or department that could logically be assigned such responsibility?

- no, not at all  to a limited extent
- to a moderate extent  to a great extent

**17.** Has country program staff been trained on how to integrate social cohesion into their programs and projects?

- no, not at all  to a limited extent
- to a moderate extent  to a great extent

Which trainings?

---

---

---

---

**18.** If social cohesion integration training has occurred, does the project staff feel competent applying their new knowledge in programming?

- no, not at all  to a limited extent
- to a moderate extent  to a great extent

**19.** To what degree has the level of staff competency in social cohesion integration, especially in core programming areas, increased in the CP during CRS' current strategy period?

- no, not at all  to a limited extent
- to a moderate extent  to a great extent

**20.** Is awareness of conflict and social cohesion included in any job descriptions?

- no, not at all  to a limited extent
- unsure  to a moderate extent
- to a great extent

**21.** To what extent do the CP's implementing partners demonstrate social cohesion strengthening capacity in their activities?

not at all  to a limited extent

to a moderate extent  to a great extent

**22.** Does the CP provide training and tools on social cohesion planning, analysis and evaluation to partners?

no, not at all  to a limited extent

on an average level  to a great extent

**PRINCIPLE 4. COHERENCE AND SIMILARITIES SHOULD BE BUILT BETWEEN SOCIAL COHESION AND OTHER SECTORS AND PROCESSES**

**23.** To what extent does the CP link any social cohesion-focused projects and other development or humanitarian programs?

not at all  to a limited extent

to some extent  to a great extent

**24.** Does your CP have any connections to or similarities with other social cohesion initiatives such as national peace processes, interreligious platforms and conflict resolution mechanisms?

none at all  a few

some  many

**25.** Did the design of programs or projects in the country program portfolio integrate the results of a conflict analysis?

no, not at all  to a limited extent

to a great extent  yes, fully

How So? Please explain.

---

---

**26.** Do regular opportunities exist for formal exchanges between peacebuilding or social cohesion-focused programs and core programming areas or other development and humanitarian sectors?

not at all  to a limited extent

to some extent  to a great extent

**27.** There are numerous opportunities and entry points for integrating social cohesion activities into core programming areas and other development and humanitarian programs.

strongly agree  agree

disagree  strongly disagree

**28.** To what extent have the core programming areas and other sectors in your CP requested social cohesion integration with their programming?

not at all  to a limited extent

to some extent  to a great extent

**29.** Our donor community has requested that we integrate social cohesion with agriculture, livelihoods, health, WASH or emergency response programming.

strongly agree  agree

disagree  strongly disagree

**30.** Our local partners have requested our assistance to integrate social cohesion with agriculture, livelihoods, health, WASH or emergency response programming.

strongly agree  agree

disagree  strongly disagree

## **PRINCIPLE 5. RESULTS OF SOCIAL COHESION INTEGRATION SHOULD BE DEMONSTRABLE AND EVIDENCE BASED**

**31.** Are there any CP projects whose MEAL plans measure social cohesion?

not at all  to a limited extent

to some extent  to a great extent

If so, which projects?

---

---

---

---

**32.** Are social cohesion dimensions in the CP's projects monitored?

- yes, formally
- yes, informally
- yes, formally and informally
- no, not monitored

**33.** Is learning from social cohesion dimensions in the projects shared internally?

- not at all
- to a limited extent
- to some extent
- to a great extent

**34.** Is learning from social cohesion dimensions in the projects shared externally?

- not at all
- to a limited extent
- to some extent
- to a great extent

**35.** To your knowledge, have the CP's proposals and/or CP's programs included indicators like the following? (check the ones that apply)

- frequency of conflict in program areas
- degree of community leader involvement in promoting social harmony
- degree to which the population feels safe
- readiness for cooperation across social divisions
- percent of citizens report a greater sense of mutual acceptance with their communities
- percent of population report that they feel better protected
- number of inter-religious related conflicts reported
- number of inter-social group conflicts reported

- percent or number of religious leaders engaged as peacebuilders
- percent of population ready to support their neighbor in emergency situations regardless of their race, ethnicity, religion, caste, gender, place of origin or another social identifier
- number of conflicts resolved
- number of community initiatives targeting social cohesion

**36.** To your knowledge, do the CP's implementing partners include social cohesion indicators in their M&E plans?

- no, not at all  to a limited extent
- to a moderate extent  to a great extent

**37.** If the CP is using social cohesion indicators, is information disaggregated along religion, ethnicity, sex, age, livelihood?

- no, not at all  to a limited extent
- to a moderate extent  to a great extent

**PRINCIPLE 6. SIGNIFICANT RESOURCES SHOULD BE DEDICATED TO SOCIAL COHESION INTEGRATION**

**38.** The CP has financial, material, and/or human resources available to dedicate to social cohesion integration

- not at all  to a limited extent
- to a moderate extent  to a great extent

If yes, please mention:

---



---



---

**39.** Have projects in your core programming areas and other sectors budgeted financial resources to support social cohesion integration?

- not at all  to a limited extent
- to a moderate extent  to a great extent

**40.** There are known funding sources (e.g., internal CRS private funds, international mechanisms, in-country donors) to tap for potential social cohesion-integrated projects

not at all  to a limited extent

to a moderate extent  to a great extent

**41.** The CP's donor community has expressed interest in social cohesion that would justify investing in social cohesion for longer than one project cycle.

not at all  to a limited extent

to a moderate extent  to a great extent







---

Catholic Relief Services 228 W. Lexington Street, Baltimore, MD 21201, USA  
For more information, contact [pqpublications@crs.org](mailto:pqpublications@crs.org).