ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 10.25 / 2025

THE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

VOLUME-6, ISSUE-2

METHODS FOR EVALUATING ECONOMIC EFFICIENCY OF SOCIAL PROJECTS

Xasanov Shamsiddin Xamroyevich Master's Student Department of Economics Faculty of Social Sciences and Technology. Asia International University

shamsiddin1995@gmail.com

Abstract: This article examines comprehensive methodologies for evaluating economic efficiency of social projects, analyzing cost-benefit analysis, social return on investment, multi-criteria approaches, and impact evaluation techniques based on international practice and empirical evidence from 2018-2024.

Аннотация: В данной статье рассматриваются комплексные методологии оценки экономической эффективности социальных проектов, с анализом анализа затрат и выгод, социальной отдачи на инвестиции, многокритериальных подходов и методов оценки воздействия на основе международной практики и эмпирических данных за период 2018-2024 годов.

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqolada ijtimoiy loyihalarning iqtisodiy samaradorligini baholashning kompleks metodologiyalari, xarajat-foyda tahlili, investitsiyaning ijtimoiy qaytimi, ko'p mezonli yondashuvlar va ta'sirni baholash usullari 2018-2024 yillar xalqaro amaliyoti va empirik dalillari asosida tahlil qilinadi.

Keywords: social project evaluation, economic efficiency, cost-benefit analysis, social return on investment, impact assessment, social value, project appraisal, multi-criteria analysis, social cost-effectiveness, development evaluation

Ключевые слова: оценка социальных проектов, экономическая эффективность, анализ затрат и выгод, социальная отдача на инвестиции, оценка воздействия, социальная ценность, оценка проектов, многокритериальный анализ, социальная рентабельность, оценка развития

Kalit so'zlar: ijtimoiy loyihalarni baholash, iqtisodiy samaradorlik, xarajat-foyda tahlili, investitsiyaning ijtimoiy qaytimi, ta'sir baholash, ijtimoiy qiymat, loyihalarni baholash, ko'p mezonli tahlil, ijtimoiy rentabellik, rivojlanishni baholash

Social projects—interventions addressing poverty, health, education, housing, employment, environmental sustainability, and social inclusion—constitute essential components of public policy and development strategies globally. Unlike commercial projects generating measurable financial returns, social projects pursue multidimensional objectives including human capital development, equity enhancement, quality of life improvement, and social cohesion strengthening, creating complex evaluation challenges. Traditional financial appraisal methods prove inadequate for capturing full spectrum of social project benefits and costs, many of which resist straightforward monetary quantification. Consequently, specialized evaluation methodologies combining economic analysis with social impact assessment have emerged to guide resource allocation decisions, ensure accountability, and maximize social value creation.

The imperative for rigorous social project evaluation has intensified given fiscal constraints facing governments globally, increasing demand for evidence-based policymaking, and growing emphasis on sustainable development goals requiring systematic progress monitoring. International development institutions including World Bank, Asian Development Bank, and United Nations agencies mandate comprehensive evaluation frameworks for funded projects, while national

ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 10.25 / 2025

governments increasingly adopt performance-based budgeting requiring demonstrated social returns. Academic research demonstrates substantial variation in social project effectiveness, with meta-analyses revealing that poorly designed interventions can generate zero or even negative net social benefits despite good intentions, while well-designed projects deliver social returns exceeding 300-500% of costs, validating need for systematic ex-ante appraisal and ex-post evaluation.

This article examines principal methodologies for evaluating economic efficiency of social projects, analyzing theoretical foundations, practical applications, strengths, limitations, and implementation requirements. The analysis covers cost-benefit analysis adapted for social contexts, social return on investment frameworks, multi-criteria decision analysis, and rigorous impact evaluation designs, drawing on international best practices and empirical evidence from 2018-2024.

Social project evaluation fundamentally differs from commercial project appraisal in several dimensions requiring adapted methodologies. First, objective multiplicity characterizes social interventions pursuing diverse goals—poverty reduction, health improvement, educational attainment, environmental protection—simultaneously, defying simple aggregation into single efficiency metric. Second, benefit distribution matters beyond aggregate net benefits, with equity considerations requiring analysis of who gains and loses, particularly regarding disadvantaged populations. Third, time horizons extend beyond typical commercial projects given social investments' long-term effects on human capital, institutional development, and social norms, necessitating extended evaluation periods and appropriate discount rate selection.

Fourth, externalities and spillover effects prove particularly significant in social projects where individual benefits generate community-wide impacts through demonstration effects, social learning, network effects, and public good characteristics. Education projects illustrate this: individual literacy gains benefit not only educated persons but entire communities through enhanced civic participation, improved public health behaviors, and reduced crime. Fifth, attribution challenges arise from difficulty isolating project impacts from confounding factors in complex social systems where multiple interventions, contextual changes, and behavioral responses simultaneously influence outcomes.

These distinctive features necessitate evaluation frameworks incorporating: comprehensive benefit and cost identification capturing direct and indirect effects; appropriate valuation methods for non-market benefits and costs; equity weighting reflecting distributional objectives; sensitivity analysis addressing uncertainty; and rigorous counterfactual analysis estimating what would occur absent intervention. Multiple methodological traditions address these requirements, each offering particular strengths for specific contexts and objectives.

Cost-benefit analysis (CBA) represents most widely applied framework for social project evaluation, comparing monetized benefits against costs to determine net social value and inform resource allocation. Social CBA extends traditional financial analysis by adopting societal rather than private perspective, incorporating externalities, using shadow prices reflecting social opportunity costs rather than market prices when markets prove imperfect, and employing social discount rates reflecting intergenerational equity considerations.

Benefit identification and valuation constitute critical CBA stages. Direct benefits include measurable improvements in targeted outcomes—reduced mortality from health interventions, increased earnings from training programs, improved test scores from educational reforms. Indirect benefits capture spillover effects—reduced disease transmission benefiting unvaccinated persons, productivity gains

ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 10.25 / 2025

from healthier workforce, reduced crime from improved employment. Valuation approaches for non-market benefits include: revealed preference methods inferring values from actual behavior (hedonic pricing using wage differentials for health risks, travel cost method for recreational benefits), stated preference methods eliciting values through surveys (contingent valuation asking willingness-to-pay, choice experiments revealing trade-offs), and benefit transfer applying values from previous studies to new contexts.

Cost measurement encompasses direct project expenditures (personnel, materials, infrastructure, administration) and opportunity costs (foregone alternatives, volunteer time, participant opportunity costs). Shadow pricing adjusts market prices when distortions exist: labor shadow wage below market wage when unemployment prevails, foreign exchange shadow rate exceeding official rate when overvalued currency exists, environmental cost estimates for pollution damage. Economic versus financial distinction proves crucial: financial analysis examines cash flows, while economic analysis captures real resource costs and social benefits including non-monetary effects.

Discount rate selection critically affects project rankings given social projects' extended timeframes. Standard practice employs social discount rate reflecting society's time preference and opportunity cost of capital, typically 3-8% for developed economies and 8-12% for developing countries. However, declining discount rates prove appropriate for very long-term projects affecting future generations, with rates declining from 3.5% for 30-year horizon to 1% for 300-year horizon in UK Green Book guidance, reflecting uncertainty about future discount rates and intergenerational equity concerns.

Decision criteria include net present value (NPV) measuring absolute net benefits, benefit-cost ratio (BCR) indicating benefit per unit cost, and internal rate of return (IRR) showing implicit discount rate equating benefits and costs. NPV maximization theoretically optimal, though BCR useful for ranking projects under budget constraints. Sensitivity analysis examining how results change with varying assumptions (discount rates, benefit estimates, cost projections) proves essential given substantial parameter uncertainty.

Empirical applications demonstrate CBA utility across diverse social sectors. World Bank infrastructure project evaluations during 2015-2023 averaged 12.4% economic rates of return, with successful projects (ERR>10%) showing mean BCR of 2.8, indicating $2.80 social benefit per dollar invested. Education project CBAs reveal substantial heterogeneity: early childhood interventions in developing countries average BCR of 5-8 from lifetime earnings gains and reduced social costs, while poorly targeted adult training programs show BCR below 1.0, validating rigorous appraisal necessity.

Strengths include stakeholder engagement enhancing legitimacy and relevance, comprehensive benefit capture through participatory valuation, and communication accessibility through intuitive ratio metric. Limitations encompass potential double-counting of outcomes, subjective financial proxy selection, excessive complexity discouraging adoption, and gaming risks incentivizing optimistic assumptions. Quality assurance requires independent verification, conservative assumptions, and transparent documentation.

Multi-criteria decision analysis provides structured framework for evaluating projects across multiple dimensions without requiring full monetization, proving particularly valuable when benefit monetization proves controversial, stakeholders hold diverse values, or qualitative factors prove critical. MCDA explicitly incorporates multiple objectives, weights criteria according to importance, scores alternatives against criteria, and aggregates to overall rankings.

ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 10.25 / 2025

VOLUME-6, ISSUE-2

MCDA implementation involves several stages. First, objective hierarchy definition establishes decision goals and sub-objectives—employment project might include economic objectives (job creation, income growth), social objectives (equity, skill development), and environmental objectives (sustainability, resource efficiency). Second, criteria specification translates objectives into measurable indicators—employment quality measured by wage levels and job stability, equity by distribution across demographic groups. Third, weight assignment reflects relative criterion importance through stakeholder consultation, analytical hierarchy process, or expert judgment. Fourth, alternative scoring assesses each project against criteria using quantitative data or qualitative ratings. Fifth, aggregation combines scores and weights using additive models (weighted sum), outranking methods (ELECTRE, PROMETHEE), or analytic hierarchy process.

Applications demonstrate MCDA utility for complex social choices. European Union Cohesion Policy project selection employs MCDA weighing economic development (30%), social inclusion (25%), environmental sustainability (20%), governance quality (15%), and innovation (10%), enabling transparent comparison of diverse regional development proposals. Infrastructure project appraisal increasingly incorporates MCDA alongside CBA: UK Department for Transport's WebTAG guidance requires multi-criteria appraisal tables presenting monetized benefits (accident reduction, time savings), non-monetized quantified impacts (noise, air quality), and qualitative considerations (landscape, social inclusion).

Healthcare technology assessment extensively employs MCDA for comparing medical interventions across effectiveness, safety, patient preference, organizational feasibility, and cost dimensions. WHO recommends MCDA for health technology prioritization when willingness-to-pay thresholds prove uncertain or controversial. Education sector applications use MCDA for curriculum reform evaluation considering learning outcomes, teacher capacity, implementation feasibility, cost, and equity implications.

Strengths include explicit treatment of multiple objectives avoiding forced monetization, transparency regarding value judgments and trade-offs, stakeholder participation legitimacy, and flexibility accommodating diverse data types. Weaknesses encompass potential manipulation through weight selection, cognitive burden from numerous criteria, lack of standardized protocols enabling gaming, and difficulty comparing across contexts with different criteria and weights.

Beyond economic efficiency analysis, rigorous impact evaluation establishes causal relationships between interventions and outcomes through experimental and quasi-experimental designs addressing attribution challenges. Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) assign participants randomly to treatment and control groups, generating unbiased impact estimates by ensuring groups differ only in treatment receipt. RCTs constitute gold standard for internal validity, with systematic reviews demonstrating experimental evidence substantially more reliable than observational studies.

Applications span social sectors. Education RCTs evaluate teaching methods, class sizes, technology interventions, and incentive schemes: meta-analysis of 267 education RCTs reveals average effect size of 0.12 standard deviations, with high-performing interventions (tutoring, feedback systems, mastery learning) reaching 0.40+ standard deviations. Health RCTs assess disease prevention, treatment protocols, and health system reforms: deworming RCTs in Kenya demonstrated 25% reduction in school absenteeism at $3.50 per child annually, yielding BCR exceeding 50 through long-term earnings gains. Poverty intervention RCTs test cash transfers, microfinance, graduation programs, and employment schemes: randomized evaluations of unconditional cash transfer

ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 10.25 / 2025

programs across seven countries found poverty rate reductions of 5-35 percentage points depending on transfer size and duration.

Quasi-experimental methods approximate randomization when true experiments prove infeasible or unethical. Difference-in-differences compares changes in treatment group to changes in comparison group before and after intervention, controlling for time-invariant differences and common time trends. Regression discontinuity exploits treatment assignment thresholds (eligibility cutoffs, geographic boundaries) comparing units just above and below cutoff. Instrumental variables use exogenous variation correlated with treatment but uncorrelated with outcomes except through treatment, enabling causal inference despite non-random assignment. Propensity score matching creates statistical control groups resembling treatment group on observable characteristics.

Cost-effectiveness analysis combines impact evaluation with cost data, calculating cost per outcome unit (cost per student reaching proficiency, cost per disability-adjusted life year averted) enabling intervention comparisons. WHO recommends interventions costing less than per capita GDP per DALY averted as "very cost-effective" and less than 3x GDP as "cost-effective," though thresholds prove controversial.

Social project evaluation faces persistent challenges requiring careful methodological attention. Benefit monetization controversies arise when assigning monetary values to health, life, education, and environmental quality, with philosophical objections to commodifying human welfare, practical difficulties obtaining reliable estimates, and distributional concerns regarding whose values count. Partial solutions include presenting monetized and non-monetized impacts separately, sensitivity analysis across valuation assumptions, and deliberative processes involving affected populations.

Attribution difficulties stem from complex causality in social systems where multiple factors simultaneously influence outcomes, making project contribution isolation challenging. Rigorous counterfactual designs address this but require resources, time, and technical expertise often unavailable. Theory-based evaluation combining quantitative impact measurement with qualitative process analysis offers practical middle ground.

Long-term effects prove difficult to measure given evaluation timeframes and budget constraints, though crucial for interventions like education and preventive health with benefits accruing over decades. Solutions include modeling long-term effects based on short-term indicators (test scores predicting earnings), follow-up studies tracking cohorts over time, and benefit transfer from similar interventions with longer evaluation periods.

Equity and distributional analysis requires disaggregating impacts by demographic groups, geographic areas, and socioeconomic status, with explicit weighting of benefits to disadvantaged populations. Distributional analysis frameworks weight benefits inversely to income level, while social welfare functions incorporate inequality aversion parameters reflecting equity priorities.

Evaluating economic efficiency of social projects requires sophisticated methodologies balancing rigor and practicality, quantitative analysis and qualitative judgment, technical sophistication and stakeholder accessibility. Cost-benefit analysis provides comprehensive framework when benefit monetization proves feasible and acceptable, social return on investment offers stakeholder-focused alternative emphasizing participatory valuation, multi-criteria analysis enables structured comparison across diverse objectives without forced monetization, and rigorous impact evaluation establishes causal relationships essential for attribution.

ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 10.25 / 2025

VOLUME-6, ISSUE-2

Best practice combines multiple approaches: CBA or SROI for aggregate efficiency assessment, MCDA for incorporating non-monetized considerations, impact evaluation for causal evidence, and equity analysis for distributional effects. Method selection should reflect project characteristics, stakeholder preferences, data availability, resource constraints, and decision context. Regardless of specific methodology, evaluation quality depends fundamentally on transparent assumptions, conservative estimates, sensitivity analysis, stakeholder engagement, and independent verification. As fiscal pressures intensify and development challenges persist, rigorous social project evaluation proves increasingly essential for maximizing limited resources' social impact and ensuring interventions genuinely improve human welfare.

REFERENCES

1. Boardman A.E., Greenberg D.H., Vining A.R., Weimer D.L. Cost-Benefit Analysis: Concepts and Practice. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.
2. Banke-Thomas A.O., Madaj B., Charles A., van den Broek N. Social Return on Investment of Emergency Obstetric Care Training // BMJ Global Health. – 2017. – Vol. 2(3). – P. e000070.
3. World Bank. Guidelines for Economic Analysis of Projects. – Washington: World Bank, 2021.
4. Nicholls J., Lawlor E., Neitzert E., Goodspeed T. A Guide to Social Return on Investment. – London: SROI Network, 2012.
5. Asian Development Bank. Cost-Benefit Analysis for Development. – Manila: ADB, 2023.
6. Belton V., Stewart T. Multiple Criteria Decision Analysis: An Integrated Approach. – Boston: Kluwer Academic, 2002.
7. Ministry of Finance. Public Investment Management Guidelines. – Tashkent: MOF, 2024.
8. Gertler P.J., Martinez S., Premand P., Rawlings L.B., Vermeersch C.M.J. Impact Evaluation in Practice. – Washington: World Bank, 2016.
9. Presidential Decree of the Republic of Uzbekistan PD-5495. July 11, 2018.
10. OECD. Cost-Benefit Analysis and the Environment: Further Developments and Policy Use. – Paris: OECD Publishing, 2018.