

# **Role of Participatory Rural Appraisal in Community Development**

## **(A Case Study of Barani Area Development Project in Agriculture, Live Stock and Forestry Development in Kohat)**

**Dr. Anwar Alam**

Associate professor / coordinator sociology, Institute of Social Work, Sociology & Gender Studies, University of Peshawar, KPK, Pakistan

Email: [alamsocap@gmail.com](mailto:alamsocap@gmail.com)

**Mr. Sabir Ihsan**

M Phil Research Scholar in sociology, Institute of Social Work, Sociology & Gender Studies, University of Peshawar, KPK, Pakistan

### **Abstract**

The study was conducted to find out the role of participatory approach in community development. Barani Area Development Project is one of Govt: sponsored project, which was started in 2001. The aim of this project was to encourage community and ensure maximum participation to sustain the project in district kohat. Kalabat, Jangle Khail , Lachi ,Usterzo and Kachi were selected for this study. Proportion allocation method of sampling was used for the selection of respondents, 150 community members were selected out of 9000 population and 50 stockholders of Barani Project were selected out of 70 population for this study. The researcher used questionnaire for educated respondents and interview schedule for illiterate respondents. The study indicates that Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) is one of the most appropriate approaches for the identification of community problems and for understanding the socio-economic and cultural aspects of the community. The beneficiaries were well aware about participatory rural appraisal (PRA) and its use because of the proper introduction and implementation in area by Barani Area Development Project (BADP). Due to PRA, the output of agriculture, livestock and forestry has risen, which has ultimately raised the socio-economic conditions of the community. The PRA training in agriculture is with special emphasis on land cultivation, preparations, fertilizer and pesticides usage has risen and helpful in producing more yields. In livestock sector they gave training on breed improvement in area and as a result livestock breed and milk products have improved in the area. In forestry sector they gave training on nursery raising and bee keeping etc to generate various ways for income. Thus through the PRA trainings and usage the community has a chance to earn more livelihoods and to satisfy their needs easily. Thus BADP used PRA approach in the area to empower the community through self-help and self-decision for participation in any developmental activities without any discrimination among the community members. The PRA tools used are helpful to

the whole community, and they will easily identify their problems not only to agriculture sector but also in livestock and forestry sector. The community was satisfied from PRA role because they will ensure maximum participation through CBO/VO/WO etc. for the community development. The researcher recommended some suggestions to overcome the obstacles in front of PRA implementation and bringing Development in agriculture, livestock and forestry sectors through Barani Area Development Project.

**Keywords:** Participatory Rural Appraisal, Community Development, Community Participation, Community Empowerment, Problems Identification, Self Help, Self Decision Making, CBO, VO,WO, Agriculture Development, Live Stock Development and Forestry Development.

## 1. Introduction

Participatory methods have gained momentum in recent years as researchers, field practices and development experts have sought more effective ways to involve local people in decision-making and research. The Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) has developed a variety of participatory tools especially for use with forest communities and other natural resource needy groups. Some of these tools are edition of existing methods; others were created particularly for work with forest dependent communities. The tools have mixed applications: stakeholder identification, decision-making, planning, conflict management, information collection, and other uses. This is concentrating toward environment and development researchers, and local government leaders. It provides information on several tools in order to help persons who read and understand the tools' basic capabilities, identify the most appropriate tool for their needs and find resources for further information.

The guide does not provide a comprehensive description of how to use each tool but rather an introduction and comparative overview. Much like a map, this guide puts the readers in the right direction. The guide is divided into three sections. The first provides a brief discussion about forest communities, participation, participatory tools, pitfalls of participatory tools and related concepts. The second section provides a summary description of each tool, considerations when selecting a tool and a comparative matrix to make it easy to find the right tool. The final section provides more details about the tools in a table format. Each tool has a general description, strengths and limitations, practical considerations, an example and resources for more information. As more tools are developed, they will be added to the guide. Readers who are new to participatory tools may find it valuable to start with the overview in "Concepts." Those who already have a clear idea of their objectives for using a tool may find it easy to visit first the comparative matrix in "Guidelines for Selecting a Tool" to determine which tool meets their needs. Others may wish to flip straight to the "Toolbox" and browse (Chamber, 1992.p3).

## **2. History of Participatory Approach**

Participatory rural appraisal PRA is a specific form of rapid rural appraisal (RRA), a research techniques developed in the late 1970s and early 1980s by the researchers in the international development as an alternative and compliment to conventional sample survey. PRA is a way of learning from and with community members to investigate, analyze and evaluate constraints and opportunities, and make informed and timely decisions regarding development projects. It is the method by which a research team can quickly and systematically collects information for the general analysis of a specific topic, question or a problem; Need assessment, Feasibility studies, Identifying and prioritizing projects and Project or program evaluations. In other words, its purpose is to gain an understanding of the complexities rather than to gather highly accurate statistics on a list of variables (Richard F, 1974 p.18).

## **3. PRA (Participatory Rural Appraisal)**

It is a way of learning from, and with, community members to investigate, and evaluate constraints and opportunities and make timely decisions regarding development projects. It is a method by which a research team can quickly and systematically collect information for the general analysis of specific topic, question, or problem, needs assessment, feasibility studies, identifying and prioritizing projects, and finally, the project evaluation. The PRA tools are implemented to achieve increased accuracy at low costs both in terms of time and money. Participatory appraisals methods are useful for accelerated knowledge, not just overall speed, but rapid rounds of field relations that result in the increasingly precise knowledge (Joachim Theis & Heather M. Grady, 1991; p.5).

Participation means involving local people in the development of plans and activities designed to change their lives. In its most developed form, participation is a continuous process of negotiation and decision making that occurs at various levels and with all stakeholders (Chambers, 1992: p.8).

Participation is the process through which stakeholders influence and share control over priority setting, policy-making Resource allocation and access to public (Gregory, 2000:p. 179).

## **4. PRA as a Toolkit**

1. Review of secondary information and data;
2. Semi-structured interviews;
3. Probing;
4. Diagrams, maps, calendars, historical profiles and Venn diagrams;
5. Ranking and quantification methods;
6. Preference/Problem Ranking (e.g. Pair-Ranking);
7. Photographs and games (Chambers, 1992: p.38)

## **5. Definition of Community Development**

1. Any action taken by any agency and primarily designed to benefit the community. (T.B Bother, 1957).
2. It is a process by which the efforts of the peoples themselves are united with those of governmental authorities to improve the social and cultural conditions of communities, to integrate these communities into the life of the nation and to enable them to contribute fully to nation (Rafiq S. Zari, 1987).

In simple words we can say that community development mean to developed human being socially, economically & politically.

## **6. Statement of the Problem**

The study is focusing on the application of Participatory approach in community development with special emphasis on the agriculture, livestock and forestry sector. It is an evaluative study of Barani Area Development project. The study highlights the use of PRA tools in these three sectors and its impact on community development. Most of the projects in Pakistan were completed under the planning and top to bottom approach, Bara area Development project is a model showing the application of PRA tools in Agriculture, Livestock and Forestry Development. The study indicates the use of PRA and its outcome in these three sectors for community development.

## **7. Significance of the Study**

The aim of this study is to eradicate social problems from the community by applying participatory methods. This study will provide a food for thought to all institutions whether governmental or non-governmental to apply these methods in their various activities & solves the problems of the community. This study will benefit the researchers, planners and policy makers to make a meaningful use of PRA tools in community development.

## **8. Objectives of the Study**

1. To asses the basket Techniques of Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) in community development;
2. To determine the role of PRA in agriculture, livestock and forestry development;
3. To study the response of community about involvement in community development through PRA;
4. To pinpoint shortcomings in PRA application and suggest measures for improvement in its application in future.

## **9. Literature Review**

### *9.1 Theories of Participatory Approach*

Participatory theories also criticized the modernization paradigm on the grounds that it promoted a top-down, ethnocentric and paternalistic view of development. They argued that the diffusion model proposed a conception of development associated with a Western vision of progress. Development communication was informed by a theory that became a science of producing effective messages. After decades of interventions, the failure to address poverty and other structural problems in the Third World needed to be explained on the faulty theoretical premises of the programs. Any intervention that was focused on improving messages to better reach individuals or only change behavior was, by definition, unable to implement social change (Hein in Quarrymen, 1991).

### *9.2 World Wide Implementation of Participatory Approach*

During the past 15 years, a large number of community forestry projects have been started in Latin America, Africa and Asia. Among these projects, many interesting cases can easily be identified in the field (Wilensky, U. & Resnick, M., 1995).

### *9.3 The Previnoba Project*

The overall objective of the Project in Senegal is to contribute to the battle against desertification through the improvement of the natural environment and the living conditions of the rural population. Specific objectives are to consolidate local capacity for integrated village land use and natural resource management, comprising the integration of forestry activities within agriculture and livestock systems, and to support the institutional strengthening of the forestry service. These activities should lead to the restoration of forest cover and enrichment of the soils to achieve sustainable self-sufficiency in forestry products for the local population, as well as raising incomes of farmers through silvicultural activities (Colella, V., 1998).

The steps followed are: Sensitization of different institutional authority, Selection of target villages, Prioritization, Farmers' training, Systematic monitoring by village forestry committees and Evaluation (Robert Chambers, 1993).

### *9.4 The Potosi Community Forestry Project*

The objective of the Potosi project in the Andean highlands of southwest Bolivia is the improvement of living standards of the peasants through the integration of sustainable forestry activities within existing production systems (Robert Chambers, 1983 p54).

As a result of the project, local forestry planning capacity has been strengthened significantly (Robert Chambers, 1983 p72).

### *9.5 The PUCD Project in Ghorka*

In Nepal the interregional project is working in the Bhusunde Khola Watershed (BKW), located in Ghorka District. In the Western Development Region. So far, 22 user groups have implemented almost all planned activities. The project has provided the required material, financial and training inputs. The user groups assumed their responsibility for the organization and mobilization of the labor inputs.

### *9.6 The PUCD Project in Butare*

In Rwanda, the PUCD inter regional project is working in the municipality of Runyanya, Province of Butare, in the south of the country. From July 1992 onwards, the project together with the local population carried out an iterative process of participatory appraisal, planning and implementation of priority actions, and planning of more complex activities for the longer term. A detailed project work plan was elaborated and finalized on the basis of actions selected and planned by the population.

### *9.7 The PUCD Project in Makamba*

In Burundi, the interregional project is working in the Rwaba watershed, Makamba Province, in the south of the country. At the time of execution of the case study, approximately 130 families, organized in 21 groups, were involved in the preparation or implementation of their own project activities, covering a wide range of fields, from erosion control to social communication. These "micro projects" have been prepared and designed by the groups themselves with additional support from the project. This support has been provided with the objective of strengthening local capacity in the areas of analysis, planning, and management of the resources in their environment, mobilization of their own financial, human and material resources, economic and financial management and self-evaluation (F.A.O Series title: Forests, Trees and People Programme, 1998).

## **10. Participatory Approach in USA**

The Community Development Programme (*CDP*) is a programme aimed at strengthening community capacity for sustainable human development. A programme in the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (*UNCHS*) Habitat, CDP has been in operation for nearly fifteen years and over that period had produced over 250 publications. CDP is aware of the importance of documenting the learning that emerged from its work with partners. This has included building partnerships, providing practical management and technical skills and providing opportunities for collaboration with other actors in the human settlements sector. CDP has also provided education to public authorities about the importance of community participation and has assisted governments to formulate policies that place end-users of local development at the centre of the planning processes. This catalogue was therefore prepared to document and disseminate the experiences of Community Development Programme and its partners.

(Arnstein, S. R. (1971). 'A Ladder of Citizen Participation'. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, no. 35, July.)

## **11. Disaster Prevention Programme (PRA Application in Africa)**

Irene Gujit and Ian Scoons have given the application of PRA methods in Africa. The Upper Mille and Cheleka Catchment - Disaster Prevention Programme is a collaborative effort between the Ethiopian Red Cross Society and the Ministries of Agriculture and Health. The UMCC-DPP is located in Wollo Province in the Ethiopian highlands, and was created to develop disaster response strategies with a broader scope than standard Red Cross activities. The village level work is carried out in Kalu and Ambassel awrajas (districts) by Development Agents (DAs) with the assistance of sub-district (woreda) and district level experts. Participatory Rural Appraisal (RRA) techniques that could be used to investigate the various issues, were: Mapping (M), Transect walks (T), Calendars (C), Specific interviews (I), Observations (O), Pie diagrams (P), Ranking exercises (R). The fields were agriculture, livestock, and forest. (Mukherjee 1995:280-282).

## **12. PRA application in Pakistan**

### *12.1 The PUCD Project in Quetta*

In Pakistan the PUCD project, executed through the Balochistan Forest and Wildlife Department of the Ministry of Agriculture, is in the Kanak Valley southwest of Quetta. Water, because of its scarcity and the low rainfall levels, is the most important natural resource in the area. The most significant cash crop, fruits and vegetables, could not be produced without irrigation from tube wells, but these wells are lowering the water table. After an analysis carried out by the villages, the project has been able to distinguish three areas for action: (1) increase the infiltration of rainwater by reducing runoff; (2) improve on-farm water harvesting techniques and water management; and (3) improve water-use regulations. A thorough cause-effect analysis was made of the issues mentioned by the villagers in order to arrive at a feasible plan of action for each of the villages (F.A.O Series title: Forests, Trees and People Programme, 1998).

### *12.2 The Malakand Social Forestry Project*

The main objective of the Malakand Social Forestry Project in northwest Pakistan is to contribute to raising the standard of living in the region by improving the productivity and use of the hillsides and marginal farmlands. This is done through restoring suitable vegetation to the denuded hillsides, while developing a participatory extension system based on the "village land use planning" (VLUP) approach. The objective of VLUP is to assist the local population in the development of a management plan for privately and commonly owned hillsides and farmlands. The planning process is implemented by villagers and interdisciplinary team of outsiders, and goes through the following phases: (1) Preparation; (2) analysis of village land use bases on RRA techniques; (3) social organization; (4) development of management plans for specific land use units; and (5) implementation and monitoring of plans (Chambers, Robert,

1994). The origins and Practice of Participatory Rural Appraisal' World Development, Vol.22, No. 7, pp.953-69.)

### *12.3 Barani Area Development Project Description*

In the NWFP., the basic source of income and livelihood is agriculture, but 60% of the cultivated land of the province is non-irrigated (barani / rain-fed). Due to rain-fed status of the land the output is low as compared to irrigated land. This is the main reason of poverty in such areas. The focus of the Barani project was to improve the socio-economic life of the people through the improvement in agriculture, livestock, poultry and forests. To ensure these developments, Barani project took initiative from the community and utilized participatory approach in community development through NGO's in the area. (Asian Development Bank Project 2001 p. 9)

Barani project was initiated during 1992. Most of the programs of the project are community oriented (Asian Development Bank Project, 2001 p. 27).

Barani Project Components: The Project focused on the development of agriculture, livestock and forestry (Asian Development Bank Project, 2001 p.28).

Agriculture Development: The project focused on variety of crops in the area. Research unit was developed to ensure higher productivity in agriculture. Agriculture extension services were established to improve the per acre yield. The project also introduced new technology in the agriculture field and thus farm mechanization was introduced. (Asian Development Bank Project, 2001 p.30).

Livestock Production Extension unit was also developed as a result improvement in productivity of livestock occurred. The major activities included; Training to small farmers, fodder preservation and utilization, breed improvement, animal health services, and poultry development. The better breeds of goats and cows were introduced under the Project and as a result more milk products ensured (Asian Development Bank Project, 2001 p. 58).

Forestry Development: The project also worked on forest development in the area. The major components of forestry development program included: nurseries and plantations, community forestry programs, farm forestry to increase local manufacture of fuel-wood and timber on private lands, and to educate farmers in improved land use; and social forestry program (Asian Development Bank Project, 2001 p. 65).

## **13. Results And Conclusion**

**A: Staff Findings**

- 100.0% of the respondents used PRA and 98.0% used PRA through Community Organization.
- 100.0% had provided training on PRA in Agriculture Sector, Livestock and Forestry, which has enhanced community capacity.
- 100.0% of the respondents had told us that PRA is the only tool through which we can sensitize and mobilize the community for Agriculture, live stock and forestry development.
- 100.0% of the respondents told us it is more effective device for community sensitization.
- 100.0% of the respondents had told us that PRA is the effective tool through which we can empower the community.
- 62.0% were of the view that community should be empower through community participation in decision making.
- 100.0% of the respondents had told us that PRA is successful in community empowerment.
- 72.0% were of the viewed that it empowered the community on self-decision.
- 100.0% of the respondents had told us that PRA gave equal right to participants to participate in community development program.
- 100.0% of the respondents had told us that PRA gave equal right to participants.
- 100.0% of the respondents were of the viewed that it gave equal rights to more extent.
- 100.0% of the respondents had told us that PRA involvement in community development was effective for over all development of the area.
- 100.0% of the respondents had told us that PRA ensured encouragement of the community in developmental program.
- 100.0% of the respondents had told us that PRA ensured encouragement of the community in developmental program.
- 98.0% of the respondents were ensured encouragement of the community to participate in developmental program.
- 44.0% of the respondents had told us that PRA bring community organization & mobilization through VO/CBO/WO.
- 100.0% of the respondents had told us that PRA effective approach for organizing & mobilizing community.
- 100.0% of the respondents had told us that PRA is effective approach to bring development in Agriculture, live stock and forestry.
- 100.0% of the respondents had told us that PRA played a positive role in the development of agriculture, livestock and Forestry sector.
- 26.0% had told us that regular training or short courses is necessary for each and every community due to which people will encourage & maximum participation should be ensure.

## **B: Community Findings**

- 100.0% respondents told us that BADP used participatory approach (PRA) for community development.
- 97.3% were of the viewed that PRA used through organization.
- 98.7% were told us that BADP gave training in our area in agriculture, livestock and forestry on PRA.
- 96.0% told this training was increased community capacity.
- 97.4% were of viewed that PRA is using for sensitizing and mobilizing the community for agriculture, livestock and forestry development.
- 90.7% told that PRA is more effective tool for community mobilization towards agriculture, livestock and forestry development.
- 100.0% of the respondents were of viewed that BADP used PRA for community empowerment.
- 93.4% were of viewed that BADP it is successful in used of PRA for community empowerment.
- 51.7% were told us that it empowered the community through self decision. 91.4% were of viewed that PRA gave equal rights to community to participate in community development program.
- 100.0% of the respondents were of viewed that we were satisfied from PRA approach to organized and mobilized community for development.
- 97.4% were told us that it is effective approach in bringing development in agriculture, livestock and forestry sectors in BADP.
- 25.8% told that seasonal calendar / diagram were used as a basket technique in agriculture development.
- 39.1% told that pair wise ranking were used as a basket technique in livestock development.
- 50.3% told that transit walk were used as a basket technique in forestry development.
- 94.7% told that basket approaches of PRA were effectives in brining development in agriculture, livestock and forestry through BADP.
- 90.1% were of view that we were satisfied from the used and effectiveness of these techniques of PRA in various sectors of BADP.
- 100.0% of the respondents were of view that we were satisfied from the role of PRA which played in the development of agriculture, livestock and forestry in area.

## **14. Conclusion**

The study was conducted to find out the role of participatory rural appraisal in the development of agriculture, livestock and forestry. A case study was delimited to Barani Area Development Project (BADP) in district Kohat. From the whole study we conclude that Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) is one of the most appropriate and suitable method for finding the actual position of community. Through PRA we analyse the socio-economic and cultural aspects of the community. All the beneficiaries were well aware about participatory

rural appraisal (PRA) and its use because of the proper introduction and implementation in area by Barani Area Development Project (BADP). Initially BADP introduced PRA in the area by providing training to community and then through establishment of Village Organization (VO) in the target area. All of the respondents were of view that the role of PRA is to organize and mobilize the people towards development. They mentioned that before the PRA approach, there was no arrangement to mobilize and organize the community. Through this approach we can enhance the capacity of the community and they will be able to identify the community problems with solution. The main focus of the project was on agriculture sector including livestock and forestry. Most of the respondents were of view that through this project and especially through PRA, the output of agriculture, livestock and forestry has risen, which has ultimately raised the socio-economic conditions of the community. The PRA training in agriculture is with special emphasis on land cultivation, preparations, fertilizer and pesticides usage has risen and helpful in producing more yields. In livestock sector they gave training on breed improvement in area and as a result livestock breed and milk products have improved in the area. In forestry sector they gave training on nursery raising and bee keeping etc to generate various ways for income. Thus through the PRA trainings and usage the community has a chance to earn more livelihoods and to satisfy their needs easily. Thus BADP used PRA approach in the area to empower the community through self-help and self-decision for participation in any developmental activities without any discrimination among the community members. The PRA tools used are helpful to the whole community, and they will easily identify their problems not only to agriculture sector but also in livestock and forestry sector. The community peoples are very happy and satisfied from PRA role because they will ensure maximum participation through CBO/VO/WO etc. for the community development.

## **15. Recommendations/Suggestions**

On the basis of the study findings, the following suggestions are extended to eliminate various obstacles in the way of Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) and make them more suitable for community.

- It should be necessary to have simple and easy the procedure of Village Organization and ensure participation from each corner of the village.
- Not to specific/target one sector of an area but to try to cover the whole sector of an area and ensure maximum participation.
- There should be a strong relationship among the community members and staff of barani area development project (BADP).
- Local elite should be involved in every activity but not give the whole authority and responsibility to them.
- Training should be given in every sphere of life and proper hand out should be necessary for long lasting.
- Different tool is necessary to use in different sector but subject specialist should be necessary.
- Involving the target community practically in PRA tool to learn more.

- No discrimination among the community members in selection a members for training.
- Gender equality should be ensured in all developmental activities.
- There should be clean and transparent system of accountability at grass root level.
- Monitoring and evaluation should be necessary at any phase.
- Benefit of the project should be ensured to every member of the community.
- Regular meeting should have weekly, bi weekly or monthly level in each corner of community.

### **Acknowledgement**

The Researchers extend their thanks to the management of Barani Area Development Project Kohat for help in data collection and implementation of PRA in CD. We also extend our gratitude's to the Institute supported in us academically and facilitated us in this study.

### **References**

Amitava Mukherjee (1995). "Participatory Rural Appraisal, Methods and Applications in Rural planning", Vikas Pulishing House PVT LTD, New Delhi: 1-3 and 280-282

Asian Development Bank (2001). "Project Completion Report NWFP (Pak)", Bangkok; NP: 9-67  
Asian Development Bank "Project Completion Report on the North-West Frontier Province Barani Area Development Project in the Islamic Republic of Pakistan October 2001

Campbell, J. (2002): A critical appraisal of participatory methods in development research. In: International Journal of Social Research methodology, 5(1): 19-29.

Bill Cooke and Uma Kothari (2001). Participation: The New Tyranny; Zed London

Robert Chambers (1993). Challenging the Professions: Frontiers for Rural Development: ITDG London.

Castelloe, P., and Watson, T. (1999). "Participatory Education as a community practice method: A case example from a comprehensive Head Start program", Journal of Community Practice, 6(1), 71-90.

Chambers, R. (1992). "Rural Appraisal: Rapid, Relaxed, and Participatory", Institute of Development Studies Sussex: HELP, United Kingdom: 3-70.

Cooper rider, D.L., and S. Srivastva (1987). 'Appreciative Inquiry in Organizational life.' In: W. Pasmore & R. Woodman (eds.), Research in Organization Change and Development (Vol.1. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press. Also available at: [www.appreciative-inquiry.org](http://www.appreciative-inquiry.org).

Colella, V. (1998). Participatory Simulations: Building Collaborative Understanding through Immersive Dynamic Modeling. Unpublished masters thesis, MIT, Cambridge, MA.

DFID (1997). "Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines", Dissemination Note No.1, Social Development Division, Islamabad: 44

Gregory, A. (2000). "Problematising participation: a critical review of approaches to participation in evaluation theory". Evaluation 6(2): 179.

Jennings, R. (2000). "Participatory development as new paradigm: The transition of development professionalism. Prepared for the Community Based Reintegration and Rehabilitation in Post-Conflict Settings Conference". Washington, DC: 49

Joachim Theis & Heather M. Grady (1991). "Participatory Rapid Appraisal for Community Development: Training Manual Based on Experiences in the Middle East & North Africa", Save the Children UK: 40

McCracken, Jennifer A., Jules N. Pretty, and Gordon R. Conway. (1988). "An Introduction to Rapid Rural Appraisal for Agricultural Development", London, International Institute for Environment and Development: 45 (Mohan and Hekey 1993, community participation)

Pretty, J., Guijt, I., Thompson, J. and Scoones, I. (1995). "Participatory Learning and Action", IIED Participatory Methodology Series, IIED, London:30

Rafiq S. Zari (1987). "Community Development principle and techniques", Peshawar, Saif Printing Press:67.

S. Rengasamy Madurai Institute of Social Sciences PRA - Participatory Rural Appraisal\*\*Concepts, Methodologies and Techniques.1-18

(Theis, J. and H. Grady. (1991). *Participatory Rapid Appraisal for Community Development*. London: Save the Children Fund. 48-89)

White: 1994. "Participation: The New Tyranny", Zed Books: New York.

Wilensky, U. & Resnick, M. (1995). New thinking for New Sciences: Constructionist approaches for exploring complexity. Presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

## **Journals**

Chambers, Robert (1994): 'The origins and practices of Participatory rural Appraisal' World Development, Vol.22. 953-69

International Journal of Action Research 2(2), 198-221 ISSN 1861-1303 (print), ISSN 1861-9916 (internet),

F.A.O Series Title: Forests, Trees and People Programme. Working paper-2 1998.

**Websites**

World Bank. Participation website.

<http://www.oneworld.org/iied/resource>

[www.scn.org/cmp.com](http://www.scn.org/cmp.com)