Participatory Rural Appraisal: A Conceptual Evaluation for Application

M. Riswan

PhD Research Scholar (Commonwealth Fellow)
Department of Sociology, University of Kerala.
Senior Lecturer, South Eastern University of Sri Lanka.

Correspondence: mriswan2008@gmail.com

Abstract

Participatory Rural Appraisal is most prominent methodology which highly connected with the local people from the grass root level in order to find out the issues they experiencing and construct a standard and sustainable solutions for their practical problems. The main objective of this study is to understand how PRA method has been exercised as a useful tool for community participation, and to highlight the basic components of PRA, and to examine the different techniques of PRA exercised by the practitioners and development experts in the grass-root level. The data for this study basically gathered from books, research report and articles published in the journals. As it is a qualitative study, the concepts and ideas have been analysed and presented in an interpretative method. The paper presented that PRA has been developed from the methodology of Rapid Rural Appraisal, which promoted the involvement of local community in the development process. However, PRA has been adopted as a useful tool to invite greater degree of community participation and allow local people to take decisions in the implementation of any development initiatives. Further, this paper revealed that PRA is used and recognized by various experts and international organizations to incorporate local people to find solutions for their problems, and provide benefit to local community from the projects implemented by the government or donor agencies.

Keywords: PRA, RRA, community participation, development projects, research tool

1. Introduction

The Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) is originally used as a procedure and strategy building instrument which facilitated the policy consultants to collect information and evidence from local people and at the same time it has been used extensively in many parts of the world (Chambers, 1990). Its methods and approaches have been used for analysis, appraisal and research as well as planning and evaluation in numerous subject extents, which comprise ordinary properties; agro ecosystems; forestry and agro forestry, fisheries and aquaculture; irrigation; technology and innovation; social programs; natural resources management; farming system research and extension; food security; nutrition; disaster relief; pastoralism; marketing; organizational assessment and design; social cultural and economic conditions and many superior themes such as general elections and evaluation of poverty reduction strategies; soil and water conservation and watersheds; wildlife reserve management and biodiversity; integrated pest management; animal and crops farming; irrigation; water and sanitation; reproductive and awareness on sexually challenged health issues like HIV/AIDS; community planning; adolescent sexual challenges; violence; slum improvement; and participatory analysis in the organisations and so on (Chambers, 1994).

Through PRA, common people can present their needs or problems to the administration and connected with policy-making bodies or institutions clearly. It is a citizen-centred way of growth, which targets to empower societies by appealing native inhabitants in the processes of classifying problems, employing resolutions, and monitoring and evaluation (Chambers, 1992). Since the PRA is labelled as a 'family of methods and approaches', the Chambers, defines it is a family of approach through which local people

can determine and address their issues, and then share, develop, thoroughly demand and analyse their familiarity of it, using this to monitor, plan, and act on it (Chambers, 1994).

This methodology helps to the communicating procedures of communal growth. It is a method of learning from the people, with the people and by the people which permit native societies to exercise their own investigation and to proceed the actions (Chambers, 1992). PRA contains project staff learning together with inhabitants about their village. Moreover, it aims to help and strengthen the capacity of the community members. PRA methods are deliberated worthy when they are implemented by a group which containing of specifically qualified interdisciplinary team or individuals.

Because of an inadequate communication with inhabitants, numerous development officers and administrators tried to trace the issues with gaining the proper knowledge or information from the people in order to identify or understand the problems exists, and the requirements of them (Mathur, 1997). But, PRA permits organizers to overcome this tricky by comprising inhabitants straight in the problem evaluation and identification procedure. In this clarification of PRA, external specialists and development staffs are no longer the individuals who have the primary accountability for examining and understanding information and coming up with ideas or proposals for development (Chambers, 1981). Apart from that, their part in PRA usually inspire local people to perform their own analysis, come to their own assumptions and enterprise their own development packages.

Conversely, the PRA method is predominantly valuable as it permits susceptible individuals in a community to have an opinion and convey their visions on problems of the access and services which they are mostly and frequently omitted. It is not just an instrument which facilitates development planners to study about rural circumstances and consult with communal individuals so that the development planners can come up with more suitable and healthier development strategies. Instead, PRA is sometimes viewed as an implementation which handovers the role of decision-making and planning, conventionally taken by government institutions and development organisations, to the target community or group itself (Panda, 2014). Thus, this study has undertaken in a view of concept in order to understand how depth PRA act as a tool for the community participation which empower local people in the society.

2. Previous Studies

Chambers (1994) wrote an article on *'Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA): Analysis of Experience'*. Researcher explained the authority and approval of PRA are partially clarified by the unpredicted logical capabilities of native people when catalysed by comfortable relationship, and articulated through classifications of participatory and particularly pictorial ways. Further, the researcher explored the high reliability and validity of evidence communicate by the local community through PRA which is out-dated approach to provide data. Moreover, the clarifications comprise setbacks and changes of prominence: from etic to emic, closed to open, separate to group, spoken to visual, and measuring to matching; and from removing evidence to empowering local experts (Chambers, 1994). However, researchers pointed out the experience of PRA techniques, in this paper.

Similarly, another work has been carried out by Chambers (1994a) on *'Participatory Rural Appraisal: Challenges, Potentials and Paradigm'*, and he stated, quick feast has made excellence pledge with hazards from prompt rushing, fashion, ruts and formalism. Moreover, the researcher pointed, PRA counterparts and vibrates with paradigm moves in the natural sciences and social, commercial administration and development thinking, supporting devolution, local assortment and individual accountability (Chambers, 1994a). Though, the researcher predominantly elucidated the challenges and paradigms which exist in the PRA, in this study.

Also, John & Champbell (2001) have undertaken a worked on *'Participatory Rural Appraisal as Qualitative Research: Distinguishing Methodological Issues from Participatory Claims'*. This paper mainly summaries an amount

of practical subjects that essential to be sensibly deliberated in the participatory investigation. Further, the researchers examined PRA in three different perspective namely; visualization, interviewing and ranking or scoring in terms of qualitative investigation. It then turns to the difficulties that rise from expending PRA methods. Lastly, the reliability and strength of PRA has been considered as mixed method approaches or triangulation research designs, which is difficult to exercise the PRA (John & Chambell, 2001). So, this study mainly based on the methods and methodological issues connected with participatory research.

Alike, Ling (2011) has done a work on *'The PRA tools for qualitative rural tourism research'* which was undertaken in the Iban village, Borneo. This study used numerous approach of PRA in order to collect information from rural people without any moral issues related to their culture and tourism intervention. The researchers believed PRA is useful practical method to comprehend, exercise and employing as research instrument for gathering information and feedback from local community (Ling, 2011). Yet, the particular article focused on the main PRA tools which used in the rural tourism sector in the Iban village.

There are many studies exist in the field of PRA, they have been conducted mainly with the content of challenges, how it helps as a tool for a qualitative research, the experiences gained by the PRA and the uses of the different kind of PRA tools in the researches and potentials and Paradigm of PRA. But most of the existing works are not conceptually concentrated on the contribution of PRA in the community participation process toward development initiative. Therefore, this research has been undertaken to examine how PRA tool become important approach or model for encourage community involvement in all types of appraisal, research and development plans.

3. Objectives

The main objective of this study is to understand how PRA techniques promote community participation in development initiatives. And specific objectives are; to highlight the elementary principles of PRA tool and, to examine the different PRA menus which are exercised by the practitioners and field experts.

4. Methodology

This is purely a qualitative work based on secondary data which are available in various sources in both text format and website materials. This study has been done on the basis library materials like books, research articles, reports and previously published journals. Finally the collected data were analysed by the researcher in the format of descriptive method. The survey data or field based information were not employed in this paper as it is only qualitative analysis. The concepts and ideas related with PRA has been interpreted analytically in this article. The interpretation and presentation of discussion also explored with the support of evince from previous work undertaken and published by the researcher, experts and theorist.

5. Historical Development of PRA

PRA is an effective application that encouraged the evaluation and study of the actual condition in rural and urban spaces for the formation of development strategies (Chambers, 1994). In this line, the concept of PRA has evolved over a time as development tool and it is not just using for examining the issues and challenges of people, rather it should apply for inquiring and planning actions (Narayanasamy, 2009). By the early 1994s the PRA has been exercised in nearly 40 countries in a huge variety of public and private agencies, both national and international in the South such as Bangladesh, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Kenya, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tanzania,

Uganda, Vietnam, Zambia and Zimbabwe (Chambers, 1994; Brown et al. 2002). The PRA has further extended to other countries like Australia, German, Canada, United Kingdom, Switzerland and Norway (Kumar, 2002). The PRA and its various applications mostly used by the non-governmental organizations, particularly in India and Kenya during 1988s, and in India and Nepal from 1989 in order to promote development (Chambers, 1992).

On the other hand, the PRA remains to change so reckless that no descriptions can be ultimate and has to be efficient numerous periods. In this background, according to Kunwar and Vashistha (2004) defined; PRA is a practice for interrelating with villagers, considerate them and learning from them. It contains a set of values, a procedure of menu and a communication of approaches for looking for villagers' contributing in pushing onward their opinions about any problem and permitting them to do their peculiar analysis with an opinion to make use of such learning. It initiates a participatory process and sustains it. Chambers (1992) argues that PRA is an interactive process, which enables people to learn and analyse their problems and potentials on their own. The methods used are flexible which gives the freedom to the practitioner and people to enhance the quality of interaction and learning from real beneficiaries. In a nutshell, PRA methods are more adaptable, as they can be modified to suit the local conditions and situations and help to empower the local people as their knowledge and ideas are incorporated. PRA is a semi-structured movement carried out in the field by a multi-disciplinary team and intended to rapidly obtain new evidence on and new assumptions about rural lifetime. Further, Kumar (2002) discussed that PRA is an upward family of methods and approaches to allow people for enhancing and sharing their knowledge to understand their situations.

6. Major Components of PRA

There are numerous positions for diverse methods which contain contribution, such as RRA, PRA, Participatory Learning and Action (PLA), Participatory Learning Method (PALM), Farmer Participatory Research (FPR) and the Participatory Technology Development (PTD). These approaches were originated from dissimilar spaces and each has its own tackles (Kumar, 2002). Nevertheless, they are all participatory in nature. In this way, PRA also has its own nature and components in its own. The principles of PRA have progressed over a time and Sontakki, Venkatesan., & Rao (2019) has listed the following principles as below mentioned way.

Preparation: Preparation is commenced earlier in the investigations, to confirm that every accessible secondary data on the area and the theme has been reviewed and studied, permitting appropriate communities to be acknowledged to detention a comprehensive sample, beforehand graphing initiates. It is also practical to convert the assistance of exterior traitors, preferably with in depth information of the area and comportment no hierarchical position or prejudice.

Facilitation: The outward proficient shows respectable simplification abilities, which targets to allow the community to carry out certain or all of the diagramming, scoring, quantification, modelling, investigation, ranking, mapping, analysis, planning and presentation themselves. Analysis is then shared with strangers, but the statistics breaks with the individuals who created it. In order to detention all that is to be witnessed and documented throughout the PRA, it is suggested that a least of two outward implementers are working. This will permit information to be documented in detail, whilst an implementer perceives the collaboration amongst participants. It is also beneficial to create some comments from the villagers.

Attitudes and Behaviour: The attitudes and behaviour of outer implementers are of crucial prominence, more prominence than approaches even. Some prominent approaches which comprise; serious self-awareness and acceptance mistake, listening and learning, sitting down, not lecturing but permitting the villagers to be the foremost analysts and teachers. It means the strangers (experts) must take time to

imitate on how their part in public connections transform and what they must study to do and to stop doing, if community people are to profit from this.

Longevity: Participatory methods are not alternates for, but are rather an essential part of elongated term dialogue and continued collaboration. A particular, brief participatory exercise with a collection of local people will not lead to positive and permanent modification. PRAs work most operative where they are approved over an adequate distance of time, with the implementers living among the community under investigation and fascinating themselves in community lifetime (Theis & Grady, 1991). In this way, communal admiration will be expanded, and less official evidence can be removed. Apart from that, the lengthier the survey, the superior and more illustrative the sample would be.

Listening and Learning: PRA is grounded on the code of listening and learning over participatory connections and learning gradually. The community members have their history and culture, their experience, their knowledge, their views and ideas and their preferences and significances. Listening to community benefits in depicting their 'worldview', which then leftover hidden and not exposed (Theis & Grady, 1991). Appropriate learning can take place with suitable physical and mental setup of a beginner. If a beginner needs to learn, then, it is significant to be spiritually organized to learn, listen and show respect towards those from whom such knowledge can take place.

Offsetting Biases: PRA targets at offsetting biases, which commonly supplement as a 'rushed' assessment by specialists for rapid consequences. Professionals incline to assess samples at suitable periods when the weather is positive, consult would be recipients who are commonly better off and professionally incline to look at those features which they reflect are significant. In order to compensation such prejudices, PRA inspires unperturbed learning and listening, pursuing participation from individuals who are comparatively worse off, staying isolated and internal localities and staying native communities at their suitability. This procedure should try to have participation of those who would, then never get a chance to express.

Utilization of precious Community Time: About learning from local people, PRA is founded on the code of employing valuable communal time in the greatest imaginable method. Local community followers are busy in compressing local maintenances and it is significant to retain track of their learn and time as much as time authorizations. This also suggests that public followers are demanded to spare their time for collaboration at their suitable time. The learning should also be attentive, so as to make appropriate consumption of such time.

Seeking Diversity: PRA contains learning from varied circumstances and diverse performers, such the women, deprived groups, poorest people in isolated parts etc. Still significant is that the group must refrain from any value decision about others. It refers with more of modification rather than looking for representativeness of consequences or data collected. It is considering for varied occasions, diverse forces and procedures, which help in accepting of problems from different perspectives. For any analysis, superior the variety, better is the considerate of 'reality'.

Triangulation/Cross checking: Triangulation is accepted as a belief to expand worthiness and faith of data. It will be done by varying, the sources of information, the team composition and the practices applied. There is a necessity that every phenomenon or activity is deliberated from diverse standpoints and studies using numerous methods. The procedure of cross-checking is a significant code of PRA for diminishing faults and doing mid-way alterations (Theis & Grady, 1991). Since there are dissimilar bases from which information can flow it is significant to cross-check the validity and reliability of the data by setting it to diverse assessments. There are diverse methods to check the legitimacy of the data in PRA such as shifting timing, locations, methods, groups and teams.

Optimal Ignorance: This means not demanding to realize more than desirable and not measuring more precisely than is essential for concrete resolutions. Therefore in PRA instead of particular scoring and

measurement position are anticipated. The foremost motive is that it is easier and more cost operative to get such information, which are sufficient for choices. Occasionally people are also not enthusiastic to provide particular material about profound zones like income, land size, wealth, or give incorrect figures (Jain & Polman, 2003). The outcomes of PRA gatherings cannot be equated with the outcomes of time concentrated socio-economic surveys or ethnographical research.

Multi-disciplinary Team: If a technical team accompanying PRA, they must have impartially comprehensive base importance. It is also significant to have female researchers in the side so that countryside women could be efficiently elaborate in the assessment implementation. The team should classify among themselves that one member who should work as a facilitator or team leader. Additional fellow should be recognised to work as Content Recorder or Process Recorder.

Qualitative data, diversity of information: PRA pursues differences and diversity in a qualitative sense rather than simplifying difficulty to quantitative averages and statistical figures. Accuracy is attained through drawing from expanded information sources through cross-checking of data and other methods for consistency.

Mix of appropriate techniques: Suitable methods are mixed to modify to the exact necessities of the study. These techniques should be flawless, simple, self-evident and suitable to native circumstances and open for any adjustment that might be recommended by the local people.

Rapid progressive learning, group interaction, and local knowledge: PRA is increasing the learning from, with and by local people, using and eliciting their standards and groups, understanding, appreciating and finding local people's indigenous knowledge.

Flexibility and context specificity: Survey and planning methods are only designed to start with and are detailed, adapted, revised, supplemented and modified as the PRA fieldwork proceeds. These are to suit each new set of circumstances and people elaborated.

New roles of experts: The PRA methodology is apprehensive with the conversion of present practices and activities and to develop the livelihoods of local people. The part of the outward expert, researcher and postponement agent is that of an expediter serving individuals to carry out their own surveys and evidence collecting, thus formulating the ground for change and action.

Community participation: Connecting local people in the PRA exercise to critically facilitate, understand, interpretation and analysis of collected data (Jain & Polman, 2003).

On-the-spot analysis/on-site presentation: Learning takes place in the field and the analysis of the indication. Results of the field study are estimated by the whole team. Whenever possible, beforehand their withdrawal, openly accessible and deliberated with community associates.

Multiple perspectives: PRA recognizes that different groups and individuals make various assessments of a condition, which leads to different action.

Actions for change: PRA is absorbed towards changes in attitudes, perceptions and readiness to anticipate movements. The procedure of joint interpretation and analysis helps to describe changes that would bring about development of livelihood circumstances.

Observation: Before conducting any PRA practices, researchers should be vibrant in their attention as to what accurately it is they are investigating and to have some accurate intentions of the PRA surveys. Though much of the methods engaged in PRA are flexible in their design and content. It is significant to have some inquiries in mind at all periods, to detention the maintenances of the rural poor in their entireness. Researchers should perform on what they perceive and recognise distinctions in age, gender and wealth between the communities.

Despite all these principles, there are some prominent tools which used in the PRA when conducting a study. Since, PRA necessitates collections of native people analysing their own circumstances and selecting their own means of enlightening them, they may use a variability of tools which are collective in an exact way to attain the objectives of the PRA process (Ling, 2011).

Semi-structured interviews: Interviewing is one of the foremost methods used in development studies. Participatory approaches have contributed to modifying the interview to make it more informal, while still structured and controlled. Questions can be asked according to a flexible worksheet and not from a proper questionnaire.

Scoring and ranking techniques: Scoring and ranking have long been used to measure people's potentials, attitudes, opinions, beliefs and preferences. Scoring and ranking means assigning somewhat in instruction.

Preference ranking: Preference ranking is a method of rapidly recognizing foremost partialities as practised by separate village groups or villagers. A set of groups are recognised and graded in instruction of importance with a score. Ranking can be used to determine personalities or group relation prioritisation of components of a particular problem (Chambers, 1993). These can be additionally broken down by standards which detail explanations and why components have been categorized in that specific order.

Matrix ranking: Matrices can be used to prompt other problems, where a two dimensional contrast are valuable, such as where occurrence or frequency can be exemplified in the similar way as preference scoring.

Wealth ranking: Wealth ranking allows villagers to distribute households in the public according to financial and other well-being classifications. This benefits classify target group followers for projects, exactly the deprived units of a community. It also divides superior collections for further PRA deliberations. Differences in wealth and predominantly well-being affect people's insights and coping policies (Chambers, 1993). It is significant to comprehend this previous to further planning or appraisal.

Card sorting: The most communal method for ranking is card sorting. Informants sort cards which characterize professions into piles. There inclines to be a close association in rank orders between dissimilar informers which presenting high reliability.

Scoring: When scoring, there are a number of diverse methods which can be used that have separate weaknesses and strengths liable on circumstances and wanted output. Free scoring allows contestants to score each component in contradiction of each principles with no bounds placed on the scores.

Transect walks: The key informants and researcher conduct a walking tour over areas of attention to identify, to observe, to listen, altered conditions or zones and to examine questions to detect difficulties and conceivable explanations. By this method, stranger can easily study about watersheds, land use, topography, soils, community assets and forests (Chambers, 1993).

Participatory mapping: Maps can be used to classify the relative position and prominence of various capitals inside an extent. They can inspect a countless extensiveness of subject matter and permit for a choice of dissimilar categories of map to be created for one area or for proportional investigation by numerous collections within the same extent.

Resource map: The village map is an instrument that benefits to acquire about a communal and its source base. The prime apprehension is not to improve an exact map but to get cherished evidence about native insights of capitals.

Social mapping: It contains the drawing or sketching of houses, additional societal amenities and substructures such as, temple, mills, pharmacy, rice, stores, water pumps, roads, school, trails, recreation and irrigation accommodations in a village (Mukherjee, 2004). It benefits to situate and visualize the

position of households and other communal amenities. It helps to plan, implement, monitor and evaluate of the development projects.

Night Halts: This assists every connections among the villagers and the outsiders, which requests modification in outsiders' behaviours and permits for early morning and evening deliberations, when villagers incline to have more relaxation time.

Shared presentation and analysis: Participants are exhilarated to present their conclusions to other villagers and to outcasts. Which provide additional chance for feedback, crosschecking, criticism and comment (Chambers, 1993).

Diagrams exhibition: Diagrams, charts, photos and maps of the exploration action are showed in a communal residence to share information, facilitate, discussion and offer a supplementary validating method. The exhibition can encourage supplementary villagers to take part in research accomplishments.

Timeline (historical mapping): The timeline with rudimentary proceedings which can be utilized to concentrate on issues and, social and technological interventions as well as on the history of the past, to facilitate solution measures. Which also can be used for concentrated on issues, social and technological inventions or on people's history of collaboration and actions which facilitated them to solve in past issues effectively.

Local histories: These are comparable to time lines, but provide a more comprehensive explanation of how things have altered or are altering. For instance, histories can be established for population changes, crops, education changes, community health trends and epidemics, trees and forests and road developments.

Diagramming: Diagrams, comprising sketches and transects, maps, summarise data in such a way that they can be used for altered determinations such as field discussion, planning, problem identification and analysis (Mukherjee, 2004). They are valuable for opening up deliberations between community participants and the outward team and helping elucidate questions and issues.

Flow diagrams: Flow diagrams are used for the methodical investigation of an extensive series of problems whereby an entire sequence of cause and consequence connections are examined. They can act as a foundation for deliberating the interactions between altered individuals, groups or problems and can establish prospective multiplier properties.

Venn diagrams: Venn diagrams are used to portray key institutions, individuals, organisations and their collaboration with the indigenous community. On the Venn diagram, every organisation is characterised, typically by a circle. The size of the circle characterises the power or importance of that organisation and the degree of intersection among the circles signifies the level of collaboration that happens.

Secondary sources: Using books, files, maps, reports, satellite imagery, aerial photographs and articles.

Key informants: Dependent on the scope and nature of an investigation, the detective recognises suitable individuals from which the key informants may be strained and then chooses a few from every group which may be families, castes and villages.

Seasonal calendars: Simply can identify the seasonal variations through this. Apart from that, crises and coping, expenditure, multiple activities, credit and debt, stability, rainfall distribution, food availability, agricultural production, health problems and income can be identifies by the seasonal variations (Chambers, 1993).

Moreover, the method of PRA provides the benefits to everyone such as, empowerment of the local people, safeguarding dynamic participation of the community, diversification and gratitude of local understanding, inspiring the expression and utilization of native diversity, generating a culture of exposed

learning with each other and with community associates, setting research significances, setting participatory allowance program and strategy review (Gosselink & Strosser, 1995).

Identification of genuine priorities for target group: PRA permits community individuals to present their own urgencies for an improvement and get them combined into development tactics.

Devolution of management responsibilities: A significant aim of PRA is to inspire self-sufficient improvement with as much of the accountability for the implementation and management of development undertakings which decentralised to community people themselves. This can momentously increase the competence of development effort and eradicate several complications concerning on development undertakings at the communal level.

Motivation and mobilisation of local development workers: Participation in PRA by community development labours, whether from government, NGOs and other interventions can impressively upsurge the inspiration and level of mobilisation in sustenance of the scheme or programme of which it is part. Where modifications in development methods are being announced, such as a shift to a more cohesive development planning mechanism, a PRA action which demonstrates how these new instruments will work on the ground and help to safeguard superior commitment and understanding by native labours. This is one motive why participation of local people from various organisational and administrative levels can be vigorous so that promise is built up in a right way through the chain.

Forming better linkages between communities and development institutions: PRA can support in establishing superior relations between groups, agencies and institutions concerned with countryside growth. PRA which inspires a better considerate of the ecological disputes at stake in communities and develops accomplishments that allow them to profit from better supervision.

Use of local resources: Where community people have had more say in the design of tasks they are also more likely to plan actions which make full use of prevailing resources.

Mobilisation of community resources: Major obligation from the society can also mean superior mobilisation of communal capitals for development and fewer dependence on external efforts. This can take the form of labour inputs, reserves or time dedicated to managing utilities.

More sustainable development activities: This mixture of belongings will commonly lead to more sustainable expansion undertakings that are less dependent on sustenance from separate interventions and is environmentally, technically and socially suitable to local circumstances.

Besides, there are some typical risks and limitations also exist, such as struggle in receiving particular information, strain in finding the right queries to enquire, not enough period to devote in the village, risk in verdict proper multipurpose team, lack of knowledge of group or participants, predominantly insufficient abilities of communication, team participants do not show the right attitude, enablement and conflict intervention and fail to listen and lack of approbation.

Raising expectations which cannot be realised: Most instant and habitually faced threats in PRA is that it increases a difficult set of prospects in societies which habitually cannot be comprehended, which given the political or institutional setting of the expanse.

Failure to take account of stratification in communities: The reality, that PRA is frequently carried out with the society as an entire can mean that stratification within the public whether by gender or ethnic group, social status and wealth which can often be ignored and obscured. This may occur even if initial research in the community has obviously recognised that there are layers and various collections of comforts in the community.

7. PRA: Tool for Community Participation

Since PRA is a rigorous, methodical, and semi-structured mutual learning process, exercised in a community with an interdisciplinary teams that contains local people for the proficient analysis and acquisition of data on community situations to produce reliable and useful information in a timely manner. This method is predominantly convenient as it permits exposed groups in a community to have a voice and impart their opinions on disputes of transport and access from which they are most repeatedly omitted (Sexena, 1998). Henceforth, involvement by various individuals such as elderly, disabled, women and even school children, professionals and additional researchers are capable to create an accurate picture of community life through the use of dissimilar PRA methods. When exercising PRA, the lifestyle, way in solving problems, method of thinking and capability to observing of the community members can be simply exposed. In the other hand, PRA is also a manufacturing research instrument to expose the capacity of individual or collection in conduct the mission within the society. The function of facilitator or researcher is to kick start and instruct the conversation but not to misleading or intervene the choice of the community followers.

PRA replying to requirements of communities and the particular aimed groups, most prominence of flexibility to adapt the time frame of local community, learning and communication tool that use to benefit to the individuals, to examine their own circumstances and interconnect with outsiders, enables or empowers the communities to create demands on improvement of institutions and agencies and closely associated to action or intervention and demanding instant accessibility of maintenance for choices and conclusions which grasped by the people as a consequence of the PRA (Alamgir & Muhiuddin, 1988: cited in Chandra, 2020). Apart from these the concentration of PRA decided by the societies and the end creation primarily used by the community.

8. Conclusion

The procedure of PRA in community is productive, because it used and recognized the wealth not just of the familiarity of villagers, but of their analytical and creative competences. It is basically a flexible, lower charge and time convertible set of methods and approaches used to permit the community people to gather and analyse evidence of their past, present and future circumstances to comprehend the community and the situation that subsists in rural areas which would afford a comprehensive and thorough idea in related with issues, resources, potentials, and explanations to articulate accurate development consultants to accomplish the anticipated objectives within an exact time frame. Since the rudimentary idea of PRA is to absorb from rural community, it helps to make initial development in rural settings and community people were acknowledged as experimenters who should and could play a much more involved role in data collection and analysis. Mostly, the researcher or the field staffs are perform as an implementers in order to assist the local community to being capable, creative and to do their particular inquiries, analysis as well planning process. Moreover, it is a method of learning from community, with the people and by the people. So, PRA has been adopted as a prominent tool in order to ensure the greater degree of community participation in various means to achieve individual and communal goals in terms of development process and sustainable solution to their problems.

Reference

Alamgir., and Muhiuddin. (1988). *Poverty Alleviation through participatory development*. Development: Journal of the Society for International Development. 2(3): 97-102.

Brown, D., Howes, M., Hussein, K., Longley, C., and Swindell, K. (2002). *Participatory methodologies and participatory practices: Assessing PRA use in the Gambia*. Agricultural Research & Extension Network. Network Paper No. 124; July 2002: 1-15. UK. AgREN. URL: https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/5204.pdf

Chambers, R. (1981). *Rapid Rural Appraisal: Rational and Repertoire.* Public Administration and Development. 1(2): 95-106. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/pad.4230010202

Chambers, R. (1990). *Rapid and Participatory Rural Appraisal.* Appropriate Technology. 16(4): 14-16. URL: https://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/bitstream/handle/20.500.12413/680/rc73.pdf;sequence=1

Chambers, R. (1992). *Rural Appraisal: Rapid, Relaxed and Participatory.* IDS Discussion Paper 311. Brighton Institute of Development Studies. October 1992: 1-68. URL: https://www.ids.ac.uk/download.php?file=files/Dp311.pdf

Chambers, R. (1993). *Methods for Analysis by Farmers: The Professional Challenge.* Association for Farming Systems Research / Extension. Research Symposium. Michigan State University. URL: https://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/bitstream/handle/20.500.12413/105/rc258.pdf?sequence=1

Chambers, R. (1994). *The Origins and Practice of Participatory Rural Appraisal.* World Development, 22(7), 953-969. Elsevier Science Ltd. URL: https://entwicklungspolitik.uni-hohenheim.de/uploads/media/Day_4_-_Reading_text_8_02.pdf

Chambers, R. (1994). *Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA): Analysis of Experience.* World Development. 22(9): 1253-1268. Elsevier Science Limited. URL: https://www.ircwash.org/sites/default/files/125-94PA-12543.pdf

Chambers, R. (1994a). *Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA): Challenges, Potentials and Paradigm.* World Development. 22(10): 1437-1454. Elsevier Science Ltd. URL: http://sergiorosendo.pbworks.com/f/Chambers+on+the+challenges+and+potential+of+PRA.pdf

Chandra, G. (2010). 'Participatory Rural Appraisal'. In: *Issues and Tools for Social Science Research in Inland Fisheries.* Central Inland Fisheries Research Institute. Bulletin 163: 286-302. [ResearchGate]. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265127750_Participatory_Rural_Appraisal

Gosselink, P. and Strosser, P. (1995). *Participatory Rural Appraisal for Irrigation Management Research: Lessons from IIMI's Experience.* Working Paper No; 38. International Irrigation Management Institute. Sri Lanka. Colombo.

John, R., & Campbell, J. R. (2001). *Participatory Rural Appraisal as Qualitative Research: Distinguishing Methodological Issues from Participatory Claims.* Human Organization. 60(4): 380-387. DOI: 10.17730/humo.60.4.4bgnlmy60fkvq4r2

Jain, S.P., & Polman, W. (2003). *A Handbook for Trainers on Participatory Local Development: The Panchayati Raj Model in India.* Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific. Bangkok, Thailand: RAP Publication. Retrieved from: http://www.fao.org/tempref/docrep/fao/006/ad346e/ad346e00.pdf

Kumar, S. (2002). *Methods for Community Participation: A Complete Guide for Practitioners.* Vistaar Publications: New Delhi.

Kunwar, N. and Vashishtha, P. (2004). *Women Self-Help Groups in Uttar Pradesh.* Indian Journal of Extension Education. 4(1): 177-179.

Ling, R.S.J. (2011). *The PRA Tools for Qualitative Rural Tourism Research.* 2011 Tourism and Services Engineering Management Seminar. The International Conference of Risk and Engineering. Systems Engineering Procedia 1(2011): 392–398. Elsevier. DOI: 10.1016/j.sepro.2011.08.059

Mathur H.M. (1997). *Participatory Development: Some Areas of Current Concern.* Sociological Bulletin. 46(1): 53-95. SAGE Journals. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0038022919970104

Mukherjee, N. (2004). *Participatory Rural Appraisal: Methodology and Application.* New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company.

Narayanasamy, N. (2009). *Participatory Rural Appraisal: Principles, Methods and Application.* New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Panda, C. K., (2014). 'Practicing Participatory Rural Appraisal: A Comprehensive Approach for Learning from the People'. In: Gupta, D.D. *Advances in Extension Education and Rural Development.* Vol 2. 325-336. India. Agrobios.

Sontakki, B., Venkatesan, P. and Rao, V.K.J. [eds.]. (2019). *Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA): Tools and Techniques.* Hyderabad. ICAR-NAARM. [ResearchGate] Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/336230869_Participatory_Rural_AppraisalPRATools_Techniques

Saxena, N.C. (1998). *What is meant by people's Participation?.* Journal of Rural Development. 17(1): 111-113. [ResearchGate]. Avaialbe at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/292712837_What_is_meant_by_people's_participation

Theis, J. and Grady, H. M. (1991). *Participatory Rapid Appraisal for Community Development: A Training Manual Based on Experiences in the Middle East and North Africa.* London-UK: International Institute for Environment and Development.