The role of villagers in Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA)

Sharareh Khodamoradi [1] and Mohammad Abedi[2]

[1] Department of Agricultural Extension Education, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
[2]Department of Agricultural Management, Islamic Azad University, Qaemshahr Branch, Iran
*Corresponding author: abedi114@yahoo.com

Abstract: The aim of PRA is to help strengthen the capacity of villagers to plan, make decisions, and to take action towards improving their own situation. Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) is considered one of the popular and effective approaches to gather information in rural areas. This approach was developed in early 1990s with considerable shift in paradigm from top-down to bottom-up approach, and from blueprint to the learning process. In fact, it is a shift from extractive survey questionnaires to experience sharing by local people. Much of the spread of participatory rural appraisal (PRA) as an emerging family of approaches and methods has been lateral, South-South, through experiential learning and changes in behavior, with different local applications. Rapid spread has made quality assurance a concern, with dangers from "instant fashion", rushing, formalism and ruts. Promising potentials include farmers' own farming systems research, alternatives to questionnaire surveys, monitoring, evaluation and lateral spread by local people, empowerment of the poorer and weaker, and policy review. Changes in personal behavior and attitudes, and in organizational cultures, are implied.

Introduction:

In the context of rural development, information regarding the communities, their livelihoods, their beliefs, the physical environment in which they live, and their resource endowments need to be gathered and interpreted in a manner that identifies their priorities with a view of developing better understanding of their status and designing appropriate intervention projects directed at resolving their problems. The different ways of data collection and interpretation can be seen under two perspectives(IUCN, 2001): qualitative versus quantitative, and participatory versus top down. While the quantitative methods generate information that can be captured numerically, the qualitative methods generally do not generate specific numbers. Qualitative methods are concerned with exploring meanings, processes, reasons, and explanations(lnglis, 1992).

RRA was criticized for being extractive and highly dependent on expert interpretation. It was thus found useful to replace it with PRA which involves a process of learning from, with and by rural people about rural conditions. PRA shares much with its parent, RRA, but is distinguished from it in practice by correcting two common errors: roles of investigation are reversed; and rushing is replaced by relaxation and rapport. At the heart of all these developments was Robert Chambers, although Paulo Friere has also had strong influence especially in similar developments in education circles (Provention Concertium).

five key principles that form the basis of any PRA activity:

1. PARTICIPATION :

PRA relies heavily on participation by the communities, as the method is designed to enable local people to be involved, not only as sources of information, but as partners with the PRA team in gathering and analyzing the information.

2. FLEXIBILITY :

The combination of techniques that is appropriate in a particular development context will be determined by such variables as the size and skill mix of the PRA team, the time and resources available, and the topic and location of the work(Dunn, 1991).

3. TEAMWORK :

Generally, a PRA is best conducted by a local team (speaking the local languages) with a few outsiders present, a significant representation of women, and a mix of sector specialists and social scientists, according to the topic.

4. OPTIMAL IGNORANCE :

To be efficient in terms of both time and money, PRA work intends to gather just enough information to make the necessary recommendations and decisions.

5. SYSTEMATIC :

As PRA-generated data is seldom conducive to statistical analysis (given its largely qualitative nature and relatively small sample size), alternative ways have been developed to ensure the validity and reliability of

the findings. These include sampling based on approximate stratification of the community by geographic location or relative wealth, and cross-checking, that is using a number of techniques to investigate views on a single topic (including through a final community meeting to discuss the findings and correct inconsistencies).

PRA techniques(Gibson, 1992)**:**
The most common methods are the following:
1- Diagramming, Mapping and Modeling:
- transects
- maps (resource, social, farm)
- venn diagrams
- seasonally analysis
- historical analysis (time lines, trend lines, activity profiles)
2- Ranking and scoring
- pair wise ranking
- matrix ranking
- matrix scoring
- well-being analysis and wealth ranking
- proportional piling
- pie charts (injera charts)
3- Problem analysis
- identification and specification
- causal chaining
- prioritization

PRA has evolved and spread from beginnings in Ethiopia, India, Kenya, Sudan and elsewhere, and in early 1994 is known to be being quite widely practiced in parts of Bangladesh, Botswana, Ethiopia, francophone West Africa, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Uganda, Vietnam, and Zimbabwe, while starts have been made in at least a score of other countries in Latin America, Africa and Asia. Hundreds of nongovernment organizations (NGOs) have adopted PRA and developed applications, as have a number of government departments. The use of PRA methods is being increasingly explored by students and faculty in universities for research, and by training institutes for fieldwork. Spread appears to be accelerating.

PRA are good for:
• Providing basic information in situations where little in known
• Identifying and assessing problems
• Appraising, designing, implementing, monitoring, and evaluation programs and projects
• Getting a better picture of needs and organizations' ability to meet them
• Developing and transferring appropriate technologies
• Appraising emergencies
• Planning projects that are more relevant, restructuring administrations, assisting in decision-making and policy formation

• Generating hypotheses, ruling out inappropriate ones
• Providing guidelines for survey designs and assessing the applicability of their results to other places.
• Fleshing – out complementing, interpreting, or giving depth and context to information obtained through other methods.

PRA is not very useful for:
Working in situations in which the problem is not usefully addressed at the local or group level, for example, in situations where large-scale structural reorganization is necessary (but even then, local views may help to shape the change).

The objectives of the PRA are:
• to enable rural people to organize their knowledge, share experience among themselves and gather information on resources they have
• to understand the rural environments and social as well as economic dynamism
• to understand the trends in the rural socio economic conditions
• to enable the community identify their problems, causes of these problems and
possible solutions
• to enable the community develop a community action plan to address their problems
In order to limit the PRA to the objectives set and to have consistency in conducting the PRA in the different villages, a PRA manual was prepared by the socio economic team. In line with the manual, emphasis was accorded to the following topics:
1) Village History. The first day of the PRA discussion begins with history of the village which enabled participants to easily and comfortably tell about the history of their village.
2) Agriculture and Livestock. Focus group discussions were made on agriculture and livestock rearing practices including the problems encountered and possible solutions.
3) Social service. The provision of social services like education and health including the associated problems were also discussed in focus group discussions.
4) Village institutions. Institutions, both from within the village and outside, as well as formal and informal with which the rural communities interact have been addressed.
5) Trend lines. Trends in food availability, forest, population growth, wealth, rainfall and poverty are addressed in this section.
6) Wealth ranking, problem analysis, and community action plan. Finally, the participants ranked the community on the basis of its wealth, discussed the major problems and formulated action plan. The PRA is to be followed with a more quantitative and structured socioeconomic survey, which will then be followed by specialized researches in specifically selected areas; notably, poverty and coping mechanisms, microfinance,

marketing, utilization and management of natural resources, and gender.

At the end of the 1980s, Participatory Rural Appraisal was developed in response to the too mechanistic and extractive implementation of RRAs. In PRAs the target group is encouraged to learn and the role of outsiders is reduced to a facilitator of the learning process. PRA aims to empower local people by encouraging them to share, enhance and analyse their knowledge of life and conditions and to plan, act, monitor and evaluate.

As with RRA it is hard to define what exactly a PRA is (some even prefer not to define it and just refer to "a family of approaches"). PRA shares the basic principles of RRA (quick, multidisciplinary, observations, etc.), yet now it is the local people who are encouraged to analyse their own situation and plan activities to improve it. The three basic pillars of PRA (and the basic differences from RRA) are:

1. the behaviour and attitude of outsiders, who facilitate rather than dominate;
2. the methods, which are open, group-oriented, visual and comparative;
3. sharing of information, food, experiences, etc. between in- and outsiders.

For the tools used, two issues stand out:

1. 'Handing over the stick': instead of outsiders trying to understand the knowledge of the local people, PRA tries to facilitate local people to develop their capabilities. They collect and analyse the data and propose actions to be undertaken.
2. Visualisation and sharing: local people convey their ideas and knowledge in a visual way. In verbal communication, outsiders dominate the dialogue more easily (via eye contact, cross-checking, etc.) than in communication via visual aids. When a map is drawn by a stick in the soil all can contribute, and local people feel more confident than when outsiders try to draw a map on a piece of paper with a pen - a typical tool of powerful outsiders. Sharing also explicitly involves the food and shelter during the PRA.

The most commonly used tools are:

- participatory mapping: a group of villagers makes a map of the community. The way they do this and what they find important provide good entry points for discussions about crucial aspects of village life;
- village transects: together with a (small) group of villagers the team walks through the village (or another relevant area) and discusses the things observed;
- ranking: people are asked to compare units (e.g. families /trees /crops) and to group them according to their own criteria. For example, via pair-wise comparing the importance of certain trees, people find out which criteria they use to assess the usefulness of these. Ranking is also used to stratify the local population, e.g. via wealth ranking. Both the results of the ranking and the criteria used provide entry

points for further discussions.

- historical recalls: the lifestory of families are recalled and the main events are used as reference points in the analysis of the present situation;
- calendars: people indicate how things change over time, e.g. in which months they have to borrow money, when their children get malaria, when the rains are normally expected, etc.

Combining information obtained from all the tools provides the villagers with an explicit picture of their daily life. This not only helps them to start a discussion on their main problems and how to tackle them, it also boosts their self-esteem because they are able to make this analysis themselves.

Conclusion:

Kamla Bhasin (1999) suggests that development practitioners should constantly ask themselves: "am I increasing the confidence of the poor, their faith in themselves, and their self – reliance, or am I making them instruments of my own plans of action, imposing my own ideas on them and that of my organization and/or institution?" Social Development is a process of gradual change in which people increase their awareness of their own capabilities and common interests, and use this knowledge to analyse their needs; decide on solutions; organize themselves for cooperative efforts; and mobilize their own human, financial and natural resources to improve, establish and maintain their own social services and institutions within the context of their own culture and their own political system. To give effect to this understanding of social development, participation of communities in their own development is important. The participatory approaches, including PRA provides first step/stage in sustainable community development.

As a result of the PRAs, the communities are expected to attain many benefits including:

• Expressing their own ideas and concerns;
• Organizing their knowledge about the past and present;
• Identifying as a community their problems, the causes of these problems and
possible solutions;
• Developing a common plan to address these problems;
• Developing the ability to use their own resources more effectively and attract
more resources from the outside.

The academicians/researchers involved in the PRAs are expected to get the following
benefits:
• Developing better understanding of rural environments and social as well as
economic dynamism taking place there;
• Appreciating the fact that communities are capable of analyzing their problems

and outlining possible solutions to their problems;
• Participating in designing possible solutions to community problems;
• Utilizing the results of the PRA work as a research output for publications and
presentations;
• Building their research and problem investigation capabilities;
• Supporting their classroom discussions to students with practical examples from
the PRA findings.
The main objectives of the current PRA are:
1. empowerment of rural communities by assisting them to systematically utilize their local knowledge to identify problems and strengths, develop skills of analysis, and design appropriate mechanisms for intervention by themselves and/or by development agents;
2. advancement of understanding by academicians/researchers of local knowledge and acknowledgement of the capacity of communities to gather data, conduct analysis, and identify as well as prioritize problems and solutions;
3. utilization of the research questions/problems identified during the PRAs for further investigation;
4. documenting and presenting the outcomes of the PRAs to development agents (governmental and non-governmental) and other stakeholders so that they could undertake interventions in line with the findings.
PRA consists of a series of participatory exercises which help community members better assess their history, resources, and overall situation as concerns agriculture, health, marketing, credit, coping mechanisms, education, and other important areas.
During the conduct of the PRAs, rural communities in the selected villages will gather information on the resources they already possess; organize their knowledge; share experience among themselves; learn from each other; identify and prioritize local development needs; and develop action plans which respond to these needs.

*Corresponding Author:
Mohammad Abedi
Department of Agricultural Management, Islamic Azad University, Qaemshahr Branch, Iran
E-mail: abedi114@yahoo.com

References:
1. Appleyard, B., Understanding the Present: Science and the Soul of Modern Man (London: Picador, published by Pan Books, 1998).
2. Chambers, Robert, "Methods for analysis by farmers: The professional challenge," Journal for Farming Systems ResearcWExtension, Vol. 4, No. 1 (1994). pp. 87- 101.
3. Chambers Robert, Notes for Participants in PRA/PLA Familiarization Workshop in 2004.
4. Clayton, A., P. Oakley and B. Pratt. Empowering People - A Guide to Participation. UNDP, 1997.
5. Cornwall, A. Making a difference? Gender and participatory development. IDS discussion paper 378, 2008.
6. Drummond, and Nontokozo Nabane, "The use of indigenous trees in Mhondoro District" (Harare: Centre for Applied Social Sciences, June 1992).
7. Dunn, A. M., "New challenges for extensionists: Targeting complex problems and issues," Paper for the 10th European Seminar on Extension Education, Universidade de Tras-os-Montese Alto Douro (Vila Real, Portugal: September 1991).
8. Ekins, P., Wealth Beyond Measure: An Atlas of New Economics (London: Gaia Books, 1992).
9. Gibson, Tony, "Planning for real: The approach of the Neighbourhood Initiatives Foundation in the UK," RRA Notes, No. 11 (1991) pp. 29-30.
10. Hahn, H., Apprendre avec les yeu, s'exprimer avec les mains: des paysarts .se,fiument ir la gestion du terroir (Switzerland: AGRECOL. Oekorentrum, Langenbruck, 1991).
11. Holland, J. and J. Blackburn. (eds). Whose voice? Participatory research and policy change, London, UK. IT Publications, 1998.
12. lnglis, Andrew Stewart. "Harvesting local forestry knowledge: A field test and evaluation of rapid rural appraisal techniques for social forestry project analysis," Dissertation presented for the degree of Master of Science (Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh, 1990).
13. IUCN. Seek... and Ye Shall Find: Participatory Appraisals with a Gender Equity Perspective. Module 2 of the ORMA modules towards Equity, 2001.
14. KGVK. Mancrjiemrnf Training Mnnuul (Bihar, India: Krishi Gram Vikas Kendra, Ranchi, Bihar, 1991).
15. Mukherjee, Neela, "Villagers' perceptions of rural poverty through the mapping methods of PRA," RRA Nores, No. IS (1992). pp. 2 l-26.
16. NCAER. Comparatil'e Study of Sample Survey and Ptrrticipatotyv Rurtrl Apprnisul Methodologies (New Delhi: National Council for Applied Economic Research, I1 lndraprastha Estate. November 1993).
17. Pretty. Jules N., "Participatory inquiry and agricultural research" (London: BED, 1993).
18. Scoones. Ian. and John Thompson, "Challenging the Populist Perspecti\~e: Rurcd People's Knor~'ledge. Agricultural Research and

E,uensio,l Practice. " Di.scusvion Paper 332 (Brighton: IDS. University of Sussex. December 1993).

19. Scrimshaw, Nevin S., and Gary R. Gleason (Ed.), RAP Rapid A,ssessment Procedures: Qualitative Methodologies .ji>r Planning and Evaluation of Health Related Programmes (Boston MA: International Nutrition Foundation for Developing Countries, 1992).

20. Swift, Jeremy, and Abdi Noor Umar, Participcrtorv Pustortrl De!vlopment in Isiolo Di.ytri(.t: Sorio-rconornic Rrsenrch in the Isiolo Livestock Development Project (Isiolo. Kenya: Isiolo Livestock Devjelopment Project, EMI ASAL Programme. 1991).

21. Uphoff. Norman, Lecrrning from GnI Oycl: Pos~ibilitiec, jin Participatory De~~elopment und Post-Newtonitrn Soc,ictl Science (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992).

4/1/2011