

Towards Assessing The Role Of Community Participation In Community Development At Tehsil Lal Qilla, Dir Lower, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa

Muhammad Israr

Department of Sociology
Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University

Arab Naz

Waqar Ahmad

&

Nasar Khan

Department of Sociology
University of Malakand

Abstract

This paper assesses the impact of community participation on community development programs, which is a precondition for successful and sustainable development in any community. However, majority of programs do not yield the desired results due to lack of community participation. This study has been carried out in Tehsil LalQilla, District Lower Dir, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. The data was collected from a purposively selected sample of 258 respondents through interview schedule (beneficiaries of different programs). Logistic regression model has been used to get the association between independent variables and dependent variable. On the basis of the statistical findings, the data revealed that peoples' direct participation' got 'p' value (0.01), 'advancement of self-reliance' which got 'p' value (0.024) and 'bottom to top approach' got 'p' value (0.001) have strong relation with the dependent variable community development. The Exponent/Beta (Odds Ratio) for the given independent variables showed 3.089, 0.320 and 4.685 respectively; which means, one unit increase in the mentioned variable the corresponding dependent variable would increase by 3.089, 0.320 and 4.685 times, respectively.

Keywords: Community, Development, Participation, Self-Reliance, Impact, Organizations.

تلخیص

یہ تحقیقی مقالہ لوگوں کے معاشرتی (کیونٹی) میں ترقیاتی کاموں (پروگراموں) میں شرکت اور اُس کی کامیابی کے بارے میں ہے، جو کہ دیرپا اور کامیاب کیونٹی کی ترقی کا ضامن ہے، زیادہ تر کیونٹی کیلئے مخصوص پروگراموں میں

معمولی شرکت کے باعث مطلوبہ نتائج حاصل نہیں ہو سکتے۔ یہ تحقیقی مطالعہ پاکستان کے صوبہ خیبر پختونخوا کے ضلع دیر پائین کے تحصیل لعل قلعہ میں کی گئی تحقیق کے بارے میں ہے۔ مطلوبہ معلومات کو پہلے سے تجویز کردہ نمونہ جو کہ ۲۵۸ رے دہندہ گان پر مشتمل تھی، ایک پہلے سے تیار کردہ سوالنامے (انٹرویو) کے ذریعے اکٹھا کیا گیا۔ اس کے علاوہ آزاد تغیر اور تغیر ماتحت کے درمیان تعلق کو شماریاتی تجزیہ کاری ماڈل کے ساتھ جانچا گیا ہے۔ شماریاتی جانچ کی بنیاد پر نتائج یہ ظاہر کرتے ہیں کہ لوگوں کے بلا واسطہ شرکت کی شماریاتی قیمت اور چلی سطح سے اوپر تک تبدیلی کے طریقہ کار کی قیمت $P=0.1$ حاصل کی گئی ہے جو کہ ازاد اور ماتحت متغیر میں گہرے تعلق کو ظاہر کرتی ہے۔ اور ثابت کرتی ہے کہ لوگوں کی شرکت کامیاب ترقی کی ضامن ہے۔

کلیدی الفاظ: جماعت، ترقی، شراکت، خود اعتمادی، اثرات، تنظیمیں۔

Introduction

Development in its real sense is capacity building, which means the members of a community are managed, channelized and mobilized in such a way, to improve their human and natural resources through a justified distribution, according to their own aspirations for sustainable improvement which is more important than the hard activities (Kamath, 1961). A comprehensive terminology which encompasses those practices and academic disciplines which believe in the improvement of local communities through the involvement of officials, activists and volunteers for promotion of a positive change in their own communities (Community Development Exchange, 2008; Passmore, 1971; and Kamath, 1961). Similarly, Ntini (2006) describes that community development is basically encouragement and involving of the people in solution of their problems. Moreover, community development is the attainment of community's common goal through involvement of the people. This process enhances collective efforts for the promotion of the wellbeing of the whole community (Edwards et al, 1976; Hakanson, 1981). Kamath (1961) believes that the central theme of community development is community's program with the organization assistance and not the organization program with the community's assistance. Thus community development is basically the services to encourage direct involvement of the people in the process community development works. The more there is participation the best would be the community development program (Cary, 1970). However, community development can be possible when external management play their role positively who are sharing their experiences, skills and technology (Israr, et al., 2013).

Whereas, participation means inclusion of maximum individuals in activities that improve their welfare, i.e. their revenue, safety, or self- esteem (Chowdhury, 1996). Westergaard (1986) has defined participation as, combined efforts to maximize the control of the locals on the resources and institutions. While, The World Bank's Learning Group on Participatory Development (1995) defines participation as "a comprehensive procedure where the stakeholders influence and fore take a leading role over the initiated enterprises. This way they are entrusted in decisions and ownership of all the resources that influence them". It is the active involvement of all the stakeholders for equitable and active engrossment of power to enhance their level of information, develop the skills to control their livelihoods and affect the initiatives affecting them. Participation is a derivation from the basic transcript of democratic theory which has been defined by many, under the belief of the equal distribution of activities by entitlement of the rights (Neufeldt, 1988). Pateman, (1970) suggests that an elaborate definition of participation must contain these four necessary elements which include participation by someone, participation with someone, participation in something, and participation for some purpose.

Researchers, for example, Hamilton (1992) has two-pronged application of participation in context of community development; as a means and as an end. As a 'means' it ensures cooperation of the local peoples with externally introduced programs while as an 'end' participation stands for, giving skills, knowledge and experiences to the people to become responsible in the process of development. It can also be called an extensive process through which the citizens respond the issues of general mass concerns by including their say in the decisions they are affected which lead them to accept the obligation for change to their communal life (Armitage, 1988). Similarly, community participation is considered a way to inform the citizens and improve their abilities for positive manipulation of those choices which affect the population of a particular area in social, economic and political spheres. This method can also be utilized as a mechanism for ensuring community interest, sensitivity and the answerability (Brager, et al., 1987). Oakley and Marsden (1987) suggested a comprehensive definition which states that, community participation is a procedure by which persons, families, or societies accept accountability for their own wellbeing and cultivate a capability of contribution to their own communities development. Thus in the process of development the beneficiaries are not only the benefit receivers but also have a say in the planning and implementation of the projects (Paul, & Bamberger, 1986).

In the developmental sector, community participation has been given much importance for its vital role, efficiency, impartiality, and social cohesiveness (Midgeley, and Hardiman, et. al., 1986). Thus considering it the fundamental concept of community development believing in bottom-to-top or grass root approach in the problem solving and leads us to fruitful and long-lasting impacts (Gamble and Weil, 1995; Smith, 1998). It has been witnessed that schemes of participation in the government projects is nor encouraging and work as an outsider with minimal services of the insiders being utilized. This is why the sense of responsibility and owning are missing on the community side (Smith, 1998). However, this process starts from the assessment, continue in the implementation and end with the exit strategy. This would lead to far reaching effects on individual empowerment, social change, economic development and political strength (Kaufman and Alfonso, 1997).

Community participation is the most important but too complicated process because it starts from the assessment process, continue in the implementation and end with the exit strategy. This criteria lead to far reaching effects on individual empowerment, social change, economic development and political strength (Rooper, 2006; Reid, 2000). While, Michener (1998) asserts that consultation is a continuous process which should be sustained in implementation so that opportunity may be given to the neglected people. A continuous non-cooperation of the officials and non- participation of the locals often lead to the failure of the programs in Pakistan (Chaudhry, 2002). Moreover participation of the people in community development meeting leads to sense of responsibility. A process of self-reliance and self- help which breaks away dependency that kills creativity (Jewkes and Murcott, 1996; Malik, 1990). Participation is necessarily accompanied by two other phenomena called sustainability and empowerment. This troika leads successful projects because of the recommended bottom-to-top or grassroots approach in the problem solving (Ajayi and Otuya 2006; Michener, 1998). Thus the process of community development ought to be democratic combination of all ages, sexes, economic status and devoid of any geographic attachment (White, 1996).

Participation is a necessary phenomenon, which is accompanied by two other necessary terminologies sustainability and empowerment. This troika leads to the successful implementation of the projects. In developmental projects this is liability on the organizations to assure the process of participation, otherwise their projects are not funded (Michener, 1998). To internalize the process of the project length results in greater participation. This method empower the people of a particular area with skills and resources to play their role in social change (Christenson, 1989). To increase the

impact, Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) shall be emphasized which includes village mapping, resource mapping, problem trees, health problems and facilities, educational avenues, poverty model, seasonal calendars, interviews, transect walks and focus group discussions (Chambers, 1997). But the vast differences among the people of the community according to their interest, sex, marital status and disability always remain a challenge for the implementers. Mostly the vulnerable members need unique kind of methodology to influence him/her from the projects. This needs a unique method of mobilization, training and awareness of self help. In this way the expectation of participations are overburdened by the community diversity. The cultural phenomena also play a barrier role in the participation process as whole because societies have given their own meanings to the disable and women who are so depressed that they can prove least beneficial in sharing information and decision making (Boyce & Lysack, 1997).

Consultation is the next important pillar, which means engaging the people in dialogue and probing people’s views. This is a two way flow of information which makes acquaintance with the project and shares their views on the project proposal. An undertaking taken after such discussion would be more fruitful. Consultation is a continuous process which should be sustained in implementation so that opportunity may be given to the neglected people. While, honest and candid participation means reasonable and genuine interests in the project. It connotes that the people involved are playing active and independent role in the process of the project implementation (Becker, 1997). Similarly, pre-planned projects hamper the way of people to better decide according to their needs (Cary, 1992). Arnstein (1996) has given a model of community participation called, “Ladder of Citizen Participation”. The model shows eight various levels of participation as given in the following:

8	Citizen Control	Citizen Power
7	Delegated Power	
6	Partnership	
5	Placation	Tokenism
4	Consultation	
3	Informing	
2	Therapy	Nonparticipation
1	Manipulation	

The model elucidates that; the bottom rung ‘Manipulation’ and ‘Therapy’, corresponding to “Nonparticipation”. The third, fourth and the fifth rungs are

'Informing', 'Consultation', and 'Placation' is termed "Tokenism". In this case the people are allowed for the expression of their views but their say is not incorporated in the actual business of decision making. The top three rung, sixth, seventh and eighth is 'Partnership', 'Delegated Power' and 'Citizen Control', which are termed as "Citizen Power". This is the community participation in real sense which has long lasting effects (Arnstein, 1996). Besides, Pimbert and Pretty (1994) have given a categorized typology of community participation which include; passive participation, participation in information giving, participation by consultation, participation by material incentives, functional participation, interactive participation and Self-Mobilization (Pimbert and Pretty, 1994). Moreover Yadma (1995) has given the elements of effective participation in the developmental program which include; People Involvement in Decision Making, Identification of Appropriate Stakeholders, Dissemination of Information, Needs Identification and Goal Determination, Consultation, Genuine Interests, Accountability, Repeated Interaction, Ownership and Control. Thus, community participation is an important aspect of community development and progress and such participation is a compulsory component of the development agenda.

Study Argument

Historically several program have been initiated by the Government of Pakistan with the economic and technical facilitation of international aid agencies i.e. Asian Development Bank, US AID and World Bank (Chaudhry, 2002). Among them, the Village Aid was an ever first initiative formally taken by government to develop rural areas of the country in 1952 (Mallah, 1997), The Basic Democracy System introduced in 1959 (Waseem, 1982), The Comilla Experiment of 1959, Extension System (TAES) in 1961, The Rural Works Program (RWP) of 1963 (Mallah, 1997; Chaudhry, 2002), Integrated Rural Development Program (IRDP) 1969, The Peoples Works Program (PWP) of 1972, (Govt., of the Punjab, 1983), Barani Area Development Program (BADP) 1975 and Training and Visit (T&V) Extension System in 1977. However, these programs could not give the proposed results due to; multi-purposive, weak structure of program, top-down decision making, lack of coordination among line departments and lack of trained technical staff contributed in failure of program (Waseem, 1982; Mallah, 1997). Muhammad (1994) concludes that, lack of mutual understanding within the nation building departments an undue intervention of bureaucracy, massive politicization and minimum participation of the local leaders in implementation, neglecting the felt needs of the people lead to the failure of these programs (Khan et al., 1984, Malik, 1990; Waseem, 1982; Lodhi, 2003).

On the basis of above arguments it can be concluded that these initiatives have failed to achieve the desired goals. These programs were mainly criticized and disbanded on the grounds that in document it was a participatory process, however in actual practice a top to down approach was adopted in planning, dissemination of information, execution and exit. Neglect of the locals say in decision making, disregard for community felt needs and authoritative decision-making lead the programs to so many hindrances in way of effective community development. It is thus conspicuous that, this study would assess the current initiative of the organizations in the target community on three grounds which include local community direct participation, advancement of self-help and the implementation approach. This study would be carried on the basis of following objectives.

Objectives of the Study

1. To measure the level of local people participation in community development initiatives
2. To indentify that whether self-help technique was adopted during the community development program or not
3. To highlight that bottom to top approach has been followed in the decision making process

Hypotheses of the Study

1. Maximum the local community's participations, maximum would be the out-put of community development program
2. Higher the focus of organization on self-help, higher would be the results of community development program
3. Maximum the bottom to top approach, higher would be the results of the program

Material and Methods

This study is conducted to assess the level of community participation in the community development programs implemented by the government and non-government organizations in three villages of Tehsil LalQilla, at Lower Dir, KPK, Pakistan. The universe of the study was purposively selected due to interventions of organizations after war on terror and flash floods. This research is carried out by taking community participation (independent variable) and its impact upon community development (dependent variable). The data was collected from the 258 sample based on purposive sampling from the households through interview

schedule using proportional allocation method from the beneficiaries of different programs. Tehsil Lal Qilla is composed of 34 villages, out of which a sample of three villages Bandagai, Kumber and Lal Qilla have been selected for the study (Tehsil Council Lal Qilla, 2012). The population and sample size was divided proportionately in the selected three villages, as given below in table No.3.1.

$$n = \frac{n_i \cdot N_i}{N}$$

Where;

n = proportionate sample

n_i = Total Household Population of the target village

N_i = Percentage as 100

N = Total Population Size

Table showing sample size and population size distribution:

Table: 1
Sample size and percentage for each village on household basis

Name of the Village	HH Population Size	Sample Size	Percentage
Kumber	1018	132	51.26
LalQilla	622	81	31.32
Bandagai	346	45	17.42
Total	1986	258	100%

(Tehsil Council LalQilla, 2009).

Data analysis was carried out through Binary Logistic Regression Model which, measures the relationship between dependent variable and independent variable/s by converting the dependent variable to probability scores. Binary Logistic Model was used as an appropriate tool for regression analysis, $Y = a + bX_i + \epsilon_i$; Where, (Y) is dependent variable, (a) is Y-intercept of dependent variable, (X) is independent variable, (b) is slope of the line and (ϵ_i) error term which is negligible.

Models Specification: Binary Logistic Model

Logistic Regression Model: $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \epsilon$

Where; (Y) is dependent variable; (β_0) is intercept; (β_1 , β_2 and β_3) are regression coefficient of independent variables (X_1 , X_2 , and X_3); while, ϵ is standard error.

Results and Discussion

In the following pages various appropriate headings has been given to illustrate the variables in details.

Uni- Variate Analysis

Uni-variate analysis include frequencies and percentage of all the variables used during the data collection process. This includes demographic findings, community participation and community development with the tables and explanation.

Demographic Profile

Demographic findings of any study are important in the data analysis as they give important generalization of the study. The following table will elaborate the age, education and socio-economic status of the respondents.

The following Table No. 2 shows age wise distribution and literacy ratio of the sample population. It was evident from the data that, out of 258 (100%) respondents, 110 (42.6%) were in the range of age group 31-34 years, 99 (38.4%) respondents were in age group of 18-30 years, while 49(19.0%) were in age group of 44-56 years. The table also showed literacy rate of the respondents, out of the total 258 (100%), 154 (59.7%) of the respondent were literate while 104 (40.3%) were illiterate. Moreover the table shows the marital status, where out of 258 (100%), 191 (74.1 %) of the interviewed persons were married while 67 (25.9%) were unmarried. The table further shows the professional status of the respondents, which depicts that out of the total 258 (100%), majority 112 (43.4%) were self-employee, 85 (32.9%) were farmers, 38 (14.7%) work overseas and 23 (8.9%) of them were the employees of some public or private organizations. It further gave us their income, which illustrate that out of 258 (100%), 97 (37.6%) of the respondents' monthly income was in range of Rs. 11000- 16000, 59 (22.9%) were earning Rs. 17000- 22000 a month at average, 54 (20.9%) got above Rs. 23000 and 48 (18.6%) were earning in range of Rs. 5000-10000 a month. The findings of the study showed that majority of the respondents were quite prudent and responsible because majority of them was in the middle age, educated and married. Their majority was self-employed doing small business and average income of majority of the respondents was fourteen thousands.

Table: 2
Age wise distribution, literacy ratio and marital status of the respondents, professional status and monthly income of the respondents

Caption		Frequency	Percentage
Age of the respondents			
18-30		99	38.4
31-43		110	42.6
44-56		49	19.0
Total		258	100.0%
Literacy ratio			
Literate	Primary	76	29.5
	Intermediate	44	17.1
	Graduate	34	13.2
Total Literate		154	59.7
Illiterate		104	40.3
G. Total		258	100.0%
Marital Status			
Married		191	74.1
Unmarried		67	25.9
Total		258	100.0%
Professional status			
Farmer		85	32.9
Self- Employ		112	43.4
Employee		23	8.9
Overseas		38	14.7
Total		258	100.0%
Monthly Income (in thousands)			
5-10		48	18.6
11-16		97	37.6
17-22		59	22.9
23 		54	20.9
Total		258	100.0%

Community Participation

The next section investigated the 'community participation in the community development program' undertaken in the target area. The following Table No. 3 illustrate the ratio of the participation of the people in the community development programs launched by organizations in the area. It was evident from the given data that out of total 258 (100%) respondents 180 (69.8%) directly participated in the community development works and 78 (30.2%) had been indirect beneficiaries of the projects. The results are in line to Cary (1970) findings, that Community Development is basically the services to encourage direct involvement of the people in the process of participation in community development works. The table further

explained the sense of reliance among the community people, which proved that out of the total 258 (100%), 202 (78.3%) were satisfied with the role played by the organization in advancement of self-reliance in the community people, while 56 (21.7%) were of the view that the organizations were not successful in advancement of self-reliance in the community as per findings of Harrison (1995) that, 'community participation in developmental works, promote the sense of self-reliance to utilize their own resources in process of problems solution'.

The table further depicts the type of people consulted during the project assessment which occupy the first and the foremost important part of the developmental initiative. Assessment helps the organisation to identify the needs of the community people. The results depicted that out of the total 258 (100%), 91(35.3%) respondents were of the view that only village elites were consulted during the assessment, 85 (32.9%) opted for the consultation of community leaders whereas, 82 (31.8%) observed that everybody was called to the meeting irrespective of the social status in the community. It could be concluded that the consultation was not satisfactory because village elite and community leaders were the main priority against general population. The results are supported through conclusion of Michener (1998) that, Community Participation is the most important but too complicated process because it starts from the assessment process, continue in the implementation and end with the exit strategy. This criteria lead to far reaching effects on individual empowerment, social change, economic development and political strength.

The table also impart us information about the democratic process followed during the projects, where the community people were found quite optimistic. Out of the total 258 (100%), 183 (70.9%) were of the view that democratic process was followed during the projects cycle, while 75 (29.1%) did negated the idea. The results matched the findings of William (1976) and Jewkes et.al (1996), community development ought to be democratic through affinity with ethnic combination of all ages, sexes, economic status and devoid of any geographic attachment.

It came to surface that throughout the implementation process a top-to-bottom approach was applied as confirmed by 167 (64.7%) respondents that community member had little say in the assessment and implementation. On the other hand 91 (35.5%) responded that the process was bottom to top. The results are contrary to, "Community participation is the fundamental concept of community development believing in bottom-to-top or grassroots approach in the problem solving. This method will give fruitful and long-lasting impacts (Lodhi, 2003).

The table also gives us the data regarding participation in the process of implementation. Implementation is the second important stage of project life cycle. It was found that that out of the total 258 (100%), 173 (67.1%) of the respondents were of the view that enough consultation with the people of community was done during this stage, while 85 (32.9%) disclosed that community people were ignored during implementation. The results promoted the findings of Rooper (2006) who

asserts that consultation is a continuous process which should be sustained in implementation so that opportunity may be given to the neglected people.

Furthermore it described the satisfaction of the people with the process of participation and here again majority being 159 (61.6%) of the population was satisfied while the rest 99 (38.4%) of population was not satisfied with the process of participation. The analysis support Malik, (1990); and Chaudhry (2002), that a continuous non-cooperation of the officials and non- participation of the locals lead to the failure of the programs in Pakistan.

Table: 3

People's participation and advancement of self-reliance consultation during assessment, duration of the projects and implementation approach, consultation during implementation and community satisfaction

Caption	Frequency	Percentage
Participation in C. D. work		
Yes	180	69.8
No	78	30.2
Total	258	100.0
Advancement of self-reliance		
Yes	202	78.3
No	56	21.7
Total	258	100.0
Consultation during assessment		
Village Elites	91	35.3
Community Leaders	85	32.9
Everybody	82	31.8
Total	258	100.0
Duration of Projects		
Yes	183	70.9
No	75	29.1
Total	258	100.0
Implementation Approach		
Top to Bottom	167	64.7
Bottom to top	91	35.3
Total	258	100.0
Consultation during implementation		
Yes	173	67.1
No	85	32.9
Total	258	100.0
Satisfaction with the process of participation		
Yes	159	61.6
No	99	38.4
Total	258	100.0%

Community Development

Community Development was the dependent variable of the study through which we were ascertaining the possible changes made by the organizations through their implemented programs in the target area. The given Table No. 4 states that, out of 258 (100%), 246 (95.3%) respondents were of the opinion that they have directly listened the word community development from the intervening organizations, while 12 (4.7%) negated the listening of such word from the organizations working in their community. This means that majority of the respondents have been included in the meetings and they have been given briefing about the development programs.

The next part of the table tells us about contribution to community development. It was surfaced that 239 (92.6%) were of the view that the organizations were successful to bring community development through reconstruction. A minority of 19 (7.4%) were of the opinion that community development was not brought through reconstruction of infrastructure. The results of variable showed that extremely positive role had been played in the mention regard and the results were tangible.

The next part of the table explicit that, out of 258 (100 %), 213 (82.6 %) argued that the organizations were successful in the development of human capital while 45 (17.4%) were of the view that they were not successful in their goal to develop human capital. Here again the people attitudes have been positively modified through initiatives and have long lasting impacts.

The table further expresses promotion of the self-help by the intervening organizations. It came to knowledge that out of the total 258 (100%), 173 (67.1%) are of the view that community development programs have promoted the lessons of self-help in the target area while 85 (32.9%) expressed their views that the organizations have failed to promote the lessons of self-help in the target community. The results showed that the organizations were successful in promoting the main idea of community development. Complying with the findings of Chambers (1997) the community development method focuses on the democratic process of just participation in the developmental activities by accentuating self-help, and a due emphasize on the emergence of local leadership in community revitalization.

The table further explores that, out of the total 258 (100%), majority 169 (65.5%) of the target population answered that human resource of the target community were not utilized for the process of the community development, while 89 (34.5%) responded that human resources of the community were utilized on and off in the programs. The next part of the table clarify that, out of 258 (100 %), 144

(55.8%) argued that the organizations used the natural resources of the community in the developmental programs. On the other hand 114 (44.2%) were of the view that natural resources of the community were not brought in direct use for the community development.

The output of the first variable is against while the results of the last one support the finding of Arnstein, (1969); Cohen and Uphoff, (1980) et.al., the chief advantage of the active community involvement in developmental works lead the implementers to have easy accessibility to human and natural resources and the attainment of collective goals. These in turn enhance the sense of ownership in the members and mature exit strategy (Rifkin, 1990; and WHO, 1991).

The table further shows that, out of the total 258 (100%), 144 (55.8%) claimed that the organizations guided the people regarding sustainable development through their different programs. On the contrary 114 (44.2%) were of the view that no such guidance was underscored by the intervening organisations through their community development initiatives in the target community. The next part of the table clarified that, out of the total 258 (100%), majority 165 (64.0%) of the target population responded that no such proper training was arranged for the target community, 93 (36.0%) replied that they got proper training in the community development programs. The findings of this variable contradict Lodhi (2003) conclusion, who opines that community participation is a means to educate the citizens and escalate their skills.

The second last section of the table depicts the information about local leadership. Out of the total 258 (100%), majority 145 (56.2%) of the target population responded that the programs contributed to the development of local leadership, 113 (43.8%) replied that no contribution was made by the programs toward the development of local leadership. Complying with the findings of Midgeley et al (1986) who found that community development method focuses on the democratic process of just participation in the developmental activities by accentuating self-help, and a due emphasize on the emergence of local leadership in community revitalization. The final part of the table clarifies that out of the total 258 (100%), 194 (75.2%) opined that the organizations did not form any CBOs for the implementation and sustainability, 64 (24.8%) orated that the organizations have been working through the local CBOs. The results of this study were quite contradictory to that of Pimbert and Pretty, (1994) who strictly observe that interactive participation means cooperative investigation to combined activities. Here the formation of Community Based Organizations (CBOs) are made or revise and strengthen the previous one.

Table: 4
Understanding community development, contribution to community development through reconstruction, contribution to community development through human capital developments, promotion of self-help, utilization of human and natural resources of the target area, proper training on skills development, contribution of programs to local leadership and formation of CBOs

Caption	Frequency	Percentage
Understanding of term “Community Development”		
Yes	246	95.3
No	12	4.7
Total	258	100.0
Contribution to CD through Infrastructure Development		
Yes	239	92.6
No	19	7.4
Total	258	100.0
Contribution to CD through Human Capital Development		
Yes	213	82.6
No	45	17.4
Total	258	100.0
Promotion of Self-help Lesson		
Yes	173	67.1
No	85	32.9
Total	258	
Utilization of community’s human resources		
Yes	89	34.5
No	169	65.5
Total	258	100.0
Utilization of community’s natural resources		
Yes	144	55.8
No	114	44.2
Total	258	100.0
Guidance about sustainable development		
Yes	144	55.8
No	114	44.2
Total	258	100.0
Proper training on skills development		
Yes	93	36.0
No	165	64.0
Total	258	100.0
Contribution of organisation toward the local leadership		
Yes	113	43.8

No	145	56.2
Total	258	100.0
Formation of CBOs		
Yes	64	24.8
No	194	75.2
Total	258	100.0%

Bi- Variate Analysis

To get the extent of relation between the independent and dependent variables Binary Logistic Regression was used as given in the following Table No. 5.

The model analyzed the desired results from the given data that highlights the significance level of independent variables upon dependent variable. The model displayed contains three independent variables i.e. advancement of self-reliance, bottom to top approach and maximum involvement of locals. The 'p' value for 'advancement of self-reliance' is (0.01) and hence there is a significant relation between independent and dependent variable. The Exponent/Beta (Odds Ratio) for this observation showed 3.089 which means, a community program emphasizing self-reliance in community would get better results in community development and a unit increase in the said variable (self-reliance) the corresponding variable (community development) would increase by 3.089 times. The results are supported by findings of Jewkes and Murcott, (1996) who asserts that community participation is a process of self-reliance and self- help which breaks away dependency that kills creativity.

The second observation is 'bottom to top approach adopted during programs' having a value of ($p=0.024$). The results are again significant and showed a relation between the two variables. The Exponent/Beta (Odds Ratio) for the given variable is 0.320 which means, that, one unit increase in the mentioned variable the corresponding dependent variable would increase by 0.320 times. The results were in consonance to the findings of Ajayi and Otuya (2006), who recommended the bottom-to-top or grassroots approach in the problem solving within the community development, is a fundamental way of community participation.

The next variable is 'maximum involvement of locals' with the value found ($p=0.001$) is highly significant and thus a relation between the two variable is evident. The Exponent/Beta (Odds Ratio) for this variable is 4.685 which means, that, one unit increase in the mentioned variable the corresponding variable would increase by 4.685 times. Michener, (1998) and White, (1996) observed that,

participation is a necessary phenomenon which is accompanied by two other necessary terminologies sustainability and empowerment. This troika leads to the successful implementation of the projects.

Table: 5
Logistic regression model

Variables	B	S.E.	Wald	Df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Advancement of self-reliance	1.128	0.436	6.701	1	0.010	3.089
Bottom to top approach	-1.140	0.504	5.103	1	0.024	0.320
Maximum involvement of locals	1.544	0.486	10.088	1	0.001	4.685
Constant	-1.927	1.022	3.554	1	0.059	.146

Conclusions

Community development is a holistic term encompassing several methods and tools to work for the betterment of the communities and societies. This include the participatory rural appraisal, democratic way of selection, targeting the most vulnerable in the community, access of information to everyone, inclusion of the whole population in the program throughout the project life cycle, advancing the motto of self-help and self-reliance and utilization of the human and natural resources of the area. But often these and some other basic important things are neglected in the assessment, implementation and wind up which lead to low results of the programs.

Despite numerous interventions the results of the programs are often negligible. This is because either the target group is not properly selected, the felt needs are not identified or the implementation is biased. This situation exists through the world but population of the rural areas are more disadvantageous in this regard especially in Pakistan. This practice of imposed programs without community consultation leads to the wastage of time, money and energy without any tangible results. The current study primarily aims to explore the level of participation of the community people in the development programs at Tehsil Lal Qilla District Dir Lower, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan; and would focus on the ultimate results of the numerous projects implemented in the area after the war on terror 2009 and the flash floods of 2010.

The results of the study were quite satisfactory and majority of the variables gives responses in consonance with the basic idea of community development. Majority of the people of the target area were found satisfactory with the initiated programs and they opined that due consultation has been taken in the major steps of program implementation. In conclusion, the major outcomes of this study revealed that the intervening organizations have observed community participation and thus have fruitful results in the community. Among the other pillars of participation, advancement of self-reliance, bottom to top approach and maximum involvement of locals were found most significant for the development of the target community.

Recommendations

Firstly, alongside the role of local leaders, maximum human and natural resources of the target area should be utilized in the community development projects. This would increase the importance of the people, value the existing resources and would contribute in sense of ownership. This practice also leads to the reliability and importance of local resources and a belief of its use and reuse in the future by the community.

Secondly, female shall be given importance in the assessment and implementation because they are more vulnerable and suffer a lot in emergencies and disasters. In the rural areas especially in Pashtun dominated areas the female are seldom made the part of the programs which lead to their further degradation. During the current programs no such specialized project has been initiated in the area to work for the betterment of the female cult. Inclusion of female in general programs are also necessitated by research studies as it lead to the strengthening of the family and the whole society.

Thirdly, long duration projects should be preferred due to their positive impacts on the attitudinal and behavioural change in the long run. Small project of limited span often lead to the waste of money and resources and shall therefore be elongated to have sustainable effect on the society.

Lastly, people with disabilities are often neglected in community development programs while they deserve the right to be facilitated in their day today life. Their inclusion and participation shall be maintained in the same or separate program so that everyone in the society may be targeted and benefitted from the project.

References

- Ajayi, A. R, N.Otuya. (2006). Women's Participation in Self-Help Community Development Projects in Ndokwa Agricultural Zone of Delta State. *Community Development Journal*. Nigeria, vol.41:2, pp.189-209.
- Ajayi, A.R. (1995). Community Self-Help Projects Implementation Procedures. A Case Study of Ekiti South-West Local Government Area of Ondo State. *Agro Search*, 1, pp.47-55.
- Arnstein S. (1969). A Ladder of Citizen Participation. *American Institute of Planners Journal*, vol.35:4, pp.216-224.
- Boyce, W. & Lysack, C. (1997). Understanding the Community in Canadian CBR: Critical Lessons from Abroad. *Canadian Journal of Rehabilitation*, vol.10:4, pp.261-271.
- Cary,L.J. (1992). *The Concept and Context of Community Development, Community Development as Process, in Adult education for Community Development*. New York: Greenwood Press, pp.47-69.
- Chambers, R. (1997). Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA): Challenges, Potentials and Paradigm, *World Development*, vol.22:10, pp.1437-1454.
- Chowdhury & Aditee Nag. (1989). *Let Grassroots Speak: People's Participation Self-Help Groups and NGO's in Bangladesh*. University Press Ltd., Dhaka, p.50.
- Christenson, J.A. (1989). *Community Development in Perspective*. Ames: Low a State University Press, Ames, pp.3-14.
- Community Development Challenge Report (2012). <http://www.cdf.org.uk/SITE/UPLOAD/DOCUMENT/communitydevelopmentchallenge.pdf>.
- Community Development Exchange (2012). Definition of CD. <http://www.cdx.org.uk/community-development/what-community-development>.
- Govt. of Pakistan (1971). Economic Survey 1970-71. Islamabad" Economic Advisor's wing, Finance Division. Islamabad. Pakistan.

- Govt. of Pakistan (1988). Report of the National commission on Agriculture. Ministry of Food and Agriculture. Islamabad. Pakistan.
- Hakanson. J. W. (2006). Community Development: who benefits? The Participation of Rural Based Teachers in Community Development Activities Chivi District Masvingo Zimbabwe, M . Sc. Thesis, South Africa, Univ., pp.29.
- Hamilton. E. (1992). Adult Education for Community Development. New York: Greenwood Press, pp.47-69.
- Jewkes R., Murcott A. (1996). Meanings of Community. *Social Science and Medicine*, vol.43:4, pp.555-563, retrieved from: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/02779536/43/4>
- Kamath, M.G. (1961). *Extension Education in Community Development*, India. Glasgow Printing Co., UK. pp.3-4.
- Khan, M. J., Sharif, M. & Sarwar, M. (1984). Monitoring and Evaluation of T&V system of agricultural extension in the Punjab. Lahore, Pakistan, http://www.pjlss.edu.pk/pdf_files/2009_1/1-10.pdf.
- Lodhi, T. E. (2003). Need for paradigm shift from top-down to participatory extension in the Punjab, Pakistan: perceptions of farmers, change agents and their supervisory staff. Ph. D. Thesis. Department of Agricultural Extension, University of Agriculture, Faisalabad-Pakistan.
- Long, N. & Long. A. (1992). *The Interlocking of Theory and Practice in Social Research and Development*. Routledge Publishers. London.
- Malik, W. A. (1990). *Systems Paradigm: A Study of Agricultural Knowledge System in Pakistan*. Leo Books. Islamabad. Pakistan.
- Mallah, U. (1993). *Extension Programs and Methods in Pakistan*. National Book Foundation. Islamabad. Pakistan. pp.35-60.
- Michener. V. (1998). The Participatory Approach: Contradiction and Co-Option in Burkina Faso. *World Development*, vol.26:12, pp.2105-18.

- Midgeley J, Hall A, Hardiman M, et. al. (1986). *Community Participation, Social Development and the State*. London. Great Britain.
- Muhammad, S. (1994). *An Effective Communication Model for the Acceptance of New Agricultural Technology by Farmers in the Punjab, Pakistan*. Ph.D thesis; Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development. University of Reading. England.
- Neufeldt, V. (Ed). (1988). *Webster's New World Dictionary of American English*. Third College Edition. New York.
- Ntini, E. (2006). *The Participation of Rural Based Teachers in Community Development Activities Chivi District Masvingo Zimbabwe*. M. Sc. Thesis; University of South Africa, p.29.
- Oakley P. (1991). *Projects With People: The Practice of Participation in Rural Development*. ILO. Geneva.
- Passmore. G. C. (1971). *Theoretical Aspects of Local Government Action in the African Rural Areas of Rhodesia* In: *Ntini, E. 2006. The Participation of Rural Based Teachers in Community Development Activities Chivi District Zimbabwe*, M .S. Thesis. South Africa. Univ. pp.29.
- Reid. J. N. (2000). *How People Power Brings Sustainable Benefits to Communities*. USDA Rural Development: Office of Community Development. Washington. USA.
- Roper, L., Utz, E. & Harvey J. (2006). *The Tsunami Learning Project: Lessons for Grantmakers in Natural Disaster Response*. Grantmakers Without Borders. Boston. <http://www.internationaldonors.org/issues/pdf/tlp>
- Roper. L., Utz, E.,Harvey J. (2006). <http://www.benfieldhrc.org/activities/> visited at 13/5/12.
- Schwartz NB. (1981). *Anthropological Views of Community and Community Development*. *Human Organisation*, vol.40:4, pp.313-320.
- Sekaran, U. (2013). *Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach*. New York, John Willey & Sons, Inc.

Waseem, M. (1982). Local Power Structure and the Relevance of Rural Development Strategies: A Case of Pakistan. *Community Development Journal*, pp.17-33.

White, S. (1996). Depoliticizing Development: The Uses and Abuses of Participation. *Development in Practice*, vol.6:1, pp.6-15.
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0961452961000157564>

Muhammad Israr is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Sociology, Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University Sheringal Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

Dr. Arab Naz is an Associate Professor in the Department of Sociology, University of Malakand.

Waqar Ahmad is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Sociology, University of Malakand.

Nasar Khan is Visiting Faculty in the Department of Sociology, University of Malakand.