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Review of literature is necessary for any research endeavour. An attempt is made to review the most important concepts within the framework of the present study and also the major findings of past studies. Since this study is exploratory in nature and inimitable in the specific area of participatory planning and sustainability, review could be done only from related areas of study and these are discussed under various heads such as concept of participation, sustainability of participatory projects, strategies for sustainable development and decentralisation.

2.1. Concept of Participation

Bhargava. B. S and Venkitakrishnan.(1997) in their paper “Panchayati Raj Movement: An Analysis of its Phases” gives wider dimension for the concept of participation. Peoples’ participation at local level tends to be confined to receiving benefits by those for whom they are meant or stipulated and in other stages the participatory thrust in the conscious act of restructuring the society is either absent or nominal. They observed that a major shift in the strategies has been occurred around 1970, in view of the fact that benefits or gains of development had not reached the weaker sections, but cornered by the well-off sections of rural community. The efforts for proper institution building and to change the “value system” had been the common strategies, thus apparently resulted in the experiment of new form of local self governance with a democratic power mechanism and development mechanism.
According to Sundaram. K. V (1997), community participation takes three forms such as mobilisation, mediation and empowerment. In the first instant mobilisation is seen as facilitator or a desired plan output. The concept, mediation refers to the role of peoples' representatives or institutions that should act as the mediators between the government and the people. The government and people are involved in the task of planning and implementation and the action should be done through a dialectical process. The concept "empowerment" impregnates a wider meaning that people have to capacitate and their institutions built up and is strengthened and this is considered to be the highest form of participation. Empowerment imbues the Communities' autonomy to decide the goals, plans, programmes and projects affecting their development. Autonomy of mobilising and controlling their own resources urges the former.

Chadha. K. M (1996) observed that rural poverty is inextricably linked up with rural productivity and unemployment including under employment. The study asserted that participation of rural poor can be guaranteed by way of active co-operative institutions. Co­operations aimed at promoting self-reliance, self-help and self-governance among members, implying equitable sharing of gains and losses. Co-operative institutions empower the weaker sections of society and help them to allocate their meagre resources to avoid being exploited by outsiders.

According to Bava (1984) participation of citizens in government, politics and administration is both an end in itself and a means to an end. She classifies three kinds of participation, which signifies the degree of influence exercised by citizens on the decision-making process in government and administration; Democratic Participation, Administrative Participation and Community Development Participation.
David Brown and Darcy Arshman (1996) reported that co-operation in policy / programme implementation between state and non-governmental actors can sometimes solve intractable development problems, provided such co-operation span gaps in culture, power, resources and perspective. Their analysis of thirteen African and Asian case reveals two successful implementation patterns such as Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO)-mediated co-operation and grass roots centred co-operation. Different forms of social capital are necessary to the said patterns. Indigenous NGOs with credibility across sectors are critical to the former, while grassroots organisations are vital to the grass roots centred co-operation. Participatory decision making and mutual influence are essential to grassroots centred co-operation, but NGO – mediated collaboration demands comparatively lesser degree of this social capital.

Participation is a process through which stakeholders influence and share control over development initiatives, decisions and resources which affect them. (World Bank, 1994)

Robert Klitgaard (1997) in his paper “Unanticipated Consequences” in Anti-poverty programmes” argues about the fact “why so many well-intentioned efforts to reduce poverty results in unanticipated outcomes?”. The most important typology evolved is concerned with information and incentive, and how they affect the institutions through which anti-poverty efforts are implemented. The study found various reasons for the unanticipated negative consequences, such as dependence on a wrong model and therefore a failure, the tendency to overlook statistical phenomena or incentive effects, and most important of all, the insufficient attention to the economics of the institutions that implement anti-poverty programmes. Much attention needs to be given to the ‘institutional
adjustment’, so that the markets and government institutions through which anti-poverty programmes are implemented have the information and incentives to make them work.

Participation of rural poor is a very much dependent variable on the ‘targeting’ component. Mis-targeting of different development programmes may leave the poorer sections into more desperate situation. By analysing the case of two villages in the State of Maharashtra, Gaiha (1996) points to the mis-targeting of the Employment Guarantee Scheme (EGS). He found that there was a marked deterioration in it over the period 1979-89 reflected in not just a larger concentration of the more affluent among the EGS participants, but also their much larger gains from participating in this scheme. A large segment of the poor depended heavily on EGS as an additional source of income, with significant welfare gains during 1979-84. Apart from this, a large subset, especially of relatively low income participants also withdrew from EGS when overall economic conditions improved.

Hemalata Rao and Devendra Babu (1994) studied the involvement of rural poor, focusing on scheduled castes and scheduled tribes, in the socio-economic upliftment programmes. The study based in Karnataka found that the mode of selection of beneficiaries was more or less without any proper basis. Though the guidelines of the schemes specified certain procedures to be followed in the selection of beneficiaries, many such procedures were not followed strictly. Major concentration of the selected beneficiaries was in the productive age (18 to 65) but as the age group went up the number of beneficiaries declined. The study revealed the inadequacy of technical supervision and guidance needed for the effective implementation of schemes. Due to the lack of follow-up actions of schemes rampant misuse of funds took place. Thus the schemes intended to alleviate poverty did not attain the target.
Yogendra Nath Das (1994) states that the history of rural development in India started with the launching of Community Development Programmes in October 1952. The objective was to bring all-round socio-economic development of the villages with the cooperation and participation of the rural people. To enhance participation of local people in the decision-making process, Panchayati Raj System was introduced in 1961 and a three-tier system of Gram Panchayat, Block Samitis and Zila Parishad was established. But this programme failed in increasing the agricultural production, in removing illiteracy and unemployment, in improving health and hygiene condition because of the fact that it gave much attention on basic amenities than on economic development, and people did not participate equally, adequately, mostly officers were not rural-oriented. Firstly, the scheme was financed by the Central Government later on in 1966 responsibility shifted to the State Governments so it was isolated.

The participation discourse promises ambitious outcomes: participation is crucial to the success of projects, it can transform development and it empowers poor people (Michener. V. J, 1998).

Deshler and Sock (1985) analyse participation at two levels such as 'pseudo-participation' where the manipulation of beneficiaries is done by development professionals to meet the needs of elite. The second one is 'genuine participation' in which participants are empowered by having control over programme policy and management.

Cohen and Uphoffs' (1980) typology is more comprehensive which analyses different types of participation and also the kinds of participants and the 'how' of participation (Table 1).
Table 1 - Dimensions of Rural Development Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinds of participation</th>
<th>Participation in decision making</th>
<th>Participation in implementation</th>
<th>Participation in benefits</th>
<th>Participation in evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who participates?</td>
<td>Local residents</td>
<td>Local leaders</td>
<td>Government personnel</td>
<td>Foreign personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is participation occurring?</td>
<td>Basis of participation</td>
<td>Form of participation</td>
<td>Extent of participation</td>
<td>Effect of participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cohen and Uphoff (1980).

'Participation' as a major concept of rural development has evolved throughout time. Their roots can be traced back to community and popular participation, promoted mainly by NGOs in the 1950s and 1960s. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, multilateral agencies, such as FAO, ILO and UNRISD, also began to promote popular participation in development projects and programmes (Rudqvist and Woodford-Berger, 1996).

The concept of participation as empowerment has many nuances. Some development agencies see it basically as an access to and control over resources, or as a way of releasing human energies and enlarging talents and potential (FAO, 1990; Uphoff 1992).

Participation is linked to democratisation, good governance, equality, equity, and human rights (FAO, 1990; Rudqvist and Woodford-Berger, 1996).

Popular participation is interpreted along three broad lines (Oakley, 1991)
- Participation as contribution, i.e. voluntary or other forms of input by rural people to predetermined programmes and projects.
- Participation as organization, either externally conceived or emerging as a result of the process of participation.

- Participation as empowerment, enabling people to develop skills and abilities to become more self-reliant, and to make decisions and take actions essential to their development.

According to Clayton et al (1998), as a means, participation is a process in which people and communities cooperate and collaborate in development projects and programmes. In this view, participation, sponsored by an external agency, is a way to support the progress of a project or programme and a means to ensure the successful outcome of activities. The term "participatory development" is commonly used to describe this approach. As an end, participation is seen as the empowerment of individuals and communities in terms of acquiring skills, knowledge and experience, leading to greater self-reliance. Participation is an instrument to break poor people's exclusion and lack of access to and control over resources needed to sustain and improve their lives. It is intended to empower them to take more control over their lives.

Concepts of participation have widened to include not only the rural poor but also other sectors of civil society. This is reflected in a change of terminology from “the rural poor”, “beneficiaries” or “users” to “stakeholders” and “partners” (Rudqvist and Woodford-Berger, 1996: World Bank, 1998).

The World Bank's Learning Group on Participatory Development defines participation as “a process through which stakeholders influence and share control over development initiatives and the decisions and resources which affect them” (World Bank, 1996).

Several factors have influenced the notion of participation as involving a wider range of stakeholders. One is the trend towards decentralisation and transfer to responsibilities from
government to people. Another is the conclusion that small-scale community participation and empowerment are not sufficient to ensure the sustainability of development efforts (Rudqvist and Woodford-Berger, 1996; Warren, 1998).

In complex socio-political environments, the concept of participation has increasingly come to include "involvement of local institutions and civil society in a power-sharing scheme, based on negotiation and conflict management" (Warren, 1998).

FAOs' peoples' participation programmes experience that the basic fault in the conventional approach is that the rural poor are rarely consulted in development planning and usually have no active role in development activities. This is because the vast majority of the poor have no organizational structure to represent their interests. This realization is provoking new interest in an alternative rural development strategy, that of people's participation through organizations controlled and financed by the poor (FAO, 1997).

According to Robinson (1993) and Moore (1993), participatory development or development from below sought to expose more of public life to the discipline of market implying a reduced role for the state and created spaces for 'communities' (villagers, private individuals, companies, groups of companies) to be more involved in development.

UNDP (1993) defines participation as the close involvement of people in the economic, social, cultural and political process that affect their lives.

Shah and Shah (1995) reported that participatory approaches in development programmes increased the participation of local communities in development process and supported the formation of accountable institutions.

Chowdhry and Gilbert (1996) defines participation as a generic term covering a broad range of activities ranging from one-shot problem identification exercise to continuing association which rural communities and individual farm families play more active role.
According to Parker (1997) participation ranges from local people being involved in implementing development or conservation of programmes to be actively involved in all stages of the development process including decision making process.

According to Kareem and Jayaramaiah (1998) participation is the degree to which the members of the beneficiary families involve themselves in different stages of the programme, starting from the selection of beneficiaries to deriving benefits from assistance, provided under the programme.


Surendran (2000) suggested that for efficient functioning of groups for sustainable development of agriculture in Kerala, the groups should promote participatory approach.

Johnson and Clark (1982) had an opinion that “participation has a large cost for the poor and they will invest their participation when they believe it will secure them valuable benefits not otherwise available at comparable cost, time and risk”.

Peoples’ participation is defined as employing a method where the associated communities are motivated to function and contribute as a group to perform a predetermined task (Venkattakumar et.al., 2000).

Tamilmani (2002) advocates for people-centered development projects and justifies, as it ensures need assessment by the people themselves which would be more accurate and reliable than that done by outsiders, transparency in every stage of the project cycle, greater chances of mobilising local community resources (labour, capital and common property resources etc), serves as a training ground for empowering people through knowledge gathering, experience sharing, decision making, confidence building and in other facets of
development discourse, as people are involved in every stage of the project cycle from formulation to evaluation, people develop concern and tend to put towards success.

Dhillon and Hansara (1995) describe the major objectives of people's participation as 1) better planning and implementation of rural development programmes, 2) mobilisation of additional resources required for rural development programmes and 3) empowering people particularly the poor to play an effective role in rural development.

2.2. Sustainability of Participatory Projects

According to Rich (1994), the decades of failed international development efforts have taught the world about the folly of induced, uniform, top-down projects. Such schemes ignore and often destroy the local knowledge and social organisation on which sound stewardship of ecosystems as well as equitable economic development depends.

Shumacher (1973) observes that from the 1970s, the failure of high technology and large scale development projects which were imposed on rural communities by outside agents began to be contrasted with the merits of alternative technologies, small-scale projects developed by or with local communities, in versions of vision that 'small is beautiful'.

Measuring sustainable development also faces serious problems regarding collection, selection, quantification and comparability of environmental indicators (Steer and Lutz, 1993).

According to Adams (1993) a clear mainstream understanding about sustainable development has been evolved from the many conflicting interpretations of the term.

Pearce (1998) defines sustainable as 'enduring' and 'lasting' and 'to keep in being'. So sustainable development is economic development that lasts.
According to WCED (1987), Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

Nordhaus (1992) observes that all of the complications arise because the sustainability criterion reifies a particular objective (the non-declining development vector) and demotes all other objectives below the one.

Sustainable development is defined as some indicator of human well-being which does not decline over time (Pearce et al., 1989; Pezzey, 1989).

Bryant and Bailey (1997) reports that sustainability depends on the capability of different social groups to cope with environmental change. Actors may also perceive and value the same environmental process differently, and seek to define and prioritise environmental 'problems' according to their own agenda.

The concept sustainability basically implies a characteristic of a system, a programme, or a resource to last intact forever (Singh Katar, 1999).

There are two distinct concepts of sustainability such as economic sustainability and ecological sustainability. Economic sustainability is concerned about the long-term constancy of economic output, income or consumption. Ecological sustainability relates to long-term preservation of bio-sphere or the sustenance of human populations and biodiversity conservation in a given geographical area / region, endowed with limited natural resources. (FAO, 1989 and Bartelmus, 1997).

According to Dasgupta (1995) and Dasgupta and Maler (1995) the concept and implementation of sustainability assumes that the appropriate way to represent human preferences for future consumption is through the inter-temporal welfare function, and the
appropriate way to discuss sustainability is via the optimal consumption path for a given inter-temporal welfare function.

2.3. Strategies for Sustainable Development


Sustainable environmental management can only occur where active local level support and participation exist. Particularly in less developed countries, community participation is believed to be the most effective strategy because people depend directly on their local physical environment and thus have a genuine interest in protecting it. (Ghai and Vivian, 1992).

The pursuit of community-based sustainable development also requires a political system that secures effective citizen participation in decision making (WCED, 1987).

The State of Kerala has recently adopted elements of a political system which included environmental goals in its policy approach. It has been suggested that this state comes 'closest to the sustainable development ideal in practice' (Parayil, 1996).

According to Turner and Hulme (1997), 'Top-down', 'technocratic', 'blueprint' approaches to development came under increasing scrutiny as they failed to deliver the economic growth and social benefits that had been promised.

Agrawal and Gibson (1999) observe that development goals could only be achieved by 'bottom-up planning', 'decentralisation' and 'participation' and 'community development'.
The ‘development from below’ demanded a reversal of conventional development thinking, working from the ‘bottom-up’ and the ‘periphery inwards’ (Stohr 1981).

According to Ghai and Vivian (1992), there was an alternative to large-scale centralised development, one ‘characterised by small-scale activities, improved technology, local control of resources, widespread economic and social participation and environmental conservation’.

Bartelmus (1997) operationalised sustainable development as "a set of development programmes that meet the targets of human needs satisfaction without violating long-term natural resource capacities and standards of environmental quality and social equity".

Streeten (1995) sees sustainability as a multi-dimensional problem. One of the aspects is the ability to handover projects to citizens of the developing country, for their own management, so that foreign experts can withdraw without jeopardizing their success. This implies training local counterparts and helping to create local technological, managerial and administrative capacity.

Reinhard Stockmann (1997) theorizes the concept of sustainability under three perspectives such as – life-course model, which places stress on the developmental phases of a project and the period following the end of the assistance – the organizational theoretical approach, which brings the conditions and impact factors internal to an organisation into the future – the diffusion-theory approach, which studies the extent to which the innovations triggered by a project go beyond the confines of the implementing agency to find dissemination in its environment.

A project oriented definition of sustainability employed by Swiss Development Cooperation, the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development
(BMZ) and GTZ says that a project is classified as sustained “if the project implementing organization and/or target population continue the innovations achieved by the project without external assistance for long period of time” (GTZ 1988 and DEH 1990).

USAID (1987) and DAC (1988) define sustainability “as a program continuing to deliver services or sustain benefits after the donor’s technical, managerial and financial support has ended”.

Brawn (1993) gives an output or ‘production-oriented approach to sustainability as it operationalises “permanent flow of benefits to beneficiaries” and reduces sustainability to have material benefits of a project that can be measured as “outcome”.

The United Nations Development Programme (1988) puts in a system-oriented definition of sustainability in which the purpose of a technical cooperation (from donor) is supposed to change the nature and performance of one or more or all components of the system.

Stockmann (1997) conceptualise sustainability as innovation-oriented which includes the ability of the implementing organisation or target population to respond flexibly to changed environmental conditions.

Charles Perrings (2001) affirms that sustainability of any particular state (or any particular development path) depends on the properties of the stability domain corresponding to that state.

A ‘resource-based’ argument is concerned with the identification of constraints that are sufficient for sustainability and it seeks the set of rights and obligations that will support the sustainable use of resources (Pezzey, 1997).
Elizabeth Kleemeier (2000) by quoting the case of a piped scheme programme, suggests that sustainability is judgement about whether the schemes have delivered an adequate and reliable supply of output to the target population for a sufficient period.

2.4. Decentralization

Decentralization is commonly interpreted as a political process whereby administrative authority, public resources and responsibilities are transferred from central government agencies to lower level organs of government or to non-governmental bodies, such as community based organizations, ‘third party’ non-government organizations or private sector actors. Decentralisation is also thought to create the conditions for a more pluralistic political arrangement, in which competing groups can voice and institutionalise their interests in local democratic forums (Crook and Manor, 1998; Rondenelli et al., 1989; Meenakshisundaram, 1999 and World Bank 2000).

Concept of decentralisation varies between four postulates such as de-concentration, devolution, delegation and privatisation. In de-concentration, the political, administrative and fiscal responsibilities are transferred to lower units within central line ministries or agencies (Crook and Manor, 1998; Rondinelli et al., 1989; Meenakshisundaram, 1999). In devolution, the sub-national units of government are either created or strengthened in terms of political, administrative and fiscal power (Crook and Manor, 1998; Rondinelli et al., 1989). Delegation in which responsibilities are transferred to organisation that are ‘outside the regular bureaucratic structure and are only indirectly controlled by the central government’ (Meenakshisundaram, 1999). In privatisation, all responsibility for government functions is transferred to NGOs or private enterprises independent of government (Meenakshisundaram, 1999).
Decentralisation through devolution of authority could enhance systems of local governance by the establishment and empowerment of local resource user groups (delegation or privatisation) thereby improving the ways in which local people manage and use natural resources, subsequently improving the resource base on which poor people are often disproportionately dependant (Baland and Platteau, 1996; IFAD, 2001; Ostrom, 1990).

According to Blair (2000), decentralisation, in theory would undermine the power of government officials by creating institutional arrangements that formalise the relationship between citizens and public servants, giving the former the authority to impose sanctions such as voting, recourse to higher-level authorities on the latter.

World Bank (2000) envisions the transfer of powers under three broad areas such as political, administrative and fiscal decentralisation. Political decentralisation transfers policy and legislative powers from central government to autonomous, lower-level assemblies and local councils that have been democratically elected by their constituencies. Administrative decentralisation places planning and implementation responsibility in the hands of the locally situated civil servants and these local civil servants are under the jurisdiction of elected local governments. Fiscal decentralisation accords substantial revenue and expenditure authority to intermediate and local governments.

Ostrom et.al. (1993) argues that decentralisation creates institutions that are more amenable to local needs and preferences. It waives the shortcomings of state such as lack of flexibility and reach to provide certain types of goods and services, particularly ones with large information requirements.

Under decentralised governance, the collaboration between public agencies and local resource users can produce ‘synergistic’ outcomes in which citizens and civil servants cooperate to produce goods that would be unobtainable were they acting alone. (Evans, 1996a, 1996b; Ostrom 1996)
The decentralisation process enables democratisation and empowerment of local administrative bodies and enhances participation in decision-making, particularly groups that have traditionally been marginalised by local political processes (Crook and Sverrisson, 2001)

According to Sarkar (1988) the conventional approach to the centralised planning process has been synthesised in decentralised participatory planning on a regional administrative basis which eventually aims at formulation of development plan at grassroots level with the available human and economic resources which will ultimately help in the realisation of aspiration of the local people.

Detailed reviews of literature of associated concepts have provided insights for formulating a standard tool in analysing the sustainability of participatory projects. The dependent and independent variables are developed from this close scrutiny of literature available in the area.