The Participation Forum
Workshop Notes*

Number 1 July 27, 1995

Rapid Appraisal and Beyond

On July 27, 1995, over forty USAID staff attended a workshop on rapid appraisal (RA) and participatory (rural) appraisal (PRA), organized by Anne Sweetser of PPC's Participation Initiative. James Beebe of USAID/South Africa, Christopher Gibbs, Senior Evaluation Officer at the World Bank, and Barbara Thomas-Slayter, Professor and Director of the International Development Program at Clark University were the speakers. These notes summarize the major points of the workshop and point to additional resources for those who want to learn more.

These workshop notes cover

- ✓ *The three principles of rapid appraisal*
- ✓ *The strengths and weaknesses of rapid appraisal*
- ✓ *Rapid appraisal versus participatory rapid appraisal*
- ✓ *A technique for institutional analysis*

What Is Rapid Appraisal?

Anne T. Sweetser

Rapid appraisal is a form of qualitative research derived from the participant observation methodology of socio-cultural anthropology. It is used for preliminary design and evaluation of applied activities. RA is fast and flexible but rigorous. It is grounded in recognition that all dimensions of a local system (be it an irrigation system or a political system) cannot be identified in advance, and that attempts to do so reflect primarily the outsider's culture. Instead, a team of individuals with contrasting expertise can develop an understanding of a system by synthesizing information from several sources: prior research and reports, direct observation, and semi-structured interviews. During a rapid appraisal, time is allocated to ensure team member interaction in an iterative learning process. The goal is to grasp an insider's perspective on the system and to understand it as a whole, rather than to come up with a statistical description of its constituent units. Rapid appraisal is an excellent tool for surveying

---

Workshops of the Participation Forum are occasional half- or full-day sessions focusing on discussion of participation methodologies and their applicability to USAID. Like summaries of the Participation Forum sessions, they are disseminated within USAID by E-mail and distributed to other interested parties in hard copy. For further information, please contact Diane La Voy or Anne Sweetser by E-mail, using either the USAID directory or INTERNET [dlavoy or asweetser@usaid.gov].

customer needs, because it can ensure that new activities are grounded in a fuller understanding of customer perspectives, and—if participatory planning processes are used (as in PRA)—it can lay the basis for empowering beneficiaries and producing sustainable results.

The Principles of Rapid Appraisal
James Beebe

In 1991, I organized a rapid appraisal in conjunction with a project sponsored by the Department of Agriculture and USAID to help the Ministry of Agriculture in Poland to deal with its economic transition. The ultimate goal was privatization of state farms, but the government needed to maintain them and keep them from failing in the meantime. I would like to discuss the three principles of rapid appraisal by describing how they were applied in Poland.

The rapid appraisal followed three years during which the state farms had been trying to cope with severe problems related to the transition of the Polish economy. For the very first time, farm directors had to deal with high inflation and interest rates, prices that did not cover production costs, and a general lack of demand for their produce. The situation was complicated by an uncertain government agricultural policy. Inadequacies in the management skills of the farm directors became apparent, although there was no solid information available about the management of the state farms. The conventional wisdom was that managers tended to be quite similar, but the rapid appraisal showed that this was not the case.

A Systems Perspective
The first of the three principles of rapid appraisal is use of a systems perspective. It is very important to note that the elements of a system *cannot* be identified in advance, nor can decisions be made in advance as to which elements of a system are most important for understanding a given situation. Rather, understanding can be gained by listening carefully to what interviewees mention.

The first task of a rapid appraisal team is to make rough approximations of the system and those elements that might be most important in the specific context. These informed guesses must be recognized as hypotheses. They are the starting point for repeated and critical reevaluation as the team clarifies its understanding of the system as viewed by insiders.

A range of techniques may be employed to obtain information about a system. In Poland, we used semi-structured interviews with both individuals and groups of people from farms representing the full range of variability. When we arrived in the country, we were invited to a meeting of all of the managers and senior staff of the state farms. That gave us a chance to explain what we were doing and to carry out group discussions. Interestingly enough, the group was very negative about the future of the state farms, but individuals were not as negative. It is common to encounter such differences between group and individual responses.

After the initial meeting, the appropriate team spent over 110 hours interviewing the directors and senior staff of the state farms, whenever possible, in the field. Our purpose was to get the participants in the system to define the major components of the system, including what they felt was most important, what they felt was going wrong, and what kind of assistance might help.

Following the basic principle of a systems perspective meant that there were things we could not do. We did not go in with a questionnaire, because we could not know in advance what the participants were going to identify as a major part of the system. We could not know the relevant questions.

Triangulation

The second principle is use of triangulation. The term comes from navigation, and means trying to find a position or location by means of bearings from two known points. When applied to rapid appraisal, it means systematically combining the observations of team members with different backgrounds and using a variety of research methods. The assumption is that for most situations, there is no one "best" way to obtain information, and even if there were, it could not be foreseen. Similarly, no single person's impressions of a situation can be perfect. Team members must employ triangulation in a highly conscious fashion, maintaining clarity about each person's tendencies toward bias, the sources of information, and the system being investigated. This improves the quality of information and ensures cross-checking. Rapid appraisal must triangulate among people by listening to the viewpoints of different groups. It is also necessary to triangulate among methods—to combine information from interviews and direct observation with information collected in advance.

Research Techniques of Rapid Appraisal

Systems Perspective
- Semi-structured interviews
- Use of "individual respondents" to represent variability and "key informants" who can describe the broader system beyond their own direct participation
- Drawing diagrams and pictures

Triangulation
- Multidisciplinary teams
- Information collected in advance
- Direct observation

Iterative Data Collection and Analysis
- Structuring research time to allow for appraisal team interaction

In Poland, we used the perceptions of a multidisciplinary team and multiple research methods, and we combined information from various sources with direct observation. We traveled over 2,000 kilometers as we tried to make sure that people had an opportunity to show as well as tell us about their situations.

The Iterative Process

The third basic principle of rapid appraisal is iterative data collection and analysis. As information is collected, it is used to modify the research process. Research time is structured so team members have plenty of time to interact. We spent almost as much time talking with each other about the implications of what we were learning for the next step of our research as we spent collecting the information. We made extensive use of microcomputers and printers to produce notes and outlines, and we met repeatedly with the people in the Ministry of Agriculture. Over the course of two weeks, we had eight meetings with them, which included having them participate in some of our interviews. We showed them the information we were collecting and discussed its implications with them. The iterative process includes both the appraisal team and the partners.

Rapid appraisal is a process during which the researchers begin with information collected in advance, and then progressively expand their knowledge and deepen their understanding by gathering new information through semi-structured interviews and direct observations, and sharing their interpretations of this new information as it is collected. It can be thought of as an open system that uses feedback to “learn” from its environment and progressively change itself. The research effort is structured to encourage participants to rapidly change questions, interviews, and direction as their understanding evolves.

On one of the rapid appraisals I conducted, all members of my team were from a traditional academic community. They were upset by the notion that as the research progressed, the questions and the methodology changed. It was difficult to get through to them the notion that a rapid assessment focuses on understanding a situation from the perspective of the participant, not on how many people do what. These academics had spent their entire careers making sure that their hypotheses were not corrupted by collecting data.

Findings of the Appraisal

Among the managers of the Polish state farms, we discovered confusion about what a market economy really meant and uncertainties about the power of information and the difference between production and profit. One manager was still meeting the production goals that had been issued two years before and wondered why his farm was failing. Some managers were devastated to discover that the market would not always pay for products at the cost of production. Cash flow appeared to be a critical issue.

These findings were not particularly profound, but we probably would not have anticipated all of them. For example, cash flow was not anticipated as an issue by the appraisal team or the Ministry of Agriculture. In the past, managers of state farms had been able to get short-term credit from state banks and did not need to be concerned with cash flow. If the appraisal team had designed a questionnaire, it would have been impossible for us to have picked this up, but, when we asked managers to show us their farms and explain what was happening, the issue was uncovered. On one farm we saw tractors sitting in the parking lot and unharvested fields. We found out they had no money to buy fuel.

In another appraisal, USAID was looking at the issues of land tenure in the Philippines. We sat down with an aerial photo and got people to draw out where the plots were and tell who farmed them and who owned them. The discussion also got into types of soil in various plots. We discovered that they had an indigenous soil classification system which correlated very closely with some of the issues of tenure. We could never have come up with this information from a survey questionnaire developed in advance in an office.

As a result of the rapid appraisal in Poland, we were able to suggest how to help the farms survive until they could be privatized or their status changed in some other way. It took us two weeks to finalize our report and two more weeks to get it translated into Polish. A rapid appraisal should both collect and disseminate material rapidly. Rapid appraisal is nothing more than organized common sense, but it can be done in a rigorous way.

Absolute Requirements

The three basic principles allow for a tremendous amount of flexibility on what techniques are used and on how the pieces are put together. However, there are a few absolute requirements. First, it is not possible to start with a questionnaire and have a systems perspective. Second, at least two people must be on a team—ideally both insiders and outsiders—for the principle of triangulation to be observed. Third, a rapid appraisal cannot be a one-shot effort. The process must consist of collecting information, talking about it, analyzing it, and then collecting additional information.

A rapid appraisal should be neither too short nor too long. There's a danger that too many resources will be invested in it. The purpose is to get enough information so that additional research can be carried out or an activity can be started up. If too much time is invested in a rapid appraisal, people might place too much confidence in it.

To maintain a certain amount of rigor in the process, a checklist of the team's activities should be prepared. It should identify who was on the team, how much time was spent, what types of people were contacted, what types of information were collected, and so on. Ideally, this checklist should note the date when some of the issues raised should be revisited.

Possibilities for Participation

This approach offers possibilities for participation on multiple levels, perhaps even participation of the people in the community as full team members. There is a lot of leeway as long as the focus is on listening to what people have to say. A wide range of specific techniques are available: focus groups, individual interviews, use of key informants, use of ecological transects on site, asking people to diagram their input.

Strengths and Weaknesses of Rapid Appraisal

Christopher Gibbs

Providing decision-makers with information that is relevant, timely, accurate, and practical is a challenge and does not happen as often as it should. Rapid appraisal, or rapid rural appraisal, as it was originally called, was designed to fill a gap between what were “quick and dirty” and “long and dirty” analyses, where dirty referred to cost-effectiveness. Formal research methods may have scientific validity, but they provide too little relevant information, too late, at too high a cost. Rapid appraisal is attractive because it is less costly and quicker than formal methods of investigation and holds out the promise that it can provide a different kind of information from the formal surveys. It is notably valuable when an interpretive understanding of a situation is required. Formal research methods can fall down when the object of the inquiry cannot be easily quantified.

Limitations

Rapid appraisal's advantages of cost, speed, and type of information come with some equally large limitations.

First, the validity of the information gained can be questioned: Are the findings sound? How much random variation is there in the results? Numerous factors can contribute to low reliability of information; three are associated with rapid appraisal.

- Rapid appraisal does not employ probability sampling and therefore may be criticized for producing results that are unrepresentative. If someone asks, “To whom exactly does this conclusion apply?” rapid appraisal may not provide the answer. Is it 50 percent of the population or 70 percent of the population? Rapid appraisal may not provide reliable information on this.
- Individual judgments can affect the conduct of the inquiry substantially. A lot of judgment is required to employ rapid appraisal effectively because there is so much flexibility in the

approach. This flexibility can help investigators to achieve depth, but it comes at the price of potential bias or distortion. The risk is that investigators hear only what they want to hear.

- Qualitative information can be very hard to record, code, and analyze. How will the information collected on tapes, in diaries, or through maps be presented? Clearly, anthropological colleagues have worked with this problem for many years, and we can learn great deal from them.

Four actions can raise the validity of rapid-appraisal findings. First, investigators should have a sound conceptual framework for the investigation before they start. Some of the short reports that have come out from CDIE explain as clearly as any I've seen how to prepare for a rapid appraisal. Second, a variety of techniques should be employed. Third, information gained through one rapid-appraisal exercise should be cross-checked with another. Fourth—and this is very hard—investigators should maintain high standards of self-criticism.

The second weakness of rapid appraisal is that it doesn't provide data from which generalizations can be made about populations. Rapid appraisal helps to enrich the picture, but it doesn't provide information about the extent or pervasiveness of a phenomenon. For example, it may tell you that rural women are being deterred from using certain birth control methods, but it can't tell you how many are being deterred for a particular reason.

The third weakness of rapid appraisal is that its findings often lack credibility. Decision makers often prefer precision to a rich description. I'm not saying that's right. I actually think it's frequently wrong, because often the precision that decision makers gain is a false sense of precision.

Strengths

Provided its limitations are kept carefully in mind, rapid appraisal is clearly useful when description is all that is needed, when what is sought is an understanding of attitudes or motivations, when quantified data needs to be interpreted, and when the aim of the investigation is to generate suggestions or recommendations. James Beebe's Poland example is classic: There's a problem to solve. Where should we begin to look for a solution? Let's talk to the people concerned. But let's talk in a structured and careful way so that we can come to conclusions fairly quickly.

In addition, rapid appraisal is useful when there's a need to develop questions for a subsequent formal study. Frequently, formal and informal methods can very usefully complement each other.

World Bank Rapid Appraisals

The World Bank is using participatory rapid appraisal (PRA) methods increasingly. An example is a recent poverty assessment for Uganda. One member of the team decided very early on that she wanted to make sure that poor people themselves contributed to the poverty assessment. What was their perspective on poverty? What did they feel it was that kept them poor? What did they think would make them better off? And how should assistance be applied to reduce poverty? The Bank employed an experienced PRA trainer from India in this case, a woman who was a protégé of Robert Chambers, to train social workers, government officials, and representatives of NGOs in Uganda to carry out an informal appraisal of poverty issues by talking to men, women, and children. The process resulted in a substantial enrichment of the picture. Unfortunately, the findings were not as fully integrated into the strategy for poverty reduction as they should have been. That's a function of the difficulty people have interpreting this kind of information in a way that is bureaucratically convenient or acceptable.

In Egypt, PRA methods were used to develop a natural-resource management project among Bedouin people in the Matruh region. These people had been nomads for generations but had become increasingly more settled recently. They were among the poorest people in Egypt. To help them, government would have had to earn their confidence and not simply attempt to control them. A traditional livestock project would almost certainly have failed.

PRA was employed through a task force that included central government, local government, and the Bedouin communities themselves. Several techniques were used: semi-structured interviews; participatory mapping; transect walks (walking with the Bedouin through the areas that they were familiar with and going to the water holes and discussing with them issues that related to their management); seasonal calendars (interpreting how their life varied over the year); social and historical profiles; and matrix ranking techniques. Special attention was paid to talking with women.

The result was a project that was far more than the sum of its components. However, this PRA wasn't very rapid or cheap. The whole process took three years, and it cost about $350,000. But this actually compares very well with the cost of other World Bank project preparations. Its distinct advantage was that the project became immediately effective and didn't go through the usual revving-up period. Furthermore, while the Bank's project planners lost a degree of control, they gained an enormous amount of ownership.

In Morocco, a PRA was used very successfully to prepare a sector study for women. This was done in a society where gender issues do not surface readily and where control of local affairs has been made a fine art. The aim was to find out what women's priorities for development were by asking them. The task manager for this project knew nothing about PRA when she started, but she knew that she wanted to talk to the women. To pull it off, she had to teach herself the basics of PRA, convince her supervisor and division chief that it was going to be useful, assure the government of Morocco that it was not going to be subversive, train people in Morocco in the techniques, carry out the assessment in several rounds, and build the findings into a document that Bank staff unfamiliar with this sort of an approach would respect.

RA, RRA, and PRA

Rapid appraisal (RA) was first developed in the late 1970s in two workshops organized by Robert Chambers at the University of Sussex in response to (1) biased perceptions based on “rural development tourism” (the brief rural visit by the urban-based professional) and (2) the defects and high costs of large-scale questionnaire surveys. The technique came to be called rapid rural appraisal (RRA).

Participatory rural appraisal (PRA) describes approaches and methods such as group mapping, diagramming, and storytelling that enable local people first to share, enhance, and analyze their knowledge of life and conditions, and then to plan and to act. Like RA, it owes much to the traditions and methods of participatory research, applied anthropology, and field research on farming systems.

In **RA** (or RRA), information is generally elicited and extracted by outsiders as part of a process of data-gathering; in **PRA** it is generally owned and shared by local people, as part of a process of their empowerment.

Source: Robert Chambers, “Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA): Analyses of Experience” and “Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA): Challenges, Potentials, and Paradigm,” *World Development*, Vol. 22, Nos. 9 and 10 (September and October 1994).

In this case, the process is not yet over, but it already appears to be quite successful. Women feel empowered to speak up in community meetings, and the director of statistics in the Ministry of Agriculture, who has been the prime contact for this project, now favors the use of PRA on a much larger scale. Again, this process has taken time and has not been cheap, but it has produced a new kind of product and has brought about a changed set of relationships among the stakeholders that I believe promises much more value in the future.

Institutional Mapping: An Example of PRA
Barbara Thomas-Slayter

Participatory (Rural) Appraisal, PRA, is a spinoff of RA or RRA, in which the emphasis is shifted from rapidity to participation. PRA appraisals may take a couple of months, not two weeks. When completed, a community has in hand an action plan in which the people themselves have determined what they want to do, who is going to do it, and what kind of outside help they may need.

It is very important to involve people from the local community through such methods as options assessment, pair-wise ranking, and voting. When the people with whom Clark University works come to grips with real choices and what seems best for their community, I have found them to be quite fair in decision making.

Institutional analysis can make a significant contribution to problems that now occupy the development profession. For example, it can be used to address a question raised by the emphasis on democratization: How can community organizations or institutions effectively build capacity, including an increase in accountability for their efforts? Ultimately, a combination of grassroots participation, political pressure, legal restraints, structural change, and strengthening of local institutions is needed.

Institutional analysis has helped Clark's work in PRA in several cases by facilitating linkages between local communities and outside donors, and between local organizations and national governments. These have promoted improvements in four areas: strengthening civil society; more effective management of development projects, including greater gender equity; increased agricultural productivity; and greater conservation of natural resources.

Two methods of institutional analysis are available. The first is to invite a representative from each of the major institutions in a community to a meeting. At the meeting, the roles and activities of the different institutions are discussed. All the representatives are asked to describe something about their organizations. Then they are asked to rank these institutions by their importance to the well-being or the development activities of the community. The other method is to ask the participants to create a diagram showing the relationships among the organizations. Different sized circles are cut out of construction paper to represent the organizations. The group is asked to mount these on a flip chart in a way that visually shows their relationships.

In Kenya, Clark carried out an institutional analysis of Chevaluky. The exercise was carried out in neighborhood communities. Lo and behold the government was represented by the smallest circle, and it was isolated spatially. The pattern showed up in all neighborhoods. The appraisal team members were quite curious about this, but the local members knew what was going on. It came out that the chief was hopeless. He was an alcoholic, a lecher, and a cheat, and the local government had disintegrated within that community. Nobody was going to come out and tell us that directly. We needed to have some process to reveal this information.

An Exercise in Institutional Analysis

Participants in the workshop broke into small groups to do an exercise in institutional analysis. They were asked to: 1) make a list of the most important institutions in D.C.; 2) rank them (big, medium, or small); 3) label large, medium, and small circles of construction paper with names of institutions of corresponding rank; and 4) arrange the circles on a sheet of flip-chart paper to represent their interrelationships.

Participants immediately asked about criteria for selecting institutions, and they were urged to answer this and similar questions within their groups. There were revealing contrasts between the institutional maps produced by the groups. It was clear that using this technique one could easily identify differences between men and women or other significant subgroups within a community and then work to facilitate understanding of the various perspectives among all community members.

The following pointers were identified during the exercise:

- Carrying out an institutional assessment has a catalytic effect and there is great diversity of opinions from group to group. Therefore, to be effective, an institutional analysis ought to be done with a couple of different groups and a couple of different neighborhoods.

- It is important to clarify the task and the criteria used for setting priorities and analyzing relationships. The exercise showed how different groups set different criteria so that they could get what they wanted out of the analysis.

- Who is in the assessment group is very important. If the assessment is part of an RRA or PRA, some thought should be given as to how the groups are formed so that a cross-section of people within any community is being represented.

- To minimize the extent to which some individuals might be afraid or nervous about expressing their true opinions in the presence of powerful or influential people in the community, pair-wise ranking may be used as a way of prioritizing. It's a systematic way of getting people to choose one out of two. In this case, the entire list of institutions would be presented in pairs. At the end, those institutions with the greatest number of votes would be assigned big circles and so on down the line. This system allows people to avoid having to say, “This is the most important thing to me.”

A PRA carried out by Clark and GTZ last summer in northern Somalia found it hard to get beyond the council of elders, a group of senior males who controlled the community and wanted everything to go through them. An institutional analysis revealed that there were a women's organization and a youth organization. The problem arose then of who was to control the activities that were coming out of the PRA. The council of elders wanted everything to go straight through them but eventually conceded certain kinds of water responsibilities to the women's organization, because, after all, water was women's responsibility. So they were willing to let go of a portion of their responsibility as a result of community-wide institutional analysis.

Institutional analysis yields an overall picture, not a precise roadmap. But it should show how the host organization of a USAID project is regarded, for example. It could be that the host organization is regarded by both men and women as outside the mainstream and that USAID should be working with another organization.

An institutional assessment provides guidelines and will introduce subtle questions that straightforward questionnaires might not reveal. It can reveal which institutions are most important in the eyes of the community, which seem to have the respect and confidence of the community, and which should be able to engage in sustainable development activities most effectively. It also shows the relationship among institutions. The diagram created shows the institutional importance through the size of the circle and the institutional relationships in the way the circles are arranged.

Practical Considerations

Workshop Participants Speak Out

Follow-up

Binah Shupak: I carried out a participatory rural appraisal in India. There the biggest bugaboo was that people got great information but forgot to follow up. They viewed their work as a final picture, whereas in the villages, the picture is constantly changing. Many villagers were so sick of rapid rural appraisal because investigators came to the villages and talked to the villagers, but nothing ever came of it. It is a concern in the rapid-rural-appraisal community that aid workers will carry out rapid rural appraisals to get the approval that they need from higher-ups but ignore the work which rapid rural appraisal is meant to inspire.

Combining RRA or PRA with Standard Surveys

Barbara Thomas-Slayter: It doesn't need to be either/or. Qualitative, descriptive data can help define a focused survey: a short, crisp, to-the-point survey to explore problems that have been identified through a participatory or rapid rural appraisal. I think the two work well together. For instance, we were working in an area in Kenya called Pwani, a community on the periphery of Lake Nikuru. Issues concerned community access to the park. A PRA was carried out to find out what the people in the community were concerned about. The PRA was followed up with a random-sample, probability survey based on what was specifically of concern in that community as revealed by the PRA: access to certain timber products, better control of animals that were destroying their crops, etc.

Christopher Gibbs: Some of the impetus for developing rapid appraisal methods was the slowness and costliness of baseline surveys. In too many cases baseline surveys took too long to complete and were incomplete; the moment had passed before they were finished. The opportunity to do something had passed.

At the World Bank, we are trying to use some rapid or informal methods in impact evaluations. We find that the kind of information we are getting from baseline surveys isn't really highly relevant for evaluating impact. Virtually nothing in the baseline surveys helps us to understand what a project really might have accomplished for people in terms that they value, or what impact meeting the main physical objectives of the project has had on people's lives.

Nevertheless, let's not be fooled: records are useful. When James Beebe did his work in Poland, he had an awful lot of information about the state farms to work with before he got there. The World Bank's poverty assessments are all based on a living-standards measurement survey, a fairly detailed survey of what is going on with respect to people's education, health, nutrition, mortality, morbidity, and so on. The Bank does not use rapid appraisal by itself in these areas. There may not be enough time for a full baseline survey. In such cases, a slightly less perfect tool might provide some useful insights.

The Need for Baseline Data

Curt Grimm: In a number of cases where PRAs have been used, the other component—the quantitative data—is missing. To move in the direction of results-based, performance-based management, one needs baseline information. But PRAs do not yield baseline information. It is not possible to measure progress on the basis of information from a rapid appraisal.

James Beebe: There may be situations where a rapid appraisal *can* produce baseline information. That baseline may not always be as quantitative as some of the people in USAID are interested in. Also customers may be involved in identifying the indicators. What impact in this community tells you that you are making progress? I would be very suspicious of studies that didn't start with trying to get an understanding of the local customers, the local participants in the system. But rapid appraisal is not an end in itself. It should lead either to additional studies or some sort of action.

Quantitative Rapid Appraisal

Binah Shupak: Rapid appraisal can be quite quantitative. If quantitative data is needed, the rapid appraisal should be planned to obtain it. Information can be obtained from villagers which produce percents, and it is much more accurate than what can be obtained from conventional sources. For instance, to find out about infant mortality rates in an area, the village could be mapped and the houses identified where people have died, including when they died, what they died of, and what their ages were.

Another example: to compare customers' use of different medical services, we gave them a rupee and asked them how much they would spend for various goods and services. That will yield percentages. By going to different groups, you can compare the percentages.

Additional Resources

Beebe, James. 1995. Basic concepts and techniques of rapid appraisal. *Human Organization* 54, no. 1.

Chambers, Robert. July 1994. The origins and practice of participatory rural appraisal (PRA). *World Development* 22, no. 7.

———. September 1994. Participatory rural appraisal (PRA): Analyses of experience. *World Development* 22, no. 9.

———. October 1994. Participatory rural appraisal (PRA): Challenges, potentials, and paradigm. *World Development* 22, no. 10.

Gibbs, Christopher J. N. 1985. *Rapid rural appraisal: An overview of concepts and application.* Paper presented at the International Conference on Rapid Rural Appraisal, September 2-5, 1985, Khon Kaen, Thailand. CDIE no. PN-AAU-157 43038 (Conference proceedings: PN-AAZ-301).

Institutional Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), Sussex, England. RRA Notes. Series of volumes on applications of RRA.

Kumar, Krishna. April 1987. *Conducting group interviews in developing countries.* Program Design and Evaluation Methodology Report no. 8, PN-AAX-088.

———. December 1987. *Rapid, low-cost data collection methods for A.I.D.* A.I.D. Program Design and Evaluation Methodology Report no. 10, PN-AAL-100.

———. December 1989. *Conducting key informant interviews in developing countries.* Program Design and Evaluation Methodology Report no. 13, PN-AAX-226.

———. December 1990. *Conducting mini-surveys in developing countries.* Program Design and Evaluation Methodology Report no. 15, PN-AAX-249.

———, ed. 1993. *Rapid appraisal methods.* World Bank Regional and Sectoral Studies.

Participatory Rural Appraisal Handbook. Prepared jointly by: National Environment Secretariat, Government of Kenya / Clark University (U.S.A.) / Egerton University (Kenya) / Center for International Development and Environment of the World Resources Institute (U.S.A.). (Available from Director, International Development, Clark University, 950 Main St., Worcester, MA 01610, phone: 508-793-7201, fax: 508-793-8820.)

Thomas-Slayter, B. P. October 1994. Structural change, power politics, and community organizations in Africa: Challenging the patterns, puzzles, and paradoxes. *World Development* 22, no. 10.

Srinivasan, Lyra. 1990. *Tools for community participation.* PROWWESS/UNDP Technical Services.

———. 1992. *Options for educators.* PACT/CDS (Communications Development Service of PACT).

Sweetser, Anne T. April 1995. *Trip report: Customer surveying: Rapid appraisal methodology*. (Available from asweetser@usaid.gov.)