



HAL
open science

Insights and Challenges of Integrated Small-Scale Longitudinal Surveys in Rural Areas of the Global South

Arnaud Natal, Christophe Jalil Nordman

► To cite this version:

Arnaud Natal, Christophe Jalil Nordman. Insights and Challenges of Integrated Small-Scale Longitudinal Surveys in Rural Areas of the Global South. 2026. <hal-05575021>

HAL Id: hal-05575021

<https://hal.science/hal-05575021v1>

Preprint submitted on 31 Mar 2026

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 - Attribution - Non-commercial use - ShareAlike - International License

Insights and Challenges of Integrated Small-Scale Longitudinal Surveys in Rural Areas of the Global South¹

March 2026

Arnaud Natal^{a,b,*}, and Christophe Jalil Nordman^{c,d,b,**}

^a *Bordeaux School of Economics (University of Bordeaux, CNRS, INRAE), Pessac, France*

^b *French Institute of Pondicherry (UMIFRE 21, CNRS, MEAE), Pondicherry, India*

^c *LEDa-DIAL (IRD, CNRS, PSL Research University), Paris, France*

^d *French National Research Institute for Sustainable Development, Marseille, France*

* arnaud.natal@ifpindia.org

** jalil.nordman@ird.fr

Abstract

Since the early 2000s, alongside the growing quantitative turn in economics, new data collection instruments have emerged in the tradition of village studies - namely, integrated small-scale surveys. This article conceptualises these types of surveys. Integrated small-scale surveys combine detailed, longitudinal, and multi-level data collection. They capture the complexity of rural dynamics while maintaining methodological flexibility and contextual depth. Drawing on six case studies in Asia and Africa, this article illustrates how these surveys enrich development research with granular and multidimensional information. Despite their advantages, they face persistent challenges in terms of data representativeness, longitudinal management, technical complexity, and promotion and openness to the community. The article calls for greater recognition of these surveys as key tools for understanding rural transformation in Southern countries.

Keywords

Village studies, micro-level data, rural development, livelihoods.

JEL codes

C81, C83, D1, O12.

¹ We sincerely thank Bishwarupa Kar, who was an excellent research assistant on this project.

1. Introduction

Nearly three-quarters of the world's population lives in the Global South, with a large majority residing in rural areas. Understanding development economic trajectories therefore requires a careful analysis of the dynamics at work in villages, as well as the interactions between rural and urban spaces. A thorough examination of local social, economic, and political structures is essential to grasp broader global economic transformations.

In India, from the 1930s and 1940s onwards, a significant tradition of “village studies” developed, driven by sociologists and anthropologists (Jodhka & Simpson, 2019). These studies aimed to document in depth the living conditions, social relations, and economic and political organisation of rural communities. One reason why these surveys played such a central role in understanding rural society is that the village often constitutes the lowest administrative unit one can observe. Village studies have been used in diverse ways (Himanshu et al., 2018). For sociologists and anthropologists, the central focus is the village as a social and cultural entity, examining its internal organisation and dynamics. Economists, by contrast, often use the village as a field site to test specific hypotheses about household behaviours, market mechanisms, and to identify socio-economic outcomes such as educational attainment or labour market participation. Despite disciplinary differences, these approaches share many common interests and have significantly enriched the understanding of rural life, largely because village studies allow for a highly detailed contextualisation of change. They also enable direct observation of social and power relations, revealing institutional dynamics and social structures that are often invisible in large-scale quantitative surveys.

This methodology quickly spread to other countries. In the 1970s, the Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex launched an ambitious programme to catalogue village surveys, known as the Village Studies Programme (Lambert, 1973). The research team collaborated with various institutes in the Global South to identify the nature and scope of local-level studies, supplementing this effort with field visits across Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The programme documented nearly 600 household surveys: approximately 200 in India, 200 in Africa, and 200 in Latin America. While some resulted in published monographs, the majority circulated only as mimeographed reports, which remained largely unknown to the international academic community.

Since the early 2000s, in a context where economics has become increasingly quantitative (and development economics is no exception), new data collection instruments have emerged in the tradition of village studies: the so-called “integrated” small-scale surveys. An “integrated” household survey is a multi-topic household survey designed so its modules can be reliably linked at the same household and individual levels. These surveys differ from traditional village studies in their stronger quantitative component. However, they retain the deep engagement with the social, economic, and political realities of villages that characterise village studies.

In this article, we conceptualise integrated small-scale surveys by proposing a definition that emphasises four key characteristics: local scope and small sample size; longitudinal dimension; level of detail and multidimensionality; and multilevel design. We also highlight the contributions of these surveys and outline the main challenges they currently face.

The paper is organised as follow. In Section 2 we conceptualise what integrated small-scale surveys are. In Section 3, we present findings from six surveys conducted in different contexts in the Global South (India, Thailand, Vietnam, Madagascar, Senegal, Ghana, Ethiopia, Nigeria, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania, and Zambia). In Section 4, we discuss four major challenges facing integrated small-scale surveys, and we conclude in Section 5.

2. Conceptual framework

Village studies refer to intensive field enquiries conducted in one village, typically combining participant observation, in-depth interviews, and the collection of socio-economic data. The most emblematic example is arguably the Palanpur village in India, which has been studied almost continuously since the 1950s and has become a touchstone for analysing long-term rural dynamics in this country (Himanshu et al., 2018). The term “village studies” is particularly associated with India, where a rich tradition of village-based research has developed (see Himanshu et al., 2016). Historically, these enquiries stem from sociology and anthropology, which explains their strong qualitative orientation.

Fundamentally, village studies and integrated small-scale surveys refer to similar approaches: in-depth, local-level enquiries involving a limited number of households but strong researcher immersion. The distinction between the two terms lies mainly in the relative weight given to qualitative and quantitative methods for data collection. Village studies originate from

a predominantly qualitative tradition, whereas integrated small-scale surveys are rooted in a more quantitative one. In practice, however, the boundaries are porous: some surveys classified as village studies may also be considered as integrated small-scale surveys when they include a substantial quantitative component. Another key distinction is that most integrated small-scale surveys span several villages or study sites in order to capture a wider diversity of situations and greater variation in responses, whereas village studies often concentrate on a single village (as in the case of Palanpur). According to the definition proposed by Axinn et al. (2021), small-scale surveys are designed to measure a specific sub-population of interest (e.g., members of an organisation, an institution, a community, a village, or a group of individuals sharing a common characteristic) without aiming to represent a national population as a whole.

Within the field of development economics (and more broadly, development studies), we suggest a more specific definition. Integrated small-scale surveys are quantitative socio-economic household surveys conducted primarily in rural areas, but not necessarily there, that capture local dynamics and individual trajectories with a level of precision rarely attainable in large-scale surveys. They may appear as a direct intellectual and methodological legacy of village studies, inheriting their focus on in-depth local enquiry, immersion in communities, and understanding of micro-level social, economic, and institutional processes. Integrated small-scale surveys have four major characteristics.

Local scope and small sample size. They are usually implemented by research teams with strong field presence and local knowledge. As a result, they generally survey fewer than 5,000 households, which is small compared with national surveys.² This limited scale allows research teams to maintain close engagement with participants and ensures high-quality data, even when the sample is not nationally representative.³

Longitudinal. These surveys become more interesting as the longitudinal dimension increases. Longitudinal data allow researchers not only to document inter-individual heterogeneity but also to analyse intra-individual variation over time. This combination provides a deeper

² For comparison, the National Family Health Survey in India covers 600,000 households, the Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) in Nigeria 42,000 households, and Brazil's *Pesquisa Nacional por Amostra de Domicílios* (PNAD) 210,000 households.

³ The issue of representativeness is discussed in section 4.1.

understanding of the complexity of human behaviour (Hsiao, 2022). In addition, a sustained presence in the field allows for a deep understanding of the context and builds trust with local populations. This improves data quality and enables a productive combination of deductive and inductive approaches (Rao, 2023). The longitudinal dimension is another major advantage of integrated small-scale surveys compared with large national surveys. National surveys are, at best, rotating panels and more often repeated cross-sections, which makes them less able to track changes at the individual level.

Detailed and multidimensional. Covering a range of topics, such as education and cognition, labour, consumption, income, wealth, agriculture, or financial practices, integrated small-scale surveys collect rich data on multiple dimensions of rural life, enabling the study of phenomena that large-scale surveys typically overlook.

Multi-level design (i.e., “integrated”). Integrated small-scale surveys collect data across multiple levels (e.g., village, household, individual, and sometimes, network levels). In practice, this means that the survey uses a single (or shared) sampling frame and a harmonised design, with modules that are built to fit together (compatible concepts, variables, and coding) and unique household and individual identifiers so information can be reliably linked across topics.⁴ The integrated may also be fielded in waves or as a panel to enable longitudinal analysis. This structure allows researchers to capture interactions and relationships both within and between these levels, such as household decision-making, local market dynamics, or social networks. By integrating multiple layers of information, integrated small-scale surveys provide a more comprehensive understanding of local socio-economic systems than single-level studies.

⁴ A significant example of such integrated surveys in the Global South are the “1-2-3 surveys” (see, e.g., Razafindrakoto et al., 2009; Nordman & Roubaud, 2010). The design includes a household labour-force survey (phase 1), a matched survey of informal production units identified in phase 1 (phase 2), and, when implemented, a living-standards module on incomes/expenditures for a sub-sample of phase-1 households (phase 3), with the possibility of adding ad hoc thematic modules. In the rest of this article, we do not discuss results from these surveys because, although they fit the “integrated survey” definition, their initial design and many applications were predominantly urban (e.g., early full implementations were restricted to capital cities in Cameroon in 1993 and Madagascar in 1995, and geographic coverage was often limited to major cities for practical constraints). Yet the approach has expanded rapidly under the initiatives of French researchers, especially in sub-Saharan Africa, with numerous repeated rounds and, in some cases, panel components (e.g., panels introduced in Benin, Burundi, and Madagascar; long series in Madagascar; national implementations in Cameroon and the DRC).

The four main advantages of village studies compared to large national surveys identified by Himanshu et al. (2018) also apply to integrated small-scale surveys. First, they enable a highly detailed contextualisation of external changes, making it possible to examine how reforms or exogenous shocks play out in everyday village life and to uncover the microeconomic mechanisms behind policy success or failure. Secondly, they allow direct observation of social and power relations. These small surveys shed light on institutional dynamics and power relations that often remain invisible in large-scale quantitative surveys. Thirdly, they provide granular data on economic transactions. They enable detailed tracking of economic interactions (e.g., between landlords and tenants, employers and workers, lenders and borrowers) thanks to intensive, long-term fieldwork. Fourthly, they offer deep qualitative knowledge of households. Researchers conducting these surveys develop a close, case-based understanding of families and individuals, which lends particular depth to the data and allows individual trajectories to be traced as more than anonymous observations tied to a mere numerical identifier.

Furthermore, integrated small-scale surveys and village studies, offer the advantage of methodological flexibility compared to large national surveys. As small-scale surveys are implemented by research teams directly involved in the field, they can be used to test and introduce context-specific variables and integrate mixed methods more systematically (for example, by linking structured survey modules to ethnographic notes). This flexibility enables small-scale surveys to document emerging or sudden phenomena and to adjust rapidly to shifting contexts, something large national surveys, constrained by fixed instruments and lengthy bureaucratic cycles, are rarely able to do.

Beyond these shared advantages, integrated small-scale surveys offer two benefits over traditional village studies for analyses related to the field of development economics. Firstly, they typically cover several villages rather than a single site, which increases heterogeneity and enhances external validity of results derived from the survey. Secondly, they rely on (often internationally) standardised instruments and structured sampling procedures, allowing comparability across households, locations, and waves. This combination strengthens the analytical precision and replicability of research findings.

3. Insights from six integrated small-scale surveys in the Global South

In this section, we present six integrated small-scale surveys, selected for the diversity of their themes and their continuity. This selection is not intended to be exhaustive: the majority of these surveys remain poorly documented or difficult to access, with some lacking a website or clear information on project continuation or data location. While research on India has historically dominated this type of data collection, we have expanded the scope and included surveys conducted in other Asian countries and in Africa to illustrate the diversity of contexts and methodologies. However, we have not identified any integrated small-scale surveys in Latin America. According to Lambert (1973), this may be partly explained by the limited applicability of village studies (and thus integrated small-scale surveys) to the social structures' characteristic of that region.

3.1. Poverty and Family Structure (PFS) - Senegal

The PFS survey fits well within the framework of integrated small-scale surveys. Conducted across more than 150 clusters in rural Senegal, it is managed by a small interdisciplinary team of researchers from the French National Research Institute for Agriculture, Food and Environment and the National Statistical Office of Senegal (De Vreyer et al., 2008). Between 2006 and 2011, the team followed around 3,000 households to examine the determinants of household composition. To achieve this, the survey directly observes the dynamics of household composition in order to identify the causes and consequences of changes in household structure over time, as well as the nature of intra-household resource allocation.

Between 2008 and 2011, the PFS survey shed light on several mechanisms shaping life in rural Senegal. Firstly, regarding intra-household resource allocation, the PFS revealed that inequalities in consumption within households account for around 14 per cent of total inequality in Senegal. It also showed that household structure and organisation are key correlates of intra-household inequality and of individuals' risk of poverty (De Vreyer & Lambert, 2020). Secondly, concerning economic mobility, the PFS demonstrated a high degree of intergenerational mobility, linked to the shift from agricultural to non-agricultural sectors and the growing economic activity of women. It also highlighted significant gender inequality in consumption, which can be almost entirely explained by factors such as education and non-land inheritance (Lambert et al., 2014). Thirdly, in the domain of marriage, the PFS showed that polygamy hampers the fertility transition in Sub-Saharan Africa by encouraging women

to desire more children (Rossi, 2019). Finally, regarding migration, the survey found that host girls aged six to nine at the time of a foster sibling's arrival significantly benefited in terms of school enrolment, whereas no comparable effect was observed for host boys (Marazyan, 2015).

3.2. Network, Employment, dEBt, Mobility, and Skills in India Survey (NEEMISIS) – India

The NEEMISIS survey fits well within the framework of integrated small-scale surveys. This survey is conducted across more than ten villages located in Tamil Nadu (South India) by a small interdisciplinary team of researchers from the French National Research Institute for Sustainable Development and the French Institute of Pondicherry (Nordman et al., 2025). Since 2010, the team has followed between 400 and 600 households and currently has three waves of observation (2010, 2016–2017, and 2020–2021), with a fourth undergoing in 2026. This longitudinal data collection aims to understand the links between labour, skills, financial practices, migration dynamics, and social network formation in rural Tamil Nadu. It collects data for examining how skills and social networks (particularly those defined at the individual and community levels) influence inequalities in social trajectories, including social status (class, caste, gender, ethnicity, and religion), employment, and migration. The survey investigates the multiple forces shaping these outcomes, from social structures and norms to the development and use of networks and the formation of cognitive skills and personality traits. To this end, the survey collects information at three levels: households, individuals, and individuals' social networks (referred to as “alters”).

Since 2010, the NEEMISIS survey has shed light on various mechanisms at work in rural Tamil Nadu. Firstly, NEEMISIS shows that financial behaviour is socially embedded, highlighting the feminisation of debt and its influence on labour and social relations (see, e.g., Guérin et al., 2023). These findings are relevant beyond the local context, illustrating how financialisation interacts with social structures and gendered labour globally. Secondly, NEEMISIS shows that cognitive skills and personality traits are neither neutral nor universally advantageous; their effects are filtered through caste and gender. This line of research emphasises how psychological and cognitive factors intersect with entrenched social structures, illustrating that the individual alone cannot overcome systemic inequalities and offering insight into the broader interplay between human capital, cognition, social hierarchy, and labour market position (Michiels et al., 2022) or indebtedness (Natal & Nordman, 2025). Thirdly, NEEMISIS reveals how resilience is unevenly distributed, mediated by social networks

and caste, and exposes the limits of formal policy interventions (see, e.g., Guérin et al., 2022b). Fourth, NEEMSIS has played a decisive role in establishing a link between social networks and trust on the one hand, and these cognitive and psychological dimensions on the other. Hilger & Nordman (2020) exploit the exogenous shock of Indian demonetisation to identify the causal effects of social networks on trust formation. They show that the relationship between networks and trust varies considerably depending on caste configurations, highlighting the ambivalent nature of social capital in segregated societies, where the expansion of networks can both broaden opportunities and reinforce boundaries. Finally, NEEMSIS highlights structural transformations in labour markets, patterns of income inequality, and the evolving social functions of practices such as marriage and dowry (see, e.g., Di Santolo et al., 2024).

3.3. Rural Observatory System (ROS) – Madagascar

The Rural Observatory System (ROS) survey fits perfectly within the framework of small-scale surveys, despite the sharp increase in the number of observatories between 2000 and 2010. These surveys were conducted in 26 rural areas of Madagascar by a team of economists from the French National Research Institute for Sustainable Development (Andrianjafindraine et al., 2024). From 1995 to 2015, the team surveyed approximately 500 households per area. The ROS methodology consisted of annual surveys of a panel of households using a questionnaire focusing mainly on economic activities, housing, assets, food security, agricultural production and livestock farming, expenditure, work, loans and savings, and transfers. The objective was to identify characteristics and dynamics in various agroecological contexts in order to guide the formulation, implementation and evaluation of rural development policies in a context of a deteriorated national statistical system.

Since 1995, the ROS has generated rare annual panel data on living conditions in rural Madagascar. Substantively, ROS-based analyses highlight risk-coping and its long-run consequences. Transitory income shocks significantly increase children's school drop-out probabilities but not school entry, suggesting that withdrawing older children from school is used as an informal insurance mechanism when formal markets are missing (Gubert & Robilliard, 2008). Adult mortality compounds vulnerability: orphans are less likely to attend school than non-orphans, with stronger effects for girls and children from poorer households, and lasting deficits in completed education into adulthood (Senne, 2014). These coping responses align with evidence of structural persistence: Thomas & Gaspart (2015) find that

past poverty itself accounts for a substantial share of current poverty risk, consistent with a vicious circle and poverty traps. Credit behaviour is likewise stratified in Madagascar: in Itasy, five livelihood “classes” display distinct patterns of credit participation, and social/moral factors help explain participation beyond purely technical or economic constraints (Andrianampiarivo & Gondard-Delcroix, 2023). Finally, under climate stress, crop diversification appears as a partial buffer: additional crop reduces perceived food insecurity and a more diverse crop mix mitigates adverse impacts of drought episodes. However, the mitigating capacity remains limited in the face of severe droughts (Ferry & de Montalembert, 2025).

3.4. Project on Agrarian Relations in India (PARI) - India

The PARI survey is another well-structured example of a small-scale survey. Conducted in 27 villages in 12 Indian states, PARI is a small-scale survey carried out by researchers from the Foundation for Agrarian Studies since 2010 (Ramachandran et al., 2010). In Uttar Pradesh, the survey was conducted in 2006 and 2023, covering 107 households; in West Bengal, it was implemented in 2010 and 2015, covering 215 households; and in Bihar, it was conducted in 2012 and 2018, covering 358 households. The main objectives of the PARI are to analyse village-level production systems, livelihoods and the socio-economic characteristics of different strata of the rural population. It also aims to conduct targeted studies on sectoral deprivation, with a particular focus on scheduled Dalit and tribal populations, women, certain minority groups and low-income households. In addition, the survey reports on the availability of basic amenities in villages and rural communities' access to modern facilities. To achieve these objectives, the survey combines a household-level questionnaire and a village-level questionnaire, administered in each village studied.

Since 2010, the PARI has shed light on various mechanisms at work in rural India. Firstly, PARI evidence shows that rural “employment” is better understood through “days of work” rather than participation alone (Dhar & Kaur, 2013). Secondly, PARI highlights how underemployment and vulnerability are socially structured: Dalit and Adivasi workers (i.e., lower-caste workers) are heavily dependent on manual work for earnings, and women are frequently confined to agricultural work and to employment within their village of residence (Dhar & Kaur, 2013). Thirdly, PARI-based work on financial inclusion suggests that high formal-sector penetration can coexist with entrenched inequality: in two villages, formal sources accounted for over 80% of total debt in both villages, yet the distribution of formal

debt remained unequal by caste and gender (Dutta, 2025). Fourthly, PARI village studies document specific forms of rural deprivation that are not captured by standard landlessness measures: “homestead landlessness” (i.e., owning the house structure but lacking legal rights over the house-site) creates vulnerability to eviction and is presented as a widespread but understudied inequality (Baksi & Mahato, 2022). Fifthly, PARI production accounts underscore how commercial crop exposure can amplify risk for smallholders (Sarkar, 2017). Finally, the PARI village studies foreground the durability of agrarian polarization (extreme wealth concentration and persistent relations of dependence in some settings): longitudinal evidence points to sizeable average income growth alongside a declining contribution of agriculture, consistent with broader patterns of livelihood diversification and uneven mobility.

3.5. African Agricultural Intensification (AFRINT) – Ethiopia, Nigeria, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania, and Zambia

The AFRINT project is also part of a series of small-scale investigations. Launched in 2002, AFRINT is an interdisciplinary research programme initiated by a consortium of researchers based mainly at Lund University (Andersson Djurfeldt et al., 2018). It aims at examining the prospects for an ‘Asian-style’ green revolution in sub-Saharan Africa, based on data collected from around 4,000 smallholder farmers in Ethiopia, Nigeria, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania and Zambia. The second wave of data collection took place in 2008. In 2010, the third wave pursued the longitudinal survey while broadening its scope to include links between agricultural and non-agricultural livelihoods and access to income by gender, both within and beyond the agricultural sector. Since 2016, the project has been in a fourth phase in a subset of villages in Malawi, Tanzania and Zambia. AFRINT enables the study of long-term agricultural development, rural livelihoods, gender dynamics and structural transformation in the smallholder farming sector in sub-Saharan Africa. To this end, the survey collects information at two levels: villages and households.

Since 2002, the AFRINT survey has shed light on various mechanisms at work in rural Africa. Firstly, longitudinal analyses for 2002–2008 indicate cautious but uneven agrarian dynamism: grain yields rise in some settings, yet productivity gains are largely labour-intensive rather than technology-driven, and there is little evidence that households “graduate” in a linear way from farming into non-farm sectors (Andersson Djurfeldt & Djurfeldt, 2013). Secondly, growth is concentrated in particular villages and can be inclusive where it occurs, but extending such trajectories to marginal areas remains a core policy challenge (Andersson Djurfeldt,

2013). Thirdly, AFRINT complicates generic claims about women's disadvantage: gender income gaps are absent in most regions. Thus, Andersson Djurfeldt et al. (2013) suggest that neither poverty nor growth in general discriminates against female headed households, but that causes of gender discrimination need to be found in specific regional contexts. Fourthly, off-farm income is strongly associated with food security, especially for female-headed households and those in low-potential areas (Dzanku, 2019). Finally, in rice-growing households, output growth in 2002–2008 is linked mainly to area expansion and commercial drivers (extensification), offering little support for a state-led Green Revolution narrative and underscoring the need for both stronger staple markets and access to productivity-enhancing technology (Nasrin et al., 2015).

3.6. Thailand Vietnam Socio-Economic Panel (TVSEP) – Thailand and Vietnam

The TVSEP survey fits well within the framework of small-scale surveys. This survey is conducted across 440 villages in six provinces in Thailand and Vietnam by a team of economists from the Leibniz Universität Hannover, the University of Göttingen and the University of Cologne (Klasen & Waibel, 2013). Since 2007, the team has followed about 4,400 households and currently has ten waves of observation (2007, 2008, 2010, 2011, 2013, 2016, 2017, 2019, 2022, and 2024), with an eleventh planned in 2025-2026. This longitudinal data collection aims to generate a deeper understanding of the development of income and poverty in their rapidly transforming rural areas, and to promote research on topics such as long-term welfare dynamics, rural-urban and urban-rural migration, agricultural transformation, intergenerational aspects of households, and the long-term impacts of shocks in rapidly transforming rural Thailand and Vietnam. To this end, the survey collects information at three levels: villages, households, and migrants through migrant tracking surveys.

Since its implementation, the TVSEP has shed light on various mechanisms at work in rural Thailand and Vietnam. Firstly, research indicates that migration can underpin structural (asset-based) welfare improvements: remittances accelerate asset growth and support durable poverty exits among rural Vietnamese households, yet these benefits are markedly weaker for ethnic minorities, pointing to persistent inequalities in access to migration-driven opportunities (Amare & Hohfeld, 2016). Complementing this, evidence on rural–urban mobility stresses how risk shapes circular migration: idiosyncratic shocks at origin are associated with longer urban stays, whereas covariate shocks (e.g., floods or droughts) are linked to shorter migration spells,

implying that different shock profiles reconfigure household labour allocation over time (Nguyen, et al., 2017). Secondly, TVSEP research on credit markets further indicates that financial inclusion may generate new vulnerabilities: multiple borrowing raises the likelihood of over-indebtedness (and both tend to persist), yet over-indebtedness does not systematically lead to additional borrowing for refinancing, suggesting that income shocks matter more than widespread “debt-rolling” (Chichaibelu & Waibel, 2017). In agriculture, livestock production contributes to poverty reduction in rural Vietnam, but livestock asset accumulation is shaped by recent shocks and by access to credit, land, education, irrigation and electricity (Do, et al., 2019). More broadly, higher resilience capacity predicts smaller shock-related losses and a lower risk of falling into monetary or multidimensional poverty (Do et al., 2025), while crop commercialisation strengthens resilience (especially for initially less resilient households) and is associated with mechanisation, non-farm employment, and more pro-poor income gains, consistent with declining relative inequality (Do et al., 2026). Finally, TVSEP yields key measurement lessons: self-assessed risk attitudes closely approximate experimental measures and predict behaviour (Hardeweg et al., 2013), and short recall periods improve drought reporting accuracy, implying that survey-only drought histories may understate climate-related health impacts (Herr et al., 2026).

Table 1: Small-scale surveys cited

Name of the survey	Website of the survey*	Country	Covered period	Nb. waves	Nb. HH	Free access**	Reference
Rural Observatory System (ROS)	N/A	Madagascar	1995 to 2015	21	500 per area	Yes	Andrianjafindrainibe et al. (2024)
African Agricultural Intensification (AFRINT)	https://www.keg.lu.se/en/research/research-projects/current-research-projects/afrint	Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania, Zambia	2002 to 2016	4	4,000	No	Andersson Djurfeldt et al. (2018)
Project on Agrarian Relations in India (PARI)	https://fas.org.in/research/pari/	India	2006 to 2023	2	700	No	Ramachandran et al. (2010)
Poverty and Family Structure (PFS)	https://sites.google.com/view/psfsenegal/home	Senegal	2007 to 2011	2	3,000	No	De Vreyer (2008)
Thailand Vietnam Socio-Economic Panel (TVSEP)	https://www.tvsep.de/en/	Thailand, Vietnam	2007 to 2024	10	4,400	Yes	Klasen & Waibel (2013)
Network, Employment, dEbt, Mobility, and Skills in South India Survey (NEEMISIS)	https://neemisis.hypotheses.org/	India	2010 to 2020	3	600	Yes	Nordman et al. (2025)

Note: *Websites accessed on January 28, 2026. **ROS data are available on DataSuds (<https://doi.org/10.23708/WNM6LW>). TVSEP data are available on the survey website (<https://www.tvsep.de/en/tvsep-data-access>). NEEMISIS data are available on DataSuds (<https://dataverse.ird.fr/dataverse/odriis>). The three websites are operational as of January 28, 2026.

4. Challenges associated with integrated small-scale surveys

Despite their analytical richness, integrated small-scale surveys face four intertwined sets of challenges: (i) how their findings are interpreted in terms of representativeness and causality, (ii) how longitudinal fieldwork is sustained ethically and operationally, (iii) how the technical burden of multi-level “integration” can be tackled, and (iv) how these data infrastructures are documented, shared, and made legible to the wider research community. These challenges are not merely “technical”; they shape what can be credibly inferred from the data and whether the survey can survive as a long-run scientific asset.

4.1 Data representativeness and causal interpretation

Scepticism from users of large-scale datasets towards village studies and other small-scale surveys often stems from a narrow reading of “representativeness” as statistical representativeness of a nation or administrative unit, whereas many village studies explicitly prioritise contextualised measurement and internally consistent time-series within a well-defined field site (Himanshu et al., 2016). This implies a first-order clarification: *representative of what* (a village, a set of villages, a livelihood zone, a district), and for which parameter (levels, distributions, mechanisms, or trajectories)?

At the same time, the “credibility revolution” has increased expectations of causal identification via quasi-experimental designs or randomised controlled trials (RCTs), sometimes implicitly relegating observational multi-level panels to a secondary role (Deaton & Cartwright, 2018). Yet even in the RCT tradition, external validity is explicitly recognised as a core difficulty: classic guidance highlights hazards such as Hawthorne/John Henry effects, general equilibrium effects, sample specificity, and the “special care” problem when treatments are delivered in atypical ways (Duflo et al., 2007). One response to external validity concerns is to multiply studies across contexts and to treat cumulative evidence as a pathway to more general lessons (Gibson & Sautmann, 2023). This strategy is valuable but disputable: adding more studies can also amplify differences in design, measurement, and implementation that make effects difficult to compare, so “more RCTs” is not a sufficient condition for learning what generalises (Slough & Tyson, 2025). A constructive implication is that integrated surveys, precisely because they document multi-level context and mechanisms, can complement causal evaluation, and can help interpret why effects vary across places (Rao, 2023).

4.2 The longitudinal dimension

Longitudinal engagement can improve data quality by building credibility and trust between enumerators and respondents - an operational asset repeatedly emphasised in long-running village-study traditions (Himanshu et al., 2018). However, repeated visits raise ethical concerns around respondent fatigue⁵ and the legitimacy of the “exchange” implied by sustained data extraction. In practice, some teams address this through systematic “feedbacks” or “restitutions” of results in the field, communicating findings to communities and using collective discussions (e.g., focus groups) to generate a reflexive reading of the data and to refine subsequent waves (see, e.g., Nordman et al., 2025).

Operationally, attrition remains a central threat to inference in panels: non-random loss of respondents may bias estimates, and the magnitude of bias depends on the attrition process and the research question (see, e.g., Falaris, 2003; Vaillant, 2013). Maintaining panels also requires continuity of field teams and institutional anchoring: when key researchers or partners exit, projects can stall unless they are embedded in durable institutions (e.g., observatories). Long-standing observatory models illustrate this logic: Niakhar (Senegal), initiated in 1962, is documented as tracking demographic, health, socioeconomic, and environmental dimensions over multiple generations (Delaunay et al., 2018).

A further long-horizon constraint is measurement comparability: instruments evolve, concepts shift, and harmonisation across waves is costly; one consequence is that researchers must explicitly document changes and preserve cross-wave construct validity (Bolazzi, 2020). Finally, repeated data collection may contribute to “survey overload” when multiple teams field overlapping instruments in the same communities, intensifying fatigue and potentially degrading response quality (Di Santolo et al., 2024).

4.3 Technical complexity of integration

Integrated designs are technically demanding because they combine multi-level units (village, household, individual) and often add specialised modules (networks, land, firms, migration tracking, shocks, biomarkers, etc.). This creates non-trivial requirements for (i) consistent

⁵ Respondent fatigue is a concrete risk: experimental evidence from lengthy interviews shows marked declines in response quality as time-in-survey increases (Jeong et al., 2023).

identifiers across levels and waves, (ii) version control of questionnaires and codebooks, (iii) secure handling of sensitive linkable data, and (iv) reproducible workflows that allow others to reconstruct merges and derived variables (Dupriez & Asghar, 2022). Even in highly structured integrated systems, the feasibility of linking modules can be uneven, and integration failures can constrain the very indicators that motivated a multi-module design in the first place (Razafindrakoto et al., 2009). Over time, these constraints interact with comparability issues: minor changes in wording, rosters, or recall windows may cumulate into breaks that are hard to diagnose *ex post* without meticulous versioning and documentation (Vaillant, 2013).

4.4 Promotion, documentation, and openness

A final challenge, and not the least important, concerns the visibility and scientific reuse of surveys. Open-science practices (e.g., clear metadata, reproducible workflows, and well-curated public releases) are central to research credibility (Crüwell et al., 2019)

Opening up data maximises the scientific value of surveys, encourages replication, comparisons and secondary uses, and integrates these small surveys into broader research dynamics. Literature shows that data sharing can increase academic visibility and the number of citations (Christensen et al., 2019). In this regard, open access is a key lever for ensuring that these surveys do not remain confined to restricted circles or disappear with the end of the projects that produced them. However, in the case of surveys conducted in the Global South by teams from the Global North, data openness cannot be considered independently of the power relations that structure knowledge production. The risk is not that of excessive openness, but that of unevenly beneficial openness (see, e.g., Serwadda et al., 2018). The central issue is therefore that of equitable data openness, that is openness that guarantees researchers and institutions in the Global South the effective conditions to appropriate, analyse and exploit the data to which they have contributed. In postcolonial contexts where measurement has historically been a tool of power, this focus on sharing modalities is not neutral: producing and disseminating reliable, accessible and co-constructed data contributes to a partial decolonisation of knowledge production.

Visibility ultimately depends on dedicated communication tools. Creating a dedicated website for the survey can play a key role: it allows documentation (questionnaires, user guides, articles) to be centralised, the scientific objectives of the project to be presented, the teams involved (in particular local partners and researchers) to be promoted, and the appropriation of

data by different audiences, particularly those in the Global South (researchers, decision-makers, civil society actors), to be facilitated.

5. Conclusion

The case for sustaining village studies and integrated small-scale surveys is sharpened by a more fragile international funding environment for large-scale data infrastructures. Recent reporting and policy tracking describe major disruptions to US foreign-assistance systems, including the termination of USAID support for the DHS programme, one of the most important sources of nationally representative survey data across low- and middle-income countries (see, e.g., Khaki et al., 2025). In parallel, national statistical systems in parts of the Global South face growing political and credibility pressures. For instance, in India, public debate has increasingly framed official statistics as politically contested objects (Ghosh, 2023). The vacuum created by delayed or constrained public data production has increased reliance on private datasets, but these too can be problematic: a detailed assessment argues that the Consumer Pyramids Household Survey is not nationally representative as often claimed, because it under-represents poorer and less educated households (and also women and young children), with biases that may worsen over time (Somanchi, 2021).

These developments strengthen the rationale for maintaining and expanding small-scale, research-led surveys as complements, and sometimes as practical alternatives, to national and international survey systems. Their core comparative advantage is not simply “more detail”, but an ability to document, in a consistent way and over long periods, the joint transformation of livelihoods, labour markets, agriculture, finance, social relations and local ecosystems within specific rural regions. All dimensions that are often only partially captured, or captured too infrequently, by standard large surveys. This matters particularly in settings where understanding inequality requires tracing interconnected processes: shifts in agrarian structures and rural-urban migration; changes in employment relations; the deepening of financialisation and household exposure to new forms of risk; evolving social networks and knowledge transmission; and highly heterogeneous exposure to climate stressors. Where national surveys become sporadic, politically constrained, or methodologically disputed, small-scale longitudinal data (panels) provide an additional angle on “what is changing” and “why” that can be difficult to reconstruct retrospectively.

A second contribution is methodological and civic: because these surveys accumulate knowledge about a place, they can support accountability and reciprocity. Longitudinal engagement allows teams to build trust, refine instruments, and detect inconsistencies, often improving data quality relative to one-off exercises. Yet these benefits come with ethical obligations: repeated surveying can impose fatigue and raise legitimate questions about what communities gain from participating (Jeong et al., 2023). In that context, practices of restitution may improve both legitimacy and analytical depth of surveys, by generating a reflexive perspective on what the data mean *in situ* (a logic aligned with open-science commitments to transparency and engagement).

Third, small-scale panels offer a form of institutional responsiveness. Where teams are locally embedded and instruments are modular, surveys can pivot quickly to document crises as they unfold (pandemic shock, like in Guérin et al., 2022a; policy shifts, price collapses, climate events) while still maintaining a long-run baseline. This flexibility is valuable precisely because many crises are temporally concentrated, while their consequences unfold over years. At the same time, the same long-run nature creates persistent operational risks: attrition can bias inference when it is non-random, and the magnitude and direction of bias depends on the empirical question (see, e.g., Falaris, 2003). This reinforces the importance of robust tracking protocols, careful documentation, and stable governance.

Finally, the durability of these data infrastructures rests on two conditions: institutional anchoring and long-term personal commitment. Panels can be fragile when key researchers or partners leave; observatory-type arrangements may mitigate this by stabilising protocols, archiving practices and local partnerships. Long-lived observatory platforms, such as Niakhar in Senegal initiated in 1962 and still active, illustrate how continuity can be built through institutional embedding and sustained collaboration (Delaunay et al., 2018). In practice, it is the long-term engagement of research teams, combined with credible fair open-science standards for documentation, sharing and reproducibility, that determines whether village studies and small-scale surveys remain isolated projects or become cumulative scientific public goods.

4. References

Amare, M., & Hohfeld, L. (2016). Poverty Transition in Rural Vietnam: The Role of Migration and Remittances. *Journal of Development Studies*, 52(10), 1463–1478. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2016.1139696>

- Andersson Djurfeldt, A. (2013). African Re-Agrarianization? Accumulation or Pro-Poor Agricultural Growth? *World Development*, 41, 217–231. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2012.06.013>
- Andersson Djurfeldt, A., & Djurfeldt, G. (2013). Structural Transformation and African Smallholders: Drivers of Mobility within and between the Farm and Non-farm Sectors for Eight Countries. *Oxford Development Studies*, 41(3), 281–306. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600818.2013.817550>
- Andersson Djurfeldt, A., Djurfeldt, G., & Bergman-Lodin, J. (2013). Geography of Gender Gaps: Regional Patterns of Income and Farm–Nonfarm Interaction among Male- and Female-Headed Households in Eight African Countries. *World Development*, 48, 32–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.03.011>
- Andersson Djurfeldt, A., Dzanku, F. M., & Isinika, A. C. (2018). *Agriculture, Diversification, and Gender in Rural Africa: Longitudinal Perspectives from Six Countries*. Oxford University Press
- Andrianampiarivo, T., Gondard-Delcroix C. (2023). Rural Classes and Credit Participation: The Itasy Livelihood Classes (Madagascar) Between Risk-aversion and Debt Capacity. *Oxford Development Studies*, 51(1), 18–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600818.2022.2104239>
- Andrianjafindraine, V. S., Andrianirina, N., Bédécarrats, F., Droy, I., Dubois, J.-L., de Montalembert, J., Rabevohitra, B. N., Rafidimanana, R., Rasolofo, P., Ratovoarinony, R., Ratsaramiarina, L. A. O., Ravelonandro, J. D., Razanamavo, V., Razafindrakoto, M., Rivolala, B., Roubaud, F., & Saint-Macary, C. (2024). Madagascar rural observatory surveys, a longitudinal dataset on household living conditions 1995–2015. *Scientific Data*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-024-03879-9>
- Axinn, W. G., Wagner, J., Couper, M., & Crawford, S. (2021). Applying Responsive Survey Design to Small-Scale Surveys: Campus Surveys of Sexual Misconduct. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 52(4), 1916–1946. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00491241211031270>
- Baksi, S., & Mahato, R. K. (2022). “Homestead Landlessness”: A Case of Rural Unfreedom in Two Villages in Bihar. *Review of Agrarian Studies*, 12(1), 114–126. <https://doi.org/10.25003/RAS.12.01.0008>

- Bolazzi, F. (2020). *Caste, class and social mobility: a longitudinal study in a north Indian village 1958-2015* [Ph.D. thesis]. Université Paris Cité.
- Chichaibelu, B. B., & Waibel, H. (2017). Borrowing from “Pui” to Pay “Pom”: Multiple Borrowing and Over-Indebtedness in Rural Thailand. *World Development*, 98, 338–350. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.04.032>
- Christensen, G., Dafoe, A., Miguel, E., Moore, D. A., & Rose, A. K. (2019). A study of the impact of data sharing on article citations using journal policies as a natural experiment. *PLOS ONE*, 14(12), e0225883. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0225883>
- Crüwell, S., van Doorn, J., Etz, A., Makel, M. C., Moshontz, H., Niebaum, J. C., Orben, A., Parsons, S., & Schulte-Mecklenbeck, M. (2019). Seven Easy Steps to Open Science. *Zeitschrift Für Psychologie*, 227(4), 237–248. <https://doi.org/10.1027/2151-2604/a000387>
- De Vreyer, P., & Lambert, S. (2020). Inequality, Poverty, and the Intra-Household Allocation of Consumption in Senegal. *The World Bank Economic Review*, 35(2), 414–435. <https://doi.org/10.1093/wber/lhz052>
- De Vreyer, P., Lambert, S., Safir, A., & Sylla, M. B. (2008). Pauvreté et structure familiale, pourquoi une nouvelle enquête?. *Stateco*, 102, 6–20.
- Deaton, A., & Cartwright, N. (2018). Understanding and misunderstanding randomized controlled trials. *Social Science & Medicine*, 210, 2–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.12.005>
- Delaunay, V., Desclaux, A., & Sokhna, C. (Eds.). (2018). *Niakhar, mémoires et perspectives. Recherches pluridisciplinaires sur le changement en Afrique*. IRD Editions and L’Harmattan Sénégal.
- Dhar, N. S., & Kaur, N. (2013). Features of Rural Underemployment in India: Evidence from Nine Villages. *Review of Agrarian Studies*, 3(1), 14–54. <https://doi.org/10.25003/RAS.03.01.0002>
- Di Santolo, M., Guérin, I., Michiels, S., Mouchel, C., Natal, A., Nordman, C. J., & Venkatasubramanian, G. (2024). A Decade in Rural Tamil Nadu: Socio-Economic, Labour and Migration Trends from an Original Longitudinal Household Survey. *Economic & Political Weekly*, 59(43), 62–71.

- Do, M. H., Nguyen, T. T., & Grote, U. (2025). Insights on household's resilience to shocks and poverty: evidence from panel data for two emerging economies in Southeast Asia. *Climate and Development*, 17(8), 684–698. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17565529.2024.2446358>
- Do, M. H., Nguyen, T. T., & Grote, U. (2026). Crop commercialization, structural change and income inequality: Insights from smallholder farmers in rural Southeast Asia. *World Development*, 197, 107212. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2025.107212>
- Do, T. L., Nguyen, T. T., & Grote, U. (2019). Livestock Production, Rural Poverty, and Perceived Shocks: Evidence from Panel Data for Vietnam. *Journal of Development Studies*, 55(1), 99–119. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2017.1408795>
- Duflo, E., Glennerster, R., & Kremer, M. (2007). Using Randomization in Development Economics Research: A Toolkit. In T. P. Schultz and J. A. Strauss (Eds.). *Handbook of Development Economics*, 4, 3895–3962. Elsevier. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1573-4471\(07\)04061-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1573-4471(07)04061-2)
- Dupriez, O., & Asghar, M. (2022). *Standards and Good Practice for Survey Data Documentation*. United Nations Statistics Division.
- Dutta, R. (2025). Financial Inclusion from a Gender and Caste Perspective: Evidence from Two Villages in Uttar Pradesh. *Review of Agrarian Studies*, 15(1), 65–85. <https://doi.org/10.25003/RAS.15.01.0006>
- Dzanku, F. M. (2019). Food security in rural sub-Saharan Africa: Exploring the nexus between gender, geography and off-farm employment. *World Development*, 113, 26–43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.08.017>
- Falaris, E. M. (2003). The effect of survey attrition in longitudinal surveys: evidence from Peru, Côte d'Ivoire and Vietnam. *Journal of Development Economics*, 70(1), 133–157. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0304-3878\(02\)00079-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0304-3878(02)00079-2)
- Ferry, M., & de Montalembert J. (2025). Mitigating climate vulnerability: the crop diversification effect. *Ecological Economics*, 233, 108568. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2025.108568>
- Ghosh, J. (2023). When numbers are treated as political weapons. *The New Indian Express*. <https://www.newindianexpress.com/opinion/2023/Oct/19/when-numbers-are-treated-as-political-weapons-2625151.html>

- Gibson, M., & Sautmann, A. (2023). Introduction to randomized evaluations. *Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab (J-PAL)*.
<https://www.povertyactionlab.org/resource/introduction-randomized-evaluations>
- Gubert, F., Robilliard, A.-S. (2008). Risk and schooling decisions in rural Madagascar: A panel data-analysis. *Journal of African Economies*, 17(2), 207–238.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/jae/ejm010>
- Guérin, I., Kumar, S., & Venkatasubramanian, G. (2023). *The Indebted Woman: Kinship, Sexuality, and Capitalism*. Stanford University Press.
- Guérin, I., Michiels, S., Natal, A., Nordman C. J., & Venkatasubramanian, G. (2022a). Surviving Debt, Survival Debt in Times of Lockdown, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 57(1), 41–49.
- Guérin, I., Nordman, C. J., & Mouchel, C. (2022b). With a Little Help From My Friends? Surviving the Lockdown Using Social Networks in Rural South India. *South Asia Multidisciplinary Academic Journal*, 29, 8309. <https://doi.org/10.4000/samaj.8309>
- Hardeweg, B., Menkhoff, L., & Waibel, H. (2013). Experimentally Validated Survey Evidence on Individual Risk Attitudes in Rural Thailand. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 61(4), 859–888. <https://doi.org/10.1086/670378>
- Herr, A., Karimi, S., & Wichert, J. (2026). Weather shocks, recall error and health. *Journal of Development Economics*, 179, 103644. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2025.103644>
- Hilger, A., & Nordman, C. J. (2020). *The Determinants of Trust: Evidence from Rural South India* (Working Paper No. 13150). IZA.
- Himanshu, Jha, P., & Rodgers, G. (Eds.). (2016). *The Changing Village in India: Insights from Longitudinal Research*. Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199461868.001.0001>
- Himanshu, Lanjouw, P., & Stern, N. (2018). *How Lives Change: Palanpur, India, and Development Economics*. Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198806509.001.0001>
- Hsiao, C. (2022). *Analysis of Panel Data* (4th ed.). Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009057745>

- Jeong, D., Aggarwal, S., Robinson, J., Kumar, N., Spearot, A., & Park, D. S. (2023). Exhaustive or exhausting? Evidence on respondent fatigue in long surveys. *Journal of Development Economics*, *161*, 102992. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2022.102992>
- Jodhka, S. S., & Simpson, E. (Eds.). (2019). *India's Villages in the 21st Century: Revisits and Revisions*. Oxford University Press.
- Khaki, J. J., Molenaar, J., Karki, S., Olal, E., Straneo, M., Mosuse, M. A., Fouogue, J. T., Hensen, B., Baguiya, A., Musau Nkola, A., Wong, K. L. M., Ba, O. A., Kikula, A., Grovogui, F. M., Semaan, A., Asefa, A., Macharia, P. M., Chikwari, C. D., Ouédraogo, M. O., ... Beňová, L. (2025). When health data go dark: the importance of the DHS Program and imagining its future. *BMC Medicine*, *23*(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-025-04062-6>
- Klasen, S., & Waibel, H. (Eds.). (2013). *Vulnerability to Poverty: Theory, Measurement and Determinants, with Case Studies from Thailand and Vietnam*. Palgrave Macmillan UK. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230306622>
- Lambert, C. M. (1973). The Village Studies Project Bibliographical Programme. *Institute of Development Studies*, *5*(4), 21–25. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1759-5436.1974.mp5004005.x>
- Lambert, S., Ravallion, M., & van de Walle, D. (2014). Intergenerational mobility and interpersonal inequality in an African economy. *Journal of Development Economics*, *110*, 327–344. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2014.05.007>
- Marazyan, K. (2015). Resource Allocation in Extended Sibships: An Empirical Investigation for Senegal. *Journal of African Economies*, *24*(3), 416–452. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jae/eju034>
- Michiels, S., Nordman, C. J., & Seetahul, S. (2021). Many Rivers to Cross: Social Identity, Cognition, and Labor Mobility in Rural India. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *697*(1), 66–80. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00027162211055990>
- Nasrin, S., Bergman Lodin, J., Jirström, M., Holmquist, B., Andersson Djurfeldt, A., & Djurfeldt, G. (2015). Drivers of rice production: evidence from five Sub-Saharan African countries. *Agriculture & Food Security*, *4*(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40066-015-0032-6>

- Natal, A., & Nordman, C. J. (2025). Psychology of Debt in Rural South India. *Journal of Development Studies*, 61(7), 1042–1057. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2025.2451871>
- Nguyen, L. D., Grote, U., & Sharma, R. (2017). Staying in the cities or returning home? An analysis of the rural-urban migration behavior in Vietnam. *IZA Journal of Development and Migration*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40176-017-0089-z>
- Nordman, C. J., & Roubaud, F. (2010). *Une approche originale en économie du développement : 20 ans d'efforts pour mesurer et analyser l'économie informelle dans les pays en développement* (DIALOGUE No. 31). DIAL.
- Nordman, C. J., Venkatasubramanian, G., Guérin, I., Natal, A., Mouchel, C., Michiels, S., & Di Santolo, M. (2025). Networks, Employment, Debt, Mobilities, and Skills in India Survey (NEEMIS): A Longitudinal Data Collection Tool. *Population*, 80(1), 79–93. <https://doi.org/10.3917/popu.2501.0083>.
- Ramachandran, V. K., Rawal, V., & Swaminathan, M. (2010). *Socio-economic Surveys of Three Villages in Andhra Pradesh*. Columbia University Press.
- Rao, V. (2023). Can Economics Become More Reflexive? Exploring the Potential of Mixed Methods. In A. Deshpande (Ed.), *Handbook on economics of discrimination and affirmative action*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-33-4016-9_19-1
- Razafindrakoto, M., Roubaud, F., & Torelli, C. (2009). La mesure de l'emploi et du secteur informels : leçons des enquêtes 1-2-3 en Afrique. *Stateco*, 109, 11–34.
- Rossi, P. (2019). Strategic Choices in Polygamous Households: Theory and Evidence from Senegal. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 86(3), 1332–1370. <https://doi.org/10.1093/restud/rdy052>
- Sarkar, B. (2017). Household Crop Incomes Among Small Farmers: A Study of Three Villages in West Bengal. *Review of Agrarian Studies*, 7(2), 62–83. <https://doi.org/10.25003/RAS.07.02.0004>
- Senne, J.-N. (2014). Death and schooling decisions over the short and long run in rural Madagascar. *Journal of Population Economics*, 27(2), 497–528. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00148-013-0486-4>

- Serwadda, D., Ndebele, P., Grabowski, M. K., Bajunirwe, F., & Wanyenze, R. K. (2018). Open data sharing and the Global South—Who benefits? *Science*, *359*(6376), 642–643. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aap8395>
- Slough, T., & Tyson, S. (2025). Sign-Congruence, External Validity, and Replication. *Political Analysis*, *33*(3), 195–210. <https://doi.org/10.1017/pan.2024.26>
- Somanchi, A. (2021). *Missing the Poor, Big Time: A Critical Assessment of the Consumer Pyramids Household Survey* (SocArXiv No. qmce9). Center for Open Science. <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/qmce9>
- Thomas, A.-C., & Gaspart, F. (2015). Does Poverty Trap Rural Malagasy Households?. *World Development*, *67*, 490–505. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2014.11.012>
- Vaillant, J. (2013). Attrition and Follow-Up Rules in Panel Surveys: Insights from a Tracking Experience in Madagascar. *Review of Income and Wealth*, *59*(3), 509–538. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4991.2012.00505.x>