



**AgEcon** SEARCH  
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

*The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library*

**This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.**

**Help ensure our sustainability.**

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

[aesearch@umn.edu](mailto:aesearch@umn.edu)

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

Scandinavian Forest Economics  
No. 44, 2012



Proceedings of the Biennial Meeting of the  
Scandinavian Society of Forest Economics  
Hyytiälä, Finland, May 2012

Anne Toppinen, Heimo Karppinen & Kati Kleemola (eds.)

---

## **Wealth ranking in 12 Tanzanian villages – turning failure into triumph**

Meilby, H., Burgess, N., Chamshama, S., Kajembe, G., Lund, J.F., Ngaga, Y., Ngowi, S., Njana, M., Skeie, K., Theilade, I. and Treue, T.

Rapid Rural Appraisal techniques are frequently used for wealth-ranking of households in rural communities. The main justifications of such approaches are that they are fast, allow pre-stratification of households in preparation for surveys and that they have been shown to have at least some empirical validity as means of stratifying households by socio-economic status. Sometimes, however, the participatory process may fail to produce consistent wealth categories, or people refuse to accept labels such as ‘poor’ and ‘rich’ and/or are reluctant to assign such categories to households within their village. A household survey in Tanzania was conducted in 12 villages across eastern Tanzania in 2008-2010. In all villages a participatory wealth ranking exercise was conducted and used for stratification of households. Sample households (n=40 per village) were allocated proportionally to wealth categories. The structured household survey emphasized assets, income, and perceived effects of Participatory Forest Management. The value of individual non-productive assets was estimated through a follow-up survey and combined with results from the household survey to estimate total value of assets for each household. In this study the original, partly inconsistent wealth ranking is examined and compared with estimated incomes and asset values. Next, alternative wealth classification rules are introduced and resulting classification outcomes are examined and discussed.