RAPID RURAL APPRAISAL PORTFOLIO

ABSTRACT

Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA) is a systematic but semi-structured approach to data acquisition when confronted with the specific problems associated with rural areas where little is known, high costs are associated with data acquisition, and there is an imminent need for reliable information. RRA is often associated with research in remote regions of developing countries, but it is applied to many situations in urban as well as developed areas. RRA was developed in contrast to methods that could not rapidly and cost-effectively provide rigorous data: extensive surveying, intensive participant observation, and quick and dirty “rural development tourism” (Crawford 1997; Townsley 1996; Chambers 1994a; Dunn 1994). The early development of RRA is associated with the University of Khon Kaen in Thailand and research promoted by the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research Centers (CGIAR) (Chambers 2002; Crawford 1997).

Principles of RRA theory include; optimizing trade-offs, offsetting biases, triangulating, learning from local people (extracting data), and learning rapidly and progressively (adaptively). There is a heavy emphasis on informed observation, in-depth conversation, and thorough recording in an adaptive atmosphere (Crawford 1997; Dunn 1994). The usual characteristics of RRA include: rural settings, generation of new data and hypotheses, multidisciplinary and demographically diverse teams, purposeful sampling methods, and use of many different data acquisition methods (i.e. semi-structured interviews, informed observation, secondary data, and focus groups) (Townsley 1996).

Geography is a necessary component of RRA. Geography is implicated in the data collection process as maps are consulted for field preparation, drawn by researchers, collected from focal groups, and produced from the final results. Questions of objectivity, scale, definition of landscapes, and sampling procedures are important to the data collection process and the data analysis. Also, the use of remote sensing (satellite images, GPS, etc.), GIS, and other innately geographic technologies are becoming more important to RRA. The issues/questions that RRA examines often involve or are built around geographic data and expertise.

Geographic questions involved with RRA involve the data, how it is collected, how it is analyzed, and how it is presented. No matter the primary objective of the research team, RRA often include investigations into local opinions and knowledge, wealth distributions (tenure of land and more liquid assets), natural resource distribution and management practices, demographic characteristics, topography, and other variables that geographers confront on a normal basis. Geographic subjects are often central to the RRA data sets. The field methods employed for data acquisition involve questions on sampling strategies and variable interpretation. Correct analysis of the data involves technical skills and an awareness of limitations that must be adequately understood and adjusted (i.e. the use of buffers in GIS, software limitations, image interpretation, etc.). The final presentation of the data to the initiators of the project will involve questions of visualization and interpretation that are best understood by researchers involved with cartographic and GIS technologies. Ways in which geographic inquiry can pose questions through and to the RRA approach are numerous.
LITERATURE REVIEW

Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA) is a systematic but semi-structured approach to field research that is designed to rapidly and cost-effectively provide rigorous descriptive and illuminative data where practical constraints like time and funding limit extensive and intensive research projects (Dunn 1994; Chambers 1980). The intellectual origins of RRA, the practical application of RRA in developing countries, and the agricultural context of the historical development of RRA have led to it being associated with rural, isolated, and underdeveloped regions (Dunn 1994; Chambers 1992). However, the RRA approach can be and is applied in more urban and developed contexts (Crawford 1997).

Much of the literature cited below can be fairly easily divided into a categorical framework defined by: articles published in Participatory and learning action, documents produced by development organizations, and lastly other academic documents. The main reference and body of literature on RRA is encompassed in a journal published since 1984 by IIED called Participatory and Learning Action. This journal was originally called RRA Notes and it documents methods, applications, and theoretical debates surrounding the evolution of the RRA approach. There is significant body of work outside of this journal that can be divided into two segments. The first group of literature originates in RRA’s early applications by NGO’s and international agencies. This literature documents the initial thoughts on how the approach should be used and comes from organizations and meetings such as the Montreal Process and FAO (the Food and Agricultural Organization). The second segment is largely academic and follows researchers’ attempts to give RRA a definitive, systematic framework and theoretical underpinning (Chambers 1994a, 1994b, 1994c; Kapoor 2002). Much of this work takes place in a critical stance towards development research and work. Below is an outline of the RRA approach and its historical roots that uses documents derived from all three of the above divisions of the body of literature.

Rapid Rural Appraisal is difficult to describe methodologically since it uses many data acquisition strategies in a semi-structured, adaptive approach (Jarrett 2000). A Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA) approach to data acquisition often includes but is not limited to: semi-structured interviews, informed observation, secondary data, and focus groups (Crawford 1997; Kumar 1990). RRA methodological procedures are diverse; therefore many practitioners prefer to encapsulate the essence of RRA in its distinctive features which are summarized below by Jarrett (2000:4):

1) **(RRA) features a commitment to multi-disciplinary research**
   A multi-disciplinary team of researchers from diverse disciplines should be recruited to provide a wide range of perspectives and perceptions through which data can be interpreted and analyzed (Chambers 1992; Conway 1987; Dunn 1994; Ison and Ampt 1992).

2) **(RRA) features a commitment to team training**
   Team training is considered a crucial step for achieving consistent approaches to data collection, and it may include training team members in techniques of semi-structured interviewing, active listening, structured observation, and the formulation of research objectives (Chambers 1992; Conway 1987; Dunn 1994).

3) **(RRA) features a commitment to project protocol**
   Project protocol specifies a method of introducing team members to local residents and provides a research design for the systematic implementation of research objectives (Chambers 1992; Dunn 1994; Ison and Ampt 1992).
4) (RRA) features a commitment to adapting methodologies

Rapid rural appraisal requires a certain degree of adaptation to particular resources and local situations that may be unique to the cultural context of field experiences (Chambers 1992; Dunn 1994).

5) (RRA) features a commitment to qualitative data

Qualitative refers to the descriptive type of data collected and the quality of observations made by a team of researchers combining their perceptions of local cultures with rapid surveys of native attitudes, practices, and concerns (Chambers 1992; Dunn 1994).

The above features of RRA are intrinsically related to the intellectual and conceptual background of RRA and to criteria developed to measure rigor in qualitative research (Trochim 2002; Dunn 2004; Jarret 2000). Dunn (1994:2) has adapted Ison and Ampt (1992) and Conway (1987) to define RRA as 'a qualitative survey methodology using a multi-discipline team to formulate problems for agricultural research and development' (Dunn 1994; Conway 1986; Chambers 1980). This definition is based on the historical setting of RRA’s development and applications in rural, development contexts since the 1970’s, but illustrates how RRA is firmly situated within the naturalist paradigms typical of qualitative methods (Crawford 1997).

The intellectual and conceptual origins of RRA are seen as activist participatory research, agroecosystem analysis, farming systems research, and applied anthropology (Dunn 2004; Chambers 1992). These approaches are involved in research projects that often are located in agricultural, rural, or remote contexts where limits of time and money mean that the rigorous, systematic methods of the logical positivism paradigm are impossible to implement (Dunn 2004; Jarrett 2000). Positivistic requirements for survey tools, like probability sampling and external validity, are not appropriate to context specific, temporally and financially constrained research projects. Alternative, more qualitative and naturalistic data acquisition methods are better ways to meet the demands for rigorous data when it must be rapidly acquired. With the adoption of these alternative methods, ontological and epistemological differences between the positivist and naturalist paradigms becomes clear (Dunn 2004). Indeed, the characteristic features of RRA listed above (multidisciplinary teams, adaptivity, strict adherence to protocol, etc.) are decidedly oriented towards the epistemological assumptions of and standards of rigor for qualitative research (Jarret 2000). Moreover, ideas such as critical reflexivity are at the very core of the adaptive and iterative RRA approaches (Crawford 1997). Despite this orientation towards a more naturalist paradigm in order to overcome the constraints that limit positivist strategies for data collection, RRA makes significant tradeoffs that many naturalist researchers also find problematic. The same constraints that limit a completely extensive approach to data acquisition also limit the intensive long-term strategies (like participant observation) typical of social and anthropological approaches. RRA finds its orientation in a more naturalist paradigm, but its characteristic constraints are problematic for both naturalist and positivist paradigms. RRA attempts to negotiate the best possible balance for quick and rigorous results.

The practical needs of field researchers for a research method that could provide rapid and rigorous results led to the development of RRA in the 1970s (Crawford 1997). RRA was a response to some very inadequate trends of research occurring in remote, rural communities (Crawford 1997). These inadequate trends were either “quick and dirty” approaches (like “rural development tourism”) or

1 Chambers (1980) makes a clear divide, that is perhaps not so well articulated by the titles, between the “quick and dirty” and “long and dirty” approaches. “Long and dirty” approaches refer to the long term extensive and intensive studies that provide rigorous data. “Quick and dirty” refer to “rural development tourism”. “Rural development tourism” is typically a quick trip into the bush by one expert wherein the following biases are
costly and long-term approaches (i.e., “long and dirty” approaches like extensive surveying and intensive participant observation) (Dunn 2004; Crawford 1997; Chambers 1992; Chambers 1980). These two trends were polar opposites in that “quick and dirty” approaches could rapidly and cheaply provide extremely biased, inadequate results, whereas extensive and intensive approaches provided rigorous results but often took too long and too much money to be of value for policy and other applications (Dunn 2004; Crawford 1997). RRA bridged the gap between these by providing a way to systematically collect and analyze data (qualitative and quantitative) that could rapidly provide detailed and rigorous descriptive results and illuminate policy makers and locals (Dunn 2004).

RRA is only to a certain extent, considered a participatory research approach (Chambers 1992; Pretty and Vodouhe 2005). In comparison with the previously mentioned “quick and dirty” or extensive research models, RRA practitioners work with communities more and give greater value to community knowledge bases due to the research approaches epistemological assumptions (Crawford 1997). RRA’s approach is focused on collecting data through the observations of a diverse team (which most often include academics, professionals, and locals) reflecting a multitude of expert perspectives and inherently recognizing local knowledge bases (such as, for example, indigenous technical knowledge). However, the fact that RRA is not usually participatory in devising and posing research questions, in directly facilitating “empowerment”, in the analysis and interpretation of research findings, or in valuing the research process over the data as the primary part of learning has led to practitioner criticisms and to the establishment and adoption of an umbrella of more participatory approaches known as Participatory Learning Action (PLA)² as an alternative to RRA (Young 2005; Chambers 1992). The literature is full of other criticisms of RRA. To avoid repetition, I will analyze these criticisms in the ethical section of this paper. I should however mention that many criticism of RRA appear to be leveled at bad examples or incomplete understanding of RRA processes. Specifically, some researchers mention problems like lack of historical background as central to RRA problems; however the use of secondary data and local community members, regional specialists, and local professionals (as part of a research team) is designed to overcome such lack of historical background. Whether RRA teams follow the best RRA procedures is a different subject than what RRA is and can do.

Literature that specifically focuses on the relationships of geography to RRA is sparse. Part of the reason for this is that RRA continues to have a somewhat passé connotation amongst many in the academic community. Another part of the reason that RRA applications by self-described geographers are not abundant is because most applications of RRA occur in the framework of development organizations. The usual audience of RRA are organizations such as World Wildlife Fund, the World Bank, government agencies, Peace Corps, and many NGOs. However, there are particular academic applications of RRA where geographers use RRA to derive data important to their study areas, like Takasaki, Barham, and Coomes (2000) study on the use of RRA for wealth ranking of Amazonian farmers. Yet, perhaps the most common formal academic application of RRA by geographers is in studies such as Choudhury et al. (2004), Messing and Fagerstrom (2001), and Hellier et al. (1999) wherein stakeholder perceptions of natural resources are recorded and matched against topographic information or other databases. Historically RRA provides geographers with evident: spatial (urban-tarmac-and-roadside biases, that is going only to easily accessible places), project (neglecting non-project areas), personal contact (meeting the less poor and more powerful rural people, men rather than women, users of services rather than non-users, and so on), dry season (travelling in the post-harvest or post-rainy season, when it is easier) and politeness-and-protocol bias (lack of courtesy and convention, lack of adaptation to local conditions, shortage of time, etc.). RRA overcomes most of these biases. ² “Participatory Learning and Action (PLA) is an umbrella term for a wide range of similar approaches and methodologies, including Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA), Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA), Participatory Learning Methods (PALM), Participatory Action Research (PAR), Farming Systems Research (FSR), Méthod Active de Recherche et de Planification Participative (MARP).” (Accessed 27 October 2005; from http://www.iied.org/NR/agbioliv/pla_notes/whatispla.html)
information on perceptions and activities related to the human-environment interaction which is becoming increasingly important in the geographic discipline.

RRA is important to geographers in that RRA can help geographers pose better questions and offer physically, socially, and philosophically better explanations of their research subjects and results. Geographers are important to RRA in that they can play a role in increasing the credibility, transferability, and dependability of RRA research. Indeed, general comments and ideas involving spatial issues (geography) are a common theme that is inherent to RRA. No matter the primary objective of the research team, RRA often include investigations into subjects that directly or indirectly involve spatial components. These subjects include local opinions and knowledge, wealth distributions (tenure of land and more liquid assets), natural resource distribution and management practices, demographic characteristics, issues of scale, topography, and other variables that geographers confront on a normal basis.

Geographers play an important role in RRA teams as they are indirectly or directly implicated in data collection, data analysis and interpretation, and data presentation. Geography is implicated in the data collection process as maps are consulted for field preparation, drawn by researchers, and collected from focus groups. Maps and images often are central to RRA teams’ ability to spatially frame their research and to correctly understand the terrain and thus develop purposeful sampling strategies (Crawford 1997). RRA often uses purposeful sampling strategies that strate the population and attempt to overcome the need for probability sampling. If population distribution is not well understood, the sampling procedure and rigor of the study suffer. The role of geographers in helping to establish purposeful sampling procedures is one of the most important roles that they can play in RRA.

Data analysis in RRA involves the data collected as well as new ways of combining and viewing the many perspectives surrounding the data. Geographers are an important part of this process as they can take RRA data and look at spatial relationships between objects or ideas of objects. Geographers can assist immensely with their technical skills in the data analysis process. However, the reciprocal role that RRA can play in assisting geographers with data analysis is also important to mention. This idea is explored more in-depth below.

Data presentation is perhaps the most obvious role that geographers can play since visualization and presentation are an important part of the final packaging of RRA results. RRA research does not take place in a vacuum. The end goal of RRA research is usually a normative change. Policy makers and the public audience will make decisions based on how the temporal and spatial continuum of results is presented to them. Geographers are experienced in creating paper and electronic maps, interactive visual modules, and with metrics that can textually describe a landscape or the ideas of it.

RRA can increase the rigor and applicability of a geographer’s research. Geography is inherently about interpreting spatial relationships. Analysis and interpretation of those spatial relationships using computer based programs or the naked human eye is a subjective process. RRA directly implicates and collects local understandings, classifications, and representations of physical and cultural ideas of space and place (Crawford 1997). By implicating local observers and their knowledge as experts in the interpretation of physical and social space a geographer’s research can become more comprehensive and rigorous. Normative policy suggestions made from interpretation of remote sensing data can be significantly more rigorous if they incorporate other perspectives and levels of landscape interpretation which can be acquired through RRA.

In summary, the literature indicates that while RRA and academic geography are closely intertwined and important to each other, the predominant uses of RRA usually occur outside of the academic environment in a normative policy framework. Despite this, with the advent of new technologies and
the current interest in human-environment interaction, **RRA** promises to be more utilized by geographers who must ground-truth their satellite derived observations in order for their observations to be rigorous. The literature also indicates there are specific theoretical and ethical dilemmas (which are explored more in depth in the next section) that academic geographers must overcome when using **RRA**. **RRA** can be used to answer geographical questions, but as professional geographers (not just academics) it is important to note the role of geography within **RRA** processes. **RRA** approaches are very appropriate for geographers to take part in to both improve policy results/applied research initiatives as well as to inform their own research questions.
ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS IN RAPID RURAL APPRAISAL

Ethical dilemmas associated with RRA include issues specific to RRA as well as general issues that confront most social science research projects. The specific ethical dilemmas most often associated with RRA center around the lack of participation by locals in the RRA research process (i.e. framing the question, setting priorities, gathering the data, analyzing the data, inability to report findings back to a community, etc.). There is a general consensus that RRA teams extract and manipulate data in ways that are not always congruous to local perceptions because RRA teams are oriented to entities outside the community. This is a recurring, critical theme in the leading journal on RRA (Participatory Learning and Action) and among practitioners of the many PLA approaches that are closely related to RRA (Whiteside 1997). Beyond the specific problem of lack of participation in RRA, there are also other ethical dilemmas involving generally problematic issues for all social science research: informed consent, confidentiality, and giving something back to the community (i.e. social or material empowerment) (Berg 2004; Valentine 2001). Literature on the ethical problems involved with RRA is notably lacking on the general issues, but quite abundant on the specifics of lack of participation. First let’s examine the general issues and then go in more depth on lack of participation in RRA.

**Informed Consent**

Informed consent is an ethical problem for RRA approaches because RRA use observations from multiple team members that may violate community members’ private space. As well, semi-structured interviews (which according to the earlier RRA practitioners at the Khon Kaen University is the “core” method of good RRA research) with children present all the caveats and ethical problems frequently encountered by social science researchers when children are involved (Chambers 2002). Government or donor support for RRA teams often also give the teams an air of official legitimacy that could in some instances be considered to force consent from the local communities.

**Confidentiality**

Confidentiality in the context of RRA is difficult for multiple reasons. First, confidentiality typically poses problems when the researcher(s) finds situations where harm is being done or some social more is being grossly violated. This ethical dilemma is common to all researcher approaches. Secondly, and more poignant to RRA, confidentiality is problematic for a field researcher whose goal is to gather detailed data, contact names, document specific leaders and their social networks, acquire spatial information like GPS waypoints that identify tract owners, and then present such private information to an NGO or another government. Confidentiality is severely compromised by the pragmatic, project-oriented data collection of RRA. There is, to my best knowledge, no literature that specifically mentions these particular issues of confidentiality within RRA approaches.

**Giving Something Back to the Community**

RRA is, ostensibly, better at this than most other research approaches because RRA is usually embedded in a development process. However, as we will explore more in-depth below, RRA does not always capture the true development priorities of a community. So, it is questionable whether what the donor agencies are giving to the community is actually what the community wants or needs. Moreover, part of giving something back to the community is in sharing the research results. RRA is notoriously bad at making these research results available for critique by the community. The practical issues that surround returning results to the community involve the development organizational culture (wherein some organizations closely control data generated by their funding), presentation fashion (which is often oriented to a literate, Western university-educated policy maker), and pure logistics (getting back into the field to disseminate results is considered wasteful of financial resources by many organizations). Again, the literature only hints at this ethical dilemma, but it becomes obvious when one considers the many criticisms of RRA’s lack of community participation.
Lack of Community Participation

Lack of community participation in RRA is the main criticism of the approach. However, a simple stating of this criticism is illusive since RRA practitioners consider the sacrifice of some participatory methods prudent and ethical when judging the alternative available approaches in the field. After a brief recounting of ethics and the history of RRA, I will explain how participation can become ethically problematic in the field.

It is interesting to note that Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA) was originally developed in response to practical and ethical problems confronted by development workers in rural settings. In the late 1970’s, development projects came under increased scrutiny due to their problematic world assumptions and lack of positive results (Townsley 1996). Central to criticisms of development work were the lack of participation of the local communities in the research process and the poor preliminary data gathering that resulted from particular constraints on development projects. Temporal and fiscal constraints typical of rural development programs rendered traditional data collection methods like extensive surveys and intensive sociological and anthropological participant observation too cumbersome and problematic. Alternatively, quick and dirty methods like “rural development tourism” were equally insufficient in that the data generated by such studies were not rigorous. The extent of community participation in RRA is a result of the normative development of RRA as a pragmatic field method for development workers to generate the most rigorous information as rapidly and cost-effectively as possible (Chambers 2002). However, ironically, the ‘bad’ data and lack of participation (that RRA was supposed to resolve) continues to be the main basis of ethical criticism of the RRA approach.

The advent of RRA was an attempt to overcome the above constraints and generate better data that could resolve the following, closely-related ethical and practical criticisms of development projects: inappropriate development (technical solutions were beyond capacity, not the true problems, target groups were missed, etc.), poor understanding of the social and cultural context of development (recognition of limitations to generalized solutions in diverse social and cultural contexts), and lack of participation (“beneficiaries” were not implicated in the priority-setting stages or any other part of the development process) (Townsley 1996). The underlying theme to the above criticisms is that more participatory approaches would generate better data and then create more successful projects.

The main problem is that RRA are one time events that usually are held at the behest of donor agencies, not grassroots organizations or local communities (Whiteside 1997). There is a general consensus that RRA teams extract and manipulate data in ways that are not always congruous to local perceptions, but are oriented to entities outside the community. From the perspective of many critics, RRA, though it collects more data from locals than previous approaches, still prioritizes the researchers as experts and devalues local abilities (Chambers 2002). This is a recurring, critical theme in the leading journal on RRA (Participatory Learning and Action) and among practitioners of the many methods closely related to RRA (Whiteside 1997). Perhaps one of the best ways to frame the ethical concerns surrounding RRA is to briefly note historical trends in the approach.

Practioners of RRA, since its conception and application in the late 1970’s, have made efforts to overcome ethical issues posed by the participatory limits of RRA. The main forum for RRA practitioners to report and debate applications of RRA was a journal called RRA Notes. In February 1995, this journal changed its name to PLA notes in order to reflect the constellation of new, participatory approaches that had evolved from RRA modifications. In October 2004, the journal again changed its name from PLA Notes to simply Participatory Learning and Action. Perhaps this change was meant to reflect that the journal was no longer just a venue for reporting uses, but instead for debating substantive issues in methodological innovation and theoretical assumptions.

3 It was created in 1984 and published by IIED (International Institute for Environment and Development).
RRA became *passé* for many of the politically correct donor agencies and practitioners of other Participatory Learning and Action approaches (Whiteside 1997). However, some authors point to the fact that the more participatory methods only created new sets of ethical dilemmas rather than substantially resolving any of RRA’s ethical concerns (Kapoor 2002; Whiteside 1997; McGee 1997). The new set of ethical dilemmas posed by more participatory (more intensive) approaches involves problems of going to scale (Whiteside 1997; McGee 1997), whether emancipatory research could actually take place in participatory approaches (Kapoor 2002), and reaching problem populations in a quick and efficient manner (Whiteside 1997). Whiteside (1997) lists the criteria for situations where RRA may be a more ethical approach to data collection: where populations are transient, when it is for an extensive ‘relief program’, or when institutional context is not participatory and false expectations are engendered by more participatory approaches. In other words, supporters of RRA continue to point to RRA’s unique and practical abilities and advantages to gather data quickly and extensively at the sacrifice of intensive participatory methods in particular situations like relief work. The below chart from Whiteside (1997:3) shows RRA as compared to PRA (Participatory Rural Appraisal) and summarizes some main differences between RRA and many of its descendants.

**Table 1: Comparing PRA and RRA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>PRA</th>
<th>RRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>For the community to decide development priorities and plans (which may subsequently be presented to government or agency for support)</td>
<td>For the agency to decide relief or development priorities and plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timescale</td>
<td>The appraisal can be short or prolonged but it is part of a longer term process in the community</td>
<td>The appraisal is normally relatively rapid - but is part of a longer term data gathering and planning process within the agency. (The appraisal is also part of the events affecting the community and has an impact, whether or not this is planned by the agency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key actors</td>
<td>Community members, often facilitated by outsiders</td>
<td>Outsiders, often facilitated by community members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of results</td>
<td>By the community</td>
<td>By outsiders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Techniques used</td>
<td>Wide variety - can be the same as RRA</td>
<td>Wide variety - can be the same as PRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political correctness</td>
<td>High (no funding without it)</td>
<td>Moderate (seen as passé)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness</td>
<td>Depends on context</td>
<td>Depends on context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In reality most appraisals combine elements of both.*

Ethical dilemmas in RRA are largely focused on participation. However, simply adopting more participatory approaches and dropping RRA is not necessarily a more prudent or ethical approach when one considers the realities of field implementations. RRA is also open to criticism on the same general ethical dilemmas that confront many of the social science research approaches. There seems to be paucity of critical analysis of broader ethical dilemmas in RRA due to the literature’s intense scrutiny of RRA’s lack of participatory mechanisms.
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