

services are excluded. Meat and vegetables from the home farm are added to both consumption and income, but no similar allowances are made for the value of work in the home, child-minding, or the preparation of meals. While there is a good deal of agreement on the desirability of including these services, and while it is clear that there are systematic biases from failing to do so — the failure to value leisure understates the relative poverty of single parents who have very little of it there is little agreement on how to value time. If labor markets are sufficiently well-developed so that everyone can work as many hours as they wish at the market wage, then that wage would be the appropriate price for imputing time. But if people have limited opportunities for work, as is often the case for women in many parts of the world, the appropriate rate would be less, perhaps very much less. The mislabelling of unemployment as leisure is injury enough, without adding the insult of labelling the unemployed as wealthy on the basis of their enforced leisure.

1.2. Panel data

1.2.1. Data collection

Most household surveys, in both developed and developing countries, draw new households for each new survey, so that it is generally impossible to track any given household through successive surveys. In a few cases however, most notably the World Bank's Living Standards Surveys (LSS) in Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana, the ICRISAT data from six villages in southern India, and in data collected in Pakistan and the Philippines under the auspices of the International Food Policy Research Institute, have individual households been revisited on a systematic basis at intervals of a year or more. The Living Standards Surveys have a rotating structure, with half of the households from the previous year retained and half replaced, so that data are obtained from each household on two occasions separated by a year. There have been a few other cases where households from a previous survey have been revisited, even though the original survey was not designed to be a panel. The National Council for Applied Economic Research (NCAER) in Delhi revisited a sample of Indian households after a ten year gap, Bevan, Collier, and Gunning (1989) used follow-up surveys in Kenya and Tanzania, and Smith, Thomas and Karoly (1992) report on a 1990 follow-up survey of the households in the 1978 Malaysian Family Life Survey. In all these cases, a large fraction of households or household members was found, nearly three-quarters of the latter in the Malaysian case, which is presumably a much higher fraction of those who are still alive and still resident in the country. Since the fractions reinterviewed would presumably have been higher had the resurvey been planned from the

