Summing up:

The thesis started with an introduction raising some problems a researcher faces in the methodology. The problems are related to the choice of the object; the problems associated with the subject and subjectivity and finally the problems relating to the object and objectivity. In the process of elaborating on the problem and conceptualising on the methodologies, one can suggest that the major source of difficulties come when both the subject and the object are in motion.

In fact, as a meta-theoretic approach, methodology can be defined as the relation between the subject and the object; with specific relations giving rise to specific methodologies. In practice, one can divide methodologies broadly as a goal centric methodology in which either only a subject is in motion, with a given object; or the object is in motion with a given subject; and a motion centric methodology in which both the subject as well as object are in motion, as illustrated by the figure 6.1. Methodologies of Popper and Medavar can be an illustration where the subject is in motion, but the object is removed from the framework of analysis. Popper proposes the study of subject in motion through conjectures and refutation, Medavar proposes imaginative conjectures and critical evaluation as two episodes and their rapid reciprocation by which forward action in science is possible. This methodology gives raise to a method named falsification for purposes of advancement of science, or in other words helps the subject in motion. Kuhn and Myrdal belong to
another category who believe that the object is in motion where the subject 1B given. Kuhn proposes scientific revolutions through Paradigm changes interspersed normal science period, which generates falsification cum verification as the method whereas Myrdal working in the domain of society, proposed changes in beliefs and valuations as the base for change and gives a major role for informal organisations, specially the STATE, for correcting the false beliefs. This goal centric methodology develops much tools of analysis that are tailored for study of a stationary object; and in case the object is in motion, they do not match with each other. Even if they match, they match in a localised situation for a short period of time and this demands a paradigm shift, a popular Kuhnian concept. In this circumstances, a researcher, using this methodology, can capture a snap-shot picture of the object at two points of time and has to take recourse to comparative statistical methods to compare and assess the changes in the object. In addition, the motion of the object is visualised as such that it requires an external force, either a superior human being an elite/genius who has a greater capacity to initiate motion, or a super natural being, like God, to direct the motion towards a pre-determined goal. Theory belongs to this category and the popular mythological story 'Gajendra Moksham', where a mighty elephant surrenders to the almighty Vishnu to release it from the clutches of a mere Crocodile, is symbolic of such a methodology. In this system, equilibrium notion plays a dominant role for the researcher- Any deviant to the expected motion is not only discouraged, it is even mopped aside, and the
focus of such a methodology will be on how far or near it the object to the goal; and a pre-determined goal gets the primacy. These limitations demanded a search for a new methodology which can equip itself with such tools that can handle successfully the study of a dynamic society.

The need for such a methodology was first felt by E.P.Thompson and he tried to put forward in clear terms a methodology which can make motion an integral part of the formulation itself. In the process, of such a formulation, he considers the concept of class, not as a physical entity, but as a result of a historical process of evolution, and in the sense, it is a fluid process in which it becomes its own agency, being responsible for its creation as well as its evolution. In his formulation, "working class did not rise like the Sun at an appointed time..... It was present at its own making*. He felt the need to systematise the marxian concepts which incorporate motion of the object in its formulation into a well defined methodology, though this is a contradiction in terms, this becomes inevitable for the sake of understanding the object in motion, at least to the first approximation. Another social scientist R.S.Rao also attempted to understand the concept 'object in motion', not as a methodological exercise, but as a a part of an inquiry examine various aspects of reality from the subjective perceptions and in the process, introduced dimensionality to the objective reality. This subject-object relation is such that the motion in the object initiates motion in the subject, resulting in
both the subject as well as object to be in motion is christened as motion centric methodology, by R.S. Rao. In this methodology, since motion is endogenised, to duly deviants to the expected predictions, they being the signals of change, becomes important. That is, the primacy is given to 'what is becoming' instead of 'what it is'. The source for the subject to be in motion can be located in the expanding brain, expanding in the sense that it acquires capacity to resolve higher and more complex problems, and hence the motion in the subject becomes a natural character of the subject. Each subject, since its perceptions are in variance with the perceptions of other subjects, becomes unique, leading to the inter-subjective variability in describing the object, resulting in multiple descriptions of the object; making inter-subjective variability as the source for multiple descriptions. Coming to the other component of methodology, that is, the object, this object is also in motion due to the internal disequilibrium between opposing forces which is also a natural inherent character of the object. Whether the subject wants it or not, the object is in motion and the laws of motion of the object are independent of the capturing capacity of this subject. Here, the subject has a role either to accelerate or decelerate the motion of the object. Imbalances or disequilibrium notion becomes a useful tool here and the process of identifying the forces of equilibrium leads to the context of the object. Hence the knowledge of the context coupled with the history of the context becomes a prime requisite for a researcher. This subject-object relation; in the perception of the subject, gives rise in this subject a world view about the
object which can be broadly seen as philosophy. With all these variations, the sources for multiple descriptions can be located in:

1. Both the subject as well as object are in motion.
2. Only the subject is in motion; or the object is in motion.
3. Subject do not realise that the object is in motion.
4. Subject faces difficulties, or rather badly equipped to capture the object in its totality.

Implications of the above notion of the motion can be as follows. If the subject remains in motion while the object is static or given, the tools of research evolve over integrating or summing over different subjects and obtaining the best average, a elephant and the five blind men. Each individual description of the object includes an error due to its motion and the research methodology has to develop the tools to successively minimise the error. It is like measuring the weight of the body or length or the condition of the displaced persons, displaced due to the construction of dams. Assuming that the body weight is a given constant, one proceeds with a simple balance, on to a chemical balance to a micro balance and even to an 'Atomic balance'. Similarly, length is measured in terms of light year, metrescale, vernier calipers, screw gauze and finally in terms of atomic distances. All the time, approximately coining closer to the 'true' weight or 'true' length of the body. Measuring instruments gain more and more precision and the subject is improving its
Knowledge and can be said to be in motion. Meanwhile, each instrument given a description and the weight is taken as a true given constant. If one takes the case of a dam and its effects on the people, an object one assumes to be a constant, the subject goes on increasing the sample size, the way of selection of a sample and improving methods of inference. It also can mean widening the definition of costs and benefits and also includes the contextual references. As was presented in the chapter 'on description', the same Hirakud dam comes under different descriptions. All the while, each description assumes that the dam and the relation with the people is knowable and a given entry, only to be studied and restudied until one gets a true relation. Any deviation or a falsification to the expected results demands the theory (conjecture) to be rejected.

On the other hand, the problematic before research methodology can be that the subject is given while the object is in motion. In other words, the motion of the object does not generate a motion in the subject. This looks an absurd proposition, if the subject happens to be a human being with a capacity to think and has a brain which can construct the images of the object and verify the correctness or otherwise of the image. But this does create problems of method which normally one confronts when one goes with a theory about the object for verification. A falsification situation can mean either the tools of analysis for verification are not precise; or in other words, the observation can be wrong and needs to be changed, or the
theory may be correct for time space specification of the object and the object may be in motion. In methodology debates, Kuhn brings to focus this aspect when he discussed the paradigm changes and Myrdal brings in changes in valuations and beliefs to the theory of knowledge.

In either of these cases, the subject is in motion with a given object or the object is in motion with a given subject, the 'given' in the system is to be interpreted as the phenomenon is in a stationary state of rest, similar to an electron motion in a stationary orbit in Bohr's model of the atom. In a more popular terminology, the phenomenon is at equilibrium between the opposing forces within itself. Equilibrium, as a notion in a methodology has a central place and some times the stability of equilibrium also play a central place. Methodologies, which take equilibrium and stability as central, will have difficulty in explaining the 'motion' of the phenomenon unless some external force, like Newton, is considered exogeneous to the system. Endogenising the motion, means that the methodology should provide for inclusion of conditions within the equilibrium which will disturb the equilibrium. Rao, commenting on the notion of equilibrium, says, "Nature is not a given constant entity due to its internal dialectics. Even without the interference of man, nature changes and was/is never at a state of rest, nor, in a state of equilibrium. It is in a state of motion". [Rao (1991 a): p-1]

Equilibrium method becomes a difficult method to capture the
motion centric methodology which keeps motion as the centre of its methodology, motion of the subject as well as the object. In an admirable attempt to get at the micro foundations of Marxian analysis, Roemer faces this difficulty and acknowledges the unsurmountability of equilibrium method. Roemer says, "What is disturbing about the equilibrium method is that it pictures the typical position of the system as a position the system rarely or never enjoys". [Roemer, (1981)p.10] Thus, the first problem a researcher has to face squarely while studying object is the concept of equilibrium which can become a constraint in the enquiry.

Following closely as a part of the 'equilibrium' constraint, is the attended problem of the relation between the knowledge of the object and the object itself, or in other words, the 'model' one has of the reality and the reality. There will always be a tendency for the researcher to confuse the model, a thought construct - an abstraction - as the concrete reality. Any information that the reality throws up which does not fit into the model, the researcher is likely to give up as an observation, as an exception or a deviant, which means that the object does not possess any autonomy outside the model. This is crucial for the growth of knowledge and the greater understanding of the reality. Axiomatically, if one permits subject in motion and keeping relative autonomy to the object, then these models/images can only be close approximations to reality. According to Rao, "In any human system, the images are always much smaller quantitatively;
than the real systems, and the growth of knowledge takes place by successive approximations to the reality. In all such circumstances, the model is some sort of a mirror reflection" [Rao (1991 b); p.1]

If the object is given autonomy, i.e., it becomes its own agent endogenising the motion, the object struggles against the uncomfortable equilibrium situation and this struggle throws up symptoms of change, which a subject captures as signals. In this struggle of the object for change, a new data and new social relations, which are dormant until now, comes to open. This data is a new data that got generated which is absent earlier, but the data is new in the sense that the subject perceives the reality in a different perspective. As per Rao, "Struggle generates new data and re-evaluate old data". This notion of struggle, in a research methodology opens a new entry point for the subject through which it can enter the object for enquiry and capture the object not in its equilibrium situation where all the internal forces are stable and equal providing a description as it is, but in its disequilibrium situation in which the struggle becomes a pointer to change which provides a description about the object in terms of what it is becoming.

In a nut shell, the thesis started with the fact that an object like a dam, or a phenomenon like development or a human being is being described in a number of ways. An attempt is made to locate the source for the existence of such multiple
descriptions, instead of an unique description, in the subject which is in motion or an object which is in motion or both can be in motion. Those methodologies which assume that either the subject is in motion while the object is given, or the object is in motion while the subject is given are classified as goal centric methodologies. 'Given' is used in the sense that the phenomenon under consideration is in a stationary state or state of rest in which the motion repeats itself with a regularity like an electron in the Bohr’s atomic model. In this goal centric methodology, the cause of motion is located in an external force like Newton and the phenomenon which is in motion can be variously imagined as a car racing towards a goal or a billiard ball directed towards the hole or a bullet fired from a gun, the source of motion is located external to the system. Alternatively those methodologies which assume that both subject as well as object are in motion because of their innate, natural character are classified as motion centric methodologies. Both are dynamic in the sense that they possess a natural chartered to change externally as well as internally. In this sense, the source of motion is located internal to the system and the motion gets endogenised and they become their own agents. Here, the subject is modelled as bipolar evolving matrix of two interacting elements namely perception set and rational set. The object is modeled as three dimensional generative matrix of three interacting, mutually dependent elements namely productive force, property relations and super-structure. In such a methodology, the necessary tools a researcher should acquire can be categorised as follows.
1. The concept of disequilibrium.

A researcher, instead of utilising equilibrium models which examined the object as through it is at rest and all conditions imposed in the model are simultaneously fulfilled, must locate in this equilibrium model itself the probable disequilibrium conditions through which changes in the object are possible.

2. The concept that model is smaller than reality.

A researcher should realise that a model is only an approximation to reality which makes reality much bigger than the model. In such a circumstances, any deviants or exceptions become pointers from where changes in the object may be possible. Researcher has to take into consideration any such deviants.

3. The concept of 'Entry through struggle'.

A researcher instead of entering the object at a situation when it is seemingly at rest/equilibrium, should keep the entry point of enquiry as struggle.

4. The concept that object contains dimensionality.

The researcher should not visualise the object as a homogeneous unitary entity, but as a three dimensional interacting fluid flux. In such a case, the object may struggle in one dimension but can be in unity in the other two dimensions. An entry through struggle in any one dimension also facilitates the enquiry in the other two.
5. The concept that object has a dual role.

A researcher, specially in case the object is another human being, should not model the object as a passive object placed on an operation table in a researcher laboratory, but as an active object which acquires all the characters of a subject due to which the researcher itself gets modeled by the object.