Methodology

6.1 Imperatives in Refugee Research

Social scientists whose research focuses on forced migration issues are both plagued by and attracted to the idea that their work be relevant. Most forced migration research seeks to explain the behaviour, impact and problems of the displaced with the intention of influencing agencies and governments to develop more effective responses. This policy orientation stems in part from the subject of research, the figure of the refugee, whose experience of violent conflict, displacement and human rights violations inhibits researchers from treating them simply as objects for research.¹ This sentiment echoed by policy-oriented refugee researchers has led on the one hand to the growth of a large body of refugee literature which consists of reports by human rights organizations like Amnesty International or Human Rights Watch, which document and expose human rights abuses with the intention of pressurizing governments to protect and promote their well being. On the other and quite paradoxically, it has produced an image of the refugee as a victim and a client in need of assistance. As Dorsh Marie de Voe comments, “Understanding the impact of the event of flight in the lives of refugees rarely enters the analysis of refugee needs, problems and programs. It is as if culture were a novelty easily dismissed in the face of events, which have turned persons into victims” (1981: 88). At the same time refugee-related social science seeks to attain methodological and theoretical rigour in order to justify its place in the academy and to attract scarce funding for social research. Refugee researchers like Karen Jacobsen and Loren Landau (2003) are led to believe that once academic sophistication is achieved, their work becomes ever more irrelevant to practitioners and policy makers. “We fear that our analyses may not address current crises, that the language and concepts we use are too arcane or jargonistic or that the questions we ask (and purport to answer) are interesting only to other academics, not to those who work in the field or to those refugees and Internally Displaced Persons and war-affected people who live the situations we study. How do we

¹ David Turton’s admonishment that research into others’ suffering can only be justified if alleviating that suffering is an explicit objective is worth noting while undertaking research on refugee groups see Turton 1996: 96-110.
address the dual imperative, which Jacobsen and Landau talk about, so that the work on refugees can be both academically rigorous and relevant to policy?” (Jacobsen and Landau 2003: 1-2). The present research study on Tibetan refugees does not explicitly seek to address this dual imperative per se. Effective research however demands that researchers reveal and explain their methods. Outlining the methodology for the present study that seeks to recognize the limits and strengths of the approaches to gathering data and the conclusions drawn from them is therefore deemed critical.

What does come out most clearly through the review of existing secondary materials on Tibetans in exile and from the conversations with lay Tibetans is the increasing realization among them that their ethnic identity or ethos is threatened not only by the event of flight but also its aftermath. The ensuing research study seeks as its object an understanding of this aftermath, which has meaning well beyond the functional, instrumental forms of physical survival. Being a refugee is not a simple identity construct that emerges from one or several experiences of violence, war and displacement from the homeland. It is rather, in Liisa Malkki’s words, “process of becoming…a gradual transformation, not an automatic result of the crossing of a national border” (Malkki 1995: 114). For analytical purposes, therefore, the use of the term “refugee” in the present study would be based on a conceptualization of “refugeeness” that is rooted not only in the flight and rehabilitation of particular individuals and groups but also in the making and unmaking of identities through the daily practices of living in one or several host societies.

6.2 Confronting the problem of refugee numbers

In more stable refugee situations, like those of the Tibetans, numbers do play an important part in any analytical endeavour. In the present study, consideration has been given to the socio-demographic structure of the refugee population; how many refugees live in camps and how many have settled elsewhere; what is the ratio between refugees and local residents among others. At the outset it is important to note that while statistics are central to the function of the international refugee regime, it has long been recognized
that the collection of accurate data on displaced populations is confronted with some formidable obstacles. Writing in the mid 80s, Gaim Kibreab pointed out, “there is a cloud of uncertainty and unreliability surrounding African refugee statistics” (1985: 10). According to a paper presented to UNHCR’s Executive Committee, the world’s most affluent states, with all of their resources and technological sophistication have great difficulties in answering or are not able to provide an answer to the simple question, “how many refugees are living in the country,” and “information is generally lacking on essential characteristics of the refugee population, for example, country of origin and sex.” Refugees may enter a country of asylum at numerous points along a border. They may arrive in such large numbers that they can scarcely be counted. The influx may take place in an area where UNHCR has no access, due to insecurity or governmental obstruction. As a refugee influx levels off and relief operations become more organized, the potential for the collection of accurate statistical data evidently improves. This was the case with the Tibetans who had to live in their country of asylum, India, for about three decades before they could come up with a comprehensive socio-demographic data of their own community in the diaspora (represented through the Tibetan Demographic Survey published in 1998 by the Tibetan Government-in-exile).

The operational constraints on gathering quantitative information on refugee groups become more visible at the local level. As residents of India, Tibetan refugees move around freely within the territory of India, unlike foreign visitors to the country. Tibetans are seen going in and out of a refugee camp to take advantage of seasonal economic opportunities in the towns and cities of India. Refugee households inevitably split up or regroup. Refugee populations are therefore dynamic social entities. However accurate they may have been at the time of their collection, statistical data about the size and composition of a refugee population can quickly become outdated. Updating this information is not a straightforward exercise, when the refugee population or host
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2 Scholars have generally been content to rely on figures offered by the two leading producers of refugee statistics – UNHCR and the US Committee for Refugees (USCR). Some limited discussion of the politics of refugee numbers can be found in The State of the World’s Refugees: In Search of Solutions, UNHCR and Oxford University Press 1995: 244-6.


4 The legal conditions that govern movement of refugee populations in India and operative upon Tibetan refugees are complicated. For more on this issue see Chapter 7 of this research study, pp. 166 - 171.
country concerned records births, deaths, ages and family size in ways that do not correspond with standard demographic practice. Tibetan refugees in Darjeeling are highly mobile (like the self-settled urban refugees everywhere). As a result, even those with legal status were effectively untraceable. In places where they are not entitled to or chose not to live in specialized housing, there may not be any practical means to keep track of where the population is centred. The “invisibility” of Tibetan refugees in the Darjeeling Urban Area poses methodological and fieldwork challenges and the necessity to choose between the different methods depending on the exigencies of the field situation.

6.3 Encountering the Field

In ethnographic fieldwork, Liisa Malkki writes, “methodology rarely means as set of standard tools and techniques applicable independently of contexts...The settings in which the anthropologists find himself or herself shape the day-to-day practices and the tool kit of field research” (1995: 47). Such was certainly the case with the conduct of this research study. The field study was spread over a period of two years (2004-2006), totaling six months: October-November 2004 in Darjeeling; May 2005 in Darjeeling; April 2006 in Dharamsala; October-November 2006 in Darjeeling. Besides, the opportunity to converse with Tibetans (some from Darjeeling) in Kolkata, Asansol (which do not have any refugee settlement) and in the Delhi settlement (this was mainly during the winter season) was seized upon. Intricate and often long historical processes are at the heart of nearly all refugee situations (Asad 1973; Said 1989). Since “refugees” are a category often seen as politically sensitive, doing field research among Tibetan refugees in Darjeeling raised problems of ongoing access (already discussed to some extent in chapter 5), representation, trust and the use of the appropriate sampling strategy.
6.3.1 Key informants

Once key informants residing at the site were fortuitously identified, the need to take recourse to formal channels of entry into the field was no longer there. It requires particular mention that the first of my key informants was not a Tibetan refugee but an Indian national of Tibetan descent and a Buddhist. His predecessors, he mentioned, had come to the Darjeeling hills from Tibet before 1959 for purposes of trade and other economic pursuits. They eventually settled down in the Darjeeling district and became Indian citizens having Scheduled Tribe (ST) status under the Indian constitution. Like his other co-ethnics, he was locally known as a Bhutia, a term used pejoratively by the dominant Nepalis, referring to those groups of people who could trace their origin in Tibet (Bhot). Over-reliance on a key informant has its pitfalls since the researcher tends to observe social reality through the eyes of the key informant. The strategy therefore was to take the help of the key informant in getting to meet other informants who would be relevant in terms of giving additional perspectives in the field. Being a Tibetan (Bhutia) himself, he had several acquaintances who were refugees at the TRSHC. He led me to a person who was born in Darjeeling and lived for most part of his forty years at the TRSHC. He became my key informant insofar as getting access to the Tibetan refugee community was concerned and was greatly aware of the kind of people or events I wanted to see or encounter, partly due to his exposure to visitors before and my attempts at making clear the purpose of my research work. His accounts for the most part was solicited, since I needed to get information concerning issues that was not amenable to direct observation or that was not cropping up during “natural” conversations. It requires particular mention that the two key informants I had managed to find at the field site were friends since childhood and the revealing fact was that my first key informant’s grandmother had extended support in the form of cash and shelter to my second key informant’s mother who had arrived as a refugee from Tibet. This information led me to examine the “refugee-host” relations (which became one of the subject-matters of my research) in Darjeeling town.

5 In the folklore of participant observation, key informants are almost heroic figures. They are the researcher’s best friend in the field. Whyte’s (1955) Doc is a notable example.
6.3.2 Role as a Researcher in the Field

Related to the issue of “ongoing access” is the question of the kind of role the ethnographer adopts in relation to the social setting and its members. In the present research study the principal role that has been followed is that of “Observer-as-participant”. Opportunities for genuine participation were few in refugee contexts and that there were situations that were not amenable to the immersion that is a key ingredient of the ethnographic method. “Hanging around” (Bryman 2004: 298) was another access strategy that was used. It entailed loitering in the TRSHC and also in the market place in Darjeeling town in order to get noticed so that unsolicited information could be extracted. For the conduct of this research study involving Observer-as-participant role, Gold’s classification of participant observer roles with their respective advantages and risks was duly considered, which has greater potential for a broader meaning and applicability to refugee research contexts than either participant observation or ethnography (Gold 1958: 217-23).

The “observer-as-participant” role in the context of this field study largely involved interviewing. Initiating the interview process required establishing “rapport” with the respondents so that they are prepared to participate in and persist with the interview. In the context of this research study on refugees this rapport could not be established quickly because of the difficulty of establishing “trust” involved in the relationship and the gulf that already exists between the refugee “lifeworlds” and that of the researcher. Too much of familiarity to begin with would have had its disadvantages with respondents answering questions that are designed to please the interviewer. In most conversations with Tibetan refugees the replies have been mainly in the nature of “We Tibetans believe…” or “We Tibetans are Buddhist, so therefore…” A response to a general question would be phrased in terms that reflect cultural ideals rooted in Buddhist ethics or of an “ideal Tibetan refugee.” It is important therefore to be forthright in acknowledging this problematic dimension of the present research. Whatever has been the achievement of rapport with the respondents in the field study has involved a delicate balancing act.
6.3.3 Use of Interview Schedules

An interview guide constituting of a list of questions and the specific topics to be covered was used having an appearance of an unstructured or semi-structured interview schedule. Interview schedules were designed to capitalize on the knowledge of the interviewees about local issues and conditions as well as about issues regarding Tibet and the Tibetan diaspora. A great deal of leeway was given to the interviewee in how to reply, wherein ‘rambling’ or going off at tangents was greatly encouraged. Questions that were not included in the guide were asked following from what was picked up on things said by interviewees. One set of questions was meant for individual respondents and the other set of questions was meant to get a collective view of the TRSHC and refugee life in Darjeeling town. Some basic questions about the TRSHC were put forth. The detailed questionnaire schedules are there in Annexure 2.

6.3.4 Issue of trust

Crucial to developing relationships in the field, which involves refugees is the establishment of trust between the researcher and the researched. Securing access is in many ways an ongoing activity. Refugees whom I encountered at the beginning seemed to adjust their behaviour in my presence (problem of reactivity), which is symptomatic of the levels of trust or mistrust that existed in the relationship. Daniel and Knudsen (1995: 1) contention that “the refugee mistrusts and is mistrusted” therefore cannot be ignored. A large part of what Emmanuel Marx (1990) calls the “social world” of refugees remains unknown to a researcher even till the end of the research study and therefore the strategy in the present field research was to desist from making an ambitious claim that a particular set of research questions and methodology deployed would reconstitute trust and but would rather regard mistrust as something inherent in the refugee system. Tourists, members of Non-Governmental Organizations, donor agencies, administrators from the Darjeeling municipality and politicians had become a routine sight over the decades at TRSHC. However my presence as a researcher, which was not noticed by all
in the beginning, was less usual, although journalists and few researchers had come before for gathering knowledge about TRSHC and its inhabitants. Initially, I was accompanied by my key informant during all visits to the TRSHC and in Darjeeling town. The preliminary introduction to the administrative staff of TRSHC tended to be officious but my presence did not arouse any suspicion or fear, which is generally the case in conflict prone refugee settlements in Africa and the Middle East. Gradually when the refugee settlement became more familiar, it was possible to start visiting the TRSHC alone. Conducting fieldwork without the assistance of the key informant is deemed crucial, since it was observed that the presence of the key informant did affect the respondents.

The problem of negotiating the levels of trust and mistrust in the relationship between myself as a researcher and my refugee informants and their neighbours was more acute in Darjeeling town. Since most of the respondents were busy shop owners, time available for conversations was limited. I had to come at a specified time of the day (mainly early morning or in the afternoon) as agreed upon for entering into any discussion which at times was interrupted by buyers. I then switched into the role of an observer of social relations. Most potential informants refused to disclose their Tibetan refugee identity first and preferred to call themselves “Bhutia” (a local nomenclature which guaranteed security and confidentiality to Tibetan refugees who used them while introducing themselves to strangers). Only on further interrogation they chose to reveal their refugee identity but it depended on how well I could build trust and confidentiality in the relationship and the time taken to do so vary with each respondent. The claims to Bhutia identity or refugee identity made by respondents were corroborated from the statements made by neighbours of other ethnic backgrounds (Bhutias and Nepalis) who lived in their midst, although their perception regarding the identity of their Tibetan refugee neighbours were based on both objective and subjective knowledge. The detailed and frequent explanation of my Bengali identity and the fact that I was a research student to them dispelled to a large extent any modicum of doubt about the purpose of my visit. I understood later on that this happened because the refugees tended to value education and scholarship highly and they could relate my ethnic identity to the historical fact that
several Bengalis have contributed to the evolution of Tibetan culture, the notable names that they often recount are that of Atisha Dipankara and Sarat Chandra Das.

6.3.5 Sampling Strategy

The sampling of informants in the present study of refugees is a combination of “convenience” and “snowball sampling” methods. Deploying the convenience sampling method to the study of Darjeeling town refugees is however difficult since majority are self-settled among host populations. Yet “convenience sample” is one that is simply available to the researcher by virtue of its accessibility. Given that refugees in Darjeeling town are self-settled, membership in any groupings is likely to be fluid with people being highly mobile (out-migration during the winter season). As a result, even refugees with legal status are effectively untraceable or absent. Physically locating the “type” of people one is interested in researching does require considerably more effort in heterogeneous urban settings. In this context, it was prudent to use a convenience sample when chance presented itself to get interview data and it represented too good an opportunity to miss. The gradual creation of relationships with key informants and their informants and so on happened through processes that culminated in “snowball samples”. Relationships with an initially small group of informants produced larger groups through introductions to friends, neighbours, business associates and kin living in their vicinity or others living in far away places. Access problems mean that most refugee researchers rely on “snowball” sampling approaches. Although the specifics vary, the researcher almost always begins by contacting a local body, such as a religious or refugee organization or an aid agency that is familiar with the refugee community, and requests their assistance in identifying and approaching potential research subjects in the community. This initial “core” group of subjects is then interviewed and asked to name others who might be willing to be interviewed, and thus the “snowball” sample is built. There are at least two problems with this approach, one methodological and one ethical. A snowball selection approach runs a high risk of producing a biased sample. Unlike a random sample, where everyone in the target population has an equal chance of being selected, a snowball sample draws subjects from a particular segment of the community, and they are likely to be similar in
certain ways—sharing a social network, for example, or belonging to same religious group. The sample will, almost by definition, exclude those who are not linked to the organization or individual who is at the center of the snowball.

Ethically, “snowballing” increases the risk of revealing critical and potentially damaging information to members of a network or subgroup. Simply informing a respondent how you obtained a name or contact information demonstrates a particular kind of link. The dangers of this are aggravated by many researchers’ tendency to “test” the validity of their findings by reporting them to their respondents and asking for their opinions. These findings can, for example, include sensitive information about political, religious, or personal affiliations, which can create problems amongst the group. Levels of wealth (or poverty) or access to opportunities can also be revealed in ways that will negatively affect respondents’ relationships with each other. Researchers must therefore be very explicit in recognizing the limits of their claims to representativeness. Doing otherwise can mean that policies recommended for one group can, on the assumption of representativeness, end up harming other refugees (and hosts) not included in the sample.

Use of open-ended interview schedules and snowball samples restricted the number of respondents drawn from the field site, unlike in structured interviews or the use of probability sampling. Given the shifting nature of Tibetan refugee population, administering unstructured interview schedules and snowball sampling techniques in order to draw interview data was the most feasible option available. About eighty respondents coming from diverse backgrounds were interviewed on an individual basis in Darjeeling town and in the TRSHC. Of eighty respondents, sixty belonged to the Tibetan refugee community and twenty from the host groups (fifteen from the Bhutia community and five from the Nepali community). Furthermore, discussions took place in groups involving members from the Tibetan refugee community, Bhutia community and Nepali community. The members of each group (maximum four individuals) belonged to the same community. Over and above the eighty respondents who were part of the individual-based interviews, about forty respondents were involved in the group-based discussions. Of forty respondents, twenty belonged to the Tibetan refugee community,
ten from the Bhutia community and ten from the Nepali community. In total, the numbers of respondents taking into account the individual-based interviews (eighty respondents) and group-based discussions (forty respondents) would be one hundred and twenty. The respondents were mainly shop-owners, craftsmen and entrepreneurs; few were scholars, administrators, activists, teachers, students and monks. The age group of the Tibetan refugee respondents was between 18 to 50 years. They comprised those Tibetans who were born in exile on and after 1959. The reason for keeping this broad age range is that in the exile context, the idea of the new generation Tibetan refugees is rendered vague by the stretch of the Diaspora. As Topden Tsering writes, “In the exile context, the idea of youth is rendered convoluted by the fleeting stretch of the Diaspora. The expiry tag on the process of being young comes with a sooner date in India than in the US. In New York at 35 you can still be a freelancer but in Dharamsala shame on you if you are not by then comfortably married complete with a kid or two to make up for the family portrait!.

On the exile shore, youth takes on a kaleidoscopic visage. Exile Tibetan youth is the 27-year-old girl in some northern Indian city of her family’s seasonal sweater-selling destination, where from a makeshift store, she retails woolen garments, hand-knit scarves, and the like, to local customers, while her aging parents ponder over her childhood swiftly passed and wonder if she will grow old to be like them. Exile Tibetan youth is the 40-year-old man, a father of three back home in Bylakuppe, who upon arriving in New York, finds himself in a dormitory-like situation he had never known, sharing a room with three other Tibetans in their twenties, all of who when not slaving under the weight of the American dream steal moments of reprieve from playing cards, joking around, sharing grocery bills, and getting drunk on the money left over from purchasing gifts back home of Nike Shoes, and sweatshirts.”

6.4 Other Methodological Concerns

The fact that Tibetans are scattered across the globe requires one to undertake what George E. Marcus (1995: 95-117) called “Multi-sited” research. It was difficult to conduct “multi-sited” research in the context of Tibetan refugees, since it was not

---

physically possible to go to other sites both in and out of India where Tibetans are residing (except the Delhi and Dharamsala settlements) in order to conduct ethnography. Yet “multi-sited” research was used in a limited way by seeking interviews with the same persons in two different places at different times in India, although the number of such respondents was few. Field study in Darjeeling enabled me to view a portion of the diasporic world that Tibetans inhabit in, worlds, which differ from each other in significant ways. The other way to offset the limitations of travel to multiple sites in the Tibetan diaspora was to use the internet in order to interact with Tibetan refugees settled in the United States but who were born in India. Other internet sites frequently used by Tibetans, like phayul.com, their news updates; tibet.net which is the official website of the Tibetan government-in-exile; Tibet.ca (Canada Tibet Committee); tibetlink.com (Canada); tibetsearch.com (U.S.A.); tibetwrites.org were referred to in order to gain access to the Tibetan diasporic world.

The fluency with which the new generation Tibetans in Darjeeling spoke English, Hindi and Nepali in Darjeeling made it easy to strike long conversations and elicit significant data (although I could speak only in English and Hindi with them). A translator belonging to the Tibetan Bhutia community was employed for interviewing some members of the older generation in exile, although this class of octogenarians was not the principal focus of this research study. The “English-Tibetan Dictionary of Modern Tibetan,” compiled by Melvyn C. Goldstein with Ngawangthondup Narkyid, published by the Library of Tibetan Works and Archives (LTWA), Dharamsala 1999 was consulted on numerous occasions.

Apart from ethnographic interviews, the source material for the research work constituted a wide spectrum such as secondary literature on Tibet and the Tibetan diaspora; subject of refugees; on diaspora in general and on Darjeeling district. The other set of publications consulted are: one, Central Tibetan Administration’s White Papers obtained from tibet.net and Central Tibetan Administration’s Integrated Development Plan 2004-

---

7 As Thubten Samphel notes, “The power of the internet to create virtual communities has fascinated Tibetans in exile. This fascination is intensified by the fact that the ability to create a cohesive community, across international borders, has been denied to Tibetans in Tibet by an internet-shy China” (2004: 167).
2007; second, Department of Information and International Relations (DIIR) publications on Political and Human Rights issues; Environment and Development Issues; third, Tibetan Demographic Survey 1998; Tibet Under Communist China; Indian Leaders on Tibet; International Resolutions and Recognitions on Tibet (1959 to 1997). Second, report brought out by Tibetan Refugee Self Help Centre (1999); documents and reports brought out by Tibetan Centre for Human Rights and Democracy (TCHRD); Tibetan Parliamentary and Policy Research Centre (TPPRC) and the Library of Tibetan Works and Archives (LTWA). Besides, articles published in newspapers and journals such as Tibetan Bulletin (available online); Tibetan Review, Rangzen (Tibetan Youth Congress magazine) and Tibetan Affairs (published from Darjeeling) have been referred to.

6.4.1 Writing up the research

For several decades, anthropologists concerned with the inherent power dynamics of the western practice of anthropology (Asad 1973) have questioned the way in which ethnography is written. Ethnographers are now increasingly held accountable by people about whom they write. At issue are the related question of the situatedness of the researcher and the representation of the researched subject. They are a result of the changing political and economic dynamics. Awareness of this state of affairs has brought about new forms of ethnographic writing with emphasis in some cases on a dialogical approach and others that highlight the author’s subjectivity (see Nowak’s ethnography on Tibetan refugees). The present work does not neatly fit into either of these styles of writing. The attempt has not been to tell the story of Tibetans through the single voice of one of my informants as in a Life History method which has been depicted as documenting ‘the inner experience of individuals, how they interpret, understand, and define the world around them (Faraday and Plummer 1979: 776). Wherever possible, the voices of Tibetans are represented through the use of direct quotations. Some of the sub-titles represent the collective voice or opinion of the respondents. Writing of this kind of research has involved the insertion of a personal narrative in the form of one’s arrival at the field site, the initial reception by the inhabitants, the process of overcoming language barriers and resistance. Though these personal narratives exist only in the margins of the
formal ethnographic descriptions, these conventional opening narratives are not trivial. As Mary Louise Pratt remarks, “They play the crucial role of anchoring that description in the intense and authority-giving personal experience of fieldwork...Always they are responsible for setting up the initial positionings of the subjects of the ethnographic text: the ethnographer, the native and the reader” (1986: 32). Aware of the experiential side to the field-based study, the inclusion of the personal narrative is done in order to reconcile the “contradiction within the discipline between personal and scientific authority,” a contradiction that had taken an acute turn “since the advent of fieldwork as a methodological norm” (Pratt 1986: 32). As Clifford states, “Anthropological fieldwork has been represented as both a scientific laboratory and a personal ‘rite of passage’. The two metaphors capture nicely the discipline’s impossible attempt to fuse objective and subjective practices” (1986: 109).

In the context of the present research study, concerns for an appropriate style of writing were complicated by some of the political realities that contextualized the research process and the existential conditions of Tibetans in exile. “Despite its frequent ahistorical – its synchronic – pretense, ethnography is historically determined by the moment of the ethnographer’s encounter with whomever he is studying” (Crapanzano 1986: 51). Fear and caution informed refugee relationship with strangers. The fact that my ethnic background came to my aid in establishing rapport with the Tibetan refugees needs to be reiterated. Opening up to the researcher served their purpose of disseminating the refugee problem to the outside world. This study of the Tibetan refugees does assume that a chasm exists between the ‘life-world’ of the researcher and the researched subject (refugees). The belief is that this chasm would remain even till the end of the research process. It is prudent therefore to proceed towards making the relationship easy for the respondents at the fieldwork stage of the research process. The aim of the fieldwork has been to ferret out that much of data which is felt worthwhile to be taken notice of without being too intrusive.