CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES OF THE WORK
In this work, as in other anthropological works, the research design has provided the framework that holds the research topic together. This research design has essentially provided the tools to show how all of the major parts of the research topic together has actually addressed the central research question. In this pursuit present worker obviously looked for the validity and dignity of 'the other' in the form of the Third World urban marginals.

A somewhat detailed account of the relevant research designs in urban anthropology as well as the field methods and techniques applied in the present fieldwork would be given later in this chapter. However, we can mention few experiences of some landmark urban anthropological fieldworks here only to take a glimpse on some of the key methodological implications that an anthropologist may have to encounter with during his/her study among the marginalised communities in urban areas. In this regard the introduction to Philippe Bourgois' account of street culture in East Harlem is mentionable, where he notes that traditional social science research techniques that rely on Census Bureau statistics or random sample neighborhood surveys cannot access with any degree of accuracy the people who survive in the underground economy - and much less those who sell or take illegal drugs..... The participant-observation techniques developed primarily by cultural anthropologists since the 1920s are better suited than exclusively quantitative methodologies for documenting the lives of people who live on the margins of a society that is hostile to them.....(Bourgois, 1995: 15).

A somewhat earlier description on the preparation for fieldwork is provided by Elliot Liebow in his 1967 book about African-American men in Washington, DC. His advisor, Hylan Lewis, described his own vision of science: "The scientific method is doing one's damndest with his brains, no holds barred" (Liebow, 1967:235).

During this fieldwork among the urban marginals in the city of Calcutta (now Kolkata) present worker found these realisations are very helpful. Though it must be mentioned here that both the above observations were made during working in the First World condition, present worker found these observations could not always hold true when working among the Third World urban marginals. Now present worker would like to discuss on the theoretical background of these methodological issues in anthropology.

3.1. METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Two visions categorised as 'humanistic' and 'scientific' which are now well established in contemporary social and cultural anthropology. In the 'humanistic' vision, the goal of anthropology is the understanding of people's lives, their social life, and their culture, an understanding that requires an empathetic grasp of the point of view of the people studied. Thus, according to this vision, the anthropologist provides a qualitative account of the cultural 'web of meaning' shaping the society and the lives of its members. The work of anthropology is likened, in this vision, to history and to literature, emphasising the particular and the idiographic.
In the scientific vision, the goal of anthropology is the discovery of descriptive generalisations and explanatory laws about the way society and culture work which can account for the commonalities and variations among societies and their trajectories over time. To accomplish this, attention is given to behaviour as well as ideas, and precise information is required, quantitative as well as qualitative. To maximise the value of the information, and to limit errors resulting from human subjectivity and bias, systematic forms of data collection are needed, and checks, as in repeat studies, are required. Thus comparative studies juxtaposing different societies and cultures generally allow the formulation of general explanations and this method of generalisation is known as nomothetic approach in anthropology.

The humanistic wing of anthropology appears to have rejected all forms of quantification. But such dichotomising is extreme and the common practice of the anthropologists to meet this challenge is to make the fieldnotes the meaningful sample of cultural events and by a process of counting cases in those fieldnotes. Anthropological fieldnotes can be representative sample of events occurring in the lives of the members of our research community. - a) if we are unbiased in our exposure to all members of the studied community, b) if we are alert to and willing to record without bias all aspects of our subjects' lives and c) if we classify its contents in theoretically appropriate ways before counting them. Though present worker has interjected few parts of his fieldnotes from the present fieldwork later but it has been experienced from the present research none of these can be fully guaranteed particularly when one studying among a marginalised community in an urban scenario. Thus the present worker, like other anthropologists, had to content with some less ideal situation when working on a particular construct in an urban context.

A theory or independent finding in any domain claims about causally related constructs. Again, when researcher measures a construct in a way that gives varying values, it is called a variable. Normally the term variable is restricted to mean an indicator or measure and theoretical variable is used to refer to an abstract or unmeasured concept or construct. However, a theory or independent finding normally choose some concepts as starting points called exogenous construct because its causes originate from outside the theory. In their measured form, such variables go by the name independent variables because they are independent of (not caused by) the other variables in the model. Endogenous construct is one whose causes appear in the model and the manifest or measured forms of endogenous constructs go by the name of dependent variables because their values or levels depend on the causal variable(s). However, it is now generally agreed by scientists and philosophers of science that theories may have considerable evidence supporting them, but no theory can be said to be true. This is because many of the concepts and ideas in theories are not directly observable and therefore not directly verifiable.

There are two important ways of assessing a measure in a social research: Reliability and Validity. Reliability refers the extent to which a measure reflects some consistent aspect of people or events
and not random error. One can gauge reliability by the consistency of score by finding agreement between parallel forms of a test or between different items of the same questionnaire or between different raters using a measurement. Reliability decreases as the amount of random error in the score increases. To make sure to apply measures uniformly so that differences in observations do not come from measurement bias, researcher can try to standardise measurement so that all methods and raters operate in the same way each time in each place. Standardisation assures the researcher that any differences in observed scores reflect real individual differences or random error. It also suggests a standard against which to compare each local version of a measure. Validity, on the other hand, refers to the appropriateness, meaningfulness, and usefulness of the specific inferences made from the measures. If a measure has high validity, it must also have high reliability, but if it has low validity, it is misnamed and misleading regardless of its reliability.

Nevertheless, one can point to some procedures that have helped anthropologists produce explanations of social or cultural phenomena. These procedures seem to consist of two types; an anthropologist may be helped by analysis of particular society in which he or she may have done fieldwork (single-case analysis), or he or she may try to come up with a theory by a comparative study of more than one society. Anthropologists, however, use several different methods to conduct research. Each has certain advantages and disadvantages in generating and testing theories or explanations. The type of research in anthropology can broadly be classified according to two criteria: a) The spatial scope of the study (analysis of a single society, analysis of a number of societies in a region, or analysis of a worldwide sample of societies); and b) The temporal scope of the study (historical versus nonhistorical). The basic research methods in anthropology, then, are ethnography and ethnohistory, historical and nonhistorical controlled comparisons, and historical and nonhistorical cross-cultural research.

The strategy of all kinds of testing in anthropology is to predict what one would expect to find if a particular interpretation were correct, and then to conduct an investigation to see if the prediction is borne out. If the prediction is not borne out, the investigator is obliged to accept the possibility that the interpretation is wrong. If, however, the prediction holds true, then the investigator is entitled to say that there is evidence to support the theory. Providing operational definitions, i.e. a description of procedure that is followed to measure the variable, is also important in these theorisations because it allows other investigators to check on a researcher's results and it allows others to evaluate whether a measure is appropriate. In the previous chapter present worker tried to provide these operational definitions of the major constructs that are relevant with this work. Present worker finds it imperative that with this prelude on the methodologies in anthropology some elaborations on the qualitative approaches as well as quantitative approaches normally employed in anthropology and in allied subjects are necessary here as the present worker did not have a sufficient scope to do this important foundation work earlier.
3.1.1. QUALITATIVE APPROACHES

As discussed earlier, qualitative "approach" is a general way of thinking about conducting qualitative research and describes, either explicitly or implicitly, the purpose of the qualitative research, the role of the researcher(s), the stages of research, and the method of data analysis. The term participant observation often stands as a synonym for qualitative research and it implies some involvement in the observed setting. Qualitative research always takes place in the field, that is, wherever the subjects normally conduct their activities. For this reason, qualitative research often goes by the name of field research. Qualitative research, by and large, entails direct observation and relatively unstructured interviewing in natural field settings. Qualitative data collection appears spontaneous and open-ended and usually has less structure and planning than quantitative research. After getting used to the observer's presence, the subjects can return to their normal routines. The observer who looks, listens, and flows with the social network should defeat any effort to "fake" behaviour. This approach has the advantage of triangulation, which compares different interviews and perceptions of the same subject or behaviour. Qualitative researchers point to these strengths of nonreactivity (little impact on the natural setting) and triangulation as setting the standard by which to judge other research methods. That is, the data of the qualitative observer may provide more detail and less distortion than those of other approaches. Among the qualitative methods ethnography has gained maximum importance among the anthropologists.

ETHNOGRAPHY: The basic emphasis in ethnography is on studying an entire culture (ethnographic group, graphy-writing). The ground-breaking publication of Argonauts of the Western Pacific by Bronislaw Malinowsky in 1922 marked the beginning of ethnography in our discipline. Before Malinowski, anthropologists had collected volumes of material from non-Western cultures and societies all around the world. However, despite this vast collection of material, very little of it made any sense to Western observers. The social and cultural practices in other cultures seemed strange and "primitive", if not frightening. An anthropologist would typically document a particular cultural practice (for example sorcery), and then try to explain it by comparison with other practices of the same kind in other cultures (see Darnell, 1974; Kuper, 1973). Thus, Frazer's The Golden Bough, first published in 1890, was an encyclopaedic collection of various cultural practices from around the globe (Frazer, 1890). Where Malinowski departed from previous researchers was in suggesting that cultural practices from other societies could only be understood by studying the context in which they took place. All previous research had simply taken various cultural practices out of context – and that is why they appeared strange. By learning the local language and living in a society for at least one or more years, by trying to understand the meaning of particular cultural practices in context, only then would other cultures and societies start to make sense to Western observers.

Today there is a critical debate within anthropology concerning the ethnographic research method (Van Maanen, 1988). There are many different schools or views within anthropology about
ethnographic interpretation (Clifford and Marcus, 1986; Clifford, 1988; Marcus, 1992). Sanday (1979) divides ethnography into the holistic, semiotic and behaviouristic schools of thought, and she further divides the semiotic school into thick description and ethnoscientific. Each school of thought has a different approach to doing an ethnography. For example, most ethnographers of the holistic school say that empathy and identification with the social grouping being observed is needed; they insist that an anthropologist should "go native" and live just like the local people (e.g. Cohen, 1985; Evans-Pritchard, 1950). The assumption is that the anthropologist has to become like a blank slate in order to understand local social and cultural practices fully. The anthropologist acts like a sponge, soaking up the language and culture of the people under study. On the other hand, Clifford Geertz, the foremost exponent of the "thick description" (semiotic) school, says that anthropologists do not need to have empathy with their subjects (Geertz, 1973; 1988). Rather, the ethnographer has to search out and analyse symbolic forms – words, images, institutions, behaviours – with respect to one another and to the whole that they comprise. An alternative to the above is the adoption of a critical perspective of ethnography. For example, Forester (1992) used the critical social theory of Habermas in the development of an approach called critical ethnography. Forester used critical ethnography to examine the facetious figures of speech used by city planning staff to negotiate the problem of data acquisition. Myers (1987) used critical hermeneutics to illuminate the ethnographic research process in his study of the independence movement in the Melanesian nation of Vanuatu (see Marcus and Fischer, 1986).

The shift of anthropology from the espousal of scientific ethnography to the study of ethnographic texts themselves was a part of the general tendencies toward a 'reassessment of dominant ideas across the human sciences' (Clifford and Marcus, 1986: 7) is known as 'postparadigm' critique of culture. Thus once stable category of ethnography, a well-established approach to social research in anthropology and some schools of sociology (such as symbolic interactionism), has recently undergone a process of fragmentation. Centrifugal forces have given rise to a multiplicity of standpoints. In the specific case of anthropology, the aforementioned shift was in the domain of contextualisation and reflexivity in the face of declining coherence of metanarrative and grand theory. Where anthropological approaches significantly part company with the general tendencies of 'postparadigm' cultural criticism is in the continued affiliation with peoples and traditions outside the 'Western' nexus. Though a small number of ethnographies are frequently cited as informed by a postmodernist sensibility (Taussig, Crapanzano, Shostak, Rainbow etc.), the tension generated by anthropology's dual allegiance has thwarted a hegemonic postmodern outlook: if the field were to relinquish 'the other' in the name of a Baudrillardian 'implosion of the hyperreal' it would have little role to play, except as provider of ethnographic detail. This postmodernist concern with 'the crisis of representation' adds to earlier forms of ethnographic criticism that focus primarily on faults of contextualisation and which have produced ever higher standards in historical, political-economic,
ecological, demographic, statistical and legal backgrounding. Present worker finds that the major works on reflexive writing in anthropology (Hymes, 1969; Scholte, 1969; Asad, 1973; Rabinow, 1977; Said, 1978; Dwyer, 1982; Crapanzano, 1980; Marcus and Fisher, 1986; Clifford and Marcus, 1986; Haraway, 1991; Abu-Lughod, 1991) have given ethnographic researches a new irreversible dimension.

Ethnography in City: To an anthropologist cities have always existed in the mind as well as in physical structure. For many poor and disenfranchised a particular city can be assumed to be a utopia of possibility in which there will be economic wealth, job security, political refuge, and religious sanctity. Thus the utopia envisions a city in which no one was exploited or impoverished, because all worked. This has never been made a terrestrial reality particularly in the Third World situation. With the rise of the industrial city and the onset of mass media, the city can has its dystopian features as well. Urban areas are plagued by enormous and widespread poverty intermingled with prodigious wealth. The plight of the poor within the city has not been a facet of traditional anthropological inquiry until the prevalence of urban anthropology and studies that evolved in the late twentieth century (Liebow, 1967; Lewis, 1968; Hannerz, 1969 etc.).

Later in one such study on the Puerto Rican crack culture in East Harlem Bourgois (1995) spent three-and-a-half years among the harsh realities of the ghetto streets along with his family. Through his intimacy with the community, Bourgois seeks to tell us some things about the symbols and symptoms of urban ghetto life, the "Achilles heel of the richest industrialised nation in the world by documenting how it imposes racial segregation and economic marginalisation on so many of its Latino/a and African-American citizens." (Bourgois, 1995) Bourgois painstakingly records and analyses the exploits of these elements of Puerto Rican diaspora. Like pioneering Polish anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski, Bourgois's method of ethnographic research is that of participant observation, which he believes to be "better suited than exclusively quantitative methodologies for documenting the lives of people who live on the margins of a society that is hostile to them." (Bourgois, 1995) His research is a continuation of Malinowski's groundbreaking work in the field of economic anthropology as well as newer fields like political economy. His aim is to veer away from "ethnographic presentations of social marginalisation...guaranteed to be misread by the general public through a conservative, unforgiving lens." (Bourgois, 1995) Instead he means to build an alternative and critical understanding of the socially marginalised that does not tend to place the blame on the victims. This is to be achieved in "a manner that emphasises the interface between structural and oppression and individual action." (Bourgois, 1995)

Unlike traditional anthropologists, Bourgois is an advocate for change and reform. Bourgois' thoughts on the theory and practice of anthropological investigation are also of interest. "Suffering," he writes, "is usually hideous; it is a solvent of human integrity, and ethnographers never want to make the people they study look ugly. This is imperative to sanitise the vulnerable is particularly strong in the
US anthropology, where survival-of-the-fittest, blame-the-victim theories of individual action constitute a popular 'common sense'." (Bourgois, 1995; 17) He proposes a different common sense, in which poverty and hopelessness play key roles. Present worker observes that the works of Bourgois and Liebow are some of the pioneering attempts to 'decolonise' urban anthropology by synthesising in interpretative and reflexive ethnographic analysis.

Other frequently employed research methods associated with the qualitative research include action research (see Rapoport, 1970; Clark, 1972), phenomenology (see Husserl, 1960, 1963; Schultz, 1962, 1964) and its offshoot ethnomethodology (see Girfinkel, 1967; Ciocourel, 1973, 1947), Hermeneutics (see Radnitzky, 1970; Gadamer, 1976a; Ricoeur, 1974, 1976; Thompson, 1981), critical research (see Hirschheim and Klein, 1983) and grounded theory (Glaser, 1967, 1992; Strauss and Corbin, 1990, 1994, 1997).

3.1.2. QUANTITATIVE APPROACHES

It refers to standardised procedures for representing constructs in numerical form and may be treated in two dimensions: (1) verbal versus nonverbal: Verbal measures apply to written or spoken messages such as questionnaires, which produce verbal responses. Nonverbal measures apply to physical signs, including visual judgements of nonverbal behaviours such as blood pressures and categories of facial expression. (2) Obtrusive versus unobtrusive: Obtrusive measures intrude to a greater or lesser degree into the awareness of the person being measured like the conventional interviewing where the interviewee cannot help noticing an interviewer. Unobtrusive measures do not enter the awareness of the subject like when a rater who secretly counts behaviours in a city part or who analyses mortality records is using unobtrusive measures.

Reactivity refers to the behaviour change caused by the measuring procedures, which can threaten research validity. The degree of reaction to a measure depends on the topic being assessed. First, reactivity varies with the extent to which the subject controls the studied behaviour. In general, we can control our behaviours better than our nonverbal responses. Second, reactivity varies with the subject’s awareness of being studied. Usually, less obtrusive measures raise less concern about reactivity.

Most frequently used obtrusive verbal measures are interviews, projective tests and questionnaires. Unobtrusive verbal measures, on the other hand, consists of transmitting information from a sender to a receiver along any of several different channels: speech, body movements (called kinesics), touch, odour, body placement (called proxemics), facial expression, and eye movement and contact (called gaze). Obtrusive nonverbal measures can be measured in two ways: ratings of nonverbal behaviour and psycho-physiological measures. Unobtrusive, Nonverbal Observations consist of least reactive measures which are collected without the knowledge of or verbal reports from the subject and are consisting of physical traces and archival records.
Quantitative research has to depend on sample surveys because the alternatives to them are either a census (that is, a survey of everyone in the population which is only possible for a national government) or no information at all. A cross-sectional survey collects data at one time and researcher can generalise findings from such one-shot studies to the sampled population only at the time of the survey like one does in an opinion poll. A longitudinal survey, on the other hand, takes place over time with two or more data collections and has the benefit of measuring change over time. Longitudinal surveys commonly fall into one of three categories: panel survey (collects data at different times from the same informant), trend (keeps up with changes in the population by drawing a new sample at each measurement point), and cohort (measures fresh samples, each drawn from the same subpopulation called cohort as it moves through time). As with any research method, surveys risk various kinds of error. The first dimension includes the two categories of error: random error versus bias or nonrandom error. The second dimension includes the two major parts of the survey process: the sampling phase and the data collection phase.

Collecting and analysing data with quantitative strategies includes understanding the relationships among variables using descriptive and inferential statistics. Briefly, descriptive statistics are theoretical postulates used to draw inferences about populations and to estimate the parameters of those populations. Measures of central tendency and dispersion summarise the information contained in a sample and are usually provided in summary form, such as distributions, graphical and or numerical methods. Inferential statistics are based on descriptive statistics and assumptions that generalise to the population from a selected sample. These assumptions focus on the use of continuous data and that the sample is a random representation of the population. Inferences made at large use probabilities and probability distributions. Statistical evidence is especially important to policy makers or other stakeholders that have a personal stake in research/evaluation projects. With quantitative analysis, it is especially important to understand the units of measurement in comprehensible formats, such as visual representations. Graphs, charts, plots, and histograms adequately display raw data for a given context and chances of remembering visuals are greater than remembering numbers or text. Acquiring this working knowledge also includes skills in understanding scales and distributions.

3.2. SAMPLING

A sample is a finite part of a statistical population whose properties are studied to gain information about the whole (Webster, 1985). When dealing with people, it can be defined as a set of informants/informants (people) selected from a larger population for the purpose of a survey. A population is a group of individuals, persons, objects, or items from which samples are taken for measurement. In order to draw a sample in a representative way, researcher ideally would begin with a list or enumeration of all the elements in the population. In practice, he/she seldom can obtain
complete population lists. Therefore, researcher must work with some incomplete list called a sampling frame.

Sampling is the act, process, or technique of selecting a suitable sample, or a representative part of a population for determining parameters or characteristics of the whole population. The purpose of sampling is to draw conclusions about populations from samples, we must use inferential statistics which enables us to determine a population’s characteristics by directly observing only a portion (or sample) of the population. We obtain a sample rather than a complete enumeration (a census) of the population for many reasons. Obviously, it is cheaper to observe a part rather than the whole, but we should prepare ourselves to cope with the dangers of using samples.

Sampling error comprises the differences between the sample and the population that are due solely to the particular units that happen to have been selected. Sometimes errors are obvious and can be detected very easily. However, when the error is the less obvious sampling error against which nature offers very little protection. There are two basic causes for sampling error. The first cause is chance i.e. the error that occurs just because of accident. This may result in untypical choices as unusual units in a population do exist and there is always a possibility that an abnormally large number of them will be chosen. The second cause of sampling is sampling bias. Sampling bias is a tendency to favour the selection of units that have particular characteristics. Sampling bias is usually the result of a poor sampling plan. The most notable is the bias of non-response when for some reason some units have no chance of appearing in the sample.

Of the two types of statistical errors, only sampling error can be controlled by exercising care in determining the method for choosing the sample. As we know that the sampling error may be due to either bias or chance. The chance component (sometimes called random error) exists no matter how carefully the selection procedures are implemented, and the only way to minimise chance sampling errors is to select a sufficiently large sample. Sampling bias on the other hand may be minimised by the wise choice of a sampling procedure.

Types of Samples: There are two primary kinds of sampling methods: the random sampling and the purposeful or purposive (non-random) sampling. The random sample is one of the most important types of sample. A random sample allows a known probability that each elementary unit will be chosen. For this reason, it is sometimes referred to as a probability sample. This is the type of sampling that is used in lotteries and raffles. Major types of random samples include simple random sampling, systematic random sampling, stratified sampling and cluster sampling. Purposeful sampling, on the other hand, selects information rich cases for in-depth study. Size and specific cases depend on the study purpose (Patton, 1990). Major types of purposeful sampling are extreme and deviant case sampling, intensity sampling, maximum variation sampling, homogenous sampling, typical case sampling, stratified purposeful sampling, critical case sampling, snowball or chain
sampling, criterion sampling, theory based or operational construct sampling, confirming and disconfirming cases, opportunistic sampling, random purposeful sampling, sampling politically important cases, convenience sampling, judgement sampling and combination or mixed purposeful sampling (Johnson, 1990).

**Sample Size and a Representative Sample:** Before deciding how large a sample should be, one has to define one's study population and then determine a suitable sampling frame. One can then struggle with the sample size. In general, sample size depends on the nature of the analysis to be performed, the desired precision of the estimates one wishes to achieve, the kind and number of comparisons that will be made, the number of variables that have to be examined simultaneously and how heterogeneous a universe is sampled.⁵

Deciding on a sample size for qualitative inquiry can be even more difficult than quantitative because there are no definite rules to be followed. It will depend on what you want to know, the purpose of the inquiry, what is at stake, what will be useful, what will have credibility and what can be done with available time and resources. With fixed resources, which are always the cases, one can choose to study a specific phenomenon in depth with a smaller sample size or a bigger sample size when seeking breadth. In purposeful sampling, the sample should be judged on the basis of the purpose and rationale for each study and the sampling strategy used to achieve the studies purpose. The validity, meaningfulness, and insights generated from qualitative inquiry have more to do with the information-richness of the cases selected and the observational/analytical capabilities of the researcher than with sample size.

**Sampling in Anthropology:** In anthropology where the prediction is required about the behaviour of people, the sampling decision involves which people to observe. If the prediction is about an association between societal customs, the sampling decision involves which societies should be studied. Not only must investigators decide which cases to choose. No researcher can investigate all the possible cases, so choices must be made. Some choices are better than others.

Before a researcher can sample randomly, he or she must specify the sampling universe - that is, the list of cases to be sampled from. Suppose an anthropologist is doing fieldwork in a society. Unless the society is very small, it is usually not practical to use the whole society as the sampling universe. Because most fieldworkers want to remain in a community for a considerable length of time, the community usually becomes the sampling universe. If a cross-cultural researcher wants to test an explanation, he or she needs to sample the world's societies. However, we do not have descriptions of all the societies, past and present that have existed in the world. So samples are usually drawn from published lists of described societies that have been classified or coded according to standard cultural variables. Random sampling is still not employed that often in our discipline, but a non-random/purposeful sample might still be fairly representative if the investigator has not personally
chosen the cases for study. Anthropologists particularly concerned of any sample that may reflect the investigator's own biases or interests. For the present study, emphases during the selection of samples have been primarily on the representative samples rather than big or statistically significant samples.

3.3. Towards a Mixed-Method Research Design

Within the so-called quantitative tradition, quality standards have been defined using the concept of validity (Cook and Campbell, 1972). This concept is a cumulative process with four steps. The initial steps are to assess whether a relationship exists between two variables (conclusion validity) and to determine if this relationship is causal (internal validity). The third examines if the theoretical model is well depicted by the means through which it was operationalised (construct validity). Finally, external validity examines if, and to what extent, findings can be generalised to other groups, places, and times. This conceptualisation of validity has been very influential even within the so-called qualitative tradition, wherein a solid approach to assess the quality of interpretative inquiry is the truth-worthiness criteria (Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Guba and Lincoln, 1989). Besides the critiques to the classical approach of validity, these criteria include the notions of credibility and transferability that are parallels to the concepts of internal validity and external validity, respectively.

A Discourse on Mixed Method: Present worker feels that it would be false to contrast traditional social science methods (generally quantitative) with those, which seek to fill in the cultural context. All studies deal in material that is inherently comparative. So, quantitative research is not best suited where subjects can be extracted from a cultural context and made to produce data free of that context. Rather, quantitative research is simply where a phenomenon can be rendered into numbers (whether these are complex behaviours measured by observers or yes/no answers on a questionnaire). Quantitative research is therefore more accurately contrasted with research that works with categories of things.

Conversely, qualitative research should not be contrasted with quantitative research, but with particularistic research. The methods dealt with in this guide generally traffic in nominal, or categorical, data. These methods generally go to lengths to discover those categories although numerical data is used more and more to help model how people conceive of categories of things (multidimensional scaling, cluster analysis, cultural consensus analysis, some kinds of content analysis, etc.).

While some qualitative researchers might argue that the concept of validity as used in the quantitative research paradigm has no place in qualitative research, there do exist some conceptual counterparts to validity in qualitative/ethnographic methods. The concept closest to internal validity in quantitative research is credibility (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The credibility of the research tool, be it observation, interview, or ethnography, is judged by the informants themselves. In other words, it is judged from the point of view of the people closest to the phenomenon being studied. The conceptual counterpart
of external validity, the validity of any set of research findings for a particular setting, is transferability or applicability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The general concept of reliability in quantitative research is similar to the concepts of dependability or consistency in qualitative research (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In ethnography, for example, the question of how dependable the data are is an important one. Some researchers at one end of the epistemological spectrum, however, may reject the notion of dependability or consistency based on the assumption that each phenomenon is rooted in a particular place and time, as viewed by a particular observer who is inextricable from the phenomenon, and therefore cannot be replicated or reproduced.

Quantitative research is predicated upon the assumption of objectivity, that the researcher does not bias the studied phenomenon or the results in any way. The closest principle in qualitative research to objectivity is confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Confirmability refers to the quality of the data—whether other observers or interpreters can confirm the data. Again, some researchers using qualitative methods may reject the notion of confirmability altogether based on different epistemological assumptions. Whereas the notion of generalisability is taken for granted in quantitative research once random sampling is in place, the concept is actually more carefully considered in qualitative research. Instead of assuming that findings can be generalised, the transferability of findings to a particular group or population is evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Thus, generalisability does not depend on sampling strategy but rather on substantive data (Patton, 1980). Without the contingency of generalisability on random sampling, qualitative researchers are free to use a variety of sampling strategies depending on the purposes of the study. Sampling strategies include extreme or deviant cases, typical cases, maximum variation, critical cases, and sample of convenience (Patton, 1980).

3.4. DOING THE PRESENT RESEARCH
In the earlier part of this chapter present worker elaborated the different methodological issues before an anthropologist started a fieldwork especially in the urban setting. Now the present worker finds it necessary to discuss on the methods actually used in the present fieldwork in some detail.

3.4.1. Selection of the Present Fieldsites
Traditionally, anthropologists have undertaken ethnographic research in small, bounded villages while living among the relatively few so-called inhabitants of those villages. These anthropologists may have been one of few so-called non-natives in that part of the world and may have been one of the first non-natives that the villagers had ever seen. It may have taken these researchers a year or more in the field to gain the language skills necessary for communication before becoming able to fashion appropriate guiding questions. These long stretches away from their homelands may have been very stressful.
Today, however, fieldsites can be nearly anywhere for an anthropologist. Research may still focus on village life, but it is also increasingly likely to take place in urban locales or in the native language of the anthropologist. Sometimes the "group" among whom one wants to study does not live in one location, and our main fieldsite can be a workplace (like a bank) or a religious centre (like a mosque) or a generic meeting room where some group meets regularly (like a library meeting room where not only alcoholics make anonymous meetings, but also other things also take place) or even in cyberspace (like a chat room). "Multi-sited" fieldwork, which allows anthropologist to engage in research in more than one locale for comparative purposes, is also common in the present studies in anthropology. Present work was done in one such multi-sited field in an urban locale in Third World where the present worker would be able to speak in his own language as almost all informants in all the fieldsites studied here could speak in Bangla (Bengali).

As present research design sought to explain social dynamics of the marginalisation of population and child labour in a Third World city like Calcutta (now Kolkata), the three populations (settlements) were selected here to study on the basis of their different conditions of urban marginality in the city of Calcutta (now Kolkata). Population I was a squatter settlement on the southern edge of the Park Circus – Eastern Metropolitan Bypass Connector in the North Eastern part of the city (in the Ward No. 36 of Kolkata Municipal Corporation) which was evicted on 25th November, 1995 to expand the Connector (see Map 2, Map 3 in the appendix). Population II was a squatter settlement in the North Central part of the city (in the Ward No. 59 of Kolkata Municipal Corporation) and on the eastern side of the Canal West Road near Narkeldanga Police Station which had been devastated by fire on 26th January, 1999 and finally evicted on 10th December 2002 as a part of implementing the Ganga Action Plan (see Map 4, Map 5 in the appendix). Population III (27, Gobra Gorosthan Road in the Ward No. 65 of Kolkata Municipal Corporation), on the other hand, was a recognised slum settlement in the North Western part of Calcutta (now Kolkata) (see Map 6, Map in the appendix).

Population I was studied (during the November and December of 1993, January and February 1994 and September and October 1995) on the basis of an information on the widening of Park Circus – Eastern Metropolitan Bypass Connector which would cause the eviction of this settlement on the southern edge of the Connector. The selection of this particular population was purposively done (Extreme Case Sampling) as the crisis related to eviction of a population was apprehended in that settlement. Present worker found it appropriate to initiate the study on the processes of urban marginalisation in Population I because this population was facing an imminent threat of eviction and thus immediately fitted into the definition of urban marginalisation.

Having studied the Population I for a considerable period of time, the issue of the selection of other populations became particularly complicated. Primary concern of the present worker at that time was to extend his observation on the urban marginalisation as well as to make a comparative study with a population which was also marginalised but got some meaningful programme for their development.
Thus the present worker began selecting two such populations (one without any security of tenure for the extension of observations made on Population I and the other with some kind of security of tenure for the comparative accounts on urban marginalisation) in the city of Calcutta (now Kolkata).

To start with present worker would like to emphasise here that as the present study is on the urban marginals in the city of Calcutta (now Kolkata) it might comprise of persons/populations from various sections of the city population like pavement-dwellers, beggars, teeters, and many groups who can also be called urban marginals. However, present research needed long-term intensive fieldwork and thus the population to be studied for this purpose must remain in a given space throughout the study period (which normally ranges between 5 to 6 years as in the present study). Primarily, this factor brought the present worker close to the study of urban marginalised population living in self-help makeshift ‘marginal’ settlements with grossly inadequate and sometimes almost non-existent urban basic amenities in the city of Calcutta (now Kolkata) which could be studied for a longer period. In Calcutta (now Kolkata), like any other Third World cities, such settlements are temporarily built on ‘useless’ urban land or on property they either do not hold title to or have later been authorised by the government to live on by promulgating some acts but legally can not sell. In the city of Calcutta (now Kolkata) the Squatter Settlements or Jhupris are one such category of marginal settlements where the housing condition is poor and the settlements lack the security of tenure as well as the basic infrastructural services (which would be called here as ‘collective consumption’). The Slums or Bustees also fall under such category of marginal settlements where the residents have constructed semi-permanent/permanent buildings which have later been authorised/legalised by the government through the promulgation of Calcutta Thika and Other Tenancies and Lands (Acquisition and Regulation) Act, 1981 (Shukla, 2000).

Squatter settlements in the city of Calcutta (now Kolkata) do not have any legal endorsement. Neither any official account is presently available on the locations of the squatter settlements or number and condition of the people living in those settlements. However, according to the informed sources, the squatter settlements along the two sides of the Beliaghata-Circular Canal (locally known as Khalper Jhupri) right from a place called Orange Sura down to the bank of Ganges (a stretch of more than 7 km) was doubtlessly the biggest concentration of the squatter settlements and reportedly the oldest concentration of the squatter settlements in Calcutta (now Kolkata) during the present fieldwork. More than 20,000 people made their makeshift houses (marginal settlements) in these settlements and were found to be living with little or no provision of collective consumption. At the time of taking up the study, present worker was aware of the fact that these squatter settlements would also be evicted due to an impending Ganga Action Plan. Present worker embarked on a long-term anthropological study among these people with the expectation that he would get enough time for such a study before these settlements would get eroded from the landscape of the city of Calcutta (now Kolkata). Thus these squatter settlements provided a unique opportunity for the present worker to study social
dynamics of the marginalisation of population in Calcutta (now Kolkata). Then the vital question came on which part of these squatter settlements was to be taken up for the long-term intensive study as studying the whole stretch on the two sides of Beliaghata canal was neither prudent nor feasible (anthropologically speaking). This factor brought the present worker in front of one key question regarding the feature of urban marginalisation i.e. socially cognisant features concomitant with the process of urban marginalisation. Present worker used judgement sampling in the particular sections of this Khalpar Jhupri stretch instead of going for random sampling for two reasons: i) random sampling of nearly 20,000 of these people required an enumeration or at least a sampling frame from a credible official source which was absent in this case; ii) at the same time without going in-depth to some of the families or individuals of the population selected by random sampling among these people might over-sensitise the researcher about some findings and simultaneously might even underplay some other findings.

Thus having decided that he would purposefully select a part of Khalpar Jhupri stretch for an in-depth study, present worker started the processes of selecting a particular part of the settlement for study which had a population of mixed nature in terms of language and religion. The reason of looking for mixed feature of population was to observe the social dynamics of these marginalised people in a true cosmopolitan ambience. To find the particular part of these squatter settlements having these features, present worker made an exploratory study (during May and June 1993) on the language as well as on the religious composition in the various parts of this Khalpar Jhupri stretch and short-listed three such sections of population for taking up a long-term study. Thus present worker started conducting few initial studies (October, November and December 1994) in all these three short-listed stretches of the Khalpar population. In one such stretches present worker found few hostile persons (presumably with some vested interests for continuing some so-called ‘illegal’ businesses) who were impeding the information exchanges which could be rather inconvenient for any in-depth study. In another such short-listed settlement, the absence of any strong local contact as well as due to some political interventions various reluctances and confusions cropped up among the settlers during the study. In the third settlement (which was second in the sequence of initiating study in the short-listed sections) present worker found himself in a position to continue his present study for a long period (January, February, May and June 1995; January, February and March 1996; December 1997; January and February 1998; May and June 1999; December, 2000; May and June 2001; October as well for a brief period in December 2002).

Selection of the third population was also a long drawn process. At the same time, present worker intended to study the entire spectrum of urban marginalisation in the city of Calcutta (now Kolkata) and had already selected the Population II before coming to the Population III. Thus the present worker decided to study a marginal settlement with some sort of security of tenure i.e. the Slum settlement or Bustee. Present worker decided to take up the third population on the basis of the fact
that the population in question received some kind of programme over a long period of time in the form of security of tenure so that the population might be treated as the Programme Group in comparison with the other two populations (two populations in combination called here as the Control Group or Comparison Group) which did not receive any such programme in term of security of tenure. There are many such slums or bustees in the city of Calcutta (now Kolkata) which have been recognised by the Calcutta Thika and Other Tenancies and Lands (Acquisition and Regulation) Act, 1981. In Calcutta (now Kolkata), according to 2001 census there are more than 1.49 million of 4.58 million people living in slums. Selecting one particular slum became necessary for the present worker for long-term intensive study. The process of selection of the Population III was again a somewhat purposive one. Present worker inclined to select one such recognised slum which came under the Thika Tenancy Act in 1981 and

i) was incepted at least 10 years before the promulgation Thika Tenancy Act 1981 and which bore the history of organised resistance against the landlords as well as against the West Bengal Slum Area (Improvement and Clearance) Act in 1972 under which act then West Bengal government was acquiring of land for the implementation of some urban improvement programmes;

ii) did have a history of forming self-help groups to improve their living conditions like community toilets, repairing roads inside the slums or any other means of collective consumption prior to the commencement of Bustee Improvement Programme or BIP in 1977 and Calcutta Urban Development Project or CUDP-I (1971-1977), CUDP-II (1977-1982) and CUDP-III, or even during these programmes;

iii) did not have of many recent migrants (i.e. migrants during last two years from initial study period of November and December 1995);

iv) did have various kinds of occupations ranging from working in traditional sector of economy to working in informal sector of the economy on daily wage basis.

For the list of recognised bustees present worker went through the records in KMC's Bustee Department. From that list (happened to be a somewhat incomplete list) present worker shortlisted the bustees formed before 1971 (again somewhat incomplete as the histories of those slums are not properly kept and there is no other alternative way to retrieve such history now). Present worker then took the help of Kolkata Basti Federation with that list and found that there were at least 20 such recognised slums having a history of resistance for their survival from late 1960s. Present worker then conducted an exploratory research in those slums to find all the other factors and found at least three slums in the northern part, western part and present one in north western part of Calcutta (now Kolkata) which fulfilled the above factors. Present worker began his initial study in one such north Calcutta (now Kolkata) slum at the Cossipore and in another such west Calcutta (now Kolkata) slum at the Metiabruz region (during May, June and July 1996). But due to the reluctance of some of the local contacts present worker envisaged difficulty in starting any long-term study in both the slums.

Once a potential fieldsite were selected, present worker had to negotiate the entry. This involved getting permission to visit the site for research purposes from the members and quite often from a person in authority in the site or groups as well.

3.4.2. Gaining Entry in the Present Field

In an anthropological work field researcher must attend the setting during the interactions of interest and occupy a role that does not cause the actors to change their natural behaviour. Of course, the researcher can attempt to gather data by interview only. Sometimes, one or more key informants will provide information to the interviewer. However, data drawn only from informants leave the risk that they will mislead the researcher. Even if the informants speak in good faith, one might doubt their accuracy. Some key informants may be deviant members of their own community and, therefore, not well placed to describe it to others (see Bernard, 1988).

Thus the present field researcher had to attend the setting during the interactions of interest and occupy a role that would not cause the actors to change their natural behaviour. Though the present worker initially attempted to gather data from the informant’s verbal materials from one or more key informants, he was aware of the fact that the data drawn only from some informants leave the risk that they might mislead the present researcher.

Informants in the present work initially served as contacts linking the present researcher to the informant’s network. Present researcher began the entry process by persuading one or more members of the setting to accept him. The method of gaining acceptance by key members of a setting varied with the nature of the settings. Sometimes, the key informants knew the present worker’s role and in other cases they did not. In both cases, the present researcher’s role permitted him to be curious and in need of instruction by other members. Such a student role sometimes worked very well and seemed natural.

3.4.3. Rapport Building in the Present Fieldwork

Cooperation of the informants is absolutely necessary for any kind of rapport building process in a fieldsite. In most of the times during the present worker, this cooperation was ensured by just ‘being there’ in the fields for long periods and participating in the informal chats with the informants. The biggest challenge of the rapport building process in the present field was to alleviate apprehension among the informants on the goal of the study. Anthropological field studies in the urban settings are particularly expected to face this challenge right on the onset of their fieldworks (see Abu-Lughod, 1991 and Bourgois, 1995). Present worker tried to deal with this problem by getting the informants and/or the so-called ‘gate-keepers’ convincing on the goal of the study. The second big challenge of
rapport building faced by the present worker during his study was the impediments on exploration of some of the problems. These exploratory researches did not permit much time to settle for the informants which was so much important in building the rapport in the present fieldwork. Primarily, to overcome this problem present worker tried to make repeated explanations on his research apart from avoiding asking for ‘meaning’ and ask for ‘use’ as meaning emerged from repeated observation of some of the facts.

3.4.4. Informal Interviews in the Present Fieldwork
The most common use of the interview in social sciences including in anthropology in India still now was a highly structured one, with every question asked in the same words and in the same order which amounts to a questionnaire. In the present fieldwork it was observed that the presence or absence of an interviewer, the rapport between interviewer and interviewee, and degree of standardisation of questions could greatly influence the informant’s answers.

In the present fieldwork it was also observed that the open-ended semi-structured interviewing is crucial for in-depth learning on a domain. For the purpose of such an interview preparation of a list of short questions (with only one aspect of a topic) as prompts rather than a questionnaire format proved to be particularly helpful in the present fieldwork.

3.4.5. Selection of Informants
This selection process was particularly important in the present study as the present worker had to choose the informants from a vast pool of persons. Anthropologists always follow following factors during selecting the informants.

i. The informants must be encultured with a history of living in the setting for sufficiently long time and engaged in an activity (though the activity might be unknown to the fieldworker) based in the present setting;
ii. The informants must have representativeness, namely, a) have both formal and informal position in the community or population under study, b) have a kind of consensus in the population under study that the prospective informants have knowledge on the population, and c) have a social network so that they can provide access to different sections of the population.
iii. The informants must be articulate, observant and able to give precise information without much analysis;
iv. The informants should be capable of follow the method of investigation and
v. They must be able to act as intermediaries or “guides”.

Present worker tried to select the informants mostly on the basis of the above factors from the populations under study but sometimes had to deal with a less ideal situation.
3.4.6. Key Informant Interviewing in the Present Fieldwork

As indicated earlier, present worker was heavily dependent on some key informants for gaining entry and making interactions of interest in the desired fields. These key informants, in most cases, became very close to the present worker. Interviewing these key informants was like an intimate and personal sharing of confidence with trusted friend which was built over time.

Selecting a Key Informant: On the basis of judgement sampling present worker always tried to select a key informant on a particular issue in a particular settlement who was i) a member of the population; ii) knowledgeable about the topic of interest; iii) sufficiently encultured; iv) currently involved in the domain of interest or recently experienced; v) contemplative individual, capable of making comparison and can explain discrepancies; vi) some staying around in the population for a while and not a recent entrant; and vii) someone with whom the present worker develop a kind of social relationship.

In most cases community leaders and other influential people were discussed to locate as well as select potential key informants and then the present worker cross-checked it by using a sort of consensus analysis by taking the responses of some other informants.

Settings for Key Interviews: Especially when starting out present worker had let the key informants select the settings which in most cases were at doorsteps of the key informants' house (Informant's Turf: Informant in Control). Later present worker gradually tried to change the turf with shared control. It was always tried that some kind of privacy and quietness were maintained in the setting for key information taking. As the present fieldwork, in most of times, was done among the poverty-stricken marginalised people present worker deliberately avoided the offers for tea or cookies from these people but sometimes for the sake of cordiality these offers were not rejected.

Interviewing Key Informants: During the present fieldwork different types of interviews were employed according to the specific requirements. Hence when the knowledge of the present worker about any given topic was very low then unstructured interactive interview technique suitable for exploratory research was employed where the key informants were allowed to tell their story with minimal interruption and with mostly 'situational listening'. Narrowing the ‘funnel’ with semi-structured and structured interviewing techniques was done much later when the confidence on the key informants as well as knowledge on the desired topic grew further.

Method of Recording Information: Various methods of recording information were employed in the present fieldwork. But sometimes recording information proved to be difficult and even counterproductive in the present fieldwork.

a) Written notes: It is traditionally the prevalent method of recording information in anthropological fieldworks except during the initial phases of interviewing where note taking are avoided in front of the informants but the notes are generally made immediately afterwards. Present worker recorded
b) Tape recording: This method of recording information was also employed especially during later stage longer interviews as tape recorder took several times the amount of interview than one using only written notes. But in most cases present worker used the combination of two methods i.e. taking notes and using tape recorder for the items missed.

3.4.7. Observation

Observation, as a method of data acquiring, played a crucial role in the anthropological fieldworks through the history of this discipline because it gives anthropologists the glimpses of actual behaviour as opposed to reported behaviour. The epistemological question of ‘how we know things’ with its contesting domains of rationalism (i.e. a priori truths, such as right or wrong), empiricism (learn from experience) or Kantian view (learn because of the way our brains are wired) can also get involved when one analyses the technique of observation in the actual fieldwork. Among the various observation methods participant observation (or unobtrusive-unstructured observation), unstructured focused observation and sometimes structured observation were employed in the present work.

3.4.7.1. Participant Observation

As a participant observer, the researcher pretends to join or actually is a member of a group and records data about that group. The group does not know they are being observed for research purposes. Here, the observer may take on a number of roles. First, the observer may decide to become a complete-participant in which they are studying. For instance, if the researcher is a member of an urban gang and study the gang operation as well as inter-gang rivalry the researcher would be considered a complete-participant observer. On the other hand, the researcher may decide to only participate casually in the group while collecting observations. In this case, any contact with group members is by acquaintance only. Here the researcher would be considered an observer-participant. Finally, if the researcher develop an identity with the group members but do not engage in important group activities the researcher would be consider as a participant-observer. An example would be joining an urbangang but not participating in any of their important activities like drug addiction. The researcher would, however, considered a member of the gang and trusted by all of the members (see Bourgois, 1995). Ethically, participant-observers have many problems. Certainly there are degrees of deception at work. The sensitivity of the topic and the degree of confidentiality are important issues to consider. Present work, like most of anthropological works in urban settings, was more akin to the last role of a participant observer where the present worker developed an identity with the population under study but did not participate in the major activities (normal or deviant). It must be emphasised
here that though present worker, at certain juncture of study, stayed as much as 12 to 14 hours in the field, he very seldom stayed in the field. The main reason for staying out of field was the reason that most of these people did not have adequate space to accommodate themselves. Present worker preferred to stay at a nearby shelter outside the field, especially during the study of Population II, so that the field could be reached at an early morning. During the fieldwork in Population III, present worker sometimes had stayed in some of his key informants' houses.

Speech-in-Action: In the present fieldwork participant observation started with ‘speech-in-action’. As the present worker watch and listen in a wide-ranging manner (though within parameters set by the research questions that brought the present worker there), he learnt to understand culturally meaningful factors among these people by this method of participant observation employed particularly in the urban areas. As mentioned earlier, the speech events in the fieldwork usually go along two traditional continuums discerned by different anthropologists (see Agar, 1980; Briggs, 1988). The first is situational: from speech events in which the anthropological fieldworker comes to the informant (in settings where the informant would be present anyway) to speech events in which the informant comes to the anthropological fieldworker and assumes the seated informant role. The second continuum is one of control: from events where the informant speaks freely to events where the anthropological fieldworker actively directs the informant’s speech. The situation continuum is split between the informant’s turf – finding the informants where they are – and the ethnographer’s turf. Sometimes, the anthropologist takes over the informant’s turf and talks with the informant in his or her place. The turf then becomes the ethnographer’s; the informant is not in exactly the place he or she would otherwise be. doing what he or she would otherwise be doing. Speech events that transpire on the informant’s turf are called speech-in-action and those on the ethnographer’s turf are interviews. The control continuum is also divided into sectors where the informant controls the topicality (what he or she says); sectors where control is shared by informant and ethnographer; and sectors where the ethnographer controls the informant’s speech, or attempts to. Analyses of participant observation have noted both the value of “volunteered,” spontaneous informant statements and the importance of directed interviews (see Paul, 1953; Becker and Geer, 1960). The speech events of fieldwork also move from wide to narrow, from the open to more a focused one like Agar’s funnel (see Agar, 1980). During the present fieldwork this speech-in-action event started on the informant’s turf with informant in control and later present worker tried to change the turf with shared control.

Most of the ethnographic studies in urban settings are composed largely on the ethnographic interviews. As Powdermaker indicated that anthropologists seem to avoid the discoveries of speech-in-action and move off the informant’s turf and thus the research gets impoverished (see Powdermaker, 1966). Ethnographers need to see as much of their informant’s turf as they can and should not narrow the funnel too early, even in urban settings where doing so is difficult (see Keiser, 1970; Bohannan, 1981; Wolcott, 1990 and Bourgois, 1995). Present work which spanned for a longer
period in each settlement (though with interruptions) was careful in this respect and tried to spend as much time as possible in the speech-in-action process especially during key informant interviewing.

The participant observer also runs the risk of being biased by the feelings, loyalties, or antagonisms generated by the setting and the actors in it. To achieve access to the most secret behaviours and perceptions of the actors, the observer must seem trustworthy and likable. Most people would find it difficult to gain the necessary trust and friendship without returning some genuine affection. As a result of these feelings, the observer may leave the neutral role of scientist and adopt the role of committed member in the setting, a role shift called *going native*. It is a hazard of participant observation and it was more than a possibility for the present worker during this fieldwork. But the data collection process in the present fieldwork was concluded before any indication of this role shift on the part of the present worker.

3.4.7.2. Unstructured Focused Observation

In the present research design unstructured focused observations were particularly helpful during the exploratory part of the research. This form of observation in the present work was mostly consisted of recording (in the form of note-taking) what the present worker saw and heard with a special emphasis on thick, detailed description. Though anthropologists (in some situations) prefer video and film technology to make these records present worker avoided this mode of recording in most of the times as in a Third World urban situation like the present one it proved to be less effective for various reasons like i) this technology is limited to the field of lens which is not always cost-effective in a Third World situation like this; ii) it takes a special kind of training for the recorder to properly use this medium of recording; iii) it was neither cost-effective nor prudent to carry other people trained in this medium (who are not remotely interested in the present domain of research) to the field which might have upset the settings; and iv) when working among the poverty-stricken marginalised people in a Third World urban situation, the presence of some high-tech gadgets may sometimes be proved to be an unwarranted cultural shock.

In the present work this type of observation started at the pan-Calcutta (now Kolkata) level for each kind of urban marginality. It helped to narrow down the observation to the neighbourhood level where initially a stroll with some local contact worked very effectively. Then the present worker focused his observation at the household level in each settlement which was followed by observing individuals. The major problem that a fieldworker usually faces in the field is what to observe and why. This problem brought the present worker to the question of sampling in observation and in this fieldwork sampling in observation was not random but purposive with specific need in mind.

During observation present worker always made note on *who*, *where*, *when*, *what* (breaking the behaviours into discrete units) and *why* (putting interpretations of some observation e.g. see mother hit child, but before that child was stealing rupees, need to be accurately recorded). These led the
present worker to identify the “key behaviours” that were related to his topic of interest and what did not happen in the setting.

3.4.7.3. Structured Observation
After the unstructured focused observation present worker employed structured observations as a part of an effort to quantify the record of some key behaviours previously identified. It can be done by continuous monitoring observations for an extended period of time where the observer (generally working with a trained team) watches a subject(s) for a specific period of time and records their behaviour as faithfully as possible, following a structured format with time, location and features of importance. This mode of structured observations could not be employed in the present fieldwork for two reasons. One the absence of any trained observation team which could garner data from a wide-range of key behaviours in a complex urban setting like the present one and second the fact that the present worker had not been able to live in the field during the fieldwork.

Alternatively, the structured observation can be done by spot check observations where the observation appears at randomly selected places/times and records people’s activities. In the present fieldwork this form of structured observations were sometimes employed to record key behaviours. This form of observation, which mostly entails minimal interaction, proved to be less reactive in the present field than the interview techniques. Present worker tried to reduce the reactivity further by repeated and extended observations. This form of observation in the present fieldwork went on in the following way: a) generating list of potential key behaviours through key informant interviews; b) conducting research to identify new key behaviours for structured observations; c) identifying actors, locations, times and events associated with key behaviours; and d) implementing data collection and data management. One caveat must be added here that this form of observation was employed at the advanced stages of the present fieldwork.

3.4.8. Free Lists
Free lists method was employed to determine discernable items in the given cultural domain and to differentiate between items that are culturally cognisant or salient and those which are not. Free lists method was used as an effort to have a preliminary outline of the research domain which was new for the present researcher when he started his work in 1992 with a notion that the frequency that a term is mentioned in a group supports its inclusion in a cultural domain. It was initially an extremely challenging job for the present researcher to find the appropriate generic term to start the listing process and sometimes the lists became either too long or too brief. It started in the present fieldwork with a primary question to generate items in that cultural domain:

‘What are the basic requisites of life you can think of?’

A pre-test was done in the present fieldwork with some key informants to ensure that this primary question works. It was not an open-ended question. The informants were asked to name all the basic
requisites of life he can think of and no clue of the examples of answers was given. The next step was
to ask the secondary question to give clarification to distinguish items given as response to primary
free list question:

*Which of these basic requisites of life are most important for your livelihood?*

For this secondary question the selection of knowledgeable as well adequate number of informants
was highly required in the present fieldwork.

### 3.4.9. Ranking

Ranking method was also used for the purpose of ordering domain items on a dimension. Thus in the
above secondary question a ranking from most to least was tried in each case and a good deal of
individual differences was found that eventually proved to be a great source of very important
information. The data were plotted according to the frequency of items and a cut off point was
selected somewhere in the middle of the steep slops.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANY</th>
<th>FEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of times item mentioned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Freq.</td>
<td>Least Freq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4.10. Case Study

As indicated earlier, case study involves a detailed ethnographic example which focuses on specific
individuals or incidents. In the 1950s and 1960s this case study method matured under the aegis of the
Manchester school of Max Gluckman and his students as a part of an effort to valorise the notion of
social dynamics in anthropology in the age of simplistic functional models in the discipline. In the
present work this method was employed frequently in conjunction with other methods to get to
explain social dynamics of marginalisation in a Third World urban situation.

A case study can be done both by interviewing and observation on a single individual or incident. It
proved very much helpful in the present fieldwork during the advanced stages of observation because
pure observation does not interfere with subjects’ thinking or encourages prepared or anticipated
answers. Present worker must also admit here that a complete unbiased case study can be myth as for
a human researcher because it is very difficult to be completely detached while observing human
interaction and thus there is always the opportunity for subtle bias or observation slant.
3.4.11. Fieldnotes

Anthropologists must take useful and reliable notes regarding the details of life in their research contexts. These fieldnotes will constitute a major part of the data on which later conclusions will be based. There are four major parts of anthropological fieldnotes, which should be kept distinct from one another in some way when anthropologists are writing them: a) jottings are the brief words or phrases written down while at the fieldsite or in a situation about which more complete notes will be written later; b) description of everything we can remember about the occasion like - a meal, a ritual, a meeting, a sequence of events, etc. c) analysis of what has been learned in the setting regarding the guiding question and other related points; d) reflection on what has been learned of a personal nature.

Present worker would like to stress on the fact that during the present fieldwork most of times these sequences could not be followed as sometimes taking fieldnotes proved to be a counterproductive one due to the special nature of the present field. Present worker at several times during this fieldwork reconstructed the notes immediately after leaving the field.

3.4.12. Data Analysis

In anthropology, data analysis most usually takes place throughout the project. That is to say, we learn from the data we gather during one visit to the field helps us learn what to watch for, notice, or ask during the next visit. As fieldwork progresses, constantly refining of our ideas of what might be happening at the site. At this level, data analysis becomes an ongoing process and helps fieldwork gain momentum towards useful information. Presumably there eventually comes a point when we turn our attention more fully to working with the data we have gathered already, often after leaving or limiting visits to the fieldsite and there is no single canonical way to approach anthropological data. However, majority of the anthropologists try to approach the data analysis with many of the following points which often has proved to be useful in helping the anthropologists arrive at some conclusions: a) reading through the fieldnotes, notes on interviews, interview transcripts, site documents, or whatever data was gathered several times; b) marking the data and take notes on any patterns, connections, similarities, or contrastive points in the data; c) facilitating the above process, called coding, by using a computer-assisted data analysis program like Nud/ist or Ethnograph; d) following up on what you noticed above by looking for "local categories of meaning" in the data; e) testing the categories and explanations to draw out of the data against the variety of recorded cases; f) trying triangulating among the various forms of gathered data; g) trying "informant validation", or explaining developing conclusions to the informants.

While all the above steps of data analysis were equally important the data analysis in the present work at most of the times had to rely on some (not all) of these points. Present work did not use any computer-assisted qualitative data analysing software like Nud/ist or Ethnograph. At the same time present worker did not use informant validation for two reasons. One, the informants in both Population I and Population II were not available for such validation after their eviction. Two, the
informants are still socially positioned, and may or may not agree with the analysis in part based on their positions or perspectives within the social network have investigated. Moreover, agreement or disagreement from informants does not necessarily make the analysis right or wrong. Once the present worker arrived at some conclusions regarding the data gathered, he had to consider the question of how to focus on the respective guiding question that drove the research. Remembering that the thesis sentence must be an answer to the guiding question, it is important to work back and forth between the emerging conclusions and guiding question to produce a cohesive report.

Above discourses on the methodological issues before the present study on the marginalisation of urban population and child labour in Calcutta brought the present worker on the brink of a conclusion that the present day globalised capitalist development (in Schumpeter’s word benevolent capitalist development) wrought several positive fundamental as well as irreversible changes in the urban life but as Southall notes, “All the most admirable and desirable achievements have been intensified in the city, as have the worst horrors” (1997:1). This treatise has endeavoured to outline the methodological considerations emanating from present fieldwork in a Third World city like Calcutta (now Kolkata) where such diametrically opposite achievements found particularly during the last few years and present worker found no sign of abetting the worst horrors in the life of the urban marginals in the next few years due to the ruthless SAP related conditionality. Next chapter would deal with the crucial results and analyses (mostly in quantitative terms) of the finds from the present fieldwork.
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1 Ideographic approach focuses on the particulars of the individual person, place, or time under study without trying to generalise or discover universal laws. A pure form of the idiographic approach assumes that each person requires a unique set of descriptors. Scholars taking the idiographic approach to human personality would describe each person as a separate case without reference to any other.

2 The term nomothetic refers to the science of general laws or properties. This approach strives to discover regular patterns that hold in different times and places. Social and cultural anthropologists do not raise one of their theories to the status of law even after repeated supportive finds. Nevertheless, researchers in the nomothetic tradition hope to find general, lawful relationships.

3 Reliability measures include different types of correlations:

a) *Inter-item* (also called *consistency*): Measured by correlation among items within test, sources of errors are within the test and may not be generalised across raters; b) *Test-retest* (also called *stability*): Measured between two administrations of the same test, sources of errors are different occasions as well as within test and confounded by memory of first test and real development; c) *Parallel forms*: Measured by correlation between two forms of the test, sources of errors are different occasions and forms as well as within test and confounded by real development; and d) *Inter-rater* (also called *equivalence*): Measured by correlation between raters, sources of errors are differences in raters as well as within test and interobserver agreement percentages may pose problems.

4 Different types of validity measurements are found in social research methodology:
a) Construct Validity: Extend to which the measure reflects the theoretical concept it is supposed to measure. Most important in social research because it addresses the threat that the measures employed does not pertain to the theory in question; i) Convergent-discriminant: The measure should agree with other measures of the same construct and disagree with measures of different constructs. ii) Theoretical-experimental: The measure should be related to other variables in a study in a way consistent with the theory; iii) Factor-analysis: The measure should have the theoretically expectable factor structure (usually unidimensional).

b) Criterion Validity: Extent to which measure agrees with some other measure believed to be a direct and accurate reflection of the behaviour or characteristic in question. i) Predictive: Relationship of measure to later criterion (often for selection or forecasting purposes); ii) Concurrent: Relationship of measure to simultaneously available criterion (often for test equivalence or categorising criterion measure); iii) Postdictive: Relationship of measure to previously measured criterion (often for same purpose as concurrent criterion validation); iv) Content (or face): Extent to which measure tests or covers the requisite topics, usually based on expert judgement and applied to assessment of achievement tests.

More technical considerations suggest that the required sample size is a function of the precision of the estimates one wishes to achieve, the variability or variance, one expects to find in the population and the statistical level of confidence one wishes to use. The sample size N required to estimate a population mean (average) with a given level of precision is:

The square root of N = (1.96)*σ/precision

Where and is the population standard deviation of the variable whose mean one is interested in estimating. Precision refers to width of the interval one is willing to tolerate and 1.96 reflects the confidence level (Salant and Dillman, 1994). For example, to estimate mean earnings in a population with an accuracy of $100 per year, using a 95% confidence interval and assuming that the standard deviation of earnings in the population is $1600.0, the required sample size is 983: [(1.96)(1600/100)] squared.

For the types of validity as well as reliability in social research see footnotes 4 and 3.

7 These sources included some activists on the rights of the dwellers of these Khalapur Jhupris and some seasoned research workers on these people in the city of Calcutta (now Kolkata) like my supervisor Dr. Sudhendu Mukherjee. Present worker also corroborated this opinion by making some exploratory studies in various parts of the city of Calcutta (now Kolkata) including the Khalpar region.

8 For detail of this Act see Chapter II Section VI.

9 Resistance as well as movement for achieving desired level of collective consumption and preventing eviction are very important features of urban marginalisation and that is the reason for the introduction of this parameter for selecting the Population III.

10 It is the only existing organisation in the city of Calcutta (now Kolkata) which has a history from the late 1960s of organising the slum-dwellers in different social causes including their living conditions in the slums.