MITIGATING THE FILTHINESS OF FIELDWORK BY LOCALIZING GENERIC STRATEGIES

By

VUBAN JOYCE AFUH

UNIVERSITY OF YORK

OUTLINE

- Introduction
- Ethical issues
- Negotiating Access
- Obstacles and overcoming strategies
- Conclusion
- References

INTRODUCTION

- Context, culture, and circumstances shaped fieldwork conducts.
- Personal experiences, selfreflexivity, challenges encountered, and overcoming strategies.

Ethical Issues

- ***** Ethical review committee
- **❖** TAP advice
- ❖ Consent forms (right to withdraw, utilization and protection of data, anonymity, avoidance of harm and others).
- Reciprocity
- -Letters of acknowledgements
- -An envelope
- -Tips to some gatekeepers
- -Offered lunch
- -Cooked food
- -Administered exams

Ethical Issues Cont'd

- **Anonymity**
- Controversial issue
- *Respect
- Freedom of expression
- Freedom to choose venue
- Use of titles
- Institutional culture
- Respected appointment time/days
- Risk assessment
- Information management

Ethical Issues Cont'd

- Advice
- Promises
- Share research findings
- Provide transcripts

Ethics in use of documents

Ethics in transcription

NEGOTIATING ACCESS

Gate keepers

Formal channels

- -Junior staff
- -Security staff
- -Secretaries
- -Low profile colleagues
- -University campus security staff
- -High profile interviewees

Informal channels

- -Acquaintances
- -Old friends
- -Step-father of a friend
- -Former mentor
- -Relatives

-It is imperative to provide a thorough explanation to gatekeepers concerning the objectives and reasons of your research when meeting them (Benton & Cormack, 2000).

Negotiating Access

- Multiple positionalities
- ✓ CSC scholar
- ✓ PhD research student from UoY
- ✓ Cameroonian
- ✓ Christian
- ✓ Indigene from North West Region Babanki
- **✓** BOBAN
- ✓ Former colleague from BUST
- ✓ Graduate from ENS, UBa, UB

- Presentation of credentials
- ☐ Institutional authorization letter
- ☐ Authorization letter from MINESUP
- □CSC Notification of Award Letter
- ☐ University of York student ID
- □Cameroon NID

"Starting where you are can ease your access to certain research sites and informants" (Anderson *et al.* 2006:9).

• Application letter (purpose of the research; who I was; why the institution was chosen, and the kinds of participants needed; length of the interview; expectations of the interviewees and ground rules).

Presented names of those already interviewed

Connection power

- Presentation of interview guide
- Snowball
- Absolute power by participants
- Professional in approach
- Persistent

- Situationally by-passed hierarchy
- Smart, flexible and adaptable
- Collected contacts of potential interviewees
- Used British accent

- Luck
- Adapted ways of addressing interviewees
- Respected institutional culture.

Obstacles Encountered/Overcoming Strategies

Obstacles	Overcoming strategies
Woman	-Didn't negotiate my safety - Didn't invest much time
Poor means of transportationDifficulty to budget time	Apologized for delayRe-scheduled appointments
- Negative mentality towards research/interviews	- Presented consent forms- Focused on thesis not jobs/organizations
- Busy nature of institutions eg meetings, conferences	PatienceRe-visited institutionsTook advantage of those who were free/willing to comply

Obstacles Encountered/Overcoming Strategies

Obstacles	Overcoming strategies
- Excessive bureaucracies/administrative procedures in terms of application	Prepared application packages -Typed a general letter and edited the address of the addressees
Problem of venue	Convenience of interviewee
Difficulty to coordinate interviews with some participants	Jotted down relevant pointsStrategically brought them on track

CONCLUSION

"I therefore argue that despite the existence of numerous publications on universal guidelines for conducting fieldwork, there is no rigid rule as different: situations, encounters, power relations and realities call for an adaptation of generic strategies to suit local context in the quest of collecting meaningful data" (Vuban, 2016).

REFERENCES

Anderson, L., Lofland, J., Lofland, L. H., & Snow, D. (2006). *Analyzing social settings: A guide to qualitative observation and analysis* (4th ed.). Wadsworth: Thompson Learning Inc. Pp 18.

Brantlinger, E. (1997). Using ideology: Cases of non-recognition of the politics of research and practice in special education. *Review of Educational Research* 67(4), 425-459.

Benton, D.C. & Cormack, F.S. (2000). Reviewing and evaluating the literature. In: Cormack D. (ed). *The Research Process in Nursing* (4th ed). Oxford: Blackwell Science.

Frankfort-Nachmias, C., & Nachmias, D. (1992). Research methods in the social sciences (4th ed.). United States of America: Martin's Press, Inc. Pp 79-91.

Goodhand, J. (2000). 'Research in conflict areas: ethics and accountability'. Forced Migration Review.

Lofland, J., & Lofland, H. L. (1995). *Analyzing social settings: a guide to qualitative observation and analysis* (3rd ed.). Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company. Pg 19-21.

REFERENCES

- Poovey, M. (1995). *Making a social body: British cultural formation 1830-1864*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. pp 84.
- Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. B. (1999). *Designing qualitative research*. (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Pp 2 198.
- Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. B. (2006). Designing Qualitative Research. Thousands Oaks: Sage Publication, (4th ed.).
- Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. B. (2011). *Designing qualitative research*. (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Pp 2 198.

REFERENCES

- Morse, J. M. & Richards, L. (2002). Read me first for a user's guide to qualitative methods. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Pp 168.
- Rager, K. B. (2005). Self-care and the qualitative researcher: When collecting data can break your heart. *Educational Researcher*, 34(4),23-27.
- Rossman, G. B. & Rallis, S. F. (1998). Learning in the field: An introduction to qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Pp 118.

THANKYOU!!!

THE END