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CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, I will first discuss the position of this research within the larger methodological framework. Then key concepts, definitions, questions, sources and tools of data collection and analysis will be introduced. Section 3.1 of this chapter will focus on issues regarding the research methodology: the paradigm, the epistemological stance as well; as the ethics of the research and its location. Section 3.2 will examine the improved Advocacy Coalition Framework and its ability to answer the specific research questions posed by this study. Section 3.3 will present the data sources and tools used in the study and sample choice. The tools of analysis are discussed in section 3.4 and section 3.6 will present the scope and limitations of the study.

3.1 RESEARCH PARADIGM

The choice of research practice depends on the research questions posed, the context in which the research is undertaken, the availability of information as well as time and resource constraints (Grossberg, Nelson, and Treichler 1992). The main question posed in the study is about multi-actor interventions in urban planning and development, focusing specifically on the changes brought about by joint state-society-market efforts in urban land regulation regimes. As the scope of this question is vast, the focus in this study is on the specific case of how the drafting of the revised Development Plan for Mumbai, how the different actor and the outcomes and their impacts on land regulation and the communities affected by the process.

The revised Development Plan as presented in the first chapter touches upon many shifts in urban policy. This study focuses on three planning instruments (the third was discovered during data collection), looking at the policy-making process, its content and outcomes. The period of analysis is from the mid-1980s to 2005 (mid-1980s to 1991 was the period of formation of these instruments, while 1991 to 2005 was the main period of implementation) as the predominant period of implementation, such that outcomes could be assessed.

The study depends on historical documents to trace the actors’ actions using reports, newspaper articles as well as state and court documents. Simultaneously, by interviews with the actors involved as well as case studies of communities affected and an analysis of policy actions the study provides an eclectic approach.

The researcher’s epistemological position is that of a housing rights activist who has worked with squatter communities and housing rights organizations and movements of Mumbai for over two decades. This means that the researcher is well aware of her activist bias in studying multi-actor policy intervention, drawing from her own experiences and the political economy and human rights perspective. At the same time she recognizes the are limitations of the subjectivity it entails which can only be compensated by drawing from other perspectives and a scientific interdisciplinary approach. Academics studying urban phenomenon have found that interdisciplinary methods provide a wider scope to study the interconnections of capital and space. (Logan and Molotch 1987; Patel 2003).

All interviewees were duly informed of the goals and objectives of the research. The names of some of the interviewees (those who chose to remain anonymous) have been changed to maintain confidentiality. Data was gathered from the community only after seeking the permission of individual household members. Where the community refused to participate in the survey, such as the Latif Compound, the choice of the community was respected. Similarly, in Maharashtra Nagar-Patra chawl all the households of the community wanted to be interviewed and thus the plan of gathering data from a sample was abandoned and the wishes of the community were respected.

My MA thesis focused on the NGOs influencing the politics of administrative decentralization and ward committees, and I used it as a starting point for my PhD research. However, this time my interest
was to study policy influencing processes, focusing more specifically on the engagement of the private sector with government. Whereas in my MA I looked at public policy processes (decentralization), I could not examine the outcomes of the policies because they had only recently begun to be implemented. However, the wish to study policy outcomes was now given more priority. These two factors—the importance of studying policy outcomes and the decision to focus on market-state relations—led me to focus on land regulation regimes. Mumbai was a natural choice given these parameters; the city was a pioneer in implementing such market instruments, and I have been working and living in the city for the past 20 years.

3.2 OUTLINING SPECIFIC RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In chapter 2 I presented the actor-oriented perspective to studying urban intervention. I decided to apply the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF) approach, developed by Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith, as a theoretical framework for answering the specific research questions raised in chapter 1. In this section I will assess the ACF’s ability to answer the research questions, and propose some modifications to the framework to make it more applicable to my case study.

The first research question deals with the ‘who of policy change’, specifically asking: who are the actors engaged in the policymaking process and what are their interests, resources and constraints? To answer this question the author needs to study historical factors. The ACF has termed them as ‘relative stable parameters’. Relatively stable parameters are stable over a long period of time, because they restrict the nature of the problem, constrain the resources available to policy participants, establish rules and procedures for changing policy and reaching collective decisions and broadly form the values that inform policymaking. Because of their resistance to change the relatively stable parameters are usually not strategically targeted by policy participants.

A combination of stable parameters, actors, their resources and networks influence the conditions for policy change. The relatively stable parameters frame the policy-making process for a policy subsystem with its territorial boundaries, (for instance greater Mumbai). The political boundaries of such a policy process are determined by the hundreds of policy participants from all levels of government, and the multiple interest groups from different sectors which influence the rules of the development plan. Their aim is to influence policy subsystems to effectively achieve their objectives and maintain their participation over ensure changes are translated into policy outcomes (see figure 3.1).

Thus to answer the first research question four subsets of the framework are used. First, external system or events are considered, referring to changes in socio-economic conditions, in public opinion, changes in governing coalition and policy decisions and impacts (these changes are not limited to the urban sector but may be broader shifts at the national political economy). Secondly, the contextual sector parameters are examined, including i) the structure of the state (in the case of Mumbai meaning local, state and central governments interventions in urban development); ii) inequality in land, habitat and public amenities; iii) the constitutional and legal framework governing the urban sector; iv) the democratic structure; and v) electoral geography. The third factor which needs to be studied is the degree of consensus needed to bring about a change in the development plan of the city. A number of actors have been included in the study and these include consensual actors as well as those who were excluded from the policy making process. An event analysis approach has been used to identify consensual actors; the tools for collecting this data were predominantly secondary sources, complemented by the use of case studies of New Planning Instruments (NPIs) project communities. This approach has also been called the bottom-up approach of identify consensus. The fourth factor that helps answer the first question concerns the constraints and resources of the actors and organizations.

The second research question deals with the actions and the goals of the actors; it examines ‘what and where actors act’ and ‘what is it that they are want to change’. The question is: What strategies and arenas are used by the actors and their coalitions to influence the decision-making process; what is the
role played by government in resolving conflicts? To answer this question I will draws from another subset of the ACF framework—the subset dealing with policy subsystems. ACF assumes that only advocacy coalitions would form to influence government decision. However, other studies have found that networks and interest groups also influence actors. Thus, for this study, advocacy coalitions are taken to mean policy networks across sectors, which are able to achieve to transfer policy core beliefs into actual policy. Policy participants (1) share similar policy core beliefs and (2) engage in non-trivial degrees of co-ordination.

The nature of networks that actors create, what is transacted, and how they change over time are theoretical questions of interest. Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith use only two criteria to describe a coalition; common beliefs and non-trivial engagement. This appears rather general and does not clearly distinguish between a network, a coalition or an alliance. These definitions need to be examined more closely.

In discussing common beliefs, according to North, major institutional change will come about only when it is in the interest of those with sufficient bargaining strength to alter formal rules (North 1990). To gain bargaining strength in an environment of fragmented power requires some kind of collaboration amongst actors. Regime analysis views the power of institutions as fragmented and regimes as the collaborative arrangements through which local governments and private actors assemble the capacity to govern. The primary reason for the fragmentation of power is the division of labour between market and state. Both local government and businesses possess resources needed for governing, for example, government enjoys legitimacy and policymaking authority, while the business sector has the capital that generates jobs, tax revenues and financing. Therefore they insist that co-creation is a necessity, not an aberration.

Further, authors have different viewpoints on what kind of collaboration takes shape amongst actors in the urban scenario and which of this are urban regime collaborations. Urban regimes are not simply networks or inter-organizational collaborations. The engagement of non-state actors is one of the main conditions. Urban regimes are not simply ‘urban governance’ (Pierre and Peters 2000). It is a broader concept that expresses the need for collaboration beyond the confines of the city hall, specifically the need for more active participation by business actors. Discussing the difference between the two concepts, Stone emphasized that private sector engagement is essential for the functioning of any regime (Stone 1989).

Also the presence of active interest groups and the role they play is examined: How active are they in lobbying and building pressure to influence the process of rule-making? Empirical studies by Evans have showed that the embeddedness of private actors can result in innovative policymaking; he recommends a balance between the two variables of closeness and distance between the private and public sector. Evans assumes that private and public sector are two different entities; however, he assumes that the sectors are autonomous, whereas overlap between the two sectors also needs to be considered.

Answering questions about the spaces actors and their networks choose to act in—also called ‘spaces of interface and encounter’ by Long (2001)—Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith use the term ‘venues’. According to them, Venues mean political arenas where coalition members have opportunities to influence the belief of policy stakeholders. Coalitions are known to spend considerable amount of time venue shopping, i.e. looking for an arena where they might have a competitive advantage. They often launch initiatives in several venues simultaneously. In my experience working in India, valuable sought after venues include print media, the state assembly, the courts and the streets as a place of protest. Informal arenas which are hidden from public view also need to be included. What factors lead to selecting one arena over another? What the limitations and scope of each of these areas? Are some inherently more open to one specific type of coalition? Are these venues themselves undergoing change? These are some questions which need further examination.
The role of the state as predicted by the framework is that of policy broker and mediator (resolving policy disagreements and seeking to find a compromise between hostile coalitions). Policy disagreements are known to escalate into political problems. ACF also recognizes that it is possible to have a stalemate between coalition members where the political participants consider the status quo unacceptable and perceive no alternative venues of archiving their objectives. ACF identifies politicians or government officers as two possible brokers. It views them as neutral actors, without direct interest in the policy outcomes. This leaves no room to examine what happens to those actors who may not be active but are in some way or the other impacted by the public policy. What coalitions would like to influence or change may boil down to institutional rules, regulations, resource allocation and appointments, and decisions made to shape policy process and its outcomes.

Figure 3.1 Conceptual framework of advocacy coalitions

The third sub-question deals with the content of the change in rules governing development of land in Mumbai—i.e. the actual design of the TDR and AR instruments. This question concerns outputs and outcomes of the changed rules: What are the policy outputs and outcomes of the process of multi-actor influence?

The ultimate test of any policy is its impact. Measuring what policies can achieve can be done rather simplistically by measuring the quantitative outputs of amenities that the policy is able to deliver. To assess the quantity of the New Planning Instruments, several variables will be used: quantity of plots acquired, existence of a usable amenity on site, access to public amenity, land sharing amongst stakeholders and ownership of amenity.

Changes in the rules governing the development of land as a result of influence of various actors can only be tested against the earlier rules; therefore, it is essential to compare NPIs with traditional planning instruments in terms of content. Further, it is also important to compare the impact both new and old instruments in terms of the quantum of land that the rules were able to deliver for public
amenities. The type of amenities and geographic location where they were constructed and the actual availability of a public amenity on the site need to be studied.

Another way to assess the output of the liberalized development rules would be to examine whether the land sharing mechanism inherent in NPI has worked out as per the new rules. Its ownership and access to public need also to be examined. Some economists have also warned about the negative outcomes of using market based instruments (presented in the last chapter). It would also be interesting to see the impacts of NPIs on city space.

The fourth research question also deals with outcomes but more specifically vis-à-vis squatter communities. The question is: Do NPIs reach out to the squatter communities and contribute to improving their living conditions? To answer this question we depend on the livelihood literature, which studies households and communities. This study will focus on the delivery aspect of public amenities, that is, whether the provider (government, private or NGO) is able to deliver the amenities in such a form that all sections of society find it accessible. Or, alternatively, is the amenity provided under conditions that are difficult to meet for a certain section of the society, and, therefore they are excluded or are denied the status of users of the amenity.

The academic literature published by the International Federation for Housing and Planning (IFHP) (Virtanen and van ‘t Verlaat 1998) suggests that equality as a goal needs to be broken down into equality among citizens living in similar urban areas, recommending various possible criteria to assess equality amongst citizens. However, for this study I will only use four indicators to assess whether the core value of urban planning—i.e. urban equality—has been achieved with the introduction of NPIs. The first three are well-known criteria recommended by IFHP: (1) security of tenure for the squatter population, (2) access and use rights of squatter populations to public amenities, and (3) improvements in living conditions of squatter households and communities. The author proposes another criterion which has gained much discussion in academic literature recently—community cohesion. Cohesion or solidarity of a community is difficult to assess using empirical means. One aspect of cohesion is living together as one unit or sharing a common identity based on place of residence. This can be assessed by the location of the members as well as shared collective resources, for example community organizations. While data for some of the above criteria of assessment of impact and outcome on the community can be gathered via interviews with leaders, data for other criteria needs to be compiled by interviewing households that together make up the community.

**Living Conditions of households**

Rakodi introduced many indicators to assess household assets—such as human, social political, physical, financial and natural capital—with indicators within each category (Rakodi and Lloyd-Jones 2002). As the key question of this study is assessing what section of the community has benefited from the NPIs and how living conditions have improved, I will gather information only on physical, social and political capital, as these are likely to be impacted by the NPIs.

Physical capital is generally understood to mean basic infrastructure (transport, shelter, water, energy, and communications) and the production equipment and means which enable people to pursue their livelihoods. However, within the physical capital there are a wide number of indicators. Some physical capital is acquired by household for their private use, such as the amenities that are connected with the home (e.g., water, electricity, toilet, the material the house is made of, and the area available for the household). On the other hand, there are the collective amenities shared by all the households living in a particular geographical area, such as a kindergarten (Anganwadi), collection service for the solid waste or a welfare centre. Still others amenities are utilized at the neighbourhood level (e.g., a primary school, a health centre or a playground).

Social and political capital include social resources (networks, membership of groups, relationships of trust and reciprocity, access to wider institutions of society) on which people draw in pursuit of livelihoods. For a household living in a slum, memberships in a specific geographic community or
belonging to some form of collective provides a conduit for obtaining access to shared facilities (such as common water taps, solid waste collection, land tenure and protection against evictions, i.e. housing security). Similarly the capacity of the communal leaders to link with other communities, to form a larger collective, or with government, NGO or service brokers is an important resource in improving living conditions and livelihood. Thus, both intra-community and intercommunity networks and memberships of groups will be covered in this research.

Similarly, exercising political rights such as the right to vote, is only possible if the resident is included in the electoral role. Accessing services which are provided by the state (such as PDS), transforms an ordinary resident into a citizen who can exercise his veto and voice.

The concepts and indicators used to assess improvements in living conditions in this study have been operationalized in the following manner (see table 3.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Measurements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical capital</td>
<td>Indoor running water</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal capital</td>
<td>Indoor electricity</td>
<td>Y/N – legal, illegal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indoor toilet</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House structure</td>
<td>Kutcha, pukka, apartment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House space</td>
<td>Actual, mazene or not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Pavement, slum, recognized slum, transit, rehab Own/tenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Security of tenure</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protection against evictions</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical capital</td>
<td>Anganwadi</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community amenities</td>
<td>Solid waste collection</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drains</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welfare centre</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical capital</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood amenities</td>
<td>Medical centre</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Playing ground</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Capital</td>
<td>Household membership of community organization</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Household access to collective community improvement efforts</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Capital</td>
<td>Voting rights—name on voting list?</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ration card for household?</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact of NPIs on project communities will be assessed by using two variables: one that assesses the access to collective amenities by the entire geographical community, and another that measures the access to private amenities by households. The data will be collected at household level as well as thorough focus groups. In the next section a detailed plan on sources and tools is presented.

3.3 DATA SOURCES AND TOOLS

Primary Data

Four sources of primary data were used for this study. The first one is interviews of key informants, who were identified by secondary sources as members of the coalition or as observers of the policymaking and changing process. Primary data was also gathered on the changed use of land plots developed using the TDR-AR and de-reservation mechanisms. Third, primary data was collected through interviews and fieldwork with three communities selected as case studies. The fourth source of primary data is a combination of a household survey conducted in three case study areas and a
A survey of the users and residents of a public park that is being privatized, purchased by a member of the coalition.

A criterion for selecting the plots was developed based on a pilot study of the plots and an analysis of plots based on their amenity reservation, size and location in terms of wards. To assure representativeness of the sample, a combination of multiple criteria was developed, including all types of amenities, all wards and all sizes. Only in the case of de-reservation plots did I limit the scope to M Ward, because I wanted to understand the reasons that contributed to making this ward a high TDR generator. The total number of sample site land plots where primary data was collected was 237—well above the targeted 15% of the total. Nineteen plots could not be located during the field work, so the total number of surveyed plots was somewhat lower—218. Further, all the selected plots which had been de-reserved in the policymaking process were selected, based on their location in M Ward. A questionnaire was developed for collecting response from the users or managers of the amenity. It was adjoined by an observation sheet, which also had a list of questions addressed to the investigators (table 3.2).

### Table 3.2: Number and types of sites surveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Universal</th>
<th>Sites surveyed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TDR</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Situ</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De-reservations</td>
<td>1669</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3563</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the fieldwork it was revealed that one of the outputs of each of the projects was four types of housing settlements: (1) rehabilitation housing, usually formal and permanent; (2) transit housing, formal but temporary; (3) housing of excluded groups, informal and temporary; and (4) the sale components of the project, formal and permanent as well as placed at a higher land price within the project.

While on one hand MBI instruments created formal housing for some, they kept others in what appeared to be poorly equipped housing. To study the impact of MBI on different sections of slum dwellers, data was collected from all three ‘outcome’ sub-communities of the project (rehabilitation, transit and excluded households), in proportion to the total sub-community which still existed on or neighboring the project or resettlement site. Around 800 households were interviewed from three project sites: Roma Banjara, Lallu Bhai compound and Fulanchiwadi. Also, 54 users and households were interviewed about their opinion on the redevelopment of the Vaidya Maidan at Bandra.

### Secondary Sources

Secondary data sources include municipal reports, debates in the state assembly, newspaper reports, articles in magazines, web pages of companies and their organizations, published reports of companies, and petitions and court case judgments. I would like to mention two court cases that were particularly helpful in providing data that would have been otherwise difficult to access. One is a court case filed by a political and housing right activist, the late Baburao Samant, urging the government to acquire private lands under the Urban Land Ceiling Act. The government’s reply to this petition gives details of all the private landowners and the location and size of land declared surplus. The other is a court case filed by Citispace urging the government to review the AR/In-situ projects. The government reply to this case brought to light the location and developer details of these plots.

One of the most helpful secondary sources of data, which was used to explain the location choice of amenity planning under the new mechanisms, is the Ready Reckoner of Stamp Duty. The Ready
Reckoner published yearly gives the official price of properties in Mumbai. It draws its information from the sale of properties registered with the Collector of Mumbai.

The assembly report—which gave the details regarding the number of land plots de-reserved, both by the local and state government in the period 1983-89—bridged a huge gap that the newspaper articles could not have filled. Many of the reports and contracts amongst government departments, such as the Jawaharlal Nehru Urban Renewal Mission (JNURM), conditions and deadlines were sought by filing for specific information under the Right To Information Act.

Table 3.3: Specific research questions and data sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
<th>Data collection tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Who are the other actors engaged in the processes of policymaking and what are their interests, resources and constraints? | - Newspaper articles, government reports, court cases, state government assembly proceedings  
- Interviews with actors                                                   | Secondary \Primary (questionnaire)                                           |
| 2. What strategies and arenas are used by the actors and their coalitions to influence the decision-making processes? What are the continuities and changes in actors, strategies and arenas? | - Newspaper articles, government reports, court cases, state government assembly proceedings  
- Interviews with actors                                                   | Secondary \Primary (questionnaire)                                           |
| 3. What are the policy outputs, policy impacts and policy outcomes of the new regime on urban space? | - Data from survey of amenities developed using NPIs  
- Data from survey of amenities developed using market based instruments  
- Household survey data of case studies, covering included, in transit and excluded groups in Roma Banjara, Lallu Bhai and Fulanchiwadi. | Primary (questionnaire) \Primary (questionnaire) \Primary (questionnaire) |
| 4. What are the policy outcomes and impacts of the new regime on inequalities among urban residents? | - Data from survey of amenities developed using NPIs  
- Data from survey of amenities developed using market based instruments  
- Household survey data of case studies, covering included, in transit and excluded groups in Roma Banjara, Lallu Bhai and Fulanchiwadi. | Primary (questionnaire) \Primary (questionnaire) \Primary (questionnaire) |

3.4 SAMPLE CHOICES, METHODOLOGY AND ANALYTICAL TOOLS

The specificities regarding the reservation/zoning direct the selection of a particular mechanism. For example, if the reservation is for medical or educational facilities, the preferred mechanism is AR; if the reservation is for open spaces or public housing, then the preferred mechanism is TDR. Furthermore, if at a later stage an internal comparison between the AR and TDR instrument needs to be made, it is important to have a proportional sample size (see figure 3.2).

During the data collection process, another database was uncovered—projects developed using a version of the AR instrument, which in the municipal parlance are called ‘In-situ developments’. This database was not part of the municipal database, because the High Court of Mumbai had passed a stay order in a case filed by citizens groups protesting against this instrument. The MCGM had submitted a list of 49 plots developed under AR/In-situ projects; of which 29 sites were surveyed using the same criteria mentioned above.
The selection of the wards where the fieldwork was conducted took place based on the criteria that all types of amenities were listed in these wards (as per municipal records); this was done to save resources. Using this criterion, the following wards were selected for further study: N, L, P (north), T, R, M (east) and F (south). As per the MCGM database, 166 plots were developed under AR and 1,679 under TDR (see table 3.5) from 1995 to April 2006, bringing the total number of developed plots under these mechanisms to 1,845. As selection for open spaces and public housing still had to be made from a large number of plots, the selection was based on those plots with the largest percentage of built-up area, ensuring that the majority of types of amenities are represented (see table 3.2).
Figure 3.3: Administrative Ward Map of Mumbai

Source: MCGM map of administrative wards (n.d.).
Figure 3.4: Map of M/East Ward

Source: MCGM (2002)

Table 3.4: TDR plots acquired from 1997-2005 and their use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TDR</th>
<th>Plots/Projects</th>
<th>In square metres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reservation places (ground, gardens, school, public housing, R &amp; R, etc.)</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>2,277,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>796,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slum Development Project</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>3,549,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.C.R. 1991 33/7 under TDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,679</td>
<td>6,626,559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MCGM TDR Data Base (2005)
Selection of case studies was done by choosing those plots from the database that were directly impacted by both the old and new regime. This selection included plots de-reserved or acquired under the old regime and currently under development or had undergone development using the MBI under the new regime. Using a random selection process (with the help of SPSS) a 15% sample of these plots was chosen, and a field survey was conducted of the plots by visiting these locations to determine the current state of affairs. The in-depth case studies were selected from this set of surveyed plots. The rationale for selecting case studies is given below in table 3.6.

The following four amenities were selected for the study: Open Spaces, Schools, Public Housing and Health Amenities. The category of ‘schools’ includes primary and secondary schools as well as schools for children with special needs. The category of ‘health amenities’ includes hospitals, maternity homes and dispensaries. The fourth category—‘public housing’—includes projects developed under Slum Redevelopment Assistance (SRA), Housing for Project Affected Persons (affected because they are relocated due to projects such as Mumbai Urban Transport Project [MUTP], Mumbai Infrastructure Project and others) and old chawl redevelopment (even though it falls under state government competence, it was one of the highest TDR generators and therefore could not be overlooked—see table 3.5).

3.5 RATIONALE FOR CHOOSING AREAS FOR IN-DEPTH CASE STUDIES

The first set of output of the secondary TDR data showed certain built-in preferences of builders for particular wards in which to locate amenities. Much of the Slum Redevelopment TDR featured in M Ward (see table 3.5). Further, M Ward had the largest concentration of households facing combined deprivations (cf. Baud et al. 2009). These features of M Ward influenced its selection as the main ward from which to select the in-depth case studies.

Table 3.5: Chart showing TDRs generated in all wards of Mumbai

- Fulanchiwadi is situated in M Ward and is a settlement of several thousand households. It was chosen for in-depth study as it was listed as a plot which was acquired by the government for housing purposes, and it appeared that the MBI had succeeded in this case. The architect who was involved with the de-reservation from the side of the landowner was willing to take part in the study.

- Roma Banjara popped up during the study of In-situ projects in M Ward. This project was selected as it was still incomplete and had all the various features of a project alive, the transit camp, the excluded families and the rehabilitated families. Also, as the majority of the residents belong to the same tribe—Lamani— intra-community comparison is easier. Further, Roma Banjara was one of the earliest projects with both resettlement as well as high-rise rehabilitation element.

- Lallu Bhai compound PAP Township was selected because it was one of the largest townships in M Ward. Household data was only collected from the Elphinstone community, which was selected based on the relationship that the researcher had established with the community during her field work.

9 All gardens, parks, playgrounds and amusement parks were categorized as open spaces.
Mohammad Latif compound was recommended by a senior planner of the municipal corporation as a case to study the implementation of the Land Acquisition Act. It is located in south Mumbai in the G South Ward. There were three reasons why this case study was selected: (1) it provided the opportunity to study redevelopment of an old chawl through MBI; (2) the case provided opportunity to study the impact of GBI and MBI on the same plot; and, most importantly, (3) the key actors, the landowner and the government authorities showed willingness to participate in the study.

The household data was collected using a questionnaire to gather information on the socio-economic status of the household as well as the household’s access to public amenities and their perception and participation in the redevelopment projects. During the earlier period of data collection, the researcher had recognized that during the course of implementing redevelopment-resettlement project (projects utilizing one of the other MBI) the community had splintered into smaller groups which were often dispersed into different settlements, some recognized, and others not. Further, some households because of their ‘non-eligibility’ had been relocated to a different location. These settlements were also included as community households and included in the study. The selection of households was done using a process of mapping, numbering and then random selection with the objective of collecting data from a reasonable sample size, varying from 10% to 50%.

In Maharashtra Nagar, a sub-settlement of currently excluded community, the sampling process failed as the community insisted that everyone be covered. The members of this settlement viewed the survey itself as an act of recognition of their community.

Table 3.6: Number of household interviews in the case study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study communities</th>
<th>Settlements - with total number of households</th>
<th>Number of households interviewed</th>
<th>Mode of sample selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fulanchiwadi</td>
<td>Mukti Nagar (325 tenements)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Both these sub-settlements are divided into 18 chawl committees which roughly cover about 30 tenements in one lane. Every third or fourth tenement was selected for data collection. If the tenement had a mezzanine and a different household was found to occupy it, they were treated as a separate household and interviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kashinath Patil Wadi (700 tenements)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lallu Bhai compound</td>
<td>Recognized transit camps for MUP - 138 A (300 tenements) - 138 B (170 tenements)</td>
<td>200 (100 per transit camp)</td>
<td>Mapping, numbering and lane zigzag selection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerated transit camp Maharashtra Nagar Patra Chawl (120 tenements)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Every household demanded to be interviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roma Banjara</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rahul Nagar</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total number of households</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(de-reservation to AR with In-situ)</td>
<td>(excluded community (100 tenements)</td>
<td>840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognized transit camps (70 tenements)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resettled households (448)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Whichever family was available during data collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Whichever family was available during the data collection period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Seven buildings, each building has 64 flats each floor 8 flats, one household was interviewed from each floor. A zigzag pattern was selected; on each floor the position of the flat was different.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Authors survey, 2007-2008*

**Analytical methods**

The final analytical process has used inductive methods such as factoring, marking of factors, pattern reading and developing relationships between variables. All answered interview questionnaires were coded and entered into SPSS. The database received from the MCGM on the TDR and AR developments were all hard copies. They were turned into Excel files, which made calculation and analysis easier. MapInfo has been used to analyze data spatially and has been extensively used to understand and explain spatial implications, the externalities and polarities of the privatization of planning.

**3.6 SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

Land use and development patterns in Mumbai make a checkered pattern—there are various types of landowners and tenancy rights, with different sets of rules and regulations. This makes the study of land regimes and policymaking a very demanding and difficult task. What this study aims to do is lift this blanket which surrounds land making policy layer by layer, such that the actors and their process can be understood by all.

As the land policy itself is dependent on land ownership the researcher shall only be able to study some sections of the city and land policies. Due to time and space constraints, other areas, such as the mill lands, old dilapidated buildings, villages, or the Special Economic Zones have not been studied—this is the limitation of the study. This study, however, does present a hypothesis on policymaking processes and actors that could be tested for other rules and rulemaking processes within Mumbai and other urban areas of India. One of the limitations of my MA research was its shortcoming in studying the outcome of the policy implementation; this limitation has been overcome in this study. However, given the clear-boundedness of the study, the researcher could not study the other changes in the developmental control rules which also took place during the same period (e.g. regarding the mill lands).