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FOREWARD

This Manual titled Ukuphepha: Manual on Community Engaged Violence Prevention, Safety and Peace Promotion has been a long time in the making within the Institute for Social and Health Sciences (University of South Africa), and the South African Medical Research Council-University of South Africa’s Violence, Injury and Peace Research Unit, under the guidance of Professor Mohamed Seedat. These guidelines for community engagement and community-engaged research, therefore, draw on decades of experience, as well as the local communities involved in the initiatives concerned.

Learning from this rich history, academic and community-based colleagues began a formal process of pooling their ideas and experiences, through a number of interactive writing workshops and write-shops aimed at identifying and illustrating key features of community engagement work. This process was praiseworthy in its use and congruent with the transformative philosophy and principles of community engagement (see the Introduction in this Manual). The final product, therefore, reflects the insights, views, and expertise of all concerned (refer Acknowledgements).

The Manual captures theoretical components central to community engaged research and development, while at the same time, attempts to link these theories to guidelines for practice. These guidelines are depicted through illustrations of case studies conducted in our local communities. We hope that these illustrations of enacted community engagement provide a realistic and useful basis for community practice.

The process begins with community entry (Chapter 1), community readiness (Chapter 2), as well as negotiation and recognition (Chapter 3), which are essential to ensuring the development of a partnership approach. This is followed by two chapters, which focus on the participatory planning of the research process (Chapter 4), as well as intervention planning (Chapter 5). This is followed by guidelines on piloting and the implementation of the programme concerned (Chapter 6). Given the emphasis on research in this Manual, Chapter 7 then provides some detailed suggestions for conducting monitoring and evaluation research, to ensure the effective implementation of plans. While many researchers stop at this point, we then move on to reflect on the challenges of research dissemination (Chapter 8), and sustainability planning (Chapter 9), which we believe are important in community-engaged research.

While the nine phases comprise a whole and should be considered together in community engagement practice, each of these phases and therefore chapters can be used in a ‘stand-alone’ manner.

Finally, while we know that this Manual and its guidelines emerge from local conditions, and may not be necessarily relevant to other contexts. We hope that researchers and community practitioners will engage actively with the various chapters, our suggestions, and find some useful pointers for community practice.
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INTRODUCTION

Samed Bulbulia, Naiema Taliep, Royal Lekoba, Nancy Hornsby & Sandy Lazarus

The introduction provides an orientation to the community engagement manual and our framework for conducting community-engaged research. We share our understanding of the aims and objectives of community engagement, and provide illustrations on the different kinds of community engagement models developed over recent years. We then present our Transformational Model of community engagement, and conclude with some ethical considerations. The introduction covers the sections below:

Section 1: Ukuphepha – Demonstrating African Safety, Peace and Health
Section 2: Orientation to the manual
Section 3: An integrated framework for violence and injury prevention, and community, safety, peace, and health
Section 4: Understanding Community Engagement
Section 5: An integrated approach to Community Engagement
Section 6: Ethics in Community Engagement

SECTION 1: UKUPHEPHA - DEMONSTRATING AFRICAN SAFETY, PEACE AND HEALTH

The Ukuphepha (isiZulu for demonstrating African Safety) programme, outlined below, is located within the South African Medical Research Council (SAMRC) and University of South Africa’s (UNISA) Violence, Injury and Peace Research Unit (VIPRU) which is underpinned by the following core values which we call our 7 C’s:

Figure 1. Core values of Ukuphepha
Within this context, Ukuphepha as a programme seeks to: (1) Implement, evaluate and maintain integrated safety, peace and health promotion programmes in resource-challenged communities in participating African countries; (2) Regularly arrange meetings focused on African-centred safety and peace promotion; and (3) Stimulate a network of service-based agencies.

The Ukuphepha projects combine research and intervention within a community engagement framework. The projects mainly focus on safety, peace and health promotion interventions that address violence and unintentional and intentional injuries in participating communities, and include senior as well as emerging researchers, post-graduate students and community workers in research, education, capacitation and training. This training intends to develop skills and expertise across the region, as well as create opportunities for ongoing collaboration between partners. The Ukuphepha programme creates opportunities to strengthen the Africa-centred science base to support violence and injury prevention and safety, peace and health promotion initiatives particularly in under-served communities in particular.

The following assumptions inform the work of Ukuphepha:

1. Safety, peace and health are essential community requisites.
2. Disadvantage and societal obstacles obstruct individual and community welfare.
3. Changes at the level of beliefs, attitudes, values, knowledge, behaviours and societal structures are crucial.
4. Individuals, collectives and broader systems need to be supported to increase control over the factors that contribute to injury and violence.
5. Individuals and communities have the capacity to act as agents of change.
6. Consciousness-raising is a prerequisite for change and well-being.

The ecological framework informs the work of Ukuphepha. Research has shown that the most effective interventions take into consideration and address multiple levels of risk and protection: societal, community, relational and individual levels. Violence and injury result because of a complex combination of interrelated factors. The prevention of violence and injury therefore relies on a comprehensive understanding of factors at the societal, community, relational, and individual level. The implementation of interventions at each of these ecologic
levels could therefore result in a more successful and sustained approach to violence and injury prevention, and safety, peace, and health promotion.

It is important to note that communities are characterised by both risk and protective characteristics. Protective factors, which include assets such as community connectedness and resilience, can be mobilised to address the consequences of risks and therefore promote safety, peace and health. Within this context, assets may be material (e.g. housing facilities), behavioural (e.g. crossing roads at pedestrian crossings), social (e.g. development of a neighbourhood watch) or structural (e.g. employment opportunities). Research suggests that the promotion of strong, protected, socially cohesive communities, that prioritise social connections and community life, is an important strategy for increasing safety, peace, and health.

The promotion of safety, peace, and health is supported through active community engagement in the design, development, implementation, and evaluation of interventions. We use the idea of citizenship. This refers to the capacities of groups, to act in the interest of fulfilling their needs by implementing effective decisions and options that result in improved structures, norms and behaviours directed at the attainment of safety, peace, and health. This form of citizenship focuses on a shared ownership of the violence and injury challenges, and associated solutions, the mobilisation of community assets, and collective responsibility for the identification of priorities and relevant interventions. This is essential for effective and sustainable violence and injury prevention, and safety, peace and health promotion.
The *Ukuphepha: Manual on Community Engaged Violence Prevention, Safety and Peace Promotion* was developed by collating theory, research and praxis, community-engaged intervention initiatives, and experiences at the South African Medical Research Council (SAMRC) and University of South Africa’s (UNISA) Violence, Injury and Peace Research Unit (VIPRU). The research unit’s main mandate is to conduct trans-disciplinary, critically oriented community-engaged public health research and interventions for addressing priority injury and violence issues, including safety, peace, and health promotion.

**Who is this manual for?**

This manual provides guidelines on a community engaged research framework for community workers, development practitioners, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), and researchers who wish to collaborate with communities to address local challenges.

**What is the purpose of the manual?**

The main purpose of this manual is to equip community workers, development practitioners, and researchers with a systematic guide on how to engage communities, particularly for preventing violence and injury, and promoting safety, peace, and health. This manual provides information for effective, on-the-ground community enquiry, and active participation, framed by critical perspectives on community engagement. We believe that this critical lens is important if scholars desire to relate to partners in a genuinely equitable way, with mutual benefit to all concerned. The manual includes examples in the appendices of community interventions that have been implemented in South Africa by the Ukuphepha Child Safety, Peace, and Health Programme, as well as other examples of initiatives that promote safety, peace, and well-being in South Africa, and the African diaspora.
How to use the manual

The manual guides the reader through the different steps in engaging communities with respect to initiating a programme and/or project. This includes identification of assets and risks/needs, planning and development of a programme/project and interventions, monitoring and evaluation, the sharing of research findings, and sustainability. Each chapter represents a particular phase in our engagement process and is presented in the form of steps.

**Figure 2. Manual chapters**
The manual is organised as follows:

**The Introduction** section provides the orientation to the manual, and an overview of the community engagement manual. A framework for conducting community-engaged research in violence and injury prevention, and community safety, peace, and health promotion that encapsulates the interconnectedness of structural, epistemic and interpersonal violence. Examples of projects that use this framework are provided. The theoretical framework and key concepts informing community-engaged research are then discussed. Understanding community engagement, challenges, models to community engagement and the need for an integrated approach using the Community-Based Participatory Action Research Approach (CBPR) follows. The utility of a Transformational Model that encapsulates community engagement is then discussed. The section concludes with Ethical dilemmas in CBPR.

**Chapter 1** focuses on the initial phase of a prospective community engagement study, gaining entry to the community, developing and maintaining a relationship with the community, the development of an initial demographic overview of the prospective research site, organization or group, and obtaining initial community approval.

**Chapter 2** focuses on determining the readiness of communities to engage in intervention development and implementation.

**Chapter 3** discusses negotiating access with community members who will be participating in the research or intervention. Different strategies for negotiating access are discussed. Developing an ethics agreement, Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), and Memorandum of Agreement’s (MOAs) are also explained.

**Chapter 4** explains the participatory research and action planning steps that are the essential building blocks to establish effective community engagement, with a particular focus on asset mapping and building networks.

**Chapter 5** provides an overview of the intervention planning phase, focusing on selecting appropriate interventions, education and training, and providing an inventory of existing interventions.

**Chapter 6** explains the piloting and implementation phase of the intervention, focusing particularly on collecting baseline data, piloting new or adapted interventions, and implementing interventions.

**Chapter 7** provides details on participatory monitoring and evaluation of all the engagement activities, including the selection of an appropriate evaluation method, setting up a monitoring system, and providing education and training.

**Chapter 8** highlights some of the definitions, challenges, and usefulness of research dissemination within community-engaged research.

**Chapter 9** discusses the importance of ownership and planning for sustainability from the start of a project, and provides steps to develop a sustainability plan.
This manual is a guide to:

- Understand how a community-strengths-based participatory approach to intervention planning and implementation respects local knowledges and uses active participation from the community in a collaborative manner.
- Identify priority problems and needs with the community through an engaging process and participatory partnership.
- Identify the most relevant programme for addressing health, safety, and peace issues in a community.
- Develop a systematic plan for piloting, implementing, and monitoring and evaluating the selected programme.
- Anticipate and plan for any challenges, identify opportunities, and recognise the importance of collaboration and ownership to maximise the desired outcomes and sustainability of the intervention.

The reader may refer to Table 1, pg. 14 for a broad overview of all the chapters. A brief description is provided of the activities, anticipated outcomes, tools, data sources as well as the Ukuphepha principles associated with each chapter.

These principles are essentially interconnected community engagement pathways. The specific interrelated activities which bolster research and intervention outcomes, are modelled upon the following:

1. Relationship building, by creating awareness and pursuing endorsement for the programme.
2. Community-centred learning, by means of recruitment and training.
3. Social justice and contextual congruence, by piloting and testing instruments for contextual and cultural congruence.
4. The building of democratic traditions, by means of encouraging optimal participation of households and community stakeholders.
5. Strengthening the case for community services, by supporting the use of data and learnings from the study for advocacy and service demands.
6. The affirmation of the social economy, through identifying and mobilising existing community assets to respond to risks and overcome challenges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Anticipated outcome/process</th>
<th>Tools/Instruments and data sources</th>
<th>Ukuphepha Principle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1: Community Entry</strong></td>
<td>• Identification of site</td>
<td>• Gaining entry into the community</td>
<td>• Community safety profile [Appendix 1]</td>
<td>• Relationship building • Citizenship and building of democratic traditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Contextual scoping research (e.g. preparing a community safety profile)</td>
<td>• Building rapport</td>
<td>• Meeting documents (agenda, registers) [Appendix 2; Appendix 3]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identification of and initial engagement with gatekeepers (Community leaders)</td>
<td>• Community safety profile</td>
<td>• Process to conducting a Transect Walk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conducting a Transect Walk</td>
<td>• Feasibility report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2: Community Readiness</strong></td>
<td>• Assessment of community engagement, participation, and readiness</td>
<td>• Level of community readiness assessed</td>
<td>• Steps to assessing readiness [Appendix 5]</td>
<td>• Relationship building • Citizenship and building of democratic traditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Initial relationship building</td>
<td>• Number of community engagement activities</td>
<td>• Community Readiness Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Community and stakeholders’ meeting/s</td>
<td>• Presentation to community members and stakeholders</td>
<td>• Meeting documents (agenda, registers, minutes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Feasibility of study is established in relation to relevance and responsiveness to community needs and interests</td>
<td>• Workshop notes and data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Diary entries, photographs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Anticipated outcome/process</td>
<td>Tools/Instruments and data sources</td>
<td>Ukuphepha Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CHAPTER 3  
Phase 3: Negotiation and Recognition | • Establishing contextual relevance of proposed programme and community needs  
• Establishing community structures:  
  o Community Advisory Committee  
  o Community Research Team  
• Developing and signing social contract/ethics agreement | • ISHS/VIPRU & Community agree on project aims objectives and community needs  
• Signed ethical framework to guide the community-university relationship (social contract/ethics agreement / MOU/MOA/ SOPs)  
• Established community structures | • Sample of signed ethical framework to guide partnership (Reference list Taliep (2016), Unpublished Doctoral Thesis); Appendix 4  
• Conducting a rapid needs assessment | • Relationship building  
• Citizenship and building of democratic traditions |
| CHAPTER 4  
Phase 4: Participatory Research and Action Planning | • Community SWOT analysis  
  o Assessing risk and magnitude  
  o Mapping assets (resource mobilization)  
  o Gaps  
• Strategic goals  
• Recognising community-based and gaining Community buy-in  
• Building networks  
• Training  
• Networking | • Identified risks  
• Identified assets  
• Established local network  
• Identified strategic goals  
• Identified intervention focus  
• Engage with community members and stakeholders in a continuous iterative process in pursuit of epistemic justice, decision-making, and active involved in the research process | • Community asset mapping manual Appendix 5  
• Service provider asset mapping manual Appendix 6  
• Action planning manual/agenda  
• Workshop evaluation form Appendix 7  
• Meeting minutes  
• Journaling Appendix 8  
• Photo documentary Appendix 9 | • Relationship building  
• Citizenship and building of democratic traditions  
• Community centred learning  
• Affirming social economy |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Anticipated outcome/process</th>
<th>Tools/Instruments and data sources</th>
<th>Ukuphepha Principle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 5</strong>&lt;br&gt;Phase 5: Intervention Planning</td>
<td>• Planning&lt;br&gt;• Selection, adaptation or development of intervention&lt;br&gt;• Establishing and strengthening information management and delivery system</td>
<td>• Number of capacity building and training sessions provided to community research team, partner agencies, and interventionists&lt;br&gt;• Reduced barriers to communication and collaboration&lt;br&gt;• Enhanced community participation&lt;br&gt;• Skilled research and intervention team</td>
<td>• Training manual and standard operating procedures (SOPs)&lt;br&gt;Appendix 10; Appendix 11&lt;br&gt;• Time-line/Action plans for proposed intervention</td>
<td>• Relationship building&lt;br&gt;• Citizenship and building of democratic traditions&lt;br&gt;• Community centred learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 6</strong>&lt;br&gt;Phase 6: Piloting and Implementation</td>
<td>• Recruitment of participants&lt;br&gt;• Baseline assessment&lt;br&gt;• Establishing cultural congruence of instruments - piloting&lt;br&gt;• Implementation of programme&lt;br&gt;• Facilitate regular reflections on the level of social justice achieved at each point of the intervention</td>
<td>• Participants recruited&lt;br&gt;• Baseline completed&lt;br&gt;• Number of programme sessions/activities&lt;br&gt;• Number of reflection sessions facilitated with stakeholders&lt;br&gt;• Knowledge, awareness, attitude and skills shift are produced in participants&lt;br&gt;• Reflexivity, and meaning-making by participants on the engagement process results in optimal participation in project</td>
<td>• Participant recruitment criteria/invitations&lt;br&gt;• Baseline questionnaire&lt;br&gt;• Intervention programme&lt;br&gt;• Training manuals&lt;br&gt;• Process evaluation&lt;br&gt;o Questionnaire&lt;br&gt;o Interview schedule&lt;br&gt;o Focus group schedule&lt;br&gt;o Observation sheet&lt;br&gt;o Workshop evaluation&lt;br&gt;o Photo documentary&lt;br&gt;o Journaling&lt;brAppendix 12; Appendix 13; Appendix 14; Appendix 15; Appendix 16&lt;br• Database template</td>
<td>• Relationship building&lt;br• Citizenship and building of democratic traditions&lt;br• Community centred learning&lt;br• Social Justice and contextual congruence&lt;br• Affirming social economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Anticipated outcome/process</td>
<td>Tools/Instruments and data sources</td>
<td>Ukuphepha Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 7</strong>&lt;br&gt;Phase 7: Monitoring and Evaluation (M&amp;E)</td>
<td>• Community members are involved in the development of a M&amp;E strategy and its implementation&lt;br&gt;• Community members play an active role in collecting and analysing data&lt;br&gt;• Conducting formative and summative evaluations of the programme</td>
<td>• Defined goals, targets, and indicators of evaluation,&lt;br&gt;• Selected and disaggregated indicators&lt;br&gt;• Decisions on how often to monitor, determined data requirements, developed data collection instruments and data collected for evaluation&lt;br&gt;• Facilitated co-learning and co-creation of knowledge</td>
<td>• Outcomes evaluation&lt;br&gt;  o Questionnaire&lt;br&gt;  o Surveys&lt;br&gt;  o Interview schedule&lt;br&gt;  o Focus group schedule&lt;br&gt;  o Observation sheet&lt;br&gt;  o Training manual&lt;br&gt;  • Database template</td>
<td>• Community centred learning&lt;br&gt; • Strengthening case for community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 8</strong>&lt;br&gt;Phase 8: Dissemination</td>
<td>• Collaborative development and planning of knowledge dissemination Planning and supporting use of data and learnings for advocacy and social justice</td>
<td>• Co-construction and co-production of knowledge products, and number of knowledge products produced&lt;br&gt;• Disseminate research findings and technology to community users, academia, and various fora</td>
<td>• Clear outline of dissemination goals&lt;br&gt;  • Clear implementation plans&lt;br&gt;  • Dissemination of project materials&lt;br&gt;  • Lessons and challenges of future dissemination processes [Appendix 17; Appendix 18]</td>
<td>• Relationship building&lt;br&gt; • Community centred learning&lt;br&gt; • Strengthening case for community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Anticipated outcome/process</td>
<td>Tools and data sources</td>
<td>Ukuphepha Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 9</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Phase 9:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Sustainability Planning</td>
<td>• Developing sustainability plan&lt;br&gt;• Building sustainability capacity&lt;br&gt;• Enhancing formal structures, and strengthening local networks</td>
<td>• Co-identified short, medium, and long-term sustainability strategies&lt;br&gt;• Enhanced empowerment and community ownership&lt;br&gt;• Developing a sustainability plan&lt;br&gt;• Establishing formal structures&lt;br&gt;• Developing an NPO</td>
<td>• Community profile (see Appendix 1)&lt;br&gt;• Training schedules&lt;br&gt;• Monitoring and evaluation procedure&lt;br&gt;• Formal registration of community structure (NPO)&lt;br&gt;• Establish a database for service providers&lt;br&gt;• How to section (NPO)&lt;br&gt;• How to develop a sustainability plan for a NPO&lt;br&gt;• How to formalise an NPO [Appendix 19; Appendix 20]</td>
<td>• Affirming social economy&lt;br&gt;• Strengthening case for community services&lt;br&gt;• citizenship and building of democratic traditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In understanding violence in South Africa, it is imperative to recognise and focus our understanding on the interconnectedness of the three different forms of violence, namely direct violence, structural violence and epistemic violence. These three facets of violence accords nuance to our work and imbues it with a criticality that is often absent in orthodox research on violence that tends to focus predominantly on direct violence. Our current basket of interventions includes several projects that work and embody community-based knowledge co-creation.

![Figure 3. Basket of interventions](image-url)
Different Forms of Violence and Intervention
Focusing on the 3 different forms of violence, VIPRU’S basket of community engagement interventions include several projects that work together, to facilitate change at multiple levels within the community.

STRUCTURAL VIOLENCE
A structure is a set of interacting systems that impact social actors in different ways, depending on their positionalities within those systems. Structural violence is then a kind of violence that is enmeshed within the different systems in which people live (Galtung, 1990). Structural violence is often believed to be insurmountable and overwhelming (‘just the ways things are’), which acts to naturalise and/or stabilise such violence (Galtung, 1969; White, 2010). Structural violence refers to injury not attributable to the actions of another, but as ‘built into structures’ and manifest as inequality of power, resources and opportunities.

Galtung’s concept of structural violence makes it possible to theorise unequal access to power and resources as a type of violence, moving the typology of violence away from superficial phenomena to a comprehensive set of social relations.

Thembelihle Safety Demonstration Site
The interventions in Thembelihle in the south of Johannesburg have three interconnected focus areas, namely direct violence, structural violence and epistemic violence. Our aim is to develop interventions, through community-engaged research, that promote a culture of safety and peace, both within this community and, ultimately, across other similar contexts in South Africa and in the African region. Direct violence, that is, physical (anatomical) or psychological (relating to the psyche) violence between individuals and groups that disrupts “normal” social functioning, is challenged through a general focus on safety promotion and peacebuilding. Structural violence, or the ways in which normalised social systems disadvantage certain communities or population groups, is addressed through activities that focus on community building and the facilitation and formation of inter- and intra-community networks. Epistemic violence, related to the arrangement of knowledge systems, and how dominant groups construct marginalised groups, is challenged through interventions that privilege knowledge creation and sharing, both from within and outside the community.

Thembela Early Childhood Development Centres Project
Early Childhood Development (ECD) centres play a vital role in promoting physical, psychological, emotional and social wellbeing. By improving opportunities for school success, ECD centres may in the long-term, reduce school dropout, engagement in harmful behaviours and violence victimisation and perpetration. However, ECD centres in low and under-resourced communities in South Africa face numerous challenges, which limit the quality of services they are able to provide. The purpose of the current study is to evaluate the implementation and effectiveness of the Thembela ECD project in strengthening the capacity of ECD centres in an informal settlement, south of Johannesburg, to meet children’s learning and developmental needs in preparation for school. The project consists of a multi-sectoral partnership, coordinated by the ISHS, which will provide participating centres with training in management and administration; training to help the teachers enrich their learning environments (including the implementation of a standardised curriculum); provision of nutritional feeding to enhance children’s capacity to learn, and support for the ECD Forum to serve as a peer resource. The results of the study will contribute to the evidence base for improving the quality of services delivered by ECD centres in low-income communities in South Africa. The aspiration of the project, which is to improve children’s opportunities for school success, aligns with the unit’s broader goal of combatting structural and direct violence.
EPISTEMIC VIOLENCE

Epistemic violence denotes the skewed arrangement of knowledge systems and how marginalised groups are constructed by knowledge systems held as universal and ‘objective’ by dominant groups, highlighting the relationship between power and knowledge.

Community Storylines

The Community Storylines project constitutes three components: a collaborative documentary film, digital stories and a participatory film. Within each of these, participants from the community work with researchers and filmmakers to produce multimedia products that attempt to tell particular stories around dehumanisation and formulate (re)humanisation discourses and practices that resist and re-story dominant narratives. Participants are recruited from various groups in the community, including school-going youth, adults who have lived in the community for a number of years and foreign nationals. In this way, we provide a platform for a range of community members to articulate and enact epistemic justice.

Through planned screenings in diverse spaces in and beyond Thembelihle, we aim to support (re)humanising spaces that facilitate social recognition, community cohesion and community action. In this regard, the project allows for innovative ways through which to express modes of resistance and spaces of (re)humanisation that speak to South Africa’s violent and unequal contemporary socio-political landscape. The project therefore sees an establishment of platforms through which participant voices can be harnessed to resist dominant meta-narratives, as well as other oppressive societal forces.

Compassionate Community Conversation and Lecture Series

This Series, initiated in early 2016, is a community-engaged intervention that provides a platform for broad-based information sharing in the Thembelihle and Erijaville communities. The Series has shown significant growth in terms of participation and engagement by community members.

The Series consists of conversations and lectures facilitated by both experts in diverse fields and individual community members or groups. In particular, through the inclusion of community members as knowledge “experts”, and by according legitimacy to community-based knowledges, the Series’ focus on knowledge-making and knowledge-sharing contributes to our agenda of pursuing epistemic justice.

The topics of engagement in the past year have also aligned with our goals of addressing direct and structural violence and have included a focus on gender-based violence and xenophobia, as well as community development and the building of community organisations. The Series has shown itself to be a generative space that bridges the gap between subject experts and marginalised groups, and has been the site of vibrant and productive conversations between different community members.
Children’s Activism Towards Safe Spaces: A Photovoice Partnership

This capacitation and mentorship project, supported by Terre des Hommes (TdH), Germany’s regional coordination office for Southern Africa, focused on the implementation of a child-centred Photovoice project by TdH partners in Zambia, Zimbabwe and South Africa. Through the provision of training, mentorship and technical support, the project aimed to strengthen and build partners’ capacities to implement Photovoice methodology as an approach to supporting child protection in precarious environments.

The TdH partners implemented the methodology with 30 children across the participating sites. Employing such formats as photo exhibitions, dialogues with municipal-level authorities on child protection, community campaigns and a photo book, the project has effected material changes at the local level that function to mitigate child safety risks. The project’s contributions have included challenging the dominant discourses on child safety and protection; privileging marginalised voices and the co-construction of social change; and supporting a culture of competencies by recognising children as influential civic actors and as social assets, and as possessing generative capacities. Importantly, the project has contributed to existing regional platforms for the development of safe spaces for children, the strengthening of local child protection mechanisms and the engagement of children in child protection-related social activism in their respective communities.

Photovoice Colloquium: Youth Representations of Safety

In May 2017, a total of forty young people from several African countries convened in South Africa for a four-day colloquium on youth representations of safety. The colloquium was the result of ongoing engagement with groups of young people intended to avail platforms for meaningful youth participation in violence and injury prevention, and safety and peace promotion initiatives in indicated communities.

As part of its youth-focused community engagement, the ISHS and its partner, VIPRU, implemented Photovoice methodology with young people from South Africa, Mozambique, Zambia, Uganda, Ethiopia and Egypt to photograph things, places and people that make them feel safe or unsafe in their respective communities. The success of the colloquium was signified by the rich contributions of the participants, reflective of their leadership and social activism; evidence of the resulting collaborations and networks within and across the participating country groups; indicators of material changes in some of the communities that are directly attributable to this youth-centred community engagement; and the capacity of Photovoice to contribute to youth-driven social transformation.
**DIRECT VIOLENCE**

Direct violence refers to physical (anatomical) or psychological (relating to the psyche) violence between individuals and groups that disrupts ‘normal’ social functioning. The everyday acts of interpersonal violence occur against the backdrop of structural violence.

---

**The Cartography of Violence and Peace Project**

The Cartography of Violence and Peace project aims to explore innovative ways to document and measure change in patterns of direct violence and peace in Thembelihle. The specific objectives of the study are to:

- Delineate the current incidence, nature, and patterns of exposure to violence.
- Identify factors that both contribute and undermine peace and safety.
- Identify community assets that contribute to safety and peace.

The project also measures violence and peace associated risk and protective factors. To do this, we employ a multi-faceted approach, which includes community asset mapping, a survey designed to delineate the current incidence, nature and patterns of exposure to violence, and to identify those factors that contribute to and undermine peace and safety. The information will be used to establish a baseline for monitoring change in the extent and patterns of violence within the community over time. The baseline information will be useful in informing and evaluating the ISHS’s interventions within the community and provide a platform for further research. Specifically, the baseline information will allow for future assessments of the influence of infrastructural development, such as electrification and provision of housing, on patterns of violence over time and, therefore, advance an understanding of the relationship between infrastructural development, socio-economic assets and the incidence and patterns of violence within a community. The asset mapping workshops we have conducted so far have revealed the extent to which community-identified assets can facilitate the engagement of the community members themselves in developing a community that mobilises for peace.

**Building Bridges**

The Building Bridges Mentoring Programme (BBMP) is a dynamic gender-transformative intervention that endeavours to promote equitable relationships by applying transformational processes to enhance agency and promote responsible and active citizenship. The programme is embedded in an integrated theory of change model, which combines individual change theories (Knowledge Attitude Behaviour and Comprehensive Values Education) with experiential learning, ecological systems and critical perspectives as a more effective universal theory to change behaviour (see Theoretical Framework section). Guided by a CBPR and a participatory community engagement strategy, BBMP was developed collaboratively with community members from conceptualization to compilation of the manual entitled *Building Bridges Mentoring Programme: Building people, Building youth, Building community.*
Theoretical framework: Community Engaged Research on Violence Prevention, and Safety and Peace Promotion

In South Africa, the high incidence of violence and injury and its impact, is disconcerting. The Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation (CSVR, 2001) posit that the medical costs associated with violent injuries was estimated at 4.7 billion rand. Notwithstanding the unacceptably high occurrence of violence and injuries in South Africa, and its deleterious effect on socio-economic development, “there remains a paucity of effective, replicable and contextually congruent injury interventions” in low-income contexts (Eksteen, Bulbulia, van Niekerk, Ismail & Lekoba, 2012, p. 499). This has prompted the South African Department of Health and its partners to develop an integrated collaborative strategic framework to deter injury and violence, and for the “prioritisation of scientifically sound evidence-based intervention, investment in surveillance systems, and improved human resources and management capacity” (Mayosi et al., 2012). While an evidence-based response to address injury and violence is necessary, the risk still exists that unsuitable Eurocentric models that do not fully take into account the importance of cultural, economic, and infrastructural factors may compromise safety, peace and health initiatives in countries such as South Africa (Seedat, 2002).

Key Concepts
The development of a ‘safe communities approach’ within an African context provides useful guidelines for developing contextually congruent research-based interventions or solutions for the promotion of safety, peace and health. Our aim is to develop interventions, through community-engaged research, that promote a culture of safety and peace, both within communities and similar contexts in South Africa and in the African region.

This entailed the use of participatory community engagement strategies where local community leaders, service providers, and community members were consulted, and where local cultural issues pertaining to masculinities and the mobilisation of community assets were identified, understood and utilised in designing the BBMP to help transform violent behaviour by promoting safety, peace and positive forms of masculinity. Community engagement and participation was thus central in every phase of the development of the BBMP, and will also be pursued in the evaluation of the BBMP.
As alluded to earlier, the **three facets or formations of violence**, namely; **Structural violence, Epistemic Violence** and **Direct Violence** accords nuance to the work of VIPRU and imbues it with a criticality that is often absent in orthodox research on violence that tend to focus predominantly on direct violence.

Seedat, McClure, Suffla and van Niekerk (2012, p.4) describe the safe communities approach as an approach that “recognises the psychological, social, economic and criminological dimensions of violence and injuries, and involves the promotion of ecological actions to address risk and protective factors at multiple levels (individual, school, peers, family, community and society), using interventions aimed at universal, selected and indicated groups”. This ensures that injury prevention and safety promotion is researched in a social context that ensures that community participation, knowledge, interests and ownership is acknowledged, affirmed and maximized (Seedat et al., 2012).

![Figure 4. The ecological approach](image)

Because of the importance for a socio-historical contextualisation of research on violence and injury, and interventions in this area, Lazarus, Bulbulia, Taliep & Naidoo (2015), have encouraged a **community-based participatory approach** that is **transformational**, and “reflects two-way processes”, characterised by co-learning, “co-management, and shared control of projects” (Lazarus et al., 2015, p.88). This resonates with the relational approach to participatory research interventions as promulgated by Seedat and colleagues (2012). They assert that this approach
would involve the development and support of robust, socially connected and cohesive communities, which foreground social relations and community life (Seedat et al., 2012, p.9).

Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) provides a strategy or framework for promoting successful community engagement between community and academic role players. Challenges to community-engaged research can be addressed if the fundamental principles of community development and empowerment are espoused, and the principles of co-learning and co-creation of knowledge and action, within an authentic partnership, is sustained. CBPR, as a form of research, seriously considers the power relations / differentials and dynamics within research initiatives, and honour the communities’ concerned (see Transformational Model on page 45).

![Image: Community members involved in a critical reflexive activity](image)

**Critical Community-Centred** scholarship argues for paradigms that are congruent with the emancipation and transformation of communities (e.g., Chilisa, 2012; Guba & Lincoln, 2005). Such paradigms assume the existence of several socially constructed realities, and that knowledge is an outcome of relational connections, in the same way as transformative and liberatory processes of the self-other are connected. This manual invites participants to work with communities to privilege, dignify community voices and their intellectual independence, and generate
innovative engagement methods and paradigms that encompass critical reflection and action to advance well-being and social transformation.

These concepts feature in this manual wherein which the authors propose a transformational model to mobilise community and citizenship via community engagement pathways. These pathways are aligned to research activities that foster democratic traditions and citizenship, enhance social justice, community centred learning, advocacy for supporting the case for community services, and affirm the solidarity economy in communities. In critical community engagement, the concept of reflexivity is central to the discourse of critical consciousness.

Other innovative methodologies by contributors, to advance the transformative concern of critical community engagement, are also made reference to in the manual. These allow the reader/participant to be reflexive of community engagement as a process. Suffla et al (2014) demonstrate the value of Photovoice as a method for favouring subaltern (marginalized or oppressed) voices, stimulating critical consciousness and action, and prioritising the inclusion of local knowledge in the empirical science base. The Photovoice method is used with individuals, and groups such as youth, women and historically oppressed and economically disadvantaged people, whose voices tend to be marginalised in processes of social change. Photovoice enables participants to represent their social realities through photographs that they take, and engage in critical and reflexive dialogue about the meanings of their photographs, the social conditions that they represent, and the potential for grassroots social activism and change. Photovoice reinforces the idea that communities’ realities, and therefore their narratives, are socially bound, and that their portrayal is mediated through culturally available forms of representation (Suffla et al., 2014).

**Asset Mapping** is an engagement approach that attempts to re-conceptualise communities as being capable, resourceful, and resilient, and to foster participation, agency and inclusivity. Asset mapping approaches can strengthen community engagement through research and action. The use of asset mapping in engaging the vulnerable to identify assets/strengths that influence violence in communities, and complements existing community engagement methods. (Please see Chapter 4 for Asset Mapping)

**Safe Communities Approach**

The concept of safe communities arose in Western Europe during the early 1980s and supports previous community development and community psychology standpoints emanating in the 1960s and 1970s in countries such as South Africa. From the 1970s, the notion of safety was
regarded as an essential component of health and well-being. Safety became progressively more framed as a necessity that required community-based participation and community-led involvement. These ideas formed the basis for the Manifesto for Safe Communities adopted at the First World Conference on Accident and Injury Prevention in Stockholm in 1989 and became the catalyst for the formalisation of the Safe Communities Approach (World Health Organisation, 1989). This approach is regarded as a key mobiliser for community-focused efforts to promote safety and peace and prevent injury.

The Safe Communities logic broadly focusses on the principles of intersectionality, partnerships and collaboration, programme sustainability, safety for vulnerable groups, documentation, evaluation and information dissemination, and International Safe Community Network participation (see Svanström, & Sundström, 2010). The Safe Communities Approach is underpinned by the following guiding principles of community-based prevention actions: Contributions from multiple disciplines; evidence for intervention effectiveness; long-term community investment; community participation; recording of injuries; documentation of learnings; evaluation of interventions; and information-sharing.

![Image: Local community in Western Cape](image-url)
This safe community demonstration programme assumed a community-based participatory research (CBPR) approach and focused on demonstrating a CBPR approach to the development, implementation and evaluation of an intervention that focuses on the mobilisation of community assets, including spiritual capacity and religious assets, and the promotion of positive forms of masculinity, safety and peace to address male youth interpersonal violence. The concept of spiritual capacity refers to a specific human capacity that animates action, compassion, and solidarity in the fullness of life (Cochrane et al., 2015). The specific emphasis of the SCRATCHMAPS project was on mobilising religious assets, and enabling spiritual capacity, to promote safety and peace. This South African case study brings together academic and community-embedded views on safety and peace to identify key factors that could contribute to safety and peacebuilding at a community level. The SCRATCHMAPS project, housed in the Violence, Injury and Peace Research Unit (VIPRU) of the South African Medical Research Council and University of South Africa (SAMRC-UNISA), was initiated because of the high levels of violence in South Africa and globally, and the overrepresentation of males as both perpetrators and victims of violence (Krug, Dahlberg, Mercy, Zwi, & Lozano, 2002; Lazarus, Tonsing, Ratele, & van Niekerk, 2011; Taliep, Lazarus, & Naidoo, 2017).

The focus on safety and peace promotion in the SCRATCHMAPS project includes the mitigation of direct and structural violence, and uses a proactive, positive approach aimed at building peace, including embracing and promoting values and behaviours that reject violence and actively promote peace. The SCRATCHMAPS project particularly placed emphasis on building a culture of safety and peace by means of education, fostering democratic participation (particularly through the community engaged participatory approach pursued in the project), and promoting gender equality. The SCRATCHMAPS project was informed by a critical and human rights perspective, focusing on actively transforming society, with social justice as a central goal; utilising a historical and contextual approach to understand ‘persons-in-context’; centering on various issues of power and oppression; and engaging with marginalised voices, including indigenous and community-embedded knowledge (Ratele, Suffla, Lazarus, & Van Niekerk, 2010). A systems approach also informed the way we understood and pursued the SCRATCHMAPS study, including identifying risks and protective factors at individual, relationship, community, and societal levels; recognising that violence includes factors that cut across systems levels, which requires a comprehensive approach.
A Critical Approach to Community Engagement

The concept of engaging communities in research projects or programmes is not new. However, community engagement has become increasingly relevant, especially where research and interventions can significantly improve people’s access to social justice, safety, peace, health and well-being. Many communities face multiple challenges such as poverty, violence, unemployment, drug and alcohol abuse, intentional and unintentional injuries, and inadequate provision and access to education and healthcare. It is, therefore, crucial that communities are requested to consider participating in community-engaged research partnerships and projects that address these challenges.

A critical approach to research is characterised by a view of reality and people, as being shaped by social, political, cultural, and economic values and ideologies. A particular critical theory informing one’s practice may emphasise one area of power relations more than another (e.g., economic forces, or racial identities), but, in general, this perspective emphasises the need to understand and address power relations, with a particular focus on oppression, privilege, and inequities, for the purposes of promoting liberation and just social transformation. This values-driven approach generally reflects a human rights perspective that focuses on power relations with a particular emphasis on race, class and gender dynamics, and the inclusion of, and analyses of colonialism and its consequences. This approach promotes reflexivity or self-reflection that focuses on one’s own social position within the relations of power (e.g., the effects of being a middle-class researcher in a low-income community context), and values, engage with and embraces marginalised voices, including indigenous and community-embedded knowledges.

The concept of reflexivity is important in a critical approach (Seedat, 2012; Seedat & Suffla, 2011). Reflexivity is utilised as a means for constructing, interrogating, questioning, enacting and recording community engagement. This involves an open and candid analysis of one’s own outlook and position in a community engagement process. This includes noting and engaging with one’s specific position in power relations in the research relationship for the purposes of avoiding harmful uses and abuses of power, and for recognising the dignity and promoting the empowerment of all concerned.

Nurturing mindfulness and critical awareness in community-engaged scholarship and community engagement initiatives may disrupt the power dynamics that exist in higher education institutions, as some scholars who work within these institutions do not recognise or value indigenous and other forms of knowledge. A critical approach places emphasis on co-learning and the co-creation of
knowledge, and the valuing of diverse perspectives and worldviews to achieve the reciprocity and mutual benefit that forms the core of community-engaged scholarship (Kajner, 2015). Community-engaged research and scholarship that is informed by this lens, therefore, calls us to contest dominant knowledge influences for the purposes of promoting social justice, humanism, reflexivity, and compassion.

All of the above suggests that there is a need to ensure and pursue a more just and ethical consideration of community engagement that emphasises deep listening and co-learning (Kasworm & Abdrahim, 2014; Sandmann, 2008; Tlostanova & Mignolo, 2012). Researchers are cautioned against developing prescriptive models that ‘tell’ others what is best or what to do; rather, we need to understand the dynamics of communities, be guided by their agendas, and seek collaborative ways to engage with community members in order to collectively find solutions to challenges in local contexts.

The contributions of community engaged research represent a compilation of critical analysis by thoughtful and reflexive scholars, who envision counter-hegemonic, alternative, and innovative ways of undertaking and thinking about research that is emancipatory in intent and community- and action centered. The contributions are an audacious attempt to make community engaged research and community psychology more critical, and interventions more responsive to social change.
SECTION 4: UNDERSTANDING COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Who or What Constitutes ‘Community’?

Increased emphasis on community collaboration indicates the need for agreement on the definition of community within public health. The term community has no single definition. ‘Community’ has been defined in different ways within different settings and different fields. The following are some of the varied ways in which the term community is defined (see MacQueen et al., 2001; Smith, Leitch, & Thomsen, 2016; Taliep, 2016):

- A group of people residing in a specific geographic location
- A group of people with strong and lasting social ties, who share common views, and engage in collaborative action
- A group of individuals tied together through emotional connections (e.g., the experience of trauma)
- A group of people with a common or shared historical identity of a place that provides a sense of connectedness to memories and past experiences
- Groups tied together through many and diverse networks connected to specific places and interests

These varied ways of understanding what community means to people have one thing in common – there is a sense of connectedness between members of a community, whether it be emotional, social, and locational, or because of a common interest. A definition of community depends largely on how community members view their community, and who represents the community in a particular project. Gaining insight into the everyday workings and structure of a community from the viewpoint of community members is therefore vital for ensuring that all the role players and stakeholders are at the table right from the start so as to ensure relevant community engagement activities. When considering who should be involved in decisions and actions in the community project concerned, ask yourself:

- Are those persons most affected by the challenge or issue being addressed at the table?
- Are those individuals who have a stake in the concern being tackled at the table?
- Are those stakeholders who have access to resources to tackle the identified issue at the table?
- Do people identified above play a decision-making role in the possible community engagement activities being pursued?
Finally, when thinking about community in community-engaged research and action, we need to note that a simplistic understanding of this concept can be problematic. The main concern being raised about our use of this term revolves around a view of a community that assumes unity and commonness without a recognition of the diverse values and interests that are often in conflict with one another in any community. The complexity of community dynamics, therefore, needs to be expected and addressed accordingly.

**What is Community Engagement?**

Community engagement refers to a process where academic institutions engage actively and inclusively with community members, local stakeholders, and service providers, and develop a participatory working relationship with equitable power and mutual benefit in order to collaboratively develop strategies to address felt needs and challenges or foster community development. Community engagement includes various activities carried out in partnership with local communities, and includes service, service-learning (combining learning objectives with community service to provide a practical learning experience whilst fulfilling community needs), community-based research, and applied research (Lazarus, Taliep, Bulbulia, Philips, & Seedat, 2012).
Why is Community Engagement important?

The justification for community-engaged research and community engagement activities or programmes is rooted in the recognition that safety, peace, and well-being are influenced by global politics, the political economy of knowledge production (who produces knowledge and who owns it), neoliberal influences, and social and physical environments. Community engagement approaches, therefore, have to be aware of the impact of the colonisation of science, language, knowledge, knowledge production and ownership, and ensure that community-engaged research and action address the concerns of communities, and benefit diverse populations. Safety, peace, health, well-being and environmental challenges are ideally addressed by engagement with community partners who bring their own learnings, perspectives, experiences, and knowledge of community life to a project. This emphasis on community engagement has encouraged researchers, safety and peace practitioners and advocates, community leaders and activists, civil society, and policymakers to re-imagine new opportunities as they encounter new challenges (Doll, Bronzo, Mercy, Sleet, & Haas, 2008).

In general, the goals of community engagement are to:

- Develop mutual trust.
- Create and establish open and harmonious relationships and communication.
- Be compassionate and committed to recognizing the dignity of all.
- Be authentic, transparent, and accountable.
- Pursue a participatory approach in planning, implementing and evaluating programmes.
- Embrace, value and respect all languages, cultures, and systems of knowing.
- Be committed to co-learning and co-sharing.
- Ascertain and recognize existing assets, enlist new resources, strengthen existing allies, and generate new partnerships.
- Collectively enhance and promote the overall safety, health, well-being and environmental outcomes as projects evolve into successful and sustainable collaborative partnerships that stimulate growth, leadership, and ownership of programmes (Centers for Disease Control [CDC], 2007; Shore, 2006; Wallerstein, 2002).
- Pursue equity, social justice, trusting and equitable partnerships, and compassionate community-engaged research.
Key Characteristics and Principles of Community Engagement

Community engagement is rooted in the principles of community organisation: equity, fairness, social justice, empowerment, ownership, participation, and self-determination. The principles outlined below can serve as guiding parameters for community practitioners, stakeholders, researchers and other professionals who embark on community-engaged activities, projects or interventions throughout the planning, development and evaluation stages of such initiatives (see Lazarus et al., 2012; Taliep, 2016).

- **The community is central**
  The community is the key area of focus. Before embarking on engagement activities, we need to find out as much information about the community as we can. A good way to do this is to draw up a preliminary community profile from existing information or speak to key informants or gatekeepers (see Chapter 1). This will provide good background information, including socio-economic conditions, political affiliations, and historical factors.

- **Understand community dynamics**
  It is important to have a good understanding of prevailing and past community dynamics in order to plan a way forward to address conflict that may potentially affect the engagement activity.

- **Formulate a clear purpose for the engagement**
  Involve community members in identifying and defining the focus of the engagement activities. This will increase community support for the intended engagement activities.

- **Align with the community’s own agenda**
  Using a bottom-up approach, establish what the issues and the needs of the community are and ensure that the research aligns with the community’s agenda.

- **Partner with the community**
  We must work in partnership with the community to accomplish the aims and objectives of the engagement activities. This partnership can be strengthened through building relationships of trust and mutual respect, fostering clear, honest and open communication, and clarifying roles and responsibilities right from the start.
Be inclusive – respect diversity
Being inclusive means to involve those who are marginalised, in particular, those with limited schooling or language and communication difficulties, race, religion, culture, gender, socio-economic (SES) status and disability. This means recognizing and valuing diversity, which can be a source of strength.

Establish appropriate and accountable structures
Partnerships, collaboration, and joint accountability can be strengthened through the establishment of an Advisory Committee, also called an Advisory Board or Steering Committee. Such a committee establishes agreed-upon ground-rules on conducting meetings, setting agendas and making decisions. The Advisory Board thus becomes the decision-making body that approves all engagement activities.

Foster engagement through participation
Community members need to be actively involved in decision-making and other activities. Participatory research methods can be used to collect and analyse data and provide community members with the necessary skills to improve participation. Opportunities for all voices to be heard need to be provided.

Mobilise assets and strengths
Community engagement activities should assume a strength or asset-based approach. By engaging with communities in identifying and mobilising both tangible (physical or visible, e.g., buildings and institutions) and intangible (not physical in nature, e.g., knowledge, networks, values) community assets and resources, community researchers can restore personal and collective agency of community members, in order to address issues and build community.

Active ownership: Release control of engagement activities and interventions
Community engagement obliges a commitment to community ownership. It is important that various capacity-building opportunities be built into the different phases of the research in order to strengthen the capacities of community members and facilitate ownership from the beginning.

Plan for dissemination
Community researchers and members should participate in the planning and implementation of a dissemination plan. This includes providing regular feedback to participants, and the
broader community on agreed-upon decisions, and progress in research and engagement activities.

- **Plan for sustainability, within a long-term commitment**
  Community engagement requires a commitment to a long-term process, with an obligation to sustainability. This means that we must ensure that sustainability plans are built into our engagement activities right from the start. This plan should prioritise capacitation and skills development so that community members can sustain activities considered important to achieve their goals and objectives.

The abovementioned principles highlight that community engagement is informed by the principles of criticality, which emphasise reflexivity, co-learning, co-construction of knowledge, the recognition and valuing of different worldviews and knowledges, and intentionally including marginalised and indigenous voices (Alinsky, 1962; Chávez et al., 2007; Freire, 1970; Wallerstein & Duran, 2006).

**Challenges of Community Engagement**

Research team members involved in various Ukuphepha projects that focus on violence prevention and safety, health, and peace promotion has highlighted the following challenges to community engagement:

- **Power struggles in the community**
  When negotiating decisions on participation, roles and responsibilities, and accountability, we should be aware of power struggles within the community, and amongst community members. These power dynamics may create conflict, but understanding the dynamics behind a conflict helps us to resolve or manage the situation in order to prevent harmful consequences.

- **Challenge of association**
  It is important to be neutral or impartial when engaging different parties in a community so that it does not appear that we are siding with a particular person or group, as this can cause ‘conflict of association’.
Building and maintaining community trust
Communities are often wary of outsiders who make promises that are not fulfilled, and/or researchers who continually use the community for research purposes without any benefit to the community. We, therefore, need to recognize the particular history of the community concerned and take time to build relationships of trust and respect. This includes clarifying and negotiating our respective expectations of the community-engaged activity.

Engaging and maintaining community participation and involvement
Obtaining and maintaining optimal participation in any community research and project is a major challenge requiring intentional strategies that facilitate both involvement and participation. This is particularly important for fostering ownership and sustainability.

Academic expert versus community expertise
Community members often have the perception that academics will bring the resources and have the solutions to their problems. Therefore, we need to be aware of the power dynamics at play when engaging community members and emphasise the value of local knowledge.

Active ownership and sustainability
Given that researchers often initiate projects in communities, achieving active ownership by the community constitutes an ongoing challenge. Active ownership should be fostered from the beginning stages of the engagement activities through capacitation and empowerment towards the promotion of ownership and sustainability. Without sustainability plans, the continuity of the project can be jeopardised. A clear timeframe for engagement activities must be negotiated with the community, and sufficient time must be allocated and support provided to strengthen the project and foster sustainability.

Project and financial management
Researchers or outside project managers generally play a key role in managing community projects and its finances. This creates a particular kind of power relation that needs to be addressed if a genuine partnership is being pursued. Addressing this challenge is also important if we want to promote community ownership and sustainability. One specific question that needs to be addressed relates to the extent of our transparency: Should we reveal the full project budget – showing the wages of people employed. We suggest that this question should be discussed and an outcome decided by the advisory structure concerned.
Emotional labour
As researchers, we are aware that community-engaged research and action creates a great deal of emotional labour in the form of extra work, stress, and other competencies that are usually not associated with research work. Acknowledging this challenge calls us to put in place both capacity building and support structures to assist both academic and community researchers involved in the projects.

Institutional/Sponsor’s agenda
Institutions or sponsors generally contribute major resources towards a project. Community-engaged researchers must be mindful of the role that money plays in community-engaged research projects, and above all, how it can unintentionally create conflict. Time and money needed for participation should be clearly detailed in project proposals as timeframes could have implications for funders. Mechanisms that promote equitable and trusting partnerships that address how resources are shared and benefits all parties in the research process have to be generated.

Spectrum of Engagement
Community engagement may perhaps best be understood as informing a process, rather than anticipating an outcome. From the perspective of communities, the process of participation in engagement activities entails interaction, that is, the chance to impact policies and services; or it entails mobilisation, where community members seek and strive to do something about the challenges they experience. Understood in this way, engaging communities could be seen as involving different levels of engagement that can be viewed on a continuum that ranges from consultation to involvement to engagement.

It is helpful to think of these terms on a spectrum of engagement that can be distinguished by the level of decision-making power and power sharing among all parties in the engagement activity (see Figure 5 below).
Figure 5. Spectrum of community engagement

- **Consultation** is a process of finding out and listening to the opinions of community members or groups before making decisions or taking action or providing information to a group or community, for example, where activists or politicians consult with locals as part of a policy development process or an awareness raising activity. This one-way communication strategy does not shift the power relations.

- **Involvement** is another one-way communication strategy that aims to involve community members in processes but does not necessarily provide real opportunities for full participation. For example, community members are invited to become involved in clarifying concerns and issues so that their views can be taken into account in decision-making processes.

- **Engagement** reflects a two-way communication process, characterised by collaboration through developing partnerships, shared decision-making, reciprocity or mutual benefit, and empowerment so that all participants can make informed decisions, take action and manage change.

Bowen, Newenham-Kahindi, and Herremans (2010) also identify three forms of engagement: **transactional**, **transitional**, and **transformational** which link directly to the framework just described (see Figure 5 above). **Transactional engagement** is unidirectional, implying one-way communication and exchange (for example, from university or funding institution to community).

**Transitional engagement** goes beyond the one-directional approach by including consultation and collaboration with community partners but still does not ensure a full partnership. **Transformational engagement** moves beyond symbolic engagement activities, reflecting reciprocal processes. This approach is dependent on genuine dialogue and critical reflexivity and is characterised by co-learning, co-construction of knowledge, co-management, and co-
ownership of projects. Notably, this approach to research and practice transforms exclusionary styles of community engagement and attends to unequal power relations within community–academy partnerships (see Lazarus et al., 2015; Ogunniyi, 2011, Taliep, 2016).

While a transformational engagement approach may be ideal in many instances, we need to assess the particular needs of the project and community concerned to decide whether and/or when to adopt a particular position on the spectrum or continuum of engagement. Some projects do not require a fully participatory and collaborative approach, while others may require that one move along the continuum as the different phases of the research unfold.

Models of Community Engagement

There are a number of community engagement models that have been developed in recent years (see Hashagen, 2002). These include:

- **Consultation/Public Participation Models**
  Public authorities commonly use these models of engagement to obtain views and perceptions from a broad spectrum of community members on needs, concerns or answers to proposals. For example, surveys, workshops, opinion polls, focus groups, and community events.

- **Asset-Based and Social Economy Models**
  These models identify and mobilise physical and human resources for community development, and try to enhance the community’s control over and benefit from such assets. For example, community-based housing organisations.

- **Community Democracy Models**
  Community Democracy models aim to extend local democracy into the community through the establishment of an informal community-based level of government with an emphasis on economic development and learning. For example, community councils.

- **Identity-based Models**
  Marginalised communities usually develop these models as a means of focusing on ‘giving voice’ to the silenced. For example, disability groups or organisations.

- **Learning-led and Popular Education Models**
  These models build and support skills development, including training, employment, and personal development. For example, Peoples Colleges.

- **Service Development Models**
  Service Development models respond to gaps in public service or to recognised community needs such as the work of local voluntary organisations and youth clubs.
- **Community Organising Models**
  These models build coalitions of action comprising religious institutions, community groups, and unions to challenge policies to establish services and community resources.

- **Regional and National Networks**
  These initiatives are characterised by broader links with other communities, networking, sharing experiences and contributing to policy processes. For example, Communities against Poverty Network.

In conclusion, models such as these are useful to community-engaged research to evaluate community engagement programmes, to develop or replicate sustainable ‘good practices’, and to disseminate effective lessons. The crux of engagement, that is, the two-way process that involves the different parties involved in the engagement activity, is central, as well as the formation of pertinent processes and structures to assist sustainability (Hashagen, 2002).
SECTION 5: AN INTEGRATED APPROACH TO COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Our transformation model of community engagement is rooted within a Community-based Participatory Action Research Approach (CBPR), which is a critical framework or approach for community-engaged research.

Community-Based Participatory Action Research

Israel et al. (2003, p. 177) define CBPR as follows:

A collaborative approach to research that equitably involves, for example, community members, organizational representatives, and researchers in all aspects of the research process. The partners contribute unique strengths and shared responsibilities to enhance understanding of a given phenomenon and the social and cultural dynamics of the community, and integrate the knowledge gained with action to improve the health and well-being of community members.

CBPR, therefore, aims to achieve social change, to enhance the outcomes of safety, health, and well-being, and eliminate inequities in social outcomes. Israel, Schulz, Parker and Becker (1998) emphasise that CBPR addresses safety and health from a positive approach, and is embedded in an ecological framework. CBPR encourages empowering community members, which assists to nurture ownership. As an approach to research, CBPR is coherent with a participatory paradigm, which mirrors a worldview that is inclusive and relational.

CBPR is a bottom-up approach, which requires humility as well as openness to learning from one another. The bottom-up approach forces the self-identified helper, or researcher in this instance, to scrutinise motives, question prevailing theories, and be open to learning from the experiences, thoughts, and traditions of those one offer to assist. This approach also affirms that the so-called recipients of the research (i.e. the community) own the process and product of change; that success and failure are shared; and that change is recognized as being reciprocal as we all grow and heal (see Bulhan, 2015). Co-learning and co-creation of knowledge are therefore central to CBPR.

Knowledge is co-constructed by the research partners within a framework of mutual respect for the values and strengths that each brings to the partnership, with community members participating fully in all aspects of the research process. We are compelled to question the
dominant structures of knowledge production which often disregard indigenous voices and regard their worldview as a superior source from which all other knowledges or ways of knowing are judged. As researchers, we should be reflexive and mindful of how our worldview may reinforce the domineering views of others, and silence indigenous voices.

Principles that Guide CBPR Work

The following values and guiding principles of CBPR have been identified for conducting research with communities:

- CBPR is entrenched in a collaborative, fair partnership between research institutions and community members.
- Openly tackles power relations, including issues of ethnicity, race, racism, and social class.
- The community is the central focus or unit of identity, solutions, and practice.
- The research is relevant and suitable to the community.
- Community engagement takes place at all levels of the research.
- CBPR promotes co-learning and co-creation of knowledge, and mutual benefits, which includes the sharing of research results and knowledge (including indigenous knowledge systems) with all relevant partners.
- CBPR builds on existing assets, resources, strengths, and relationships within the community, so it focuses on assets.
- A commitment to action is evident in the ‘action research’ characteristic of CBPR, giving emphasis to a complex relationship between theory and practice that supports just social transformation (praxis).
- This approach requires a long-term commitment, with an emphasis on ownership and sustainability.
- CBPR ensures validity and research rigor, and also endeavours to expand the scope of validity regarding research relevance (Hawe, Shiell, & Riley, 2009; Israel, Schulz, Parker, & Becker, 2001; Israel, Parker et al., 2005; Lazarus, Duran, Caldwell, & Bulbulia, 2012; Lazarus et al., 2012; Minkler & Wallerstein, 2008; Schulz et al., 2002; Taliep, 2016; Wallerstein & Duran, 2008).

Our Model: A Transformation Approach to Community Engagement

Our transformational model can be regarded as a critical approach to community-engaged research, and draws on the guidelines and principles of CBPR (see Figure 6. Transformational Model of Community Engagement below). As indicated above, transformational engagement is
characterised by mutually beneficial processes, requiring honest discussion, negotiation, critical reflexivity, co-learning and co-construction of knowledge, co-management, and co-ownership of projects. This method of engagement, therefore, reflects a participatory or collaborative paradigm that places emphasis on the optimal participation of community members in the planning, development, implementation, and assessment of initiatives (Taliep, 2016). In the context of marginalisation and inequalities, this form of engagement requires that the emphasis be on social justice, community knowledge, agency, ownership, and power differentials. This focus on power requires that we attend to unequal power relations within community–academy partnerships. It is a process that necessitates a comprehensive understanding of community dynamics. It warns against making unitary assumptions about communities; requires dialogue; is flexible, and therefore open to change, and puts into place structures and engagement activities that are accessible and meaningful to marginalised communities (see Bowen et al., 2010; Hashagen, 2002; Lazarus, 2006, 2011; Lazarus et al., 2012; Lazarus et al., 2015; Ogunniyi, 2011, Seedat 2012; Taliep, 2016).

Figure 6. Transformational Model of Community Engagement
Community engagement is reflected as a continuum including consultation, involvement, participation, and praxis (see Seedat, 2012) engagement, and is underpinned by a commitment to ownership and sustainability. The model comprises eight non-linear inter-connected phases: (a) community entry; (b) negotiation; (c) resource mobilisation and mapping; (d) establishing and strengthening information management and delivery system; (e) implementation; (f) monitoring and evaluation; (g) dissemination; and (h) sustainability. The core principles that underpin the model places emphasis on ownership, mutual beneficence, community voice, co-learning, and co-construction of knowledge as well as epistemic justice, and social transformation.

The core principles representing a transformational community engagement approach that inform all community engagement phases and activities include: **Equitable and collaborative partnerships**, with power differentials remaining a focus in all **power relations**; the promotion of **optimal participation** of all involved in the research – in all or most of the phases of the research process; enabling **agency** to facilitate **self-empowerment** to support engaged citizenship; a commitment to **co-learning, co-construction of knowledge; co-management**, and **co-ownership** of the project concerned; a **strengths-based approach** that values all people and contributions involved; **valuing** and engagement of **all liberatory knowledges**, including different disciplines and the **worldviews and voices** of historically marginalised groups, including Africa-centred knowledge systems; **critical reflexivity** on the part of researchers and other community members; a relational approach where compassionate **relationship building** and ongoing negotiation is the focus; **action research** where theory and practice are held within a praxis relationship; **mutual beneficence** of the research and action – to both academic and community partners, with relevance to **community needs** being paramount, and where contributions/resources to building solidarity and strengthening the social economy is highlighted; an emphasis on **capacity building** and therefore education and training; and a long-term commitment to **social justice and sustainability**.
SECTION 6: ETHICS IN COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Debates and criteria about research ethics are not new. Historically, ethical violations have occurred in many communities, resulting in distrust of researchers. It is crucial for researchers and other practitioners engaging communities to abide by the highest ethical standards. The rights, welfare, and safety of communities and individual members must be respected, and prioritised. Community engagement and participatory community-engaged research, therefore, place a great deal of emphasis on ethical behaviour, including building ongoing relationships with and among communities, researchers, and research institutions.

What is the code of ethics of community engagement and partnerships/collaborations? Since community-engaged research gained prominence and became more diverse, this fundamental question calls for interrogation and has generated interest, questions, and ideas (Khanlou, 2005; Silverstein, Banks, Fish, & Bauchner, 2008). We need to consider whether the principles and values of community-engaged research highlighted in Figure 6 above are embedded in community engagement practices and protocols, in the actions that are pursued, in the administrative and managerial processes that are followed, and in the assessment processes.

Ethical dilemmas
Six broad themes relating to ethical dilemmas often experienced in CBPR are explained below.

1. Partnerships, collaboration, and power:
All participatory research involves some amount of collaboration between researchers and the community partners (refer to chapter 1 of this manual). Therefore, it is important and necessary to attend to how partnerships are formed, and how power is distributed and controlled. Banks and colleagues (2013) noted that ethical dilemmas often include tackling the mismatch between timelines and expectations of community, funders and academics; cognizance that closer research relationships create greater potential for exploitation; and taking into considerations that co-researchers may experience instances of inclusion and exclusion during the research process. With partnerships, trust evolves over time, which means that partnership agreements and norms need to be reviewed constantly (Anderson et al., 2012). This is done by establishing a ‘Standard Operating Procedure’ and a ‘Memorandum of Understanding’ or ‘Memorandum of Agreement’, which is explained later in this section.
2. **Blurring the boundaries:**
Blurring the boundaries between researcher and researched, academic and activist, CBPR involves the co-production of research and action orientation, meaning that members fulfil various roles to fulfil their tasks. Tensions may rise for people who fulfil the role of both researcher and community member, or academic and activist (Horn et al., 2008). Community researchers studying their own communities or peer groups may find themselves in the roles of both researcher and researched, and have to consider whether and where to draw the lines between being a researcher, and friend or neighbour (Banks et al., 2013).

3. **Community rights, conflict, and democratic representation:**
While most ethical guidelines for research focus on the rights of the individual, CBPR raises the challenge of expanding rights to communities or groups. Wallwork (2003) identifies that this creates issues in defining community bearing in mind conflict within and between communities and groups, and determining who represents a community or group.

4. **Ownership and dissemination of data, findings, and publications:**
If numerous partners are engaged in research, conflicts of interest may arise in terms of who takes credit for the findings and what channels are utilised for dissemination (Love, 2011; Maddocks, 1992; Quigley, 2006). These may manifest in decisions on co-authorship, publications, and claims for research impact, particularly as academics are pressurised to publish, and provide evidence for impact on policy and practice.

5. **Anonymity, privacy, and confidentiality:**
Whilst these matters are shared concerns in all types of social research, the close relationships developed in CBPR projects, preclude clear-cut solutions. If community or peer researchers are involved, and broad dissemination envisaged and planned for within the community, identities of research participants may be hard to conceal. Some participants may request to be named and recognised, whilst others may not. There may be certain matters that representatives of a community or group may not want revealed.

6. **Institutional ethical review processes:**
A noticeable theme in some of the literature is the difficulty of fitting CBPR into the process and procedures for institutional ethical review (Flicker & Guta, 2008; Love, 2011; Manzo & Brightbill, 2007). Whilst many of the assumptions underlying the ethical review process – including the predictability of research trajectories – are problematic for all social research, they pose specific
challenges for CBPR. Ethical guidelines for research and forms to be completed are often based on a clear distinction between researchers and those participating in the research; require individual consent to participate, and make assumptions that an academic or professional researcher (‘principal investigator’) has primary control over and responsibility for the research.

The following principles serve as guidelines for adhering to ethical codes of conduct (see Glesne, 2006; Taliep, 2016):

- **Informed consent and voluntary participation**
  Research participants must be provided with sufficient information in a language that they prefer and are literate in so that they can make an informed choice on whether to participate in a study or not.

- **Privacy, confidentiality, and anonymity**
  “Privacy implies the element of personal privacy, while confidentiality indicates the handling of information in a confidential manner” (Strydom, 2005, p. 61). Participants’ rights to anonymity and confidentiality must be respected by ensuring that the data remain confidential, by not disclosing their names during the course of the research or afterward, or identifying personal information on questionnaires, workshop evaluation sheets, research reports, or in any other publications.

- **Beneficence**
  Participants must be informed about the possible benefits that they may or may not gain from the study.

- **Protection from harm**
  Participants must be informed of any foreseeable risks or harms attached to the engagement activities, and their right to withdraw from the study at any stage during the research process. Every effort must be made to protect researchers and participants from harm.

- **Data use and storage**
  Part of the ethical conduct is developing a legitimate dissemination plan for the findings of the proposed research that will meet the needs of both communities and researchers. In this regard, the Yale University Clinical and Translational Science Award’s (CTSA) Community Alliance for Research and Engagement (CARE) Ethical Principles of Engagement Committee (2009, p. 3) note the following: “University Researchers should involve community partners as early as possible in
discussions about the potential uses of all data to be collected, including a dissemination plan for the sharing of the research findings with the wider [non-academic] community, and should develop a process for handling findings that may reflect negatively, and thus cause harm to one or both partners”.

➢ Reflexivity: Researcher role and ethical dilemmas

Glesne (2006, p. 133) poses the following important ethical question with regards to the role of researchers and the ethical dilemmas that they face: “Do researchers, as uninvited outsiders enter a new community, mine their raw data of words and behaviours, and then withdraw to process those data into a product that serves themselves and, perhaps, their professional colleagues?”. To guard against this ethical challenge, it is important to be reflexive and inclusive throughout the engagement process.

Finally, since engaging communities is a dynamic and interactive process, it provides many opportunities to identify possible ethical problems and dilemmas before they occur, and as they emerge.
CHAPTER 1

Phase 1: Community Entry

Naiema Taliep and Samed Bulbulia

This chapter focuses on the initial phase of a prospective community engagement study. The chapter centers on: planning; developing an initial demographic overview of the prospective research site, organisation or group, and obtaining initial community approval; gaining entry to the community; developing and maintaining a relationship with the community, and negotiating project aims and objectives for the proposed study.

STEPS FOR NEGOTIATION AND RECOGNITION

The table below serves as a guideline for community practitioners, interventionists or researchers, and outlines the steps that can be pursued during the community entry phase of a study. These steps are by no means a linear process and depend on the community of interest, the study setting and whether or not you are familiar with the community, organisation or group concerned.

Table 2. Steps in Community Entry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Anticipated Outcome/Process</th>
<th>Instruments and Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>• Formulated clear objective&lt;br&gt;• Identified timeframe&lt;br&gt;• Identified resources&lt;br&gt;• Developed initial safety profile, and identified initial needs</td>
<td>• Meeting documents (agenda, registers, minutes) &lt;br&gt;• Existing data sources&lt;br&gt;• Community Profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td>Gaining Entry to the Community</td>
<td>• Gaining entry to the community&lt;br&gt;• Principles of community entry&lt;br&gt;• Goals in community entry&lt;br&gt;• Process of community entry&lt;br&gt;• Establishing community entry as part of a participatory process</td>
<td>• Meeting documents (agenda, registers, minutes) &lt;br&gt;• Existing data sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td>Initial Relationship Building</td>
<td>• Conducted a Transect Walk&lt;br&gt;• Identified gatekeepers or key informants&lt;br&gt;• Approached community members, stakeholders, leaders, groups and institutions&lt;br&gt;• Built rapport and trusting relationships</td>
<td>• Meeting documents (agenda, registers, minutes) &lt;br&gt;• Notes, diary entries, photographs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 1: Planning

Engaging communities without a clear and flexible plan is possibly setting yourself up for failure. Researchers usually have some idea of what it is that they envisage researching within a particular community, and develop a broad profile of the demographics and challenges of that community which serves as background information. Planning requires us to be as flexible as possible - taking institutional constraints into consideration. In order to minimise the risk of imposing our agenda onto the community, it is important that our plans are broad and flexible. To achieve an effective and participatory community engagement process, prior planning is required. At the outset, you need to have a clear idea of the scope and aims of the engagement process, with a realistic assessment of the resources at your disposal.

Clear aims and objectives

Important questions to answer at this stage are, for example:

- Why are you engaging a particular group, organization or community?
- Whom will you engage?
- How will you gain access to the community, group or organisation?
- Is the engagement designed to obtain community approval for a proposed study?
- Is the engagement intended to identify and address community needs and challenges?
- Is the engagement meant to reach consensus on a proposal or plan?
- What are the resources that you need and can draw on to engage meaningfully with this community? For example, researchers often underestimate time as an important resource for building relationships with communities.

A clear aim will assist you in identifying engagement objectives and expected outcomes, and it will establish the level of the engagement. As outlined in the Introductory chapter, engaging communities can range from simply imparting information to a community, and asking for feedback (consultation), involvement in decision making, to a more participatory or collaborative form of engagement that emphasises the optimal participation of community members in the planning, development, implementation, and assessment of initiatives.
The following useful tips may serve as guidelines to take into account before conducting an engagement activity in the community:

- Establish as an organisation whether the community in which you intend to conduct the programme meets the basic programme criteria, for example, population demographics, or housing types. This could be achieved by drawing up an initial community profile (see next section).
- Engage in informal meetings with community leaders to establish what their community research priorities and needs are, and see if these coincide with your organisation’s programme. If your interests differ, the organisation can see if the community needs, or has an interest in the programme or research your organisation wish to implement or conduct. Both parties can then jointly agree on and negotiate the benefits of the proposed programme.
- Ensure that community representation and active engagement are integrated into the planning, implementation, and evaluation of your programme from the beginning so that an appreciation of community-centred knowledge, process and ownership of a programme can come to fruition.
- Assess the level of infrastructure present in the community, such as the availability of office space, which can be used for training and community meetings, as well as supportive agencies who could assist with, for example, referrals and a meeting space.
- An important consideration is the distance and travel time to the community. Since the programme relies on daily contact between staff and fieldworkers, your organisation must be aware that travel can be costly, as well as tiring for the staff. Ideally, an organisation should try to secure an office space in the community.
- Working with transient communities may be problematic since the programme requires researchers to establish a rapport and gain trust.
- When the community decides that a programme is responsive to a need, encourage, promote and negotiate formalising ownership of the programme. It is important to establish from the beginning, without pressuring the community, whether they wish to continue the programme if or when the organisation decides to leave.
- If the community decides to continue the programme once the organisation has left, the organisation may want to establish whether the community can sustain ownership of the programme. The following issues need to be discussed between both parties: resources available and required, support from other agencies and local organisations, available skills
and capacity, as well as gaps. For example, can proposal writing and fundraising skills training be offered and implemented at the beginning of the programme so that community members’ skills are enhanced, and can your organization provide ongoing technical and organisational support.

It is important to be cognisant of various technical or procedural factors that may facilitate or impair your engagement activities.

These are some issues, which could ease the transition towards ownership and sustainability of a community programme.

Preparing a Community Profile

A community profile (CP) is a tool comprising a broad description of the socio-demographic characteristics, economic activities, political structures, community infrastructure, services, resources, and challenges within a specific geographic area of interest. Hawtin and Percy-Smith (2007, p. 10) define a community profile as:

A comprehensive description of the needs of a population that is defined, or defines itself, as a community, and the resources that exist within that community, carried out with the active involvement of the community itself, for the purpose of developing an action plan or other means of improving the quality of life of the community.

The development of a community profile is a participatory process, which encourages active participation of local community members and organisations in the process. A community profile is not a static document, but changes over time as more information is gathered in the different phases of the research process.

Why draw up a Community Profile?

A community profile provides valuable information before conducting research with communities, as it enables researchers to identify the needs, challenges, and strengths within a community. It is a tool for gathering data that may not already be documented; draws attention to gaps in our understanding, fosters broader thinking, and establishes who is likely to be affected by the research or action intended. It provides information on possible partner organisations and institutions, builds relationships, and serves as a means to collect relevant information over time that may be used for recruitment purposes, monitor changes and dynamics of communities, and identify relevant stakeholders that could play a key role in the
success of the project. It serves as a guide for advocating for the development or choice of services or programmes needed in the community and can prevent the duplication of existing programmes/interventions that will benefit a community.

**How to develop your Community Profile?**

The following figure outlines the steps that you may follow when developing a community profile.

![Figure 7. Steps in developing a community profile](image)

Collect data that is appropriate and useful to your project. Prior to conducting the profile, identify what baseline information you require to gain better insight into the community. The following are examples of information that you may include in your community profile:

- **Inventory analysis of geographic features of the community**
  - Environmental aspects and conditions, e.g. roads, bridges, buildings.
  - Community amenities and services, e.g. crèches, etc.
  - Businesses and organisations, e.g. informal and formal businesses, NGOs, NPOs, CBOs, etc.
  - Visual appearance of community structures.
Demographic characteristics of the community

- Population
- Gender
- Age distribution
- Marital status
- Ethnicity
- Religion
- Population density
- Population migration
- Health
- Disability
- Other sources of information including community or interest groups, e.g. cultural, cooperatives, etc.

Socio-economic characteristics of community

- Education and skills, e.g. literacy levels
- Average household income
- Employment status
- Type of businesses, e.g. mobile shops, supermarkets, etc.
- Family structure
- Transport
- Housing (type, tenure / owned / rented)

Crime, Injury, Violence, Safety, Health, etc.

- Crime/violence trends and demography (type, frequency, etc.)
- Injury (intentional, e.g. bullying, child neglect, and unintentional, e.g. pedestrian, burns, etc.)
- Health issues
- Levels of safety

Leisure

- Sport activities
- Hobbies
- Gardening
- Seasonal activities
- Community events

Image: A local ECD in Thembelihle
Sources of information: Where and how?

A distinctive feature of a community profile is the participatory nature of the process. Even though data sources may include secondary data (information that already exists), the process of compiling a community profile actively involves local stakeholders and community members through the collection of primary data (new information collected from community members or organisations) and verification or checking of the final community profile. The initial profile only provides an outline of the demographics of a particular community. It must be viewed as a draft that will be developed further once initial relationships have been built, or gatekeepers and key informants have been contacted. Sources of data include the following:

- **Secondary Data Sources:**
  1. The internet
  2. Photographs and maps
  3. Media sources (including community newsletters)
  4. Reports of community organisations
  5. Statistics databases (e.g., Census data, Crime statistics)
  6. Reports produced by tertiary institutions on local studies
  7. Institutional repositories
  8. Government department data

- **Primary Data Sources:**
  - Community conversations with leaders and community members
  - Interviews with stakeholders
  - Focus Group Discussions
  - Survey questionnaires (e.g., Skills Audits)

- **Experiential Data:**
  - Conducting a Transect Walk / Walkabout
Verification of your CP with community members

The participatory nature of a community profile requires that you verify or confirm the accuracy of the information collected during the participatory data collection, data analysis, and write-up of the findings with community members, key stakeholders, gatekeepers and/or key informants. Information can be verified in a meeting with the relevant participants by reviewing the community profile in a participatory manner. It is important to establish the accuracy of the community profile by involving community members in developing the profile, and assessing whether it is a true reflection of how they see their community. Importantly, this process requires that the CP is accessible, and written in a format and language that can be understood by community members.

Step 2: Gaining Entry to the Community

An important first step, and often the most difficult step, in conducting community-engaged research, is ‘gaining access’ to the prospective research site, group or community organisation. Community entry is the process of entering community spaces, with the intention of meeting the community members where they are ‘most comfortable’ to speak about their ideas, needs, and aspirations, in order to initiate and sustain working relationships and to secure the community’s interest in the prospective research or programme. Community entry is a prerequisite to any participatory process (Guanzon, 2015).

According to Guanzon (2015), some of the principles that guide community entry are:

- **Respectful dialogue:** Facilitators need to remove one’s biases and prejudices when entering a dialogue with another person. Going into a community is similar to entering a dialogue process wherein one prepares to listen attentively, and learn from others, rather than impose ideas on them. Encourage respectful dialogue by using 2-way communication skills, avoiding unnecessary jargon, showing interest, maintaining good eye contact, and being patient, humble and empathetic.

- **Sensitivity to needs:** Being constantly on the lookout for what communities want addressed in the process of working together, especially at the entry phase of engagement. This could include the need for more information or skills, or for plans to be developed. It is necessary for the team to consider these needs and to take the appropriate steps to address them.
Historical perspective: Events should be viewed from the perspective that everything has a historical origin, and perceptions developed through time. Listen to the history and community perspectives that have informed concepts, practices, and values. When a community articulates doubts or mistrust in the entry of development projects, instead of looking at these as weaknesses or limitations, it would be useful to continue probing for more facts that resulted in such sentiments.

Openness to iterative learning: Being able to reflect on one’s own assumptions, and challenge them about realities happening on the ground, is important to allow genuine receptiveness, dialogue, and clear and sensitive communication. At the onset of any collaboration or partnership, stakeholders are required to be open to, and willing to learn from each other, to be self-reflective, and to allow for change in their own perspectives.

Important goals of community entry:

Contextual grounding: Prior to engaging in any collaboration, it is important for the key actors to gain a better understanding of the conditions and conflicts that could influence the dynamics within the community. With sufficient consideration of the context, it is easier to put in place measures that can help ensure that planned processes will proceed without serious hindrances.

Building trust and confidence: Relationship building among stakeholders is an essential ingredient for the success of any collaboration or partnership. Thus, issues related to trust and acceptance of the local communities from government support or development institutions need to be addressed during the community entry phase, through appropriate information and communication strategies.

Generating support: A sense of ownership of the program, and request for government support, NGOs, or other partners can be built in during the community entry phase through meetings or other mechanisms so that institutions, governments, sponsors understand community’s perceptions of development and how it can be jointly achieved.

Nation et al. (2011) identify community initiation or entry and community collaboration as distinct approaches to community-engaged violence prevention research, with the method of power sharing among partners being a central factor distinguishing different levels of engagement.
Step 3: Initial Relationship Building

A central building block to community engagement is fostering a trusting relationship between communities of interest, researchers and research institutions. Whilst we offer suggestions for building initial rapport and fostering a trusting relationship with members of prospective study sites, it should be noted that relationship building is not a once-off process. It is an ongoing process that enables the cultivation of trust, the building of rapport, and strengthening of relationships over time. The following are strategies for building relationships with communities:

- Identify various ways of approaching a community, and identify strategies that serve as guidelines for interactions aimed at building trust with community members and stakeholders.
- Identify key stakeholders and community leaders. These may include civic and non-governmental organisations, as well as faith-based organisations, communities of interest, as well as different racial, ethnic and cultural groups. This will ensure that historically marginalised voices are included.
- Ensure that all the relevant role-players are at the table, and avoid being associated with a specific group. This can lead to power challenges and conflict.
- Make appointments with the local leaders and stakeholders in the community, such as the ward councillor, ward committees, leaders of civic associations, non-governmental organisations, community-based organizations, religious leaders, community elders, members of street committees, crèche forums, policing and safety forums, local clinics, businesses, religious leaders, traditional healers, school principals, and local government officials, or any other groups or service agencies who may have an interest in your programme. Some of these organisations may become your partners, or be keen to be part of an advisory committee or a coalition, while others may be people or organisations whose approval and support is important to the programme and the community.
- Try to personally meet with all the respective stakeholders if possible, or give them a courtesy call and/or send them invitation letters providing information on your organisation. Mention that you would like to invite them to a presentation of your proposed project in the community. Make time and effort to engage with community leaders and the broader community so that they may be better disposed towards the programme. Keeping the dialogue simple and transparent creates a mutual understanding, engenders respect, and builds trust.
- Agree on a convenient date, time and comfortable venue for making the initial presentation.
Send invitation letters well in advance to allow for flexibility in schedules and to confirm attendance. This may ensure maximum representation, inclusiveness and participation in the meeting. You could follow up your invitation with phone calls, faxes and emails to encourage attendance. If people are unable to attend the meeting, send the presentation to them. Keep the presentation short, focused, interesting, simple, and preferably in the language acceptable to all present.

Allocate a reasonable timeframe for the community leaders and broader community and stakeholders to make comments, and decide on the acceptance of and participation in this programme.

Establish and/or support local networks to develop and sustain relationships, share information and resources, encourage collaboration, and obtain a commitment for the mobilisation of community. This will enhance community connectedness.

Ethical Considerations

When engaging communities, we are dealing with human beings and should, therefore, be aware of, and adhere to the ethical principles that protect the rights and well-being of participants that guide our engagement activities. The following ethical considerations must be adhered to when engaging communities (refer to the Manual Introduction for an example of how one do this formally):

- Be familiar with different levels of power and voice, and the influence and possibilities and barriers to relationship building they raise.
- Be mindful of the diverse beliefs and practices of racial, religious, cultural or social groups in the community.
- Find ways to build respect and trust. The processes and methods utilised to engage the community must be respectful of community members’ views and opinions, diversity, indigenous and other community-embedded knowledge systems, and local cultural practices and beliefs.
- Remain aware of past experiences communities might have had with researchers using a “top-down data-mining” approach, and use participatory strategies to effectively collaborate and engage with community members, and involve them in decision-making.
- Listen attentively to the community’s concerns, as this is key to establishing rapport and building trust.
- Once the community leaders give voluntary, prior, and informed consent and the relevant stakeholders wish to pursue the programme, arrange for a meeting to discuss any
outstanding issues, which may have an effect on the programme before it is implemented. This may include addressing such questions as: Is there support and receptivity for the institution’s programme; is there synergy between the programme outputs and community priorities, who has ownership and distribution of the data, and how do community leaders and stakeholders feel about forming an advisory committee or coalition? There may be other issues, which organically develop during the implementation of the programme, so you should plan in advance what processes you will follow to address such issues, and the role of the advisory committee in the resolution process. Such plans should be included in the design of the programme. The advisory committee usually comprises your organisation’s representatives, including community and stakeholder representatives. The advisory committee may have various roles and functions, such as overseeing the smooth functioning of the programme (see Chapter 3 for an example from one of our projects).

Identifying Gatekeepers or Key Informants

Who is a gatekeeper?
A gatekeeper is someone with influence or a level of power in a community, group, organisation, or study setting who acts as a go-between person between researchers or community workers, and a community or group of interests. A gatekeeper may also be a committee or an organisation that can facilitate access to a particular population, e.g., Diabetic support group. The gatekeeper mediates access to a study setting or an organisation or a group, for example, a tribal chief in a rural setting or the leader of a gang. Hence, the gatekeeper is often the person who may have influence regarding whether to permit a researcher access or to conduct the research.

Why identify gatekeepers?
Gatekeepers can influence the progress of research and access to community members or participants, depending on their opinions, beliefs, and preconceptions regarding the implications of the research. If permission has not been obtained from a gatekeeper within the group, organisation or community in which you plan to undertake your research, it may be unlikely that access will be granted. In lieu of this, it is important that you are familiar with the particular viewpoints, cultural norms, beliefs, values and even political agendas of the gatekeeper. Know how these would relate to your prospective research project. This is particularly important when conducting research on sensitive issues, or when participants are vulnerable (McFadyen & Rankin, 2016; Saunders, 2006).
outstanding issues, which may have an effect on the programme before it is implemented. This may include addressing such questions as: Is there support and receptivity for the institution’s programme; is there synergy between the programme outputs and community priorities, who has ownership and distribution of the data, and how do community leaders and stakeholders feel about forming an advisory committee or coalition? There may be other issues, which organically develop during the implementation of the programme, so you should plan in advance what processes you will follow to address such issues, and the role of the advisory committee in the resolution process. Such plans should be included in the design of the programme. The advisory committee usually comprises your organisation’s representatives, including community and stakeholder representatives. The advisory committee may have various roles and functions, such as overseeing the smooth functioning of the programme (see Chapter 3 for an example from one of our projects).

**Case Study:**

**An example of an informal engagement without an established relationship**

Our initial engagement with particular communities in one large geographic area was pursued through ‘informal entry’. One of the key researchers in the programme first drove through the different communities. He then held informal conversations with community members, keeping an open mind so that he could see and hear what was important for the community. He walked through the community and often stopped to talk and engage with people. Through these informal conversations, he determined who the community leaders and key stakeholders were, and set up meetings with them.

Source: Ukuphepha Strand projects

*Image: Making contact with gatekeeper in local community*
Conducting a Transect Walk

What is a transect walk?
A transect walk is an information gathering participatory method that involves conducting a walk with key informants from the community, along a pre-determined route, and exploring the features and layout of the area (Nadu, 2005).

Why do a transect walk?
Transect walks are done to obtain an understanding of the resources of a community, the diversity and associated problems, as well as to assess opportunities (Nadu, 2005). A transect walk provides researchers with the opportunity to walk along an agreed upon route with key informants or gatekeepers and to ask questions, to listen to community views, and to observe tangible socio-demographic characteristics of a community. It thus provides an initial means for researchers to learn about a community of interest or prospective study site.

Embarking on the transect walk
Depending on the size of the community, two to three hours should be allocated to meet up with key informants or gatekeepers to provide introductory information on the purpose and scope of the transect walk, to plan the walk, to embark on the walk itself, and to have sufficient time for talking with community members along the way. The following points can be used as a guide, or adapted as needed to conduct the transect walk:

1. What you need
A map of the community, a notebook, and pens to make notes during the transect walk and to develop the diagram or map and record the discussion generated during the diagram development. Obtain a map from the local municipality or simply download a google map of the area, verify the information on the map with key informants and update the map if necessary.
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Transect walks are done to obtain an understanding of the resources of a community, the diversity and associated problems, as well as to assess opportunities (Nadu, 2005). A transect walk provides researchers with the opportunity to walk along an agreed upon route with key informants or gatekeepers and to ask questions, to listen to community views, and to observe tangible socio-demographic characteristics of a community. It thus provides an initial means for researchers to learn about a community of interest or prospective study site.

Embarking on the transect walk
Depending on the size of the community, two to three hours should be allocated to meet up with key informants or gatekeepers to provide introductory information on the purpose and scope of the transect walk, to plan the walk, to embark on the walk itself, and to have sufficient time for talking with community members along the way. The following points can be used as a guide, or adapted as needed to conduct the transect walk:

1. What you need
   A map of the community, a notebook, and pens to make notes during the transect walk and to develop the diagram or map and record the discussion generated during the diagram development. Obtain a map from the local municipality or simply download a google map of the area, verify the information on the map with key informants and update the map if necessary.

2. Identify and Select Key Informants or Gatekeepers
   Identify key individuals who are knowledgeable about the community of interest, are known to the residents, can accompany you on the transect walk, and can introduce you to community members so that you can hear their opinions, experiences and insights of the community, its challenges, and resources. Establish a suitable date and time to conduct the transect walk, where to start with the walk, and how long it will take. These decisions are dependent on the goals and complexity of information needed for the research.

3. Introductions and Clarifications
   The researchers or community practitioners should start by introducing themselves and clearly outlining and clarifying the aims and objectives of the transect walk, and the key discussion points for the informal community conversations. Ensure that the gatekeepers/key informants understand and are comfortable with the focus of the community chats or conversations.

4. Conducting the Transect Walk and Producing a Transect Diagram
   Discuss and reach an agreement with key informants/gatekeepers on the route to follow for the walk. Plan the route carefully to ensure that key landmarks and features of the community that they want to show during the walk are visible on the route. Depending on the tasks assigned (e.g., taking notes, updating the map, or talking with community members), participants in the transect walk should observe and document in detail all significant things in the notebooks or on the map and obtain as much information from the community members as possible.

Start the walk at the agreed upon location, and pause at key structures or landmarks and make notes of significant facts about these structures or landmarks. For example, where it is located, what kind of structure or landmark it is; the historical significance of such amenities; and the role it plays in the community. Ask questions about any significant issues, features, and factors that emerge along the walk and make observations. Try to obtain different viewpoints on aspects
related to socio-economic challenges, land, housing, and other issues. Walk slowly, obtain different opinions, views, and experiences, and record relevant information in your notebooks and draw sketches where required.

After completing the transect walk, come together in a suitable place with the key informants/gatekeepers to talk about, and document the data collected. You may develop a map with the information collected on the transect walk, or add the information you have collected or observed to the printed map (e.g. buildings, drainage system, type of housing, and food gardens). You may also instead of compiling a map, just add the information to the community profile.

5. Analyse the Transect Diagram and notes

It may be useful to have a list of key questions to guide a discussion about the information gathered during the transect walk. Key questions can be determined by the objectives of the study and the information that is required, but could include the following examples:

- What are the tangible (things we can see or touch) and intangible (things we cannot see or touch) assets or resources in the community?
- What is the physical condition of these assets?
- How do these assets/resources vary in different sections of the community?
- What type of housing do people live in?
- What are the visible and invisible challenges or shortages in the community?
- What are the felt or expressed needs of the community?
- What opportunities are there in the community?
- Where do different population sub-groups live? (For example, do people of a particular ethnicity live in a specific section in the community?)
- Where do the poorest households live? (For example, do they live in specific locations like on the outskirts of the community?)
- What are the qualities and characteristics of the population? (For example, health status, ethnicity, gender, etc.)
- Are there any conflicts or disagreements in the community?
- What is important for outsiders to know about this community’s history?

6. Conclude the Activity

Ensure that the participants understand how the information will be used, for example, if the information will be used as data for a community profile or for developing a map as baseline data.
for a prospective intervention study. Allow the participants the opportunity to reflect on the benefits, drawbacks, and the methodical possibilities of the tool. Finally, thank the participants for their time and effort.

The above method may be used as a guide. You may adapt the method to your setting and requirements. You may, for example, provide each participant in the transect walk with a camera and ask them to take pictures of key tangible structures and resources and visible challenges (e.g., potholes; no roads, etc.) in the community, and use these pictures to develop a map of the community or incorporate them into an existing map.

### Case Study: Example of conducting a Transect Walk

We were three academic researchers, accompanied by the gatekeeper, and conducted a transect walk through the community. This provided us with an opportunity to establish rapport with the local community so that we were not strangers to them when the actual project commenced. ‘There [was] clearly some real ‘care’ and pride evident in many of the houses… and in some of the gardens (especially the vegetable gardens)’ and ‘the man cleaning the pavement in front of his house’. There were a few open spaces, which were a bit dilapidated and neglected, but it was an asset that “had great potential for a community recreational area”. Walking through the community gave us as academics the chance to meet the people, introduce ourselves, and gauge their feelings, laying the foundation for building a relationship and trust with the community.

Source: SCRATCHMAPS project (Taliep, 2016).

### CONCLUSION

This chapter has focused on an important first step in community engagement, i.e. community entry. The chapter outlined the principles, goals, and process of community entry, planning community entry, and initial relationship building. What is important to note here, is the significance of establishing rapport and trust from the outset of engaging with communities.
CHAPTER 2

Phase 2: Community Readiness

Ghouwa Ismail and Kamilla Rawatlal

In this phase, the level at which a community is ready to participate in an intervention programme is explored. The different levels of community readiness and readiness strategies are highlighted. Assessing community readiness, using both quantitative and qualitative tools is then discussed.

**STEPS FOR ASSESSING COMMUNITY READINESS**

Table 3 outlines the four steps in community readiness, i.e. (1) defining community readiness, (2) levels of community readiness, (3) Community readiness strategies, and (4) assessing community readiness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Anticipated Outcome/Process</th>
<th>Instruments and Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Step 1 | Defining Community Readiness | • Understanding Community Readiness and implications for intervention planning | • Meeting documents (agenda, registers, minutes)  
• Existing data sources |
| Step 2 | Levels of Community Readiness | • How to identify the community/communities level of awareness to effect change or implement intervention | • Meeting documents (agenda, registers, minutes)  
• Existing data sources |
| Step 3 | Community Readiness Strategies | • Enhancing community readiness at the different levels using different strategies | • Manual document |
| Step 4 | Assessing Community Readiness | • Assessed community readiness to participate in an intervention programme  
• Exploring readiness quantitatively  
• Exploring readiness qualitatively | • Community Readiness Survey/Questionnaire  
• Semi-structured Interview Schedule - Assessing Community Readiness and Safety Problems |
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In this phase, the level at which a community is ready to participate in an intervention programme is explored. The different levels of community readiness and readiness strategies are highlighted. Assessing community readiness, using both quantitative and qualitative tools is then discussed.

STEPS FOR ASSESSING COMMUNITY READINESS

Table 3 outlines the four steps in community readiness, i.e. (1) defining community readiness, (2) levels of community readiness, (3) Community readiness strategies, and (4) assessing community readiness.

Table 3. Steps in Community Readiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Anticipated Outcome/Process</th>
<th>Instruments and Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Defining Community Readiness</td>
<td>• Understanding Community Readiness and implications for intervention planning • Meeting documents (agenda, registers, minutes) • Existing data sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Levels of Community Readiness</td>
<td>• How to identify the community/communities level of awareness to effect change or implement intervention • Meeting documents (agenda, registers, minutes) • Existing data sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>Community Readiness Strategies</td>
<td>• Enhancing community readiness at the different levels using different strategies • Manual document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Step 4 | Assessing Community Readiness | • Assessed community readiness to participate in an intervention programme • Exploring readiness quantitatively • Exploring readiness qualitatively | Community Readiness Survey/Questionnaire • Semi-structured Interview Schedule | Assessing Community Readiness and Safety Problems

STEP 1: What is Community Readiness?

Understanding and gauging the readiness of communities to engage is important to intervention development and implementation. Community readiness can be understood as the extent to which a community adequately understands and is prepared to implement an intervention. Thus, readiness can be viewed as the presence of characteristics within either the individual and/or a community, which are likely to promote engagement in interventions and in turn enhance change. This involves a community’s culture, attitudes, and behaviour that reveals an openness to the implementation of interventions (Donnermeyer et al., 1997; Feng & MacGeorge, 2006; Han, 2003; Jumper-Thurman & Plested, 2000; Travis, Learman, Brooks, Merrill, & Spence, 2012).

In order for an intervention to be effective, communities require the support and commitment of its members alongside available resources for implementation. The involvement of key informants to determine the levels of readiness of a community is important to gain this support. It could thus be argued that if members of a community are not ready to receive an intervention, there is a high probability that the intervention, even after being implemented, will not be effective (Beebe et al., 2001; Edwards et al., 2000; Han, 2003).

An understanding of community readiness allows researchers or individuals to tailor interventions or programmes to community needs and allows members an opportunity to receive and to get involved in these interventions or programmes. Community readiness is a theory “based on the premise that communities, using a step by step method, can be emerged through a series of stages to develop and implement effective prevention programs” (Thurman, 2000, p. 3). By using the community readiness model, it can guide you to determine the stage of readiness of your community, and thereafter develop appropriate intervention strategies.

A community’s level of readiness is not the same for every intervention proposed (Feng & MacGeorge, 2006). Since communities are multi-dimensional and constantly in a state of change, so too their readiness level to address a particular community issue may change. As a result, a community's level of readiness needs to be established before the development and implementation of an intervention (Jumper-Thurman, Vernon, & Plested, 2007). This readiness can range from not being ready at all due to a lack of awareness of a particular issue in the community (see Figure 8), to already having effective interventions that are creating positive changes in communities.
STEP 2: Levels of Community Readiness

Community readiness can be described by the following nine different levels (see Figure 8):

- **No Awareness.** The issue is not generally recognised by the community or leaders as a problem (or it may truly not be an issue).
- **Denial/Resistance.** At least some community members recognise that it is a concern, but there is little recognition that it might be occurring locally.
- **Vague Awareness.** Most feel that there is a local concern, but there is no immediate motivation to do anything about it.
- **Preplanning.** There is clear recognition that something must be done, and there may even be a group addressing it. However, efforts are not focused or detailed.
- **Preparation.** Active leaders begin planning in earnest. The community offers modest support for their efforts.
- **Initiation.** Enough information is available to justify efforts. Activities are underway.
- **Stabilisation.** Administrators or community decision-makers support activities. Staff is trained and experienced.
- **Confirmation/Expansion.** Efforts are in place. Community members feel comfortable using services, and they support expansions. Local data are regularly obtained.
- **High Level of Community Ownership.** Detailed and sophisticated knowledge exists about prevalence, causes, and consequences of a particular challenge that a community faces.
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1. **No Awareness**
   The issue is not generally recognised by the community or leaders as a problem (or it may truly not be an issue).

2. **Denial/Resistance**
   At least some community members recognise that it is a concern, but there is little recognition that it might be occurring locally.

3. **Vague Awareness**
   Most feel that there is a local concern, but there is no immediate motivation to do anything about it.

4. **Preplanning**
   There is clear recognition that something must be done, and there may even be a group addressing it. However, efforts are not focused or detailed.

5. **Preparation**
   Active leaders begin planning in earnest. The community offers modest support for their efforts.

6. **Initiation**
   Enough information is available to justify efforts. Activities are underway.

7. **Stabilisation**
   Administrators or community decision-makers support activities. Staff is trained and experienced.

8. **Confirmation/Expansion**
   Efforts are in place. Community members feel comfortable using services, and they support expansions. Local data are regularly obtained.

9. **High Level of Community Ownership**
   Detailed and sophisticated knowledge exists about prevalence, causes, and consequences of a particular challenge that a community faces. 


---

STEP 3: Community Readiness Strategies

1. **No Awareness**
   **Goal:** Create awareness of the area under discussion
   - Face-to-face visits with community leaders and members.
   - Meet existing and established small organisations or groups to inform them of the issue.
   - Call or email potential supporters.

2. **Denial**
   **Goal:** Promote increased consciousness around the issue that exists in the community
   - Continue one-on-one visits and encourage those you have talked with to assist.
   - Discuss descriptive local incidents related to the issue.
   - Approach and engage local education/health outreach programs to assist in the effort with flyers, posters or brochures.
   - Highlight media articles that illustrate local critical incidents.
   - Develop articles for the local newsletters and or church noticeboards, etc.
   - Conduct meetings to present information to community members.

3. Vague Awareness

Goal: Create awareness that the community has the ability and capacity to change the situation

- Present information at local community events and to unrelated community groups.
- Create flyers, posters, etc. that can be put up in the community.
- Conduct informal local surveys/interviews with community members Print and distribute newspaper editorials and articles with general information and information related to the local context.
- An example of a media message: “Our community can change their world” (with photos of children).

4. Preplanning

Goal: Create awareness by foregrounding concrete ideas to combat the situation or social ill identified

- Introduce information about the issue in the community through presentations and media.
- Develop networks and support from community leaders.
- Review existing efforts in the community (curriculum, programs, activities, etc.) to determine who benefits and what the degree of success has been.
- Conduct focus groups in the community to discuss issues and develop strategies for positive outcomes.
- Amplify media exposure through radio and public service announcements.

5. Preparation

Goal: Draw on existing information to help plan strategies

- Conduct school surveys with general prevalence questions related to the identified challenge in the community.
- Conduct community surveys.
- Sponsor a community picnic to initiate the effort.
- Present in-depth local statistics.
- Determine and publicise the costs of the problem to the community.
- Conduct public forums to develop strategies.
Utilise key leaders and influential people to discuss with community groups and to participate in local radio and television programmes.

6. **Initiation**

*Goal: Provide community-specific information*

- Conduct in-service training for professionals, para-professionals and community members.
- Plan publicity efforts associated with the start-up of programme or activities related to the issue under investigation.
- Attend meetings to provide updates on the progress of the effort.
- Conduct community interviews to identify gaps and improve existing services.
- Commence with library or internet searchers for resources and/or funding.

7. **Stabilisation**

*Goal: Stabilise efforts/program*

- Plan community events to maintain support for the issue.
- Conduct training for community professionals.
- Conduct training for community members.
- Introduce programme evaluation through training.
- Conduct quarterly meetings to review progress and adapt or improve current strategies.
- Arrange special recognition programmes for local supporters or volunteers.
- Prepare and submit newspaper articles detailing progress and future plans.
- Begin networking between service providers and community systems.

8. **Confirmation/Expansion**

*Goal: Expand and enhance services*

- Formalise the networking with social contracts, qualified service agreements memorandum of understanding, or memorandum of agreement.
- Develop a community risk assessment profile.
- Publish a localised program services directory.
- Develop and maintain a comprehensive database.
- Begin to initiate policy change through the support of local city officials.
- Conduct media outreach on specific data, and trends related to the issue.
9. Professionalisation

Goal: Maintain momentum and continue growth

- Engage local business in the community and solicit financial support from them.
- Diversify funding resources.
- Continue with more advanced training of professionals, para-professionals, and/or community members.
- Continue assessment of issue and progress made.
- Utilise external evaluation and use feedback for programme modification.
- Track outcome data for use with future grant requests.
- Continue progress reports for benefit of community leaders and local sponsorship.


STEP 4: How to assess Community Readiness?

There are several instruments available to measure community readiness. A community’s readiness to participate can be measured qualitatively and quantitatively. In other words, a community’s readiness may be assessed using an interview, a focus group discussion, or even a survey, but this depends on the aims and objectives of your intervention. However, no matter what the method of assessment, the following always needs to be taken into account when assessing a community’s readiness to receive an intervention:

- Step 1: Identify the issue
- Step 2: Identify and clearly define your community
- Step 3: Prepare your interview questions or survey
- Step 4: Choose your key respondents
- Step 5: Conduct and transcribe the interviews/administer and capture data from surveys
- Step 6: Score the interviews/surveys
- Step 7: Develop an action plan

1. Community Readiness Survey/Questionnaire

Currently, there is no standardised instrument available to measure and quantify the willingness of community members from low-income settings to participate in child-centred safety promotion interventions. It is thus invaluable to develop an accessible and user-friendly tool specifically for the South African population that measures the level of willingness of community members to engage or participate in safety interventions. With willingness to
participate being difficult to define, and even more difficult to measure, engaging in the continued exploration of this construct will produce new knowledge that can inform its further development. Engendering the willingness of individuals to participate in child-centred safety promotion interventions will facilitate the implementation of evidence-based prevention strategies. Moreover, fostering community members’ willingness to participate will contribute to mobilising efforts within the community to sustain and evaluate the use of evidence-based approaches for the promotion of safety. These efforts are expected to maximise the opportunity for community participation by shedding light on barriers to collaboration and delineating key activities to foster multidisciplinary, collaborative approaches to safety promotion programmes.

The community readiness/willingness instrument (Ismail, 2017) addresses three shortcomings of existing willingness to participate measures: (a) the questionnaire is the first known generic instrument developed that can be utilised across multiple safety intervention domains (including violence and the prevention of injuries due to traffic, burns, poisoning, and falls); (b) the conceptualisation of willingness to participate as it relates to safety promotion interventions, which will provide a foundation for further research; and (c) the resulting questionnaire will assist researchers and intervention developers to identify not just overall levels of willingness to participate, but also specific psychosocial barriers and enablers that can be targeted to improve intervention outcomes.

Individuals in communities are the building blocks of community change; if they do not participate in interventions or programmes, it is unlikely that communities will change. Small and Supple (2001) suggest that individuals are influenced by communities at three levels: 1) via the settings and institutions in which they participate (e.g., schools, churches); (2) through the norms and trust that develop by means of social networks (social capital); and (3) through systemic effects such as social cohesion (emotional closeness among members) and collective efficacy (willingness to engage in collective action).

Thus, gauging individual community members’ attitudes and cognitions, and the degree to which an entire community is willing to participate in an intervention could be measured via the aggregation of attitudes and cognition at the individual level (Holt et al., 2007). Such a tool can play a pivotal role in helping practitioners, researchers and organisations to enhance programmatic outcomes, which in turn may contribute to long-term ownership and sustainability of interventions in these communities.
Semi-Structured interview with Key informants

Semi-structured interviews can also be used to assess community readiness. Although there may be few questions about community attitudes, most questions are relatively concrete and ask for specific information. Interviewers must have an interview plan to conduct a semi-structured interview successfully. This section presents a sample semi-structured interview plan adapted to the context of safety diagnoses. It begins with a few instructions on how to use the plan.

Interviewing respondents

Semi-structured interviews utilise an open-ended questionnaire guide and could last from 60 to 90 minutes or longer depending on the talkativeness of the respondent. To ensure that quality data on the subject in question is collected, a minimum of sixty-minutes is adequate. It also allows enough time that neither the interviewer nor the respondent lose their concentration. A comfortable manner in which to commence an interview is to introduce yourself to the respondent and then remind him/her of the goals, projected length, and the topics under investigation during the interview. It is important to remind the respondent that he/she will be the expert in the interview. The respondent’s prior informed consent must be obtained for both the interview and the recording of the interview. The respondent should also be assured that his/her responses would be kept confidential at all times. It is highly recommended that interviews be recoded (with a digital or another form of tape recorder), even if they will not be transcribed in full. Note that recording can only be done with the prior consent of the respondent (see Appendix 2). If he/she refuses for the interview to be recorded, handwritten notes can be taken.

Conducting interviews:

A few tips

- Ensure the person is comfortable and the room or venue for an interview is fitting.
- Conduct the interview in a language preferred by the respondent.
- Commence the interview with general, open-ended questions.
- Keep questions to a minimum. Allow the respondent to do most of the talking.
- Be patient and respect the respondent’s capabilities in answering, and do not be afraid of pauses or silences.
- Interviewers should not judge what respondents say. They must keep the interview focused on the topics previously defined (see the section “Key informant semi-structured interview plan”).
plan—Instructions for use), refrain from suggesting answers, and be careful not to ask leading questions.

- Be careful not to ask closed questions that leave respondents no room to elaborate, and that can slow the interview’s pace.
- Be sure to cover all of the pertinent topics included in the interview plan.
- If necessary, formulate questions so that informants answer on behalf of the people they represent.
- Listen carefully to all answers, and ask more questions to obtain additional information.
- Ensure that key informants thoroughly understand each question.

The text box below highlights questions that may be used in assessing Community Readiness

**Example 1: Assessing Community Readiness**

1. Tell me about your involvement in the community?
2. What types of activities have you been involved in?
3. What tools/approaches/methods have you used that have been particularly effective in reaching and motivating people in the community?
4. Who have your efforts been focused on? What individuals have you, and can you reach?
5. Who have you collaborated with? For example, you may have held workshops with the local child and family services organization?
6. From your knowledge and experience in the community, what are some of the most and least effective strategies or programs you have heard of to reach, involve, and motivate people?
   a. What has really worked and what mistakes have commonly been made? Why do you feel that way?
7. What do you think have been the keys to successful endeavours? Why do you feel that way?
8. What do you think have been the greatest obstacles? Why do you feel that way?
9. Is there anyone else in the community that I should speak with about this issue, who may have some ideas?
### Example 2: Assessing Community Readiness on Safety Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAFETY CHALLENGES</th>
<th>Main questions</th>
<th>Additional questions</th>
<th>Clarifying questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can you tell me about the safety challenges encountered in your area?</td>
<td>How did you learn about the problem?</td>
<td>Can you expand a little on this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Why is it considered a problem?</td>
<td>Can you tell me anything else?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under what circumstances does the problem arise?</td>
<td>Can you give me some examples?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What is the scope of the problem?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Which places are most affected by the problem, when does it usually occur and who are the main victims?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Have you noticed any changes in the situation over the past few years?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Which safety problems give rise to complaints?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How do you explain the problem?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### In your experience, which safety problems bother people the most?

|                   | In your experience, which safety problems bother people the most? | | Why? |
|                   | OR | | |
|                   | | In your opinion, what are the most worrisome safety problems in your area? | |

### Example 3: Assessment of Public Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSESSMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICES</th>
<th>Main questions</th>
<th>Additional questions</th>
<th>Clarifying questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are people satisfied with the services offered by the municipality?</td>
<td>If not, what are the main problems that you have witnessed or heard about?</td>
<td>Can you expand a little on this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td>Can you tell me anything else?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In your opinion, how satisfied are people with the public services available?</td>
<td>Can you give me some examples?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once you know your community's level of readiness, you can plan your effort to start at that level and move the community to the next, and then continue to move towards the highest level of community ownership.

This chapter highlighted the importance of assessing community readiness and the level at which a community could be ready to participate in an intervention programme. The different levels of community readiness and readiness strategies were espoused upon, and assessing community readiness, using both quantitative and qualitative tools were discussed. This chapter provides a framework that can be utilised in order to assess at which level your community is willing and ready to participate.
Once you know your community’s level of readiness, you can plan your effort to start at that level and move the community to the next, and then continue to move towards the highest level of community ownership.

**CONCLUSION**

This chapter highlighted the importance of assessing community readiness and the level at which a community could be ready to participate in an intervention programme. The different levels of community readiness and readiness strategies were espoused upon, and assessing community readiness, using both quantitative and qualitative tools were discussed. This chapter provides a framework that can be utilised in order to assess at which level your community is willing and ready to participate.
CHAPTER 3

Phase 3: Negotiation and Recognition

Naiema Taliep and Samed Bulbulia

After having gained entry into the community, establishing a relationship with key community leaders or stakeholders, and assessing community readiness, we also have to negotiate access with community members who are prospective participants in the research, action, or intervention. In this phase, it is also important to recognise the deep, historical connections of individuals within communities. It is essential to recognise the community as ‘meaning makers’ and knowledge agents as this helps to build relations and trust within the community, and with external agencies.

**STEPS FOR NEGOTIATION AND RECOGNITION**

The negotiation and recognition phase comprise the following steps: the process of negotiating access, recognising community-based actors as meaning makers, establishing community structures, developing an agreement to formalise the engagement relationship, closure, and maintaining relationships.

**Table 4. Six Step Negotiation and Recognition Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Anticipated Outcome/Process</th>
<th>Instruments and Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Step 1 | Negotiating Access | • Negotiated access with participants  
• Negotiated project aims and objectives  
• Conducted Rapid Needs Assessment  
• Obtained agreed-upon community aims and objectives | • Meeting documents (agenda, registers, minutes)  
• Workshop notes and data  
• Diary entries, photographs |
| Step 2 | Recognising Community-Based Actors as meaning makers | • Recognising community members as meaning makers and knowledge makers | • Photovoice and Digital Stories |
| Step 3 | Establishing community structures | • Advisory team and research team established | • Meeting documents (agenda, registers, minutes)  
• Notes, diary entries, photographs |
CHAPTER 3
Phase 3: Negotiation and Recognition
Naiema Taliep and Samed Bulbulia

After having gained entry into the community, establishing a relationship with key community leaders or stakeholders, and assessing community readiness, we also have to negotiate access with community members who are prospective participants in the research, action, or intervention. In this phase, it is also important to recognise the deep, historical connections of individuals within communities. It is essential to recognise the community as 'meaning makers' and knowledge agents as this helps to build relations and trust within the community, and with external agencies.

STEPS FOR NEGOTIATION AND RECOGNITION

The negotiation and recognition phase comprise the following steps: the process of negotiating access, recognising community-based actors as meaning makers, establishing community structures, developing an agreement to formalise the engagement relationship, closure, and maintaining relationships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Developing an Ethics agreement, SOPS, MOU</th>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Anticipated Outcome/Process</th>
<th>Instruments and Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Developing an Ethics agreement, SOPS, MOU</td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Negotiating Access</td>
<td>• Negotiated access with participants</td>
<td>Meeting documents (agenda, registers, minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Negotiated project aims and objectives</td>
<td>• Obtained agreed-upon community aims and objectives</td>
<td>Notes, diary entries, photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Recognising Community-based Actors</td>
<td>• Recognising community members as meaning makers and knowledge makers</td>
<td>Sample of Ethics agreement, SOPS, MOU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Establishing community structures</td>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>Establishing community structures</td>
<td>• Advisory team and research team established</td>
<td>Sample of Ethics agreement, SOPS, MOU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Developing an Ethics agreement, SOPS, MOU</td>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td>Developing an Ethics agreement, SOPS, MOU</td>
<td>• Developed ethical actions and practices</td>
<td>Sample of Ethics agreement, SOPS, MOU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Developing an Ethics agreement, SOPS, MOU</td>
<td>Step 5</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>• Agreed on timeframe and closure of project</td>
<td>Sample of Ethics agreement, SOPS, MOU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Developing an Ethics agreement, SOPS, MOU</td>
<td>Step 6</td>
<td>Maintaining Relationships</td>
<td>• Maintaining relationships</td>
<td>Sample of Ethics agreement, SOPS, MOU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 1: Negotiating Access with Participants

There is no single correct method for gaining access to participants as it depends on the context and availability of the participants. The following are different ways of gaining access:

1. **When you already know key stakeholders** of a community or you are familiar with organisations or groups within the community, you can contact these individuals, group leaders or organizational leaders to negotiate access. This will entail first contacting the person in charge of the organisation or the community leader, and working through this person to access participants.

2. **You can approach a gatekeeper** to gain access and formally or informally introduce yourself to members of the community at a community meeting, and obtain their approval and or negotiate aims and objectives for a proposed study. This is a common approach used in qualitative studies and involves an additional stage of providing the gatekeeper with information about the study. This may involve first building rapport and gaining the trust of the gatekeeper, and then asking him/her to provide the details of prospective participants or obtain his/her assistance in recruiting participants. A good and trusting relationship with your gatekeeper/s is therefore paramount as he/she may prevent access.

3. **When you are unfamiliar with a community** and must build individual rapport with community members, you may enter the community, and, for example, conduct a transect walk, introduce yourself, and engage in informal talks with community members. The conversation
points may include basic information about the community, organisations, demographics, and identification of the leaders and key stakeholders. A formal meeting, to which community members and stakeholders are invited, can then follow to obtain their approval, and or negotiate aims and objectives for a proposed study.

4. **When you are unfamiliar with the research setting**, you may formally approach a local leader, chairperson of a local organisation, community committee or tribal council and first build rapport before obtaining access to community members (Brähler, 2012; Johl & Renganathan, 2009; Laurilla, 1977).

![Image: Negotiating project aims and objectives and establishing local structures – The SCRATCHMAPS Project](image)

After having negotiated access, the next step would be to negotiate the aims and objectives of the prospective engagement activity.

**Negotiating Project Aims and Objectives**

You may have an idea of what you would like to research, but this may not be what a community wants. An important step in establishing the aims and objectives of a project is to present the findings of your initial research findings with community members at a community
meeting. This could include the initial community profile, and rapid needs assessment, followed by your proposed research topic.

Perhaps your past involvement has already indicated a particular need, but if this is not the case, you will first have to ask the community leaders for permission to gather information by conducting a **rapid needs assessment**. A rapid needs assessment may comprise a rapid appraisal of what the needs of the community are by using one or more of a variety of methods. This may include informal conversations with community members, leaders or stakeholders, focus group discussions, Café conversations (creating a comfortable space where people share ideas, feelings and thoughts on a particular topic), community meetings, or a community-based household questionnaire. Gathering this information provides you with a snapshot of the community, and informs you of the gaps in research, as well as the levels of interest in programmes deemed appropriate and relevant to the priorities of the community.

This will then become the foundation for negotiating and agreeing on the aims and objectives of a proposed study. Since researchers almost always enter a community with a mandate (i.e., predetermined requirements for a particular project), we are ethically bound to explain to the community what that mandate is, explore what their challenges and priorities are, and then align your mandate with community needs and challenges.

**Some important points to emphasise in relation to negotiating aims and objectives:**

- Avoid imposing the programme on a community.
- Always encourage and ensure inclusiveness and collective participation and support for the programme. You may encounter groups and individuals who may accuse you of not consulting them, so it is important to be thorough in your engagement process.
- Make sure that you maintain contact and nurture the trust with the community leaders and the stakeholders, or advisory committee, and with those who have agreed to participate in this programme.
- Your organisation should schedule meetings with community leaders, stakeholders and or the advisory committee to discuss issues and challenges relevant to the programme. Other forms of communication can be done via written reports, telephone calls or personal visits.
- Lastly, and more importantly from a research ethics point of view, the principle of voluntary, prior informed consent (VPIC) of a community and its leaders are necessary.
before a programme is going to be conducted. Achieving consent can benefit the community and engagement activity. Without a doubt, as a principle and as a practice, VPIC is an important part of legitimacy. “And if you wonder if this is true, simply ask this question: Is your organisation better off having the people in the communities where your programme is conducted with you or against you?” (Sohn, 2007, p. v).

Step 2: Recognising Community-Based Actors as Meaning Makers

Community-based participatory research (CBPR) has become a widespread approach for deterring and controlling complex social challenges (Horowitz, Robinson & Seifer, 2009; Israel, Schulz, Parker & Becker, 1998). This collaborative research approach uses community action and social change to efficiently tackle and improve the health and well-being of the communities (Israel, Schulz, Parker, & Becker, 2001; Minkler, Blackwell, Thompson & Tamir, 2003). CBPR incorporates the research process with community capacity-building values and principles to bridge knowledge creation, and health promotion practice in communities.

Photovoice is one of several qualitative methods used in CBPR, where community participants use photography, and stories about their photographs, to pinpoint and represent matters of significance. The photovoice process provides participants with an opportunity to visually depict experiences, and share personal knowledge about specific issues that may be challenging to express with words (Wang & Burris, 1997). This active engagement of community members in the research process reveals to participants that they are valuable members of the research team (Moffitt & Robinson-Vollman, 2004), and may add to a sense of community ownership through participation in a project, that will assist in drawing attention to important community issues (Wang & Burris, 1997).

For researchers, the use of photographs helps to spark dialogue amongst participants around their views and perceptions of the topics under discussion, and further, diverse ideas may be obtained than those collected exclusively from interviews or focus groups (Darbyshire, MacDougall, &
Schiller, 2005). The combination of the narrative and visual portrayals enhances the ability of researchers to capture the meaning of an issue truly from the participant’s point of view (Harrison, 2002; McIntyre, 2003; Nowell et al., 2006). The resulting photo stories become a rich platform from which researchers can provide a nuanced grasp of community issues to the scientific community – an advance that can potentially inform suitable intervention or action on social and health challenges.

The photovoice process is also invaluable for the partner communities. The flexibility of the collaborative photovoice process is well suited to CBPR projects, allowing since it can be used in ways that can meet different communities’ needs. Additionally, the co-production of results by the participants and researchers strengthens the saliency of findings for the community. Greater meaning of the results can be utilised to influence policies, actions, and decisions affecting the community, thus improving the potential impact of projects at the community level (Wang & Burris, 1997). The photographs further help provide a means for decision-makers to see and understand community members’ perceptions of the social and health challenge that must be addressed. Participants often identify novel solutions to challenges not normally be recognised by decision-makers, however, the photo stories may stimulate intuitive responses from decision-makers that can stimulate action on local challenges (Wang & Burris, 1994). (See Appendix 11, Photovoice Manual).

Visual methods and visual analyses are neglected in community-engaged work. As a result, community work often relies on written or spoken communication exclusively. However, visual text - like all language - can be read (Kress & Leeuwen, 2006). Instead of communicating ‘better’ or ‘worse’ information, visual languages convey different meanings to that of linguistic text (MacDougall, 2011). Furthermore, visual languages are often able to express local knowledges in a more effective way than written or spoken languages, especially in cases where researchers are outsiders within a particular community. With so much of cultural life being visual, the use of visual languages is useful in helping us to consider seriously different social phenomena in ways that can be communicated effectively to different audiences. When conducting participatory community-engaged work, visual languages often allow participants to take on a degree of ownership within these processes (Malherbe, Suffla, Seedat & Bawa, 2016). Visual languages also assist us in exploring experiences and understandings of ‘invisible violences’ (e.g. structural, epistemic, cultural and symbolic violence) for which written or spoken communication may, at times, fail to capture adequately (Banks, 2001). It is by rendering visible these kinds of violences that visual methods help us to mobilise people towards social action. In our work, we have used visual languages in a number of ways. Below we outline some of these:
The Multi-Country Photovoice Projection Youth Representations of Safety is located within a community-engaged research frame and seeks to explore and elicit young people’s representations of safety in marginalised African contexts. The project aims specifically to enable youth to record and reflect their representations of safety in their respective communities, focusing on things, places, and people; promote critical dialogue and knowledge about safety through small and large group discussions of participants’ photographs, and, develop participants’ sense of agency and activism in relation to safety promotion. The participating countries are South Africa, Mozambique, Zambia, Uganda, Ethiopia, and Egypt.

The Photovoice project is underpinned by four key principles of community-based participatory research. Firstly, it seeks to challenge dominant cultural discourses that position youth as either victims or perpetrators and that typically construct youth as “other”. In this way, the project argues against the deficit-approach that is frequently employed in characterisations of youth. Secondly, the project is aimed at privileging marginalised voices through engagement with youth, as well as the creation of opportunity structures for youth to dialogue about their social worlds. Thirdly, the Photovoice project places the accent on the notion that knowledge is co-created, and thereby positions youth as producers of knowledge. Finally, the project centres the idea that social change is co-created. Through the construction and availing of platforms for meaningful civic participation, the agentic capacity of youth is stimulated, made more apparent, and supported through project activities.

Activities for 2016 included the hosting of a multi-country photo exhibition, the launch of a photo book, participant follow-up, data analysis, write-up, and information dissemination. The multi-country photo exhibition was launched in South Africa in 2014 and hosted in Zambia and Mozambique in 2015. The exhibition travelled to Kampala, Uganda in January 2016, where it was held in association with the Kyambogo University International Multi-Disciplinary Conference. The exhibition showcases a collection of photographs taken by the young people participating in the project. It offers a unique visual portrayal of the participating youths’ social worlds, shares the voices and stories behind the photographs, and provides a platform for the celebration of youth knowledge and agency. The launch of the photo book, My Voice in Pictures: African Children’s Vision of Safety, which is based on the participants’ photographs and showcases Photovoice as an innovative approach to community-engaged scholarship, also took place at this event. The exhibition was opened by the Vice-Chancellor of Kyambogo University and was well attended. A keynote address on engaging youth through Photovoice was delivered at the conference.

The photo exhibitions were accompanied by engaged dialogue between the project participants and members of the audience. Participants also granted radio interviews on their participation in the project and the outcomes of the project. In Mozambique, activities included follow-up discussions and meetings with project participants. Publication outputs included a journal article in Discourse and Society.
Step 3: Establishing Community Structures

What are community structures and why do we need them?

The research process can directly or indirectly affect communities that participate and collaborate in research. An important step in community engagement is the selection of community partners and the formation of some kind of Community Advisory Board (CAB). A CAB is usually composed of representatives of the community-based organisations who share a common identity, history, interest, language and culture, and serve as community partners, along with community residents, and other consultants. CABs act as a means of communication between the communities and researchers. The selection of CAB members is one of the first major decisions a researcher will need to make, so it is wise to ask key informants for the names of individuals who would be good choices (D’Alonzo, 2010). Potential CAB members should be well known in the community.

Roles and Responsibilities of the Community Advisory Boards

CABs and similar advisory mechanisms have become a standard requirement of ethically conducted research (Pratt et al., 2015). CABs can contribute to the ethical and scientific quality, relevance and acceptability of the proposed research in a number of ways, including:

- Educating the research team on local cultural and community norms that may impact the research, including community entry, recruitment, informed consent, and other processes
- Educating the community on aspects of the research, including the purpose, and design of the research, as well as ethical-legal rights of participants
- Advising the research team on key issues such as potential risks and burdens for participants or host communities that may be hidden from researchers, and how to minimize them, as well as potential benefits of the research for host communities and how these could be maximized. Other issues include appropriate recruitment, consent and payment for research participation.
- Making inputs into the research process, including protocol development and review, implementation of the research, and dissemination of research findings
- Advising the research team on the research agenda and ensuring a community voice in the research process
- Assisting to ensure that the research conducted complies with human rights and ethical standards (National Health Research Ethics Council [NHREC], 2012).
Step 4: Developing an Ethics Agreement

What is an ethics agreement?

Engagement with communities often involves interacting with the general community, or with some selected members or representatives of those communities. The community representatives interface with research staff, and can potentially be involved in a broad range of research activities, including protocol development, providing information and obtaining consent, data collection, reviewing access to data and participants, in dissemination of findings, and/or as co-authors in publications of research findings (Kamuya et al., 2013).

Community advisory boards (CABs) often assist researchers in the ethical processes with communities. They advise on whether a study is acceptable to and perceived as beneficial by the community. CABs, therefore, play a key role in advising researchers on the ethical and operational aspects of proposed studies (Pratt et al., 2015; Quinn, 2004). These include, but are not limited to, informed consent procedures, fair compensation, risks and benefits, and the confidentiality of research participants. See the Introduction to the manual for an overview of ethical principles.

Why is an ethics agreement important?

An ethics agreement is important because:

1. Consistent ethical behaviour can lead to a more effective community programme. By considering the ethical principles in all aspects of a community research project or an intervention, it can improve participation, funding and community support.

2. Community research and projects that adopt ethical principles are most likely to be respected by the participants and the community. Researchers who abide by ethical practices will be seen as competent and will be trusted to treat people with respect. This will make it easier to recruit volunteers, community members, and participants to raise public support.

3. Following ethical principles allows us to argue the merits of our programme, and it exercises moral leadership in the community.

4. It assures that we remain in good standing, legally and professionally.
Case Study:

Example of an Ethics Agreement
This research will be conducted in a manner that complies with the ethics approval committees at the University. The following ethical principles will guide the research.

- There are no foreseeable risks and discomforts for the participants expected in this study. The asset-based approach in this research will minimize risks relating to negative outcomes for any groups in the community. Furthermore, community engagement processes will ensure that sensitivity to community dynamics and relationships will remain at the forefront throughout the process.
- The CBPR participatory approach adopted in this study will ensure that the research is conducted within a partnership of respect, with maximum community participation, in all aspects of the research design, being pursued. An inclusive approach will be pursued at all times.
- An Ethics Agreement will be used to document the negotiated agreements between the research institution and the respective community. Consent forms (in a language familiar to the participants) will be utilised to inform participants on the research aims and process, as well as facilitate voluntary, informed consent in the data collection processes.
- Participants involved in the various research processes will be ensured of their protection through mechanisms such as confidentiality and anonymity in all reporting (unless otherwise requested), through the right to withdraw at any point in the research, and data will be stored safely (in the research institution), although access to this data by the community will be ensured.
- Participants will be informed of the knowledge and practical benefits of this study, for themselves, for their community, for the country, and for international efforts to combat violence and promote safety and peace. The broader community development benefit of this study, particularly through the CBPR and community asset mapping approaches being adopted, will also be highlighted.
- Community members will not be materially compensated for their participation in the research. However, those community members who become part of the formal community research teams linked to this study will be financially compensated for their roles as researchers. In addition, the members of the research teams will be exposed to research training, and will, therefore, experience research skills development.
- The specific (local community data) and general knowledge emerging from this study will be regularly shared with the communities involved in this study, through mechanisms such as the community research structures, community factsheets, workshop presentations, annual process evaluation reports, specific research reports (e.g. on the religious/spiritual assets mapping), and conference presentations. Agreement on ownership of data and authorship of documents (including journal articles) will be clarified.

Signed by academic and community partners
Source: SCRATCHMAPS Project

It should be noted that the normal ethical principles (outlined in the Introduction Chapter) were used and should be used as a basis of community-engaged ethics agreements with communities.
Standard Operating Procedures

For research ethics committees to function adequately, standard operating procedures (SOPs) are needed. These documents describe in a systematic manner the steps to follow in an ethical review process (Ikingura & Kithinji, 2014). SOPs should be clearly formulated in a logical manner, and regular revision is necessary in order to address the emergence of new ethical issues. Research ethics committees and community advisory boards have to work together in the development of SOPs – to guide its operations and to ensure the protection of research participants. The value of these documents is that they provide a transparent document that can serve to guide or instruct research ethics committee members and researchers alike. SOPs promote consistency and uniformity and can improve public trust in the process of research projects. SOPs also ensure compliance and provide clarity regarding the different responsibilities of the chair, the administrator and the research ethics members. The existence of and adherence to detailed SOPs provide partial defence against lawsuits, and a basis for addressing complaints (Bankert & Amdur, 2006; Ikingura & Kithinji, 2014).
Memorandum of Understanding/Agreement

A memorandum of understanding (MOU) or a memorandum of agreement (MOA) is a document that describes the terms of a cooperative agreement between two or more parties, as well as the goals of the cooperation. An MOA typically marks the beginning of a collaborative project, and is an opportunity for stakeholders to outline their visions, conduct debates, and resolve issues. An MOA is normally not considered to be a legal contract but is an agreement for parties to work together to meet an objective without the necessarily exchanging anything (McGill, Bears, & Woods, 2015).

How to Develop an MOU

Figure 7 below presents general guidelines for drawing up an MOU. The MOU comprises an introduction, a purpose, agreement, and scope of action, definitions, procedural requirements, ethical considerations and responsibility for compliance, oversight, commencement, renewal, and termination, and lastly, a plan of action.

1. Introduction
2. Purpose of the MOU
3. Agreement of parties and scope of action
4. Definitions
5. User procedural requirements
6. Ethical considerations and responsibility of SOP compliance
7. Oversight
8. Commencement, renewal and termination
9. Plan of action

Figure 9. General guidelines for an ethics agreement (Source: SAFECOM, n.d.)
1. Introduction
The introduction of an MOU provides clarity regarding the partner agencies involved, including a description of the need and the reason for working together. This section provides a straightforward explanation of the agreement entered into between the “parties” involved, and why it is necessary. The introduction needs to include the full legal name of the agencies or parties participating in the MOU, why this MOU is required, and state the agreements to be laid down by the MOU.

2. State the purpose of the MOU
The purpose section should be a brief statement outlining the intention of the MOU. It clarifies how the agencies involved will use the new agreement and under what circumstances. In this section the reader needs to understand when the MOU will be used, and how the MOU will be used and to what extent.

3. Agreement of Parties and Scope of Action
This section of the MOU lists the parties and jurisdictions to be included in the agreement and describes their relationship. Additionally, this section outlines the agreed upon activities, roles, and duties each party will be delivered to ensure project success. The roles and responsibilities must be congruent with project aims, objectives and projected outputs. The MOU needs to reflect: (1) what needs to be done, (2) the duties of each party, and (3) what the contribution of each party will be.

4. Definitions
The definition section defines the operational and technical terms associated with the research or engagement activities for which the agreement is written. Providing definitions will assist in preventing confusion and doubt. You need to consider the technical and operational aspects of the project or the community engagement activities and include any community-specific terms or abbreviations.

5. User Procedural Requirements
This section outlines the obligations of this agreement, and the guidelines for collaboration, including the development of proposals, plans of action, and reporting requirements. When developing this section, you need to consider the obligations that guide the collaboration between the parties involved, the training, exercises, and equipment requirements associated with participating in the MOU, and any financial obligations.
6. Ethical Considerations and Responsibility for SOP Compliance

This section allocates responsibility to Parties to ensure Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for the project are adhered to. This section also outlines the ethical considerations that will guide the research and engagement activities, including agreed upon guidelines regarding ownership of intellectual property. We need to consider who will be responsible for ensuring that the SOPs are followed and that personnel is trained suitably, how compliance will be achieved, and develop guidelines with regard to the ownership of data and publications.

7. Oversight

The oversight section describes how Parties will provide oversight for ensuring implementation of the MOU. The following questions need to be considered:

- What governance structure oversees and enforces all requirements of this MOU?
- Who is the chairperson of this governance structure and how is he/she appointed?
- What are the participation prerequisites in this governance structure of Parties entering this MOU?
- How are issues affecting policy, recommendations, and/or succeeding change implemented by the governance structure?
- What is the voting method within the governance structure?
- How do individual Parties establish oversight authority?

8. Commencement, Renewal, and Termination

This section indicates the date from which the MOU will be effective, and explains how updates can be made to the MOU, and the period for which the MOU will be in force. It comprises information such as, who has the power to update the MOU, and how revisions will be made, how participating Parties will be informed of modifications and the kinds of updates that will need signatures of all participating Parties.

9. Plan of Action

Once the MOU has been signed, the Parties will draw up a Plan of Action that will define the scope of the project to be pursued. This plan of action will be reviewed on a regular (at least annual) basis, and agreed upon in meetings between representatives of all parties. The plan of action once agreed upon, will be added as an addendum to this agreement. The parties shall make reasonable efforts to implement this plan of action, but neither Party gives any warranty that they
shall participate in all or any of the activities proposed therein. Any implementation of the plan of action will be in accordance with the protocols and ethics agreements.

An MOU is imperative because it delineates the responsibilities of each party in the agreement, outlines the scope and authority of the agreement, explains terms and summarises compliance issues.

Step 5: Closure

Where projects have a clear timeframe, the project will need to go through a formal closure process. During the closure phase, you must develop a report that provides overall feedback on the project. The learnings from this exercise can be used in other projects and improve the success of those projects. A final reflection session can be conducted with key stakeholders or community research team or advisory committee members to reflect on the project and evaluate its successes, identify strengths and weaknesses, note challenges encountered, address financial issues, and share experiences and final thoughts. The project’s final report could report on timeframes and budgets, changes and learnings over time, challenges encountered, and how these were addressed, as well as sustainability plans and issues.

It is important to negotiate and agree on a project closure strategy with community members’ right from the start. This involves developing a timeframe for the lifespan of the prospective project, as well as a sustainability plan. Whilst institutional funding and resources are essential, these are usually not enough to maintain ownership and sustainability of a project (see Chapter 7 for a detailed discussion on sustainability). Planning for sustainability is a guiding principle of CBPR, which is essential to the success of a community-based project, as it ensures that ownership is planned for and build into the study from the outset.
**Step 6: Maintaining Relationships**

Although practical constraints will create time and space boundaries, it is important to maintain an enduring relationship through continuous engagement with community members, even after a project has ended. To provide continuity in this relationship, we need to negotiate whether and when researchers need to have contact with community leaders and members. This could include maintaining visibility in the community by negotiating planned visits, and reflective sessions.

When making these commitments, it is important for all partners to recognize that this involves time and resources (e.g., money to travel) – both for the academic and community researchers. This will require an institution and community to plan to support such an arrangement.

**CONCLUSION**

This chapter focused on negotiating access to participants, developing an agreement to formalise the engagement relationship, closure, and developing and maintaining community-institutional relationships. Once this foundation has been initiated, the prospect of maintaining a strong partnership, characterised by a trusting relationship, to support the project and the community throughout the community engagement process, is more likely to be achieved.
CHAPTER 4

Phase 4: Participatory Research and Action Planning

Abigail Simons and Naiema Taliep

Community engagement requires the participation and commitment of community members to address issues of their interest. Participatory research and action planning is the essential building block in establishing effective community engagement, contributing to the effectiveness and efficiency of a research project or intervention with communities. In this chapter, five steps in the participatory research and action planning process will be discussed: (1) providing education, and training, (2) appraisal of key risks, and the magnitude thereof, (3) conducting community asset mapping, and (4) building networks.

STEPS FOR PARTICIPATORY RESEARCH AND ACTION PLANNING

The early participation of community members and leaders in a project leads to the realisation of community ownership and enhances the sustainability of research programmes (Butterfoss, 2006). As outlined in the Introduction to this manual, community participation goes beyond the consultation and involvement of community members and embraces the process of engaging with community partners (Eksteen et al., 2012). Through a system of co-learning and co-sharing, community members can act as agents of change to achieve social and behavioural outcomes. Table 5 highlights the common activities or steps, and key principles to guide participatory research and action planning. These steps highlight the importance of community participation in the planning process of community building.
Table 5. Steps in Participatory Research and Action Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Anticipated Outcome/Process</th>
<th>Instruments and Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Step 1 | Providing education and training for both researchers and community members | Trained research team and community members in asset mapping, research skills, facilitation skills, presentation skills and research ethics | • Training agenda  
• Training manual/s  
• Workshop evaluation questionnaire |
| Step 2 | Risk and Magnitude Determination | Assessment of risk and protective factors in the community  
Assessment of key health and social issues in the community to support intervention | • Risk assessment profile of violence  
• Risk assessment profile of health and social issues in the community |
| Step 3 | Conducting community asset mapping | Identification of the various ways to map assets. | • Asset Mapping Manual for Community Members  
• Asset Mapping manual for Service Providers  
• Action Planning Manual  
• Workshop evaluation questionnaire |
| Step 4 | Building networks in the community | The establishment of local networks (e.g., community leaders and members, key informants and service providers) | • Meeting documents (agenda, registers, minutes)  
• Notes, diary entries, photographs  
• Constitution of networks |

Step 1: Capacity Building through Education and Training

Community research capacity represents the skills and knowledge individuals within communities have that enable them to participate in research activities. By building community research capacity through training and education, co-learning occurs (Tumiel-Berhalter, Mclaughlin-Diaz, Vena, & Crespo, 2007). Not only is research translated into a language that is meaningful to community members, but also by understanding and adapting research methodologies to meet community needs, trust is developed between researchers and community members (Tumiel-Berhalter et al., 2007).

In order to facilitate the successful implementation of CBPR, it is important that researchers possess the necessary skills needed to follow the principles of this approach (Israel, Schulz, Parker, & Becker, 2001). Not only do researchers need competencies in the area of research design and methods, but researchers also need skills in-group process, communication, conflict resolution,
competencies to participate in multicultural contexts, an ability to be self-reflective and admit mistakes, capacity to work within different power structures, and humility (Israel, Schulz, Parker, & Becker, 1998, 2001). Researchers may need to engage in further training and education in order to enhance their skills. These competencies are best learned through field-based learning, in which early career researchers work with and are mentored by both faculty and community partners involved in CBPR projects.

Similarly, community members involved in a community research project are often charged with complicated tasks that need additional understanding and knowledge. For community members to participate as equal partners and share power and control over the research process, they often need to enhance their knowledge and skills in all the steps in a research process, including specific areas such evaluation, grant proposal writing, research design and survey administration (Israel et al., 2001). Training is a crucial step in participatory research and action planning as it provides community structures and community members with the necessary skills to fulfil their roles and responsibilities, and equip them to take ownership, and promote sustainability of the programme.

What is our approach to capacity building, training and education in this manual?

![Figure 10. Learning together: Our approach to capacity building, training and education](image)

In this manual, community and academic partners are viewed as co-creators of their collective learning. Co-learning and co-construction of knowledge in a co-created context of learning and
teaching occur when researchers and community members work collaboratively with one another to create knowledge and insight (Bovill, Cook-Sather, Felten, Millard, & Moore-Cherry, 2015). An important principle in CBPR is the opportunity to share skills and knowledge among partners, researchers and community members, including training in areas that contribute to personal and professional development. Our model of capacity building emphasises the participatory process that occurs between the researcher and community members. This is similar to Paulo Freire’s notion of an interactive dialogue which stresses the importance of researchers, whether academics or community members, coming together to meet and reflect on their reality as they make and remake it. Through this dialogic approach, we can then act critically to transform our realities.

While capacity building through education and training tends to occur primarily through formal workshops or other educational events, we have experienced the strength of a mentoring approach pursued through on-the-job training. Thus, our Learning Together approach highlights the necessity of working and learning alongside one another as we actually do the research or intervention planning and implementation. While the academic researchers may act as primary mentors when sharing research skills and knowledge, community researchers have a central role to play in mentoring the academic researchers in the more action-orientated aspects of the project.

Experiential learning provides a useful teaching and learning methodology, which is congruent with our co-learning approach to capacity building, education, and training. Kolb’s theory of experiential learning shows the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experiences (Sternberg & Zhang, 2000). Kolb’s model portrays a cyclical model of learning consisting of four stages, as seen in Figure 11 below. According to the four-stage learning cycle, when you actively experience an activity (action) this forms the basis for observations or reflections, where you consciously reflect back on the experience. This helps to link new knowledge directly to one’s concrete experiences. The reflections are distilled into abstract concepts (think) where you conceptualise what is observed (and therefore construct new knowledge), and from this, new implications for action can be drawn.
In other words, we tap into, engage with relevant knowledge systems, and facilitate a process of mediation of learning where academic or community members assist one another to reflect on and learn from experiences and their respective knowledge bases. A critical approach (see the Introduction to this manual) includes a problem-posing element to the reflection moment in the experiential learning cycle. This is where we question and think critically about the experiences and knowledges shared. For example, when collaboratively analysing data on risks for violence, noting that males are most at risk of being killed, and females are most at risk of being raped, we consider why this so – drawing on appropriate theories to make sense of these facts, including an analysis of power relations and more specifically, a patriarchal society.

What does the training involve?

Participatory research and action planning education and training usually involve some or all of the following:

- Capacity to conduct needs assessments and community asset mapping
- Research skills, including all stages of research from A to Z (e.g., developing clear aims and objectives, research designing, data collection and analysis skills, and dissemination skills)
- Facilitation skills (see Chapter 3 for details)
- Presentation skills (including workshop and conference presentations)
- Research ethics
In other words, we tap into, engage with relevant knowledge systems, and facilitate a process of mediation of learning where academic or community members assist one another to reflect on and learn from experiences and their respective knowledge bases. A critical approach (see the Introduction to this manual) includes a problem-posing element to the reflection moment in the experiential learning cycle. This is where we question and think critically about the experiences and knowledges shared. For example, when collaboratively analysing data on risks for violence, noting that males are most at risk of being killed, and females are most at risk of being raped, we consider why this so – drawing on appropriate theories to make sense of these facts, including an analysis of power relations and more specifically, a patriarchal society.

Steps in developing a training and education programme

The steps involved in developing a capacity building, training and education programme are outlined in Figure 12 below.

1. Decide what type of training is needed (based on an analysis of needs)
2. Identify the goals and the objectives of the training
3. Decide what type of training is needed (based on an analysis of needs)
4. Decide who will provide the education and training (draw from both community and academic partners)
5. Identify most appropriate venue for the training
6. Prepare for, and conduct training as planned
7. Evaluate the effectiveness of the training programme
8. Improve the training programme

Image: Providing formal research training to local Community Research Team members

Figure 12. Steps in developing a capacity building and training programme
Step 5: Risk and Magnitude Determination

As discussed earlier in the manual, the different forms of violence (epistemic, structural and direct violence) are not mutually exclusive, rather, they relate to one another. Numerous models exist to demonstrate the determinants of health, as well as the ecological nature of health (National Centre for Biotechnology Information [NCBI], 2003). Understanding and improving a population's health hinges on knowing the ecology of health and the reciprocal interconnected relationships between the different domains (NCBI, 2003). This framework sees injury and violence as the outcomes of interaction between different factors at four ecological levels - the individual, the relationship, the community, and the societal.

Hanson, Vardon, and Lloyd (2002) argue that safety is not only a physiological phenomenon but also a psychological, environmental and sociological occurrence. They state that safety is an ecological concept, shaped by the association between a person and his or her physical and social environment. They highlight that:

[The] ecological model provides a complex web of causation and creates a rich context for intervention. It can be used to map the key links in an accident sequence, identifying upstream “latent failures” along with the more obvious “active failures”. Breaking the chain at any point will reduce the risk of the accident sequence culminating in an injury. Identifying the strategic links (leverage points). will ensure effective action. The model also accommodates the often overlooked, but extremely important, positive aspect of safety promotion - identifying and reinforcing the protective characteristics of the ecological system, which minimise the occurrence and adverse effects of unsafe behaviours (Hanson et al., 2002, p.28).

Models of health determinants pinpoint macro-level (or societal-level) circumstances and policies (socio-economic, cultural, and environmental) as powerful drivers in influencing mid-level (working conditions, housing) and immediate or individual-level (behavioral, biological) determinants of health (NCBI, 2003). Societal-level or upstream determinants and micro-level determinants (such as sex) interact along intricate and dynamic pathways to yield health at a population level (NCBI, 2003).
Figure 13 provides examples of risk factors at different ecological levels.

**Figure 13. The ecological framework: examples of risk factors at each level**  
(Source: WHO, 2018)

The SEM enables us to address the factors that place people at risk, or safeguard them from being subjected to or perpetrating violence at multiple levels, outlined below:

1. At the **individual level**, personal history and biological factors affect how people behave and escalate their probability of becoming a victim or a perpetrator of violence; for example, being a victim of child maltreatment, alcohol and/or substance abuse, and a history of aggressive behaviour or having experienced abuse.

2. **Personal relationships** such as intimate partners, family, and peers may influence the risks of becoming a victim or perpetrator of violence. For example, having violent peers
may influence whether a young person becomes involved in or becomes a victim of violence.

3. **Community** contexts, where social relationships occur, such as schools, and neighbourhoods may also influence violence. Risk factors at this level include unemployment rates, population density, mobility and the presence of local drug or alcohol outlets.

4. **Societal** factors that have a bearing on whether violence is encouraged or inhibited include socio-economic policies that sustain inequalities between people, accessibility to weapons, and social and cultural norms that promote the subjugation of women and girls, and norms that approve of violence as an acceptable means to resolve conflicts. (WHO, 2018, unpaginated)

**Assessing Magnitude (key health and social issues) in the Community.**

In order to assess the magnitude of key health issues, the World Health Organisation (2001) highlights the following key measurement indicators:

1. **Characteristics of the population**
   A number of elements will enable you to describe the community you work in:
   - **Geography:** Describe the location of the community and define the boundaries. The community identified may be a village with distinct boundaries, a section of a city or geographic area with named roads or highways marking the outer limits.
   - **Numbers:** Record the total number of people within the community
   - **Age distribution:** Examine the age distribution of the community because this will have a key influence on health needs. Age can be disaggregated into pre-school children, school-age children and youth, adults and elderly people.
   - **Gender distribution:** Identify the ratio of males to females as this have a major influence on the community’s health needs.
   - **Ethnicity and religion:** Minority ethnic and religious groups are often marginalised within a community. Researchers must be cognisant of the diverse ethnic and cultural groups in the community. Different groups face different challenges researchers should record, for example, equality of access to services such as health care and culturally and linguistically appropriate health programmes.

---
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Population trends: patterns over a period provide an indication of patterns of violence and injury, and the need for services, and interventions.

Language and literacy. Knowledge of local languages is important to ensure equity and to enable the entire community to be involved in safety and health assessment and intervention processes.

Health inequalities. It is vital to collect information on health inequalities. Violence, injury and health patterns are closely linked to economic circumstances; hence, those in poverty suffer disproportionately higher rates of poor health and injury. Consider the following questions: Who is disadvantaged in this community, and why? Who does not have access to services in this community?

2. Local factors affecting health
Collect data on the following local factors that may influence safety, peace, and health:
- Levels of employment and unemployment
- Occupational diseases.
- People’s self-worth related to job satisfaction or unemployment
- Poverty and income poverty
- Environmental factors (e.g. Pollution or drinking water contaminated by sewage).
- Sanitation
- Housing

3. Social cohesion
Social support is necessary for the safety, health, and well-being of a community. The following elements need to be taken into account when describing the level of social cohesion in a community.
- Family and friendship networks
- Migration
- Marginal groups
- Opportunities for non-work social activities

4. Destabilizing factors
A record of destabilising factors, such as natural disasters or wars, and their effects must be included in a community health needs assessment because these affect health directly because of their impact on disease patterns and mortality.
5. **Resources, formal and informal**

All communities have resources and assets, which they use or could use to respond to community needs. These assets include both formal services and informal networks. Assess the extent of these resources so as not to undermine existing assets.

Table 7 illustrates a profile that can be created to establish Key health and social issues on the Community

**Table 7. Key community health and social issues profile**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of the population</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age distribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender distribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity and religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population trends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and literacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health status of the population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local factors affecting health (positive and negative)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work and employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty and incomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social cohesion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destabilizing factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources, formal and informal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local people’s views of their health needs and health services</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Local and national priorities |  |
Step 4: Conducting Community Asset Mapping

When conducting research from a community-based participatory research perspective, researchers are guided by the understanding that communities are places with strengths and resources. An asset-based approach focuses on assets that can be leveraged to foster community development. Kramer, Amos, Lazarus, and Seedat (2012) identified a number of different methods for identifying community assets. One approach to identifying assets is the Asset-Based Community Development (ABCD) approach that creates a community capacity inventory by producing a written list of the talents and skills of community members and of the relations and other resources and assets of the locality as a whole (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993). Another approach is the Geographic Information Systems (GIS), which maps information and data relative to geography or location and analysis data in different spatial contexts (ESRI, 2010). Other approaches include the Participatory Inquiry into Religious Health Assets, Networks and Agency (PIRHANA), the Community Health Assets Mapping for Partnerships (CHAMP), the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach (SLA), and Planning for Real (Kramer et al., 2012).

We will now focus on the community asset mapping approach as a starting point to actively engage community members, service providers, and stakeholders to identify and leverage existing strengths and resources in the process of community development/building.

What is community asset mapping?

Foot and Hopkins (2010) defined an asset as any feature component or resource that increases the capacity of individuals, communities and societies to maintain health and well-being. An asset-based approach is a strategy that focuses on:

- Helping communities to identify and build on their strengths and human capabilities
- Recognising that important assets lie in networks and relationships
- Focusing on making community assets visible for the community
- Promoting leadership engagement for the purposes of supporting action
- Adopting a participatory inquiry approach
- Creating new theoretical understandings
  (Kramer, Seedat, Lazarus, & Suflla, 2011)

Kerka (2003) defined community asset mapping as a process of documenting the tangible (assets that have a physical form), and intangible (assets that are not physical in nature) resources of a
community by viewing the community as a place with strengths or assets that need to be preserved and enhanced, not deficits to be remedied. The Asset-Based Community Development (ABCD) approach, developed by Kretzmann and McKnight (1993), encourages community members to recognise that their community is a ‘glass half full’ of assets, rather than a ‘glass half empty’ with needs (Mathie & Cunningham, 2002). Assets can include the skills and assets of individuals, coalitions and networks, physical structures, community services and businesses (Berkowitz & Wadud, 2003). In essence, the primary objective of community asset mapping approaches is to reframe community members’ perspectives concerning their contexts, facilitating a shift from a needs-based or deficits outlook to a positive, resource-based one (Kramer et al., 2012).

The benefits of community asset mapping
Community asset mapping is a useful approach that provides communities with an opportunity to mobilise existing strengths and resources. A focus on assets provides an effective strategy to foster participation, agency, and inclusivity, and to reconceptualise or reframe communities as being resourceful and resilient rather than contexts of problems. Identifying and mapping the assets of the community helps to visualise the networks of service organisations, community organisations, neighbourhood associations, and other groups that exist to serve the community. The community is then able to obtain a common view of what is important, as well as to affirm or broaden their thinking, and to hear and appreciate the values of others. The coming together of researchers, local leaders and community members around common assets change the way we think about communities because it unites people around a positive identity and a collective cause.

Foot and Hopkins (2010) state that the community asset mapping approach values knowledge, skills, capacities, associations, connections, and potentials within communities. Asset mapping can enable communities to 1) become their own resource or become aware that they are already a resource; 2) trigger participation; 3) develop accountability among themselves and between them and others; 4) formulate a self-sufficient structure able to relate with others, and 5) acquire voice and gain strength ((Burns, Paul, & Paz, 2012; Cutts et al., 2016; Guy, Fuller, & Pletsch, 2002; Kramer et al., 2012; Ngunjiri, 1998; Taliep, 2016). Community asset mapping promotes civic involvement by making it possible for community members to view themselves as contributing citizens; organise and bring people together to address local issues; build on what is already taking place in the community; develop a belief in the capacities of community members; help locals to see possibilities; increase community spirit and pride; nurture a preparedness to reach
out to others; build relationships; develop trust and ‘social capital’ via connections and linkages; cultivate a sense of hope; mobilise capacities to yield concrete outcomes (Lazarus et al., 2010).

**How to identify assets**

The techniques for identifying community assets are not difficult. A few simple, yet important, questions need to be answered before you begin to identify assets. The questions include the following:

1. What is the size of the community in which you want to identify assets?
2. Who are available to assist in identifying assets?
3. How much time do you have or how much time can you allow to identify assets?
4. How much money, if any, is at your disposal to identify assets?
5. What do you want to do with the identified assets?

There are different approaches to identifying group or individual community assets. You can begin with what you know, and write down what comes to mind regarding assets within the identified community. You can use a number of sources to identify assets such as the yellow pages, neighbourhood or community directories, or the local library may have lists of businesses and organisations in the community. The local newspaper and bulletin boards are also great sources for identifying assets. You could also speak to the people within the community, and compile a list of assets that local members of the community identify and perhaps engage in a walkabout through the community (see Chapter 3) to identify buildings and small businesses in the community.

Once the assets have been identified, it is often useful to write them onto a map. Maps are good visual aids that can increase our understanding and insight of the community. You could make use of a mind map, or a spidergram (a map depicting relationships) to write down the assets identified. In this way, you can clearly see the linkages between the different categories of assets.
Image: Mapping local assets that contribute to peace and safety

An Example of Asset Mapping

Table 6 outlines one asset mapping methodology used in the Ukuphepha SCRATCHMAPS study. The SCRATCHMAPS asset mapping process included three different workshops with community members, one workshop with service providers, and a combined action-planning workshop with both community members and service providers. Each activity in the mapping process built on the previous activities. This example focuses specifically on safety, peace, spiritual capacity, and religious assets. The following table shows how these activities were pursued in the community asset mapping and the service provider mapping workshops.

Table 6. Asset Mapping Workshop Exercises

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Members Workshops</th>
<th>Service Provider Workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Community Mapping:</strong> Participants draw maps of the strengths and resources (assets) in their community.</td>
<td>1. <strong>Mapping Footprint of Organisations:</strong> Participants identify and add organisations to the map (developed in community workshops), and describe how they contribute to general community development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Safety/Peace Promotion Index:</strong> Participants identify the most important factors contributing to and working against peace and safety in the community, and then rank community organisations on how well they promote safety and peace in the community.</td>
<td>2. <strong>Areas of Engagement/Safety &amp; Peace Index:</strong> Participants identify the ways that local entities contribute to safety and peace.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Spirituality/Religion and Safety/Peace Index and Matrix:** Participants share views on religion and spirituality, and identify ways spirituality/religion and religious organisations contribute to peace and safety.

3. **Spiritual Capacity/Religious Assets and Masculinities Index and Matrix:** Participants share views on spiritual capacity and religious assets, and then identify ways that these assets contribute to community development, safety and peace, and positive forms of masculinity.

4. **Masculinities and Safety/Peace Index and Matrix:** Participants share views on how masculinities contribute to violence, peace, and safety, and then list current assets that contribute to promoting positive forms of masculinity, describing the characteristics of good practice.

4. **Social Capital and Networking Spidergram:** Participants develop a Spidergram to capture how community entities link with one another around community development (and safety and peace more specifically) and identify good practice.

5. **Local Action:** Preparation for final workshop, which will focus on planning action aimed at mobilising spiritual capacity and religious assets to promote positive forms of masculinity, and thereby promoting safety and peace.

5. **Collaboration Contribution Grid:** Participants identify existing and potential collaboration partners and shared resources, particularly in relation to promoting safety and peace.

6. **Local Action:** Preparation for the final workshop.

---

**Step 6: Networking**

The next step in community participatory research and action planning is to identify networks within the community. The community asset mapping approach not only helps to identify the assets within a community, but it also assists in identifying and mobilizing networks.

**What are networks?**

Networking has increasingly become recognised as an important aspect of community work and a necessary aspect of building partnerships (Gilchrist, 2009). A key principle of community development is to ensure that participation in decision-making is democratic and inclusive, enabling people to contribute as equal citizens and to learn through their involvement (Gilchrist, 2009). Interaction with others is an inevitable and necessary aspect of this, and community development workers play an important role in helping people to work together, to communicate effectively and to deal with the inescapable tensions and disagreements that arise from this work. Networks that connect individuals and different sections of the local community are an invaluable resource, functioning as communication systems and organizational mechanisms.
A network is formed when two or more organisations collaborate to achieve common goals and to solve problems or issues too large to face independently. Additionally, networks are formed to leverage the power of numbers in exercising influence or flexing political muscle, to maximize limited financial and human resources of a community by reducing duplication or organizations or to operate more efficiently in concert with others (West, 2009). Networking for community development is influenced by key values around equality, empowerment, and partnership (as explained in the Introduction to this manual).

Community networks involve the development of a collective, but not necessarily a common, voice through which different views and interests can be channelled. A more formal kind of networking is to create community forums that can be used as part of public consultation processes, although constant work is needed to make sure that these remain genuinely representative, transparent and accessible (Gilchrist, 2009). Strategies for enhancing community engagement should include support for networks that create spaces for dialogue and dissent, not just for selecting and supporting community representatives (Gilchrist, 2009).

The benefits of building networks in the community
Networks are useful in developing and supporting violence and injury prevention and health promotion programmes, because no single agency has access to and the resources to address multiple public health challenges (Green, Daniel, & Novick, 2001). Networks can have an
influence and benefit the likelihood of particular outcomes (Gilchrist, 2009). The following section provides guidelines on how to establish and maintain effective networks.

**Guidelines for establishing and maintaining effective networks**

1. Identify a clear purpose for bringing people together
2. Identify whether similar networks or partnerships exist within the community
3. Identify the organisations or people you intend to work with: identify people with relevant skills and experience and check whether the identified people have the ability to make decisions about personnel or budgets
4. Identify the resources you need to support the network: this may include venues for weekly gatherings, budget, programmes, and administration
5. Schedule frequent monitoring and evaluation of those included in the network to ensure that the processes and goals are being met and that the ethics agreement is still being held
6. Acknowledge people’s contributions regularly, and celebrate milestones and achievements

**Some challenges to building networks in the community**

Despite the benefits, building and maintaining networks can be challenging and often requires hard work. Below are a few challenges network members need to keep in mind.

1. Building consensus can be a time-consuming process and network members may not always agree on the goals, objectives and the strategies of the network.
2. It is important that trust be built among network members. Competing for funding and perhaps previous experiences between members can affect a member’s ability to collaborate.
3. As networks grow, this may make it more difficult to manage logistics such as keeping all members aware of meetings, actions, results, and upcoming activities.
4. The workload can become a problem so delegating responsibility needs to be done sensitively.
5. Collaboration is an ongoing challenge so we must be careful that the process is not highjacked by one or a few people.
6. Members need to agree on rules for the network to run smoothly.
7. The network must decide on how to leverage resources to support collaborative activities, and ensure continuity and sustainability.
Case Study:

An example of building networks

In the community of Strand, a core group of people was invited to a meeting where conversations around starting a network were held. The idea behind this meeting was to strengthen the work of existing organisations and the broader intervention work in the area of the Strand, Western Cape. This meeting proved very successful as the following two meetings showed an increase in members. Even though this was only the beginning of formulating networks in the community, organisations had already started to engage in network practices. For example, the community police forum and a local shelter for the homeless agreed to assist those with shelters during the cold winter months.

In one workshop, networking exercises were held with local community members where they engaged in a mapping process to make organisational relationships and other networks visible. They developed a Spidergram to show the relationship between themselves and other organisations. Members used different colours to indicate the type of relationship (strong, medium, weak and none) they have, and with whom they would like to have a relationship. Black lines represented a strong relationship; green lines represented a medium relationship, red lines indicated a weak relationship and blue lines indicated with whom the members would like to have a relationship. This exercise proved to be very helpful in the process of strengthening existing networks and identifying new ones that could be developed.

Source: SCRATCHMAPS Project
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CONCLUSION

This chapter commenced with an overview of community participatory research and highlighted the common activities or steps to guide this process. These steps include conducting community asset mapping, identifying risk elements, building networks, establishing community structures, developing an ethics agreement, and training and education. The next chapter will provide a detailed overview of the steps involved in intervention planning.
CHAPTER 5

Phase 5: Intervention planning

Nancy Hornsby and Nicholas Malherbe

The intervention planning phase is a participatory process that involves selecting or developing an appropriate intervention, providing support and training to the project team (both within the organisation and community), as well as monitoring and evaluation of processes and target activities. Chapter 3 provides the required steps, strategies, and actions, as well as challenges of the planning phase of an intervention.

Phase 5 includes four main steps: (1) planning with community members, (2) selecting the appropriate intervention, (3) education and training, and (4) monitoring and evaluation.

Table 8. Strategies for Planning of the Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Anticipated Outcome/Process</th>
<th>Instruments and Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Step 1  | Planning with community members           | • Engaging community members in designing the intervention  
|         |                                            | • Building trust, transparency, communication and commitment for intervention implementation | Refer to Appendix I for existing interventions |
| Step 2  | Selecting the appropriate intervention    | • Confirmation of aims/objectives identified in Chapter 3 (Negotiation and Recognition Phase)  
|         |                                            | • Follow up on the process in Chapter 4 (Participatory Research and Action Planning Phase)  
|         |                                            | • Selected relevant intervention depending on following options:  
|         |                                            | a) Entirely new intervention  
|         |                                            | b) Adaptation of an existing intervention  
|         |                                            | c) Use of a pre-existing intervention without adaptation  
|         |                                            | • A clearly defined Theory of Change when selecting the appropriate intervention | Refer to Appendix I for existing interventions |
| Step 3  | Research education and training           | • Facilitators / interventionists successfully recruited  
|         |                                            | • Facilitation and interventionist training provided  
|         |                                            | • Established trained intervention team | Training manual including standard operating procedures (SOPs)  
|         |                                            | • Training workshop agenda  
|         |                                            | • Evaluation forms |
Step 1: Planning

In designing and implementing an intervention, it is important to include representation from community members. In community-academic research partnerships, a diverse group of stakeholders, commonly including community members, healthcare providers, and academic researchers, collaborate for the purpose of sharing ownership and responsibility in planning and implementing research studies with a mutually beneficial research objective (Berge, Mendenhall, & Doherty, 2009; Lasker, Weiss, & Miller, 2001; Lindquist, Grantz & Vaughn, 2016). Research approaches that involve the community as an active partner in addressing health and social concerns are ample and have become increasingly recognised as an important model for safety, peace, and health research (Israel et al., 2013). These approaches are especially needed to engage disadvantaged minorities who have been historically underrepresented in research studies and who have many reasons to mistrust health research, including cases of unethical research in the past (Ferreira and Fidji, 2011; Hodge, 2012; Scharff et al., 2010; Shern, Trochim, & LaComb, 1995a; Vaughn, Jones, Booth, & Burke, 2017). Recommendations articulated in the literature identify four broad categories in which community participation in intervention planning may be enhanced:

1. **Trust Building**
   Plowfield et al. (2005) emphasize trust building through investing adequate time in partnership development and operating under the assumption that all parties are working in good faith to address the chosen problem. Trust is enhanced by transparency, which includes being clear about the extent and nature of community involvement, and acknowledging and respecting different agendas among partners (Baker et al., 1999).

2. **Transparency**
   Transparency includes agreeing on roles, norms, and processes for partnerships using input from all partners and developing common missions, goals and outcomes (Green et al., 2001). Multiple authors address aspects of communication that are critical to maintaining successful partnerships.
3. Communication

Plowfield et al. (2005) note the importance of tactful, direct communication when voicing needs and concerns, while Green et al. (2001) emphasise the necessity of attending to feedback from all partners. Clear communication is of particular importance as partnerships mature and transition to new stages (Baker et al., 1999). While trust, transparency, and communication are essential to establishing community-academic partnerships, commitment is a key component in achieving their sustainability.

4. Commitment

Commitment may be expressed through building on identified strengths and assets within a community and by using existing structures, such as schools and networks, to implement partnership strategies (Green et al., 2001). Identifying talented leaders from the community (Plowfield et al., 2005) and establishing strong relationships with local institutions (Green et al., 2001) are other dimensions of commitment that help lead to sustainability.

Step 2: Selecting the Appropriate Intervention

Considerable planning must be invested in selecting the appropriate intervention for a specific community. This is a process that should be negotiated with the community at the outset of the project - before proceeding with any action. Researchers may already have ideas for what an intervention should look like, including desired needs, goals, and outcomes, and these ideas may be congruent with what the community has identified, but there is still a need for engagement, collaboration, and negotiation with key community stakeholders. All activities in the intervention-planning phase are guided by the core principles outlined in the Introduction to this manual, including a commitment to developing equitable and collaborative partnerships and power relations, optimal participation, co-learning and co-construction of knowledge, co-management, and co-ownership of all planning activities, a strengths-based approach that values all contributions, knowledges, and voices, capacity building, and sustainability.

It is within this framework of co-learning and co-construction of knowledge that the steps and activities pursued to select and develop an appropriate intervention(s) and planning for implementation are described below.
How to select an appropriate intervention or programme

The initial step in choosing a programme is confirming the aims and objectives (or goals), identified in Chapter 3 (Negotiation and Recognition Phase). It is important to see if these goals have remained the same and that everyone agrees that this is what is desired. If any changes need to be made, this must be done through a democratic process of negotiation and consultation. This process may be done through workshops, focus groups and/or interviews with community members.

Secondly, follow-up needs to be made on the Participatory Research and Action Planning Phase (discussed in Chapter 4) activities in which community assets, needs, opportunities, and risks were mapped. By revisiting the desired community goals, assets, risks and needs, the team assures that the chosen programme will be the correct one for realising the desired action or change.

Depending on the outcomes that result from reassessing the process of the first two phases, three broad options for interventions are available (refer to Table 10).

Table 9. Selecting the appropriate intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention option</th>
<th>Piloting required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1: New Intervention</td>
<td>YES (Refer to Chapter 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2: Adapt pre-existing intervention</td>
<td>YES (Refer to Chapter 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3: Use pre-existing intervention (no adaptation)</td>
<td>NO (Refer to Table 10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 1: A new programme

The negotiations may reveal that an entirely new programme is required for addressing community needs, as existing interventions may not sufficiently address the unique or distinct...
requirements of different communities. When developing a new intervention, you may use the community asset mapping and action planning process outlined in Chapter 4 (Participatory Research and Action Planning Phase) to design and develop a new intervention using a participatory “bottom-up” approach, and thereafter follow the steps for piloting described in Chapter 6 (Piloting and Implementation Phase).

- **Option 2: Adapting an existing programme**
  Where an existing programme needs to be adapted to achieve the desired action or change - agreed upon by the researchers and the community concerned - it will have to go through a process of piloting to ensure the integrity and trustworthiness of the programme. The steps outlined in Chapter 6 need to be consulted when attempting to adapt an intervention.

- **Option 3: Using a pre-existing programme**
  It may be decided that a programme from the inventory of pre-existing interventions will be appropriate in accomplishing the desired change or action identified by the community. Table 10 provides an overview of the programmes that have been developed within Ukuphepha.
Before choosing an intervention (new, adapting an existing programme, or using a pre-existing one), the specific theory of change (approach used to bring about the desired action or change) needs to be clearly defined and decided upon.
Theory of Change

The theory of change helps us understand different behaviours (e.g., violence against women and children), and how interventions can be designed to bring about desired changes regarding that behaviour (Taliep, 2016). Such theories make clear the principles and expected short, medium, and long-term goals, and outcomes of an intervention (or group of interventions) that is likely to be achieved, as well as strategies that could be employed to meet those goals. This includes a mapping of what an intervention does (activities used to create the desired change), and how these actions lead to the desired goals (Center for Theory of Change, http://www.theoryofchange.org/what-is-theory-of-change/). The desired change, goals, and outcomes must be identified and agreed upon by the community (see Chapter 7 Monitoring and Evaluation). Six steps that could be pursued when developing a theory of change are outlined below.

Figure 14. Theory of Change: Six stages

Once all the long-term goals have been identified, the necessary conditions to accomplish these goals must be defined. A “pathway to change” is drawn up by a backward mapping of the basic assumptions about the context, identifies long-term goals, and the conditions necessary to bring about the change. Basic assumptions (beliefs held to be true) about how change will be achieved, and the specific context and environment, are clearly laid out to understand how intervention activities are connected to the desired goal.

An intervention could be underpinned by more than one theory of change, especially where different aspects and methods need to be used in order to change behaviour. For example, the Building Bridges violence prevention intervention drew on a number of theories to inform change, including (1) Critical Theory; (2) Ecological Systems Theory; (3) Knowledge Attitude Behaviour Theory; (4) the Comprehensive Values Education Model; and (5) Experiential Learning Theory. The critical lens allowed the intervention to deal with issues of violence and masculinity, power and oppression, gender equality, historical trauma, contextual issues, and social justice. The ecological focus enabled the intervention to consider violence at different levels of the system or environment (e.g., individual, family, community, and social levels). The Knowledge, Attitude and Behaviour and the Comprehensive Values Education models influenced our approach to knowledge and attitudes, while the Experiential Learning Theory guided the educational processes pursued to bring about a change in knowledge, attitudes, values, and behaviour (Taliep, 2016).
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Step 3: Intervention Education and Training

The approach to education and training used in this manual is one where both researchers and community members are co-learners and co-creators of knowledge. The process of co-learning and co-creation of knowledge occurs when researchers and community members act as both teachers and learners within a collaborative learning environment, and where the knowledge emerging represents the worldviews of all concerned. Please see the Introduction chapter for further details of this collaborative approach. In this chapter, we focus on education, training, and capacity building as it relates to the intervention being developed.

What are intervention education and training?

Capacity building includes both education and training – for both academic and community researchers. Education and training typically refer to developing and strengthening knowledge, skills, abilities, processes, and resources at both the individual and collective level (Potter & Brough, 2004; World Health Organization, n.d.). The education component involves the building of knowledge, insights, and attitudes while training has to do with developing and strengthening the
skills and capacities of individuals and groups. Including both education and training brings about a deeper understanding of the change or action needed by developing the needed skills and abilities (the how part), and also the reason for why a chosen intervention is being implemented (the why part).

Capacity building can be viewed in three ways: (i) capacity building as a method where capacities of stakeholders are strengthened to perform specific tasks; (ii) capacity building as a process which involves continuous support through communication, debate, relationship building and the ability to deal with challenges, and finally; (iii) capacity building as an outcome where capacity of stakeholders are strengthened, allowing them to participate in political and socio-economic decision-making for achieving specified objectives. Throughout this process, the role of all stakeholders is taken into account, recognising unique strengths and valuing the contribution of each individual in the process (Eade, 1997 as cited in Technology; Enhanced Learning, n.d.; Taliep, 2016).

The key principle of engagement within a partnership approach emphasised in this manual means that a negotiated agreement has to be obtained around issues such as the recruitment of community researchers, facilitators/interventionists, as well as the education and training processes needed to build their capacity. For example, partners need to answer the following questions: Will interventionists be recruited exclusively from the target community, or will individuals from other communities also be part of the project team? Will all interventionists be required to have some kind of secondary level education as a minimum requirement? Negotiations around the type of intervention to be developed, the skills being transferred, as well as who will provide the training must also take place.

Image: Community Research Team members conducting Asset Mapping workshop
Why are education and training needed for community researchers and facilitators/interventionists?

The co-learning approach adopted in our community engagement model stresses that both academic and community members could and should be involved as teachers. This will safeguard against the potential power imbalances that exist between academic researchers and community members in traditional research settings. Initially, the researchers from academic institutions may play a major role in sharing research knowledge. However, community members often have more expertise in community action and related competencies, and should, therefore, play a key role as teachers in this Phase. Even professionals who have completed formal education or who have worked on programmes and interventions before can benefit from the kind of training that is tailored to the intervention in question.

All those involved in implementing the intervention (including the researchers, community leaders and members, the administrative team and others working behind the scenes) will need to receive some form of education and training. This should include information and knowledge about the problem being addressed in the selected community, and the proposed strategies to be used to address this challenge, and it should equip the facilitators to carry out relevant intervention activities.

Why draw up an intervention education and training plan?

It is helpful if a clear, detailed plan is drawn up before proceeding with any research or intervention training activities. The education and training plan will provide a clear work plan and timeline of activities and steps to be followed and will ensure that key training targets are met timeously. It will also reflect the key training needs identified by the project partners, identify the areas that need to be focused on to meet those needs, and ensure that the appropriate knowledge, skills, and competencies are included in order to meet the goals of the project.

What should be included in intervention education and training programmes?

The education and training required to build the necessary capacity to develop and implement the intervention should reflect an experiential learning approach, where learning is mediated through ongoing action and reflection. This includes linking and applying knowledge and understanding to real-life situations and scenarios. Chapter 4 provides more detail on the process involved in experiential learning.
Researchers and relevant community members identified as data collectors, or facilitators/interventionists (through democratic processes) will need to learn about relevant ‘facts and figures’ related to the intervention focus, basic research skills (see Appendix 12) engage with the core principles guiding the specific intervention. They need to become familiar with details about the delivery of the intervention and become aware of legal and ethical standards required of the facilitator/interventionist, which should focus on the importance of ensuring individual and community welfare (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, n.d.).

Facilitation skills training is a crucial component of intervention training. This kind of training includes the skills required to mediate learning (adult education skills), as well as group facilitation skills that focus on the management of communication and interactions at both individual and group levels. This training aims to equip facilitators to:

- Be task orientated – to ensure that desired outcomes are achieved.
- Clarify the role/s of each person in the intervention delivery.
- Communicate with individuals and group members in a warm, non-judgemental and empathic manner.
- Listen deeply and actively to what others are saying and doing.
- Facilitate effective communication between individuals or group members so that all opinions and views are respected.
- Manage conflict effectively.
- Problem solve and make appropriate decisions when appropriate.

**Step 4: Monitoring and Evaluation of Intervention**

**Planning and Implementation**

**What is monitoring and evaluation?**

Generally, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) refer to a process of ensuring performance and achieving results through a specific programme. The monitoring component of any programme entails the collection and analysis of information about an ongoing project/programme, while evaluation refers to the retrospective (looking backward) assessment of key projects or programmes that have been conducted either internally or externally (Monitoring and Evaluation for Sustainable Communities, 2014). For more information on monitoring and evaluation, refer to Chapter 7 of this manual.
The most common forms of monitoring and evaluation used in the intervention-planning phase are process and formative evaluation methodologies. Process evaluation is often used to gain insight into the specific dynamics involved in the development of an intervention. For example, in the Building Bridges project referred to above, the monitoring and process evaluation focused specifically on the community-based participatory research process, with the aim being to learn about the participatory way of doing research. Using the same example, the evaluations performed during the development of Building Bridges programme were formative in nature, in that, the questions asked, and findings emerging informed the improvement of the programme and manual.

Challenges of intervention planning

Having a clear idea of the potential difficulties or things that could go wrong when planning an intervention, is very important. An intervention could fail at the implementation stage, or not be taken up by communities at all if challenges (identified in consultation with the community) are not highlighted early on, and properly planned and addressed. Some of the challenges we have noted in our projects are briefly discussed below.

- **Community dynamics**

  Community forces and dynamics (such as previous relationships between different community members) and problems arising in the community (e.g., gangsterism, violent protests) could stand in the way of planning a successful intervention. If a community is experiencing issues such as gang violence or certain community members are not getting along, or are involved in political contests, this may delay intervention planning actions. Conflict could also be because of the intervention itself if some members feel that only some community people are benefiting. If community conflicts are violent in nature, intervention staff members could experience physical threats. Such problems must be identified as early as possible. This early identification of potential conflicts and problems could be done through research (e.g., reading news reports or consulting crime statistics) and through direct contact with the community in the early stages of the project development, e.g., through transect walks (see Chapter 1). Intervention planning activities need to be arranged in a way where they are least affected by community forces outside of the research and intervention teams' control. During times of community instability and threats to
physical safety, it may be best to temporarily stop intervention activities until the situation has been resolved. Always prioritise the safety of both community and interventionists.

➢ **Cultural diversity**
South Africa has a rich cultural background, and communities are often made up of very diverse cultures. Many communities also contain large groups of people coming from the African continent (Africa Check, n.d., [https://africacheck.org/factsheets/geography-migration/]). People from various cultural backgrounds may hold very different views on what they think are important issues in need of change in a community. This means that we need to listen and be sensitive to these different views.

➢ **Staff and community changes**
Changes in staff in the research organisation could negatively affect carrying out intervention development and implementation activities, including providing education and training with community members. Organisations need to plan for this and ensure that the human resources are made available and that necessary preparation is provided for new staff members. This is true for community members involved in the intervention too. Community mobility and changes (people in a community moving away, the death of community members) could pose threats to successful intervention planning. In addition to the education and training required for any new community members entering the intervention team, those individuals leaving the community left with important historical and institutional memory, which may be permanently lost to the intervention. Building relationships and trust between the research team and community members take time, so any changes to the composition of the intervention group could cause setbacks for the intervention. Changes in the intervention team are often unavoidable and even inevitable, so plan ahead of time. This challenge can be addressed by allowing enough time in project planning and activities for ongoing training of new and old staff.

➢ **Resources**
Not having the required human, time, financial and material resources could become major barriers in the planning and implementation of interventions. Having a cohesive and passionate team and community partners to plan and implement the intervention is important. Research staff and community members, therefore, need to have the time and commitment to go through the planning and implementation processes and be present at all required education and training events. Material resources such as office space, equipment, and supplies are also required for the
day-to-day activities of the intervention, and therefore need to be available. Funding and proper management of funds are essential for making sure that both human (paying research and community team members) and material (buying paper, office supplies, renting space) resources are covered. Above all, ensuring that there are adequate leadership and management is essential to ensure successful coordination of the intervention planning and implementation. This includes providing an enabling environment to support the evolving / unfolding of a collaborative partnership approach.

**CONCLUSION**

This chapter outlines the steps involved in planning an intervention and includes selecting an appropriate intervention, education, and training in all intervention-related activities, and monitoring and evaluation of the planning phase. The purpose of a clearly defined Theory of Change is described, as well as the process involved in achieving the desired goal or change. The intervention education and training aspect are summarised highlighting the approach of experiential co-learning and co-creation of knowledge from both researchers and community members. The entire intervention-planning phase is presented in a culture of collaboration, empowerment, and capacity building. The chapter briefly refers to M&E of planning activities, of which the detailed M&E process is described in Chapter 7. Two examples drawn from an intervention developed within the SCRATCHMAPS project (Building Bridges Intervention) are presented as illustrations of the practical steps involved in intervention planning. Finally, challenges associated with intervention planning are described.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAMME</th>
<th>PROGRAMME FOCUS</th>
<th>DESIRED OUTCOME(S)</th>
<th>AGE RANGE</th>
<th>TARGET AUDIENCE</th>
<th>AGENT(S) OF CHANGE</th>
<th>SYSTEMS LEVEL</th>
<th>LINK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Development and Safety</td>
<td>To understand: - The relationship between child development and injury - The specific risks facing children at different ages - How different caregiver skills can help prevent injuries</td>
<td>Decrease injury risk in relation to developmental stages - Increase safety promotion at the home level</td>
<td>0-7 years</td>
<td>Universal</td>
<td>Parents/caregivers, Teachers (early childhood development centres [ECDs]; schools)</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>HVP manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns Prevention and Treatment</td>
<td>To understand: - The extent of burns - The main causes of burns - Prevention of burns - Emergency treatment</td>
<td>To prevent and treat burn injuries - Safe operation and use of paraffin stoves</td>
<td>0-7 years</td>
<td>Universal, Selective</td>
<td>Parents/caregivers, Teachers (early childhood development centres [ECDs]; schools)</td>
<td>Individual, Family</td>
<td>HVP manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILD-CENTRED</td>
<td>Traffic Injury Prevention</td>
<td>PROGRAMME FOCUS</td>
<td>DESIRED OUTCOME(S)</td>
<td>AGE RANGE</td>
<td>TARGET AUDIENCE</td>
<td>AGENT(S) OF CHANGE</td>
<td>SYSTEMS LEVEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To understand:</td>
<td>Reduce incidents of child traffic related injuries</td>
<td>0-7 years</td>
<td>Parents/ caregivers, Teachers (early childhood development centres [ECDs]; schools)</td>
<td>Universal</td>
<td>Selective</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ø The nature, extent, and risks of childhood pedestrian injuries</td>
<td>Improve parents/caregivers’ knowledge, attitude and behaviours around good road safety practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ø The prevention of childhood pedestrian injuries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poisoning Prevention and Treatment</th>
<th>PROGRAMME FOCUS</th>
<th>DESIRED OUTCOME(S)</th>
<th>AGE RANGE</th>
<th>TARGET AUDIENCE</th>
<th>AGENT(S) OF CHANGE</th>
<th>SYSTEMS LEVEL</th>
<th>LINK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To understand:</td>
<td>Reduce the incidence of poisoning</td>
<td>0-7 years</td>
<td>Parents/ caregivers, Teachers (early childhood development centres [ECDs]; schools)</td>
<td>Universal</td>
<td>Selective</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ø The different types of poisoning</td>
<td>Create safer living environments for children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ø The different categories of dangerous substances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ø How to identify the different risk areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ø Emergency care in a poisoning incident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CHILD-CENTRED | **Child Maltreatment** | To understand:  
- What child maltreatment involves  
- The difference between different types of child maltreatment  
- Identify the signs of child maltreatment  
- How to respond to child maltreatment  
- Risks facing families  
- How to report child maltreatment | Promote positive parenting practices to prevent child maltreatment | 0-7 years | Parents/caregivers | Universal | Selective | HVP manual | Individual | Family |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Nutrition and Immunisation** | To understand the importance of good nutrition  
To identify nutritional foods for health child development  
To understand the benefits of immunisation  
To identify the risks posed to children who are not immunised | Enhance the health and well-being of children | 0-7 years | Parents/caregivers  
Teachers (early childhood development centres [ECDs]; schools) | Universal | Selective | HVP manual | Individual | Family |
| CHILD-CENTRED | **Solidarity Economy** | | | **Themba ECD Project: Strengthening ECD Centres in low-income contexts** | | | | **Themb ECD Manual** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **To understand:** | **Generate income, and raise the quality of life of the marginalised** | **0-7 years** | | | | **HVP manual** |
| | Ø What solidarity economy is | | | | | | |
| | Ø How solidarity economy can be used towards family development | | | | | | |
| | Ø How solidarity economy promotes peace and safety | | | | | | |
| | Ø The concepts of Co-ops, Stokvels, food gardens, and | | | | | | |
| | Ø How to create and implement Co-ops, Stokvels, food gardens, and recycling programmes | | | | | | |
| | | **Parents/caregiver** | | | | | |
| | | **Teachers** | | | | | |
| | | (early childhood development centres [ECDs]; schools) | | | | | |
| | | **ECD principals** | | | | | |
| | | **ECD teachers** | | | | | |
| | | **Individual** | | | | | |
| | | **Family** | | | | | |
| | | **Community** | | | | | |
| | | **Universal** | | | | | |
| | | **Selective** | | | | | |

---

1 Stokvels are South African rotating saving schemes in which members contribute a fixed amount of money to the central fund over regular time periods.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHILD-CENTRED</th>
<th>Family Functioning</th>
<th>Building Bridges Mentoring Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To understand</td>
<td>To promote positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information about</td>
<td>and equal gender relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>child development</td>
<td>(especially positive forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and its relationship</td>
<td>of masculinity and femininity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to injury</td>
<td>To create safety and peace by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>using existing spiritual capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and religious assets (strengths)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in local communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The role and</td>
<td>Non-violent communities that are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>responsibility of</td>
<td>peaceful and safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>caregivers</td>
<td>Equality among men and women to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>increase community health and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>generate positive forms of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>masculinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pro-social community values that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>support peace and safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Changing harmful beliefs and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>practices on violence through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>skills and knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve child</td>
<td>0 – 7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>safety through</td>
<td>Parents/caregivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nurturing and</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>attachment</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>imparted through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>caregiver roles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>safety through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>family social and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>emotional bonding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12-18 years (mentees)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;19 years (mentors)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(mentees and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mentors)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents/caregivers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(mentees and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mentors)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents/caregivers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YOUTH-CENTRED</th>
<th>Building Bridges Mentoring Programme (cont.)</th>
<th>Performing Arts Group</th>
<th>Photovoice: Youth Representations of Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To understand</td>
<td>The programme focus is to elicit youth voice and encourage youth initiative</td>
<td>To enable youth to record and reflect their representations of safety and peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information about child development and its relationship to injury</td>
<td>To create a safe space for adult-youth dialogue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The role and responsibility of caregivers</td>
<td>Empower and transfer youth development campaign planning skills.</td>
<td>Critical consciousness, voice and agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve child safety through nurturing and attachment imparted through caregiver roles</td>
<td>Provide youth with skills to contribute to the community.</td>
<td>Improvement of safety conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve child safety through family social and emotional bonding</td>
<td>Enable youth to mobilise their peers to engage in positive change initiatives</td>
<td>Adult-youth dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth, adults, policy-makers, stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY-CENTRED</td>
<td>Safe and Sustainable Project</td>
<td>To develop participants' sense of agency and activism in relation to safety and peace</td>
<td>Determine the immediate and medium-term performance, efficiency and technical effectiveness of the multiple energy solutions, independently. Conduct formative evaluations with the participating communities on the suitability, relevance and significance of the proposed research process and suite of interventions. Determine key human, environmental and institutional enablers and barriers that may affect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To develop participants’ sense of agency and activism in relation to safety and peace...

To evaluate community utilisation of the energy options...
- Evaluate the immediate and medium-term safety and health outcomes of multiple, direct and indirect energy solutions...
- Evaluate the use of a participatory energy intervention approach that has considered the influences of context, community engagement processes, and attitudinal transformations to intervention implementation...
- Monitor the long-term satisfaction and effectiveness of the community.

To assess liberatory forms of energy in the poor communities...
- An indication of the related safety outcomes, including injury (reduction of burns and conflagrations etc.) and violence preventions (e.g. reduction of protest actions related to lack of energy services in the intervention sites)
- The health benefits for the beneficiaries, including the reduction of illnesses associated with exposure to indoor/ambient air pollution, and reduction of heat stress (from thermal comfort intervention) and related illnesses.
CHAPTER 6
Phase 6: Piloting and Implementation
Ghouwa Ismail and Nancy Hornsby

The piloting and implementation phase of the intervention is a continuation of the previous planning phases, with some activities overlapping between this phase and preceding project phases. In addition to the strategies and activities necessary for piloting and implementation, it is during this stage that baseline information is collected to later test the effectiveness of the chosen intervention.

REQUIRED STEPS FOR PILOTING AND IMPLEMENTATION

Five main steps comprise phase 6 of the project: (1) Recruitment of participants; (2) baseline assessments; (3) piloting of the intervention; (4) implementation of the intervention; and (5) monitoring and evaluation [repeated throughout the entire process].

Table 11. Steps in Piloting and Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Anticipated Outcome/Process</th>
<th>Instruments and Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Recruitment of participants</td>
<td>Recruitment strategies in research</td>
<td>• Participant recruitment plan/ criteria/invitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Baseline assessment on the situation the intervention aims to change</td>
<td>• Pre-assessment on identified outcome measures • Identified suitable intervention(s) and evaluation instruments</td>
<td>• Baseline questionnaire • Database template</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>Piloting of selected interventions</td>
<td>• Increased/maintained stakeholder buy-in for the intervention • Contingency and adjustment plan • Collected and evaluated pilot results</td>
<td>• Selected Interventions • Project timeline • Piloting Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td>Implementation of an intervention</td>
<td>• Intervention implementation fidelity</td>
<td>• Observation Checklists • Implementation plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5</td>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>• Process evaluation</td>
<td>• Questionnaire(s) • Interview schedule(s) • Focus group(s) • Observation sheet • Workshop evaluation • Photo documentary • Journaling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Step 1: Recruitment of Participants for the Intervention

One of the most challenging phases of conducting research studies is the employment of effective recruitment approaches (i.e., the method of inviting and selecting participants) and retention strategies (i.e., participants continue participating for the full duration) for a research study. Engagement with communities in the recruitment and retention strategies is key to positive outcomes of research projects (Cruz, Davis, FitzGerald, Canaca, & Keane, 2014). The community engagement principles and recruitment strategies can dramatically contribute to increased sample size (i.e., the number of participants in a programme or intervention). This can be crucial to the success of achieving the outcomes of the implemented programme or intervention. Thus, it is important to note that recruitment, and in effect, retention as well, begins with the initial contact that the participants have with the researchers or research organisation.

#### Why draw up a recruitment plan?

Since every community is different, researchers are faced with unique recruitment and retention challenges. However, a well-developed plan assists in preventing potential problems. Developing a recruitment plan is important not only to ensure that all the criteria for participants are met, but also to avoid bad recruitment decisions, which may lead to a loss of time and money.

#### What a recruitment strategy entails

Researchers can use a variety of strategies to inform participants of a particular study, including:

- Advertisements, flyers, pamphlets, brochures, posters, information sheets, notices, internet postings and/or media are used to recruit participants
- Advertising in newsletters, local newspapers, or radio stations
- Direct recruitment of potential study participants
- Conducting or participating in community outreach activities
- Placing phone calls, emails, or sending messages

When guided by the community engagement principles (see Introduction to this manual), the above recruitment strategies should actively involve community members. Thus fostering trust and respect, using clear communication processes, maintaining equitable relationships, and following through on
commitment are all important (Cruz et al. 2014). Keeping the aforementioned in mind, strategies need to accommodate the chosen individuals by taking into account, for example, the language of the flyers or newsletters and/or advertising media, as they need to be accessible to the targeted community. Each programme is unique, and thus it might be necessary to use more than one recruitment strategy to engage potential participants. Figure 15 below provides a picture of how we have proceeded with this phase.

Figure 15. Example of our work on a recruitment strategy

The use of an optimally participatory approach to community engagement in the recruitment process outlined above helps to prevent potential conflict that can occur when we are choosing people to participate in a research and/or intervention project because, inevitably, a process of inclusion and exclusion does occur.

Step 2: Baseline Assessment

In order to track change in a community, one of the first steps that are needed is to determine how prevalent any problem and/or positive factors being investigated are, including how often these problems or trends occur, and their duration and intensity. This process of gathering and tracking information is regarded as the baseline assessment.

A baseline assessment provides critical information regarding the situation or problem the intervention aims to change or address. The information provides a reference point for assessing change, as well as impact (the lasting effects) within the selected community, and establishes a basis for comparing the situation before and after an intervention. From this information, one can then make inferences as to
the effectiveness of the overall programme or intervention. Baseline assessment should be conducted prior to the commencement of the actual intervention implementation, to serve as a yardstick for assessing change, and identifying whether a component of the intervention triggered this change.

The type of data to be included in the baseline assessment is informed by the objectives the intervention aims to achieve, the theory of change (see Chapter 5) underlying the research process, and the change indicators that are identified in the monitoring and evaluation framework.

Baseline information should be carried out in such a manner that the same type of data can be collected after the intervention, in order to evaluate the results, and assess the extent of change, or lack thereof.

**Why do a Baseline Assessment?**

In addition to providing a yardstick for assessing change, and identifying whether a component of the intervention triggered this change, baseline assessments are useful for various purposes.

- A baseline assessment can assist in making sense of something that might be too huge and complicated to understand otherwise.
- A baseline assessment can assist in making sure whether or not it is a suitable time to commence with an intervention, whether an intervention is necessary at all, and/or whether a particular intervention is appropriate.
- Baseline measures can assist in identifying whether the methods utilised are working effectively.

**How is baseline assessment done?**

Suppose you have observed a high rate of male violence in a selected community, and your institution decides to do something about it. You collect data over a one-year period to find out the number of reported male violence incidences in this community, and then you develop and implement or pilot your intervention. Once your intervention has run its course you will, once again collect data, comparing the new data against your baseline data. Depending on whether the figures have gone up, gone down, or stayed the same, you will know whether your intervention has worked.
Step 3: Piloting of New or Adapted Interventions

What is Piloting?

Piloting can be described as a small-scale study for ‘testing’ the feasibility (whether something will work or not) of the larger intervention (van Teijlingen & Hundley, 2001). Piloting is a crucial element of a good study design. A study design refers to the general approach that one chooses to put together the different sections of the study in a clear and logical way. It is important to note that a research problem determines the type of study design one should use, not the other way around. The study design guarantees that we will effectively address the research problem.

The importance of piloting

Piloting an intervention does not guarantee the success of the main study, but it does increase the likelihood of positive outcomes. Data from piloting an intervention can provide valuable insights for intervention and programme developers.

- Piloting is an important strategy to use to avoid methodological surprises.
- Piloting enhances reliability (referring to the trustworthiness of a tool which will give the same results over different times) and validity (whether a tool measures what it is supposed to measure) of an intervention.
- Piloting allows the opportunity for the intervention focus to be refined and modified to be contextually and culturally appropriate (i.e., relevant for the specific situation or background).
- Both qualitative and quantitative (usually including ‘facts and figures’) methods can be used in pilot studies.

Pilot studies increase the validity of research results and can help to make sure that an intervention delivers the best possible results. In order to ensure all the tools (e.g., questionnaires or scales) used in the pilot phase of an intervention are in fact measuring what it is supposed to be measuring (validity), the following six main steps can be used to check whether the tool is a valid one:

- Implement the intervention to pilot participants in exactly the same way, as it will be administered in the main study.
- Ask the intervention pilot participants for feedback to identify vagueness, unclear and difficult areas, information and activities of the intervention.
Step 3: Piloting of New or Adapted Interventions

What is Piloting?
Piloting can be described as a small-scale study for 'testing' the feasibility (whether something will work or not) of the larger intervention (van Teijlingen & Hundley, 2001). Piloting is a crucial element of a good study design. A study design refers to the general approach that one chooses to put together the different sections of the study in a clear and logical way. It is important to note that a research problem determines the type of study design one should use, not the other way around. The study design guarantees that we will effectively address the research problem.

The importance of piloting
Piloting an intervention does not guarantee the success of the main study, but it does increase the likelihood of positive outcomes. Data from piloting an intervention can provide valuable insights for intervention and programme developers.

- Piloting is an important strategy to use to avoid methodological surprises.
- Piloting enhances reliability (referring to the trustworthiness of a tool which will give the same results over different times) and validity (whether a tool measures what it is supposed to measure) of an intervention.
- Piloting allows the opportunity for the intervention focus to be refined and modified to be contextually and culturally appropriate (i.e., relevant for the specific situation or background).
- Both qualitative and quantitative (usually including 'facts and figures') methods can be used in pilot studies.
- Pilot studies increase the validity of research results and can help to make sure that an intervention delivers the best possible results.

In order to ensure all the tools (e.g., questionnaires or scales) used in the pilot phase of an intervention are in fact measuring what it is supposed to be measuring (validity), the following six main steps can be used to check whether the tool is a valid one:

1. Implement the intervention to pilot participants in exactly the same way, as it will be administered in the main study.
2. Ask the intervention pilot participants for feedback to identify vagueness, unclear and difficult areas, information and activities of the intervention.
3. Record the time taken to conduct the intervention, and decide whether it is reasonable. Get rid of all unnecessary, difficult or ambiguous activities, issues, and information related to the intervention.
4. Assess whether each area and phase of the intervention gives an adequate range of instructions, activities, and information.
5. Establish that replies can be interpreted in relation to the instructions provided, and the information that is required.
6. Check that all areas of the intervention are conducted, and the intervention pilot participants are satisfied with the modules, instructions, areas, and activities of the intervention. Re-word or re-scale any areas that are not clear and shorten, revise and, if possible, pilot again (Peat et al., 2002, p. 123).

Within an unknown setting, the researcher can use a pilot study to gain insight into the selected community. This pilot can lead to redesigning the research focus, questions and methods. For example, we select a community to conduct a pilot intervention focused on safety and health. The results of the pilot indicate that drugs and gangsterism are more of a problem in the community, so we redesign the focus of the intervention to concentrate on drugs and gangsterism. Pilot studies could also identify potential practical problems, or uncover local politics or problems that may affect the research process.
Based on research such as that of Cohen, Morrison, and Manion (2007), van Teijlingen and Hundley (2001), and our own experience, we list the following opportunities that pilot studies offer for conventional and action research (note that this is by no means a complete list):

- Assessing people’s willingness to participate
- Assessing the feasibility of the main study (in other words how practical is the study)
- Assessing the best way to examine the problems or issues that may exist
- Assessing whether the research design is realistic and workable
- Collecting preliminary data (initial information)
- Convincing funding bodies that the main study is feasible and worth funding
- Convincing stakeholders that the main study is worth supporting
- Determining what resources (finance, staff) are needed for the main study
- Developing and testing the adequacy of research instruments (how well these instruments work)
- Establishing whether the techniques and the community where the intervention will be implemented are the best possible choices
- Estimating variability (differences between individuals or communities getting the intervention) in outcomes to help determine the number of people or communities to include in the research
- Gaining feedback on length, timing, coverage, or ease of completion (when to conduct the data collection as well as how long each type takes to complete)
- Gaining general feedback on how easy the methods and approaches are to read and understand
- Generating items for further exploration/discussion
- Identifying logistical problems (challenges relating to planning and organising different research activities) that might occur using the proposed methods
- Identifying sensitive topics and/or problematic or difficult issues

**How a pilot is conducted**

Once the initial intervention design has been determined, a pilot needs to be implemented to see if it is feasible, and whether or not adaptations need to be made. The type of intervention will determine the kind of piloting study required. For example, in the case of novel community-level interventions, a pilot is used to implement a formative evaluation (to evaluate the development of an intervention). This includes a process of testing and re-testing (using the same tools in the same way at different times), and adaptation over a period of time. This allows for an opportunity to clarify fundamental issues such as, the problem or issue that needs to be addressed, the appropriateness of structure and duration of the intervention, what training is required to administer the intervention, who should deliver the intervention, and where and when it should be delivered, and how to maximise the amount of people
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**How a pilot is conducted**

Once the initial intervention design has been determined, a pilot needs to be implemented to see if it is feasible, and whether or not adaptations need to be made. The type of intervention will determine the kind of piloting study required. For example, in the case of novel community-level interventions, a pilot is used to implement a formative evaluation (to evaluate the development of an intervention). This includes a process of testing and re-testing (using the same tools in the same way at different times), and adaptation over a period of time. This allows for an opportunity to clarify fundamental issues such as, the problem or issue that needs to be addressed, the appropriateness of structure and duration of the intervention, what training is required to administer the intervention, who should deliver the intervention, and where and when it should be delivered, and how to maximise the amount of people reached in a population (Wight, Wimbush, Jepson, & Doi, 2015). Figure 16 below provides an illustrative framework, which may serve as a guideline when piloting an intervention.

**Figure 16. Piloting process**

A case example from an intervention pilot project used in our projects is presented below (see Figure 14). This illustration outlines the research and community-engaged activities involved in the intervention piloting process.

**Figure 17. Example of a pilot study**

- **Step 1** Negotiate access to the community
- **Step 2** Recruit participants from the selected community
- **Step 3** Pilot the developed intervention with participants utilising observational research
- **Step 4** Conduct FGDs and interviews with participants to explore views on intervention
- **Step 5** Incorporate feedback and information received during the pilot
Step 4: Implementation of an Intervention

Implementation will vary greatly from intervention to intervention in terms of duration (how long the intervention lasts), frequency (how many times in a given period activities occur), and intensity (how much material is covered, and how much time is spent during each activity). With all interventions, we need to supervise and support the research team, maintain a consistent level of participation, and keep the community interested in the intervention.

1. What is an Implementation Plan?
An intervention implementation plan provides a detailed blueprint of the implementation process, performance expectations of intervention activities, and outlines the roles and responsibilities of all team members. The implementation plan allows the team to track the degree to which implementation efforts follow the planned course of action.

2. What should we include in an Implementation Plan?
An implementation plan encompasses a structured approach of the information, tasks, and activities required to bring a project to fruition. An implementation plan outlines:

- The negotiated objectives, proposed inputs, and outputs, and expected outcomes and benefits
- Who should be involved and be held accountable
- The assumptions made about the links in the delivery chain, and how its supporting assumptions will be evaluated
- Timeframes and project phases
- Standards and quality controls to be used during implementation
- Possible implementation challenges, and how risks and change will be managed

A project implementation plan may include the following:

- Task – list of project tasks
- Percentage Completed – lists the percentage of each task completed
- Status – task status such as: completed, on schedule, behind schedule, cancelled
- Day Started – date task began
- Day to Be Complete – estimated date of task completion
- Actual Completion Date – date task was completed
- Task Assignment – Name of task owner
- Priority – task priority such as High, Medium or Low
- Milestone – Yes or No to indicate if this is a milestone task
- Challenges – how to manage
Implementation will vary greatly from intervention to intervention in terms of duration (how long the intervention lasts), frequency (how many times in a given period activities occur), and intensity (how much material is covered, and how much time is spent during each activity). With all interventions, we need to supervise and support the research team, maintain a consistent level of participation, and keep the community interested in the intervention.

1. What is an Implementation Plan?

An intervention implementation plan provides a detailed blueprint of the implementation process, performance expectations of intervention activities, and outlines the roles and responsibilities of all team members. The implementation plan allows the team to track the degree to which implementation efforts follow the planned course of action.

2. What should we include in an Implementation Plan?

An implementation plan encompasses a structured approach of the information, tasks, and activities required to bring a project to fruition. An implementation plan outlines:

- The negotiated objectives, proposed inputs, and outputs, and expected outcomes and benefits
- Who should be involved and be held accountable
- The assumptions made about the links in the delivery chain, and how its supporting assumptions will be evaluated
- Timeframes and project phases
- Standards and quality controls to be used during implementation
- Possible implementation challenges, and how risks and change will be managed

A project implementation plan may include the following:

- Task – list of project tasks
- Percentage Completed – lists the percentage of each task completed
- Status – task status such as: completed, on schedule, behind schedule, cancelled
- Day Started – date task began
- Day to Be Complete – estimated date of task completion
- Actual Completion Date – date task was completed
- Task Assignment – Name of task owner
- Priority – task priority such as High, Medium or Low
- Milestone – Yes or No to indicate if this is a milestone task
- Challenges – how to manage

Figure 18 below provides an example of an implementation plan.

![Implementation Plan Timeline](image)

**Figure 18. Implementation plan example**
Details about how to monitor and evaluate interventions are provided in Chapter 5. What is important to note here is that, throughout all phases of the intervention, it is essential to monitor the progress, and see whether the intervention is on track, and implemented according to the implementation plan. At the end of the implemented intervention, a summative evaluation will determine how well the aims and objectives of the intervention were achieved, assessing how the intervention reached the intended participants, and whether the planned outcomes were obtained. It is also important to compare the costs of the programme with the benefits of the programme in order to ascertain whether the intervention is feasible and cost-effective. It may be necessary to conduct a follow-up study to assess the long-term effects of the intervention. These evaluatory mechanisms will strengthen the fidelity of the intervention (i.e., the degree to which an intervention is delivered as intended, and trusted to achieve what it is supposed to achieve). It will also allow the identification of unanticipated problems or barriers.

**Figure 19. Monitoring and evaluation of an Intervention**

What is being sought at this stage of monitoring and evaluation is some evidence that the intervention is working as intended, that it is achieving at least some short-term outcomes, and that it is not having any serious unintended effects, for instance, worsening social inequalities.

**CONCLUSION**

This chapter provides an overview of the process and steps followed when piloting an intervention, highlighting the recruitment process, and various participatory strategies for inviting potential participants. It also looks at conducting a baseline assessment, which serves as a reference point for assessing change and impact. The next chapter outlines the monitoring and evaluation of an intervention. The chapter also offers examples from our work in safety and peace promotion.
CHAPTER 7

Phase 7: Monitoring and Evaluation

Sarah Day and Mapula Mochudi

Monitoring and Evaluation is an essential part of the intervention process. Although there are different definitions provided for these concepts, monitoring is used here to refer to the ‘regular, ongoing assessment of activities and trends’. Evaluation is the ‘periodic performance review’, and is the ‘assessment of strategic issues, changes, achievements, and of impact (efficiency of the programme)’ (Guijt, Arevalo, & Saladores, 1998, p.1). In this chapter, we discuss participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) in selecting an evaluation, setting up a monitoring system, doing a formative evaluation, conducting a summative evaluation, providing training and education, doing analysis and presentation of data, and providing feedback.

REQUIRED STEPS FOR MONITORING AND EVALUATION

This chapter offers illustrations and guidelines for how to implement PM&E in community-engaged work. Israel, Eng, Schulz, and Parker (2005) emphasise measuring the long-term outcomes of projects, and the importance of embarking on early and continuing documentation and evaluation of community-engaged projects in order to ascertain the effectiveness of such collaborations. The following table outlines the steps for monitoring and evaluating interventions.

Table 12. Monitoring and Evaluation Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Anticipated Outcome/Process</th>
<th>Instruments and Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Selecting an evaluation</td>
<td>Selection of an appropriate evaluation method for the project</td>
<td>Meeting documents (agenda, registers, minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Setting up a monitoring system</td>
<td>Defined goals, targets, and indicators of evaluation; selected and disaggregated indicators; decisions on how often to monitor; determined data requirements</td>
<td>FGDs, questionnaires, observation sheets, surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>Formative Evaluation</td>
<td>Developed process evaluation indicators; determined baseline; target indicators</td>
<td>FGDs, questionnaires, observation sheets, surveys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) is a method where stakeholders in various roles and levels participate and engage in the monitoring and evaluation of a particular project, intervention or policy. Because of this participatory process, the various stakeholders share the ownership and control over the content, process, and results of the monitoring and evaluation process. Stakeholders, therefore, share responsibility for the project and identifying and taking of corrective actions (MacKay, 2010).

PM&E is concerned with getting all the stakeholders and the target population involved in the evaluation design and implementation (Estrella & Gaventa, 1998; Rossman, 2000). Participatory work includes valuing insider knowledge and skills (this includes the target community and other stakeholders), and requires a shift from doing interventions on people to doing interventions with people (see our principles outlined in the Introduction to this Manual). Project accountability belongs to everyone involved in the intervention, including the funding agency, service providers, the research team and the target community.

PM&E is part of a wider shift towards participatory research practices. In recent years, there has been an increased acknowledgement that participation is essential for community-based work and that monitoring and evaluation practices of community-based initiatives should move towards a more participatory framework (Estrella & Gaventa, 1998; Guijt et al., 1998). The increased interest in monitoring and evaluation has been influenced by several practices: performance-based accountability management practices (the demonstration and accounting for performance related to agreed upon targets); a growing scarcity of funds which has resulted in a demand for demonstration of successful practice; decentralisation (the transfer of power from central government to local or regional offices); and the growing capacity of NGOs and community-based organisations in the field of development and community-based research.

As there is no one way to define participation, and the level of participation at each stage, there is no one way to do PM&E. This is important to remember while reading this chapter. Hopefully, the proposed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Summative Evaluation</td>
<td>Decision regarding when to evaluate; measured impacts; determined data; requirements; obtained data</td>
<td>FGDs, questionnaires, observation sheets, surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Education and Training</td>
<td>Training of community members to carry out monitoring and evaluation; transfer of new skills</td>
<td>Capacitation and development of community members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
guidelines and sharing of our experiences can help you with your community-engaged work. Additionally, the steps that are proposed here are generally not pursued in a linear fashion, as flexibility is needed when practicing PM&E. Instead of proposing steps, Rossman (2000) proposes six fundamental processes:

1. To collaboratively and collectively identify, and define the key objectives and goals for the intervention.
2. To identify indicators (see the section on setting up a monitoring system for a definition) which track the intervention progress.
3. To identify sources of data, and gather data for the measuring of change.
4. To measure the baseline conditions, and to measure progress.
5. To collectively gather the required data, analyse and interpret, and draw conclusions about the progress or success of the intervention.
6. Take corrective action to better implement the programme, and to successfully achieve the objectives.

In order to determine the success of the participatory part of monitoring and evaluation, we need to answer certain questions when implementing the intervention (Guijt et al., 1998):

- How do we maintain high levels of involvement?
- How does the participation of the group that is directly affected by the intervention influence what we monitor and evaluate?
- What methods are feasible in a particular context (this is a very important consideration as PM&E is context specific)?

PM&E has unique challenges and successes (Rossman, 2000). One strength of PM&E is that the communities directly affected by the intervention can feel responsible for the evaluation processes and results, unlike when the process is only done by a researcher, and where the communities who are directly impacted in the intervention have a limited or no voice in participating in the intervention. The second strength of PM&E is the potential to develop skills and capacity related to evaluation. This will be discussed further later in this chapter in the education and training section. Thirdly, when evaluation practices are incorporated in the routine programme operations, there is greater ability to use the information to correct and adapt the programme to address the difficulties that arise as it is implemented. This creates commitment through collaborative inquiry. Additionally, participation is experiential and can add meaningfulness to the programme.

PM&E is not without its challenges, and it is important to remember that this approach may not always be appropriate. PM&E has a high resource and time cost in building capacity, implement the
evaluation; collecting and analysing of data and the process requires facilitator skill, and risk management processes due to unpredictability, and unexpected consequences.

Grounding principles of participatory monitoring and evaluation

Participatory monitoring and evaluation is not just a method of doing monitoring and evaluation, but is a philosophy which prioritises the involvement of communities directly affected by the intervention (Rossman, 2000). There is, however, little consensus on what participation means and the extent of the participation in each phase. The level of participation can vary. Community members can help to set the objectives, targets, select data sources, collect data, tell their story and interpret the results (Estrella & Gaventa, 1998; Rossman, 2000). However, this is not always feasible to do for every project. Evaluators in each project need to define clearly what they mean by participation and agree on the extent of the level of participation they want to achieve.

Rossman (2000) proposes five grounding principles for PM&E, which are participation, negotiation, learning, flexibility and methodological eclectic (diverse). The first principle of participation emphasises the creation of structures and processes to include those community members directly affected by the programme who are often excluded from the programme design and implementation. As outlined in the Introduction to this manual, our community-engagement model includes the optimal participation of all those involved in the research process in the planning, development, implementation, and assessment of interventions (Taliep, 2016). This process centres co-learning, co-construction of knowledge, co-management, and co-ownership. This enables agency to facilitate self-empowerment to support engaged citizenship; and the valuing and engaging with all knowledges, including different disciplines and the worldviews and voices of historically marginalised groups, including Africa-centred knowledge system.

Rossman’s (2000) second principle is negotiation, which is a commitment to working through different viewpoints that may result in conflict and disagreement to decide the focus of the intervention, how it should be implemented, and what actions should result from it. Our model emphasises a relational approach, where compassionate relationship building and ongoing negotiation is an ongoing focus.

The third grounding principle is learning for all partners, which can lead to programme improvement. Our model promotes Learning Together, which emphasises co-learning, interactive and dialogic strategies, experiential learning, and problem posing and mentoring.

Rossman’s fourth principle is flexibility, which recognises that community-based research is often subject to change. PM&E requires those involved in the research process to modify their strategies to achieve the desired outcome when faced with changing circumstances in order to make the intervention both
effective and sustainable. Flexibility is central to our community engagement model. This process requires us to have a comprehensive understanding of community dynamics; warns against making unitary assumptions about communities; requires dialogue; is open to change; and puts into place structures and engagement activities that are accessible to marginalised communities (see Lazarus, Taliep, Bulbulia, Phillips, & Seedat, 2012; Lazarus, Bulbulia, Taliep, & Naidoo, 2015).

The final principal of Rossman (2000) states that PM&E needs to be methodologically eclectic (diverse), which means that it draws on a variety of methods to generate an intervention, invents, and uses local processes, which are relevant. Our model links to this principle as there is an emphasis on including community knowledge in our interventions.

While our model can be linked to the principles set out by Rossman (2000), our work also extends this through its emphasis on power differentials. The focus on power requires that we recognise and address power differentials within community-academy partnerships, and emphasises community knowledge, agency, and ownership as we strive to build authentic partnerships.

### Step 1: What is an Evaluation?

An evaluation is a process of gathering information (Board of State and Communications Correction, n.d.; Global Road Safety Partnership, 2007):

- To understand a programme’s benefits and results.
- To see if the programme’s goals and objectives achieve their intended purposes.
- To analyse data, and see what the programme’s impact was.
- To generate ideas as to why the programme performed as it did.

The central question is why do we do an evaluation? Evaluating a programme allows us to answer questions about the intervention, i.e. (Board of State and Communications Correction, n.d; Prennushi, Rubio, & Subbarao, 2001):

- Do key programmes/interventions achieve the intended goal?
- Can changes in the community be attributed to our programme/intervention or is it a result of external factors?
- Does the impact of the intervention differ for different people, communities, regions and time?
- What are the unintended effects of the programme, both positive and negative?
- Compared to alternative interventions, how effective is our key programme?
- Is the intervention cost-effective?
It is important to note that the questions that the evaluation of the programme would like to answer should be very specific to the programme implemented.

A PM&E evaluation requires that audiences, stakeholders, and community members should be involved in decisions regarding the evaluation, and be aware of how they influence the evaluation process. Monitoring and evaluation practices should be built in from the programme development stage, including the decision making process at the beginning of the project and how it will be implemented. It should be integrated into each stage of the intervention implementation process. Evaluation criteria must be clearly stated from the beginning of the evaluation process (Potter, 1999; Prennushi et al., 2001; Rossi, Lipsey, & Freeman, 2004).

With all of this in mind, there are **two main types of evaluation** (Potter, 1999):

- **Formative evaluation** – It is used to evaluate the intervention at critical points during the development or implementation process to obtain information on what aspects of the process worked well, did not work well, and how to modify or revise certain aspects of a program for improvement (see Mackay, 2010).
- **Summative evaluation** – It is used to assess the value of a program on completion of the program activities (summation). It provides a means to assess whether a programme has reached its intended goals or outcomes.

**There are also two types of evaluators:**

- **External evaluators** – researchers or consultants who are not managed by or linked to those who make use of the evaluation results. They provide an outsider’s perspective, yet may not be especially intimate with the aims and strategies of the dissemination.
- **Internal evaluators** – those who are connected to the project, and will use the results of the evaluation. Due to their knowledge of the project, they are usually able to provide an in-depth, yet potentially biased, evaluation (Ovretveit, 2002).

**Should a programme be evaluated?**

Not every programme needs to be evaluated. However, programmes should be evaluated if they:

- Have a potentially important impact
- Are likely to be re-implemented
- Have a high resource cost
- May have consequences for the participants, especially projects that deal with sensitive issues
- Are funded by outside sources (Funder expectation)
Programmes that have a limited impact and that will not be repeated, do not need to be evaluated. Additionally, some programmes have multiple components and it is not always feasible to measure the outcome of every single component due to time and/or resource costs.

**Example:**

**When to conduct an evaluation:**

Building Bridges is a mentoring programme that aims to mobilise spiritual capacity and religious assets to aid in the construction of non-violent, pro-social masculine identities, identified as an important area of focus for violence prevention, and safety and peace promotion. The Building Bridges project was evaluated because it was a novel and new programme that was developed using an optimal participatory approach. Because we wanted to improve the programme, needed to know if the programme was effective, and use the data from the evaluations to obtain funding.

Source: SCRATCHMAPS project (Building Bridges intervention)

**What type of evaluation should be used for your programme?**

Monitoring and evaluation should take place throughout your programme, and at each stage of the programme, a different type of evaluation should be used. Below is a table summarising the different evaluation types, at what stage of the programme they should be implemented, the purpose of the evaluation, the method, and the data sources.

**Table 13. Different Types of Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Evaluation</th>
<th>Stage of programme</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs assessment</td>
<td>Prior to intervention</td>
<td>Determine area of need</td>
<td>Survey; Situational analysis</td>
<td>Interviews; questionnaire; observation; archival material (a collection of historical documents or records); documents; previous research; prior evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme planning</td>
<td>Programme conceptualisation (the process through which the project’s aims, objectives and methods are decided)</td>
<td>Examine programme’s aims and purposes and the feasibility of the intervention</td>
<td>Interviews; document analysis, Focus groups</td>
<td>Documents; interviews; diaries; minutes; workshop evaluation sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative evaluation</td>
<td>Project implementation; process evaluation</td>
<td>Identify aspects of the programme that work well, are problematic and aspects which require modification/improvement</td>
<td>Survey; Observations; Focus groups</td>
<td>Interviews; questionnaire; observation; documents; diaries; workshop evaluation sheets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Setting up a monitoring system often happens in the needs assessment and project planning stage. At this stage the programme’s goals, targets and indicators are usually selected. See the chapters on needs assessment (Chapter 4) and programme planning (Chapter 5) for a more detailed discussion of these processes. This chapter will now go on to discuss setting up a monitoring system, and formative and summative evaluation in more detail.

**Step 2: Setting up a Monitoring System**

In order for us to determine if our intervention is effective, we first need to set up a system to monitor our progress. This section will discuss the steps and particular challenges we have experienced in our projects. While this manual sets up these steps as a linear process which progresses from one stage to another, it is important to note that participatory work is seldom linear. As the team progresses through these steps, it is important to continually emphasise participation, negotiation, learning, flexibility and being methodologically eclectic (Rossman, 2000). Setting up a monitoring system will take place during the negotiation and project planning phases, and has overlapping features with each phase (see Chapters 4 and 5).

1. **Collaboratively Defining Goals, Indicators, and Targets**

   Before an intervention can be assessed to see if it works, the programme’s goals, indicators, and targets need to be decided upon. There are many possible definitions of these words so for the purposes of this manual; these are the definitions that will be used.

   **Goals** refer to the objectives that the intervention or programme wants to achieve. Goals need to be realistic in relation to context, resources, and timeframe. The ways in which these are expressed is usually in non-technical language.

   **Indicators** are the variables used to measure the progress of the goal of the programme.

   **Targets** are the quantified levels of the indicators that the programme wants to achieve at a certain point in time.
Case Study:
Example of determining goals, indicators and targets
The overall goal of the Ukuphupha Themba Early Childhood Development (ECD) project is to strengthen the capacity of ECD centres in an informal settlement, south of Johannesburg, to meet children’s learning and developmental needs in preparation for school.

The indicators for the Themba ECD project include improving ECD management and administration, nutrition, and the quality of the teaching and learning environment, and the child’s physical and cognitive development (the mental action or process of acquiring knowledge and understanding through thought, experience, and the senses), and socio-emotional development (the process through which children and adults acquire and apply the knowledge required to manage emotions and social relationships).

The research team wanted to complete the baseline measurements for ECD management and administration by December 2016, as key targets of the Themba ECD project.

Source: Themba ECD Project

The process of collaboratively identifying the key objectives of a project is not always a straightforward process, and the level of participation may differ for each activity. What is essential for this step is maintaining a commitment to negotiation and flexibility.

Case Study:
Example of identifying objectives, goals, and targets
In our Building Bridges intervention, the collaborative identification of objectives, goals, and targets of the intervention was a lengthy process. The research team first conducted three asset mapping workshops with community members and one asset mapping workshop with service providers. At these workshops, stakeholders were asked to (a) identify challenges and rate how important these challenges were, (b) identify their assets and say how they could mobilise these assets to address challenges highlighted, and (c) identify particular activities that needed to be in place for this to happen. This was followed by action planning using the Planning for Real steps. Focus group discussions (FGDs) were also conducted with community members and service providers to explore their views on how to build a safe and peaceful community. Once this part of the research was completed, the findings were presented to the broader community.

During this process, many priorities for action were identified. The research team then followed up with workshops where they narrowed down these challenges, resulting in about ten key
Priorities. The outcome of this process was a mentoring programme, which included a ‘basket’ of activities aimed at promoting positive forms of masculinity to create safety and peace.

The goals of the Building Bridges intervention are to: (1) promote non-violence, peace and safety by mobilising spiritual capacities and religious assets; (2) mobilise males to work alongside women to transform overall community health; (3) transform dominant forms of masculinities which are destructive to men, women and the community as a whole; (4) promote generative masculinities; (5) transform understandings of community values; (6) change harmful beliefs and practices that lead to violence through knowledge and skills development; and (7) provide mentors with skills to mentee young males and females.

Source: SCRATCHMAPS Project

Select indicators

Once the process of selecting the goals of the programme is complete, the next step is to define the indicators. This process should also be participatory in nature. Indicators help us to measure our progress towards the programme’s goals. We can classify indicators in two ways: intermediate and final. It is important to track both intermediate and final indicators.
An intermediate indicator measures a factor that contributes to or is an outcome of the process of achieving an outcome. It can also be called an “input” or “output” indicator (Prennushi et al., 2001). Input refers to factors that are needed to achieve the outcome. Output refers to measures, which refer to outcomes that arise during the programme intervention. Intermediate indicators change quickly over time, which help us to see what is happening in our intervention.

Final indicators measure the effect of the intervention on the target population and/or infrastructure (Prennushi et al., 2001). Final indicators can also be called “outcome” or “impact” variables. Impact measures the direct effect of the intervention. Final indicators change slowly over time.

Outputs are different from outcomes because they are under the direct control of the intervention team. Outcomes depend on the behaviour of other people.

**Table 14. Examples of outputs, short-term outcomes, intermediate and final indicators using our Building Bridges intervention**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Short-term outcomes</th>
<th>Intermediate Indicator (input and output)</th>
<th>Final Indicator (outcome and impact)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants understand the meaning of ‘values’; they know its relevance in the prevention of violence; they identify their own values; explore the value of respect, compassion, empathy and hope</td>
<td>Acquire basic knowledge of spiritual capacity</td>
<td>Attitude shift toward the mobilisation of spiritual capacity and religious assets to promote peace and safety</td>
<td>Mentors exhibit and promote positive values (respect, empathy, compassion, hope)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a basic knowledge and understanding of the concept of leadership; know what characteristics make for a good leader; become aware of a range of leadership skills and styles</td>
<td>Acquire basic knowledge and understanding about leadership</td>
<td>Better equipped leaders</td>
<td>Listen to others and communicate more efficiently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the concept of violence; know the different forms of violence; have a basic knowledge of the key factors that contribute to violence and the protective factors which protest against violence</td>
<td>Acquire leadership skills</td>
<td>Change in attitude about being a role model to young people in the community</td>
<td>Implement leadership skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the concept of violence; know the different forms of violence; have a basic knowledge of the key factors that contribute to violence and the protective factors which protest against violence</td>
<td>Have basic knowledge and understanding about violence; the risk and protective factors of violence; the gendered nature of violence; and the promotion of peace and safety</td>
<td>Promote peace and safety in the community and in interpersonal relationships</td>
<td>Able to manage or resolve conflict peacefully</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Disaggregate Indicators

Aggregating and disaggregating indicators is the next step in setting up the monitoring system. To *disaggregate* means to separate an indicator into its separate components. To *aggregate* is to combine separate components to form a whole.

We can disaggregate indicators along various dimensions, including location, gender, income level and social group according to the needs of the project. Aggregating and disaggregating indicators may provide different levels of information according to the needs of the intervention, and the monitoring of the intervention. If you aggregate many variables, you may not get a nuanced enough picture of what is happening, and as a result of this, it becomes difficult to design an intervention if some of the differences are hidden (Prennushi et al., 2001). It also becomes difficult to see which variables change over time, and what is causing the intervention to work or not work. However, looking at too many disaggregated indicators could be very time consuming, and would not necessarily add more meaning.

At this step of setting up a monitoring system we need to decide:

(1) How are we going to disaggregate indicators?
(2) Are our indicators good indicators?

It is especially important to examine whether or not our indicators are ‘good’ indicators. This will tell us whether we have successfully aggregated or disaggregated our indicators, and therefore whether it is possible to measure the success of our intervention. We need to look at a number of key areas when deciding whether an indicator is a good indicator. Is the indicator:

1. **Specific**
2. **Manageable**
3. **Attainable**
4. **Relevant**
5. **Time-bound**

Set targets

When setting targets, it is important to keep in mind the following questions:

- What is the current situation, and what is attainable at the given time?
- What are the different levels of disaggregation for each of the targets?
- Have you included qualitative and subjective factors in goal setting (if appropriate)?
What are the resource implications of selected targets?

It is important to note a few things. It is more difficult to see improvements as levels improve because as the intervention progresses, the improvements may slow down. If an indicator has decreased over time, it is not realistic to expect improvements in the short term; and if during the last while the indicator (such as the level of crime, or the amount of incidences of gender-based violence) has become more severe, it is unlikely that the intervention will immediately result in improvements. This suggests that we need a long-term focus. Therefore, it is important that an intervention identify short-term, intermediate and final indicators.

**Determine data requirements**

A good monitoring system will include data on both intermediate and final indicators. Data can be collected in a number of ways, and it is possible to hire agencies to collect our data if needed. Depending on the project, it is also possible to hire members from the community in which the intervention is being implemented to collect the data. This, however, is not always a simple task.

*Case Study:*

**Example of determining data requirements**

In our violence and injury survey in one community, it was not possible to use members from the community to conduct the survey due to the sensitive nature of the survey. The survey asked community members to disclose their experiences of violence, including both sexual and physical violence. People may not want to see people who interviewed them on a daily basis after disclosing sensitive information. In this instance, the bringing in of external data collectors was discussed with the community leaders, and their agreement was essential to this process. This is in contrast to the Building Bridges project, which hired community members to collect, capture and assist in the analysis of the surveys. They were also part of the authentication of the findings.

Source: Violence and injury survey

Generally, it is preferable to collect outcome and impact data directly from the households or individuals that the intervention has directly affected, using tools such as surveys, interviews and focus group discussions. This primary data should be supplemented with other external sources of data. Using this multi-method approach has cost implications, which must be taken into account.

It is also important to remember that in research, translation and adaption of instruments and tools is often needed. Translation is the process of converting one language into another, while adaption is the
action of adapting a text to suit its context or target audience (see Houlind, 2001). This is not a straightforward task. Translation and adaption of tools is a time consuming and resource heavy task, which needs to be considered in the planning stage of the intervention.

Some questions to ask when considering the data requirements of the monitoring system include:

- What data is already available on the indicators?
- What data do we still need to gather?
- Do we have multiple sources of data?
- Are we collecting data from groups or individuals who are not easily reached or may not feel comfortable with interviewers?
- Does the monitoring system include data on external factors that may influence the effectiveness of the intervention?
- Have we considered translation and adaptation?
- Whom do we employ to do the translation and adaption?
- How long will it take to do the translation/back-translation/adaption?

Case Study:

**Example of using multiple sources of data**

The SCRATCHMAPS project (Building Bridges intervention) used both quantitative and qualitative methods to triangulate their data. The project drew on two surveys (the first one being quantitative, and the second one having more open-ended questions), interviews, FGDs, analysis of meeting minutes, notes and diaries of the research team as well as the mentors and mentees involved in the mentoring programme.

Source: SCRATCHMAPS Project

### Determine the frequency of monitoring

Determining the frequency of monitoring requires careful consideration of the frequency of monitoring, and the cost of the data collection. Some questions to ask yourself are:

- How frequently must a particular indicator be monitored?
- What is the balance between the frequency of monitoring and the cost of data collection?
- How often is the external data updated?

It might be worth drawing up a table, which considers the indicator, indicator type, and instrument needed to measure the indicator, as well as the frequency of monitoring.
Step 3: Formative Evaluation

What is formative evaluation?

Formative evaluation provides information to guide programme improvement. Formative evaluations complement summative evaluations, revealing why a particular programme works and why it does not work. Formative evaluation is more costly and time-consuming than a summative evaluation, so this needs to be considered in the planning phase.

Why do a formative evaluation?

There are a number of benefits of doing a formative evaluation:

- Not doing a formative evaluation may make it difficult to assess whether the programme is making a real change or if external factors are reducing the efficacy of the intervention.
- Allows the intervention to be flexible to emerging challenges. Community-engaged research and interventions are often complex and need consistent monitoring to respond to emerging difficulties.
- Without a formative evaluation, you cannot capture or observe feedback, which will improve the implementation of the evaluation. This may affect your chance of achieving your desired impact.
- A formative evaluation can help you understand the progression of change as well as finding out what works, what does not work and why. All of this information will allow you to improve the implementation and future project designs.
- For community engagement initiatives, formative evaluation should include evaluation of the process by which partnerships are created and maintained.

Formative evaluations often lend themselves to a qualitative methodology. Stecher and Davis (1987) outline five commonly used evaluation approaches:

Table 15. Formative evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-project</td>
<td>To explore the need for the project</td>
<td>Literature review; stakeholder analysis; transect walk (a systematic walk through a community with community members to explore a specific thing and observing, asking questions and producing a transect map); needs assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project development</td>
<td>To make sure the project’s theory is correct; To develop and plan the intervention</td>
<td>Focus group discussion with stakeholders and target communities; literature reviews; outcome model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project implementation</td>
<td>To improve the project design; to ensure project activities are being carried out effectively</td>
<td>Focus group discussions; semi-structured interviews; project journals; budget tracking; time tracking; observation; questionnaires</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Stecher & Davis, 1987)

**Developing Formative Evaluation Indicators**

1. There are four general concepts that need to be measured during a formative or process evaluation: types of inputs, activities, outputs, and the integration of these components (Berkowitz et al., 2008). For each of these targets, you will have to select indicators that form our measurement guidelines. It is helpful at this stage to use a logic model. A logic model is a tool to demonstrate and track project progress (see Figure 20 below).

![Program Action - Logic Model](image)

**Figure 20. Logic Model**

**Determining the Baseline**

2. On completion of the previous step, it is advisable for the team to collect data prior to the intervention to determine the baseline for each indicator. The data will provide a starting point for the intervention, and allow the research team to create realistic timelines. This information also allows the team to identify benchmarks (standard points of reference to compare things against) for evaluating if their intervention is effective.
In the Themba ECD project, fieldworkers started the intervention with a baseline assessment of the ECDs, including an assessment of the learning environment, and teacher qualifications. This provided information on the ECD’s current situation and helped the researchers to identify what further training and resources the ECDs were required.

**Targets and Indicators**

Targets and indicators need to be collaboratively decided upon prior to the intervention being implemented. They need to be set up in relation to the baseline indicators. This will help to set specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, time-bound indicators that can be evaluated. The indicators and targets identified will then be monitored and evaluated by the team. These targets and project indicators are used at various stages during the life of a project (including the intervention implementation stage, during the intervention, and after the intervention has been completed) to determine and help track any changes that need to be noted (Prennushi et al., 2001).

**Case Study**

**Identifying targets and indicators: Ukhuphepha Building Bridges Mentoring Intervention**

The Ukhuphepha Building Bridges project team went through extensive research training and preparation to conduct the process and formative evaluation before and during the intervention implementation. The safety and peace indicators for the evaluations conducted were agreed upon, using the logic model. The logic model clearly stipulates the resources and outputs, activities and action, and the short-term, intermediate and long-term outcomes. The data collection methods used included focus group discussions, questionnaires, surveys, and semi-structured interviews.

The evaluation considered the following:

- **Intervention congruence with community needs**: the extent to which the project aims were consistent with community priorities
- **Alignment with aims and objectives**: the extent to which the programme components were in alignment with the aims and objectives?
- **Conceptual basis**: assessing the linkages between the different parts of the intervention
- **Programme designed on best practice**: evaluating whether the intervention was based on evidence of best practice
- **Target population**: noting whether the content and structure of the programme was relevant to the target population
- **Planning of the intervention**: evaluating the planning and logistics for the implementation of the intervention.

Source: SCRATCHMAPS Project
Step 4: Summative Evaluation

Summative evaluation indicates whether the programme worked, whether the goals and objectives were met. Summative evaluation is therefore more concerned with the impact of the intervention than the process, focusing on what the project has achieved. A summative evaluation takes place after the intervention. While traditionally this evaluation has been associated with quantitative methodology, there is often a need for both quantitative and qualitative methodologies, depending on the aims of the evaluation.

People often use the terms outcome and impact evaluation interchangeably. However, outcome and impact evaluations are two different types of summative evaluations. Although outcome evaluations are not directly related to the indicator being measured by the intervention (i.e., it is not an exact measure though proxies exist that are close estimations of the indicator/s), they are closely associated to the indicator. Outcome evaluations focus on the observable conditions of the study group. Impact evaluations reveal the degree to which the intervention has met the ultimate desired goal. Impact evaluation is therefore concerned with the long-term goals of the intervention.

Decide when to conduct an outcome evaluation

1 When conducting a summative evaluation, it is important to decide which interventions require such an evaluation. Summative evaluations take considerable time and resources, so it is not possible to do them for every intervention, or for every aspect of an intervention. Some interventions may have many objectives, and it is only worth examining a select few. Some guiding questions that might help you to make that decision include:

- Which programme is considered to be of strategic importance?
- Which programme contributes to filling in gaps in knowledge?
- Which programme has an innovative approach?

(Prennushi et al., 2001)

Measure the impacts of your programme

2 It is important to understand the possible benefits of our potential intervention when examining its impact. Furthermore, some programmes may have multiple objectives, so it may be of strategic importance to select a few key objectives to evaluate (Prennushi et al., 2001). It is very important to keep in mind the timeframe in this regard. Measuring the impact of our programme allows us to ask: What are the long-term and short-term outcomes of the intervention?
Choosing an appropriate evaluation design (the method that the researchers choose to evaluate the intervention), depends on the questions we are asking about our intervention. Below is a table that describes the different evaluation approaches that will assist the team in choosing the appropriate design:

Table 16. Five Evaluation Designs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Emphasis</th>
<th>Focusing issues</th>
<th>Evaluator’s role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Research designs</td>
<td>Effects and results of project/ generalisability of findings (to what extent the results of the intervention can be used to make inferences about the group as a whole)</td>
<td>Expert/ scientist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal orientated</td>
<td>Goals and objectives</td>
<td>Programmes goals and objectives/ measurements of goals and objectives</td>
<td>Measurement specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision focused</td>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>Identifying decisions to be made/ identifying relevant information</td>
<td>Decision-support person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User orientated</td>
<td>Information users</td>
<td>Identifying information users and information needs</td>
<td>Collaborator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsive</td>
<td>Personal understanding</td>
<td>Identifying potential stakeholders/ identifying different perspectives</td>
<td>Counsellor/ facilitator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Stecher & Davis, 1987, p. 40)

For instance, an experimental design (where the researcher manipulates one variable to see a change in another variable) may not seem to be appropriate for a participatory monitoring system, because it comes from a traditional research paradigm that is not normally very participatory. However, we have used an experimental design in a participatory way in our Themba ECD project.

Case Study:

Example of different levels of participation

This project provides a nice example of how one can pursue different levels of participation at different stages of the project. The ECD teachers in the community of Thembelihle requested that the Institute conduct an intervention to help them improve their ECD centres. The initial conceptualisation of the intervention was participatory in nature. Due to the nature of the intervention, which aimed at measuring improvement in ECD management, learning environments and child outcomes, an experimental design needed to be used to assess the impact of the intervention. Because of the nature of the research design, the levels of participation decreased in the implementation and measuring of the programme.

Source: Themba ECD Project
Determine data requirements

Data requirements (i.e., the data that you need to conduct an evaluation) are linked to the evaluation methods, and the choice of evaluation method depends on the type of intervention, amount of resources available, time constraints, and desired level of reliability of the results. Evaluation methods can include both quantitative and qualitative data. See the discussion in the previous section on setting up a monitoring system for a more detailed discussion on determining data requirements.

Obtain data

For a more detailed discussion on obtaining data, see the previous section on setting up a monitoring system.

Once we have determined our data requirements, we need to ask ourselves the following questions:

- What existing data can we take advantage of?
- What additional data sources do we need?
- How do we go about collecting this data?

When we have determined our data requirements, we can collect our own data through:

- Questionnaire interview schedules
- Focus group discussions
- Observation sheets
- Surveys

Analysis and Presentation of data

Throughout the evaluation process, data collected will tell us how effective our intervention is, and what the effects of the intervention are. This data needs to be captured and analysed. The type of analysis used will depend on the type of evaluation method selected. Once the data is analysed, the findings need to be presented to the target community, various stakeholders and service providers, and, if appropriate, the funding agencies. Community members targeted by the intervention can do both the analysis and the presentation of the data.
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- What additional data sources do we need?
- How do we go about collecting this data?

When we have determined our data requirements, we can collect our own data through:

- Questionnaire interview schedule
- Focus group discussions
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Analysis and presentation of data

Throughout the evaluation process, data collected will tell us how effective our intervention is, and what the effects of the intervention are. This data needs to be captured and analysed. The type of analysis used will depend on the type of evaluation method selected. Once the data is analysed, the findings need to be presented to the target community, various stakeholders and service providers, and, if appropriate, the funding agencies. Community members targeted by the intervention can do both the analysis and the presentation of the data.

Case Study:

Example of analysis and presentation of findings

Data collection was pursued through a questionnaire, which included both closed and open-ended questions. One of the research team members captured the quantitative or closed question responses on an Excel spreadsheet. The community research team members transcribed the qualitative data. The academic and community members of the research team then conducted a thematic analysis of the data, identifying patterns or themes relevant to the research questions posed. This participatory process was crucial to ensure both quality of data and community ownership of the findings.

The research results were presented to the community in two formats. Firstly, there was a report on the process evaluation that was co-written by the academic and community members. This report was written using language that was understandable by all. The second format was a presentation of the results of the evaluation that was explained to the community.

Source: SCRATCHMAPS Project
Step 5: Education and Training

Participatory monitoring and evaluation require the participation of community members, internal and external stakeholders, and the research team. As a result, all these partners need training and education at relevant points in the project. Refer to Chapter 2 for further discussion on the importance of training and education of community members in participatory interventions.

Case Study:
Example of capacity building for evaluation purposes
We held two formal training sessions in preparation for the process and outcomes evaluations, but ongoing education and training occurred both formally and informally throughout the evaluation process as well.
Once the outcomes evaluation tool was collaboratively created (which in itself was a capacity building experience for both academic and community members), the academic members of the team provided skills training relating to using the evaluation tool. This training included various interactive activities within an experiential framework, focused on becoming familiar with both the content and process of the evaluation. The training was conducted in the primary language of the community members to ensure that it was understood.
Source: SCRATCHMAPS Project

Image: Continuous on-the-job training and capacitation of Community Research Team members

Feedback and Dissemination
There are many ways in which dissemination can be monitored, drawing on both process and outcomes methods (Rossi, Lipsey, & Freeman, 2004). This includes following closely the progress of dissemination outcomes, tracking budget, tracking sustainability of dissemination outcomes, comparisons with other internal and external dissemination procedures, interviewing audiences, recruiting external evaluators, and utilizing questionnaires to monitor the dissemination process among target audiences, as well as other community members and stakeholders.

To ensure that the dissemination and reporting of research findings to all appropriate audiences is accomplished in a comprehensive manner, the team will have to develop a dissemination plan during the planning stage of the evaluation. See Chapter 8 for details on planning the dissemination of research findings.

Challenges of Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation
Having different stakeholders involved in the evaluation process may be challenging, but there is evidence to suggest that the participatory process can improve the quality and sustainability of the programme (Sufian et al., n.d.). A key challenge that community engaged researchers encounter is how to ensure that we maintain optimal community involvement in the monitoring and evaluation process? In this regard, it is important to set up appropriate and accountable structures and processes to enhance relevant and diverse participation, mediate power dynamics and conflict, and provide a safe space for reflection (Taliep, 2016).

Case Study:
Example of mitigating challenges
In order to prevent unnecessary challenges, the SCRATCHMAPS research team, for example, created a great deal of space for reflection, identification of problems, and the development of solutions. “The use of critical reflexivity through diary entries, and the check-in process of the weekly research team meetings, and the monthly Advisory Committee meetings provided a space for the team to reflect. With our weekly check-in process, [we] were given the opportunity to openly express [our] grievances, and it was addressed as required. It also proved to be an invaluable means to enable community members to feel free to express, and address their concerns and any pressing issues that they encountered.”
Source: Taliep (2016)
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Another challenge with PM&E centres on issues of time. Evaluations that involve community members requires more time than conventional evaluation, as researchers may take longer because of the need for training and capacity building, as well as time constraints of community members. What is important for us to consider is that we need to continuously ensure that there are adequate resources to engage the community members in the evaluation, to conduct the evaluation, and to analyse the results. We also need to find different ways of developing realistic timeframes in our research proposals and grant applications (Taliep, 2016).

**CONCLUSION**

Participatory monitoring and evaluation should take place throughout the intervention, starting at the conceptualisation and planning of the project and moving through to the sustainability of the intervention. While the steps in this chapter are set up in a linear fashion, it is important to remember that community-engaged work is seldom straightforward, and does at times get messy. To navigate this messiness, we reiterate Rossman’s (2000) five grounding principles, which emphasise participation, negotiation, learning, flexibility and being methodologically eclectic (diverse). Figure 21 illustrates the community participatory planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation phases.

![Figure 21. Graphic Illustration of Community Participatory Planning, Intervention Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation Phases](image-url)

**EPISTEMIC JUSTICE**

1. Help communities exercise their knowledge (risk, capacities and assets) to identify priority issues.
2. Identify interventions to activate a delivery system and mobilise different resources.
CHAPTER 8

Phase 8: Research Dissemination

Nick Malherbe and Naiema Taliep

This chapter aims to highlight some of the definitions and challenges of research dissemination within community-engaged research. We provide a working definition of dissemination, the importance that dissemination procedures hold for community-engaged research and social change, and the kinds of challenges that you may encounter throughout the dissemination process. Next, general and project-specific dissemination goals are discussed, followed by the sorts of preparatory measures and implementation strategies needed. Finally, the chapter touches briefly, on how we can evaluate research dissemination processes. Our goal is that this chapter will provide researchers, community members, and stakeholders with an overview of how project materials can be disseminated in an accessible and sustainable manner.

DISSEMINATION AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

The following table outlines five broad steps (that are to be continually revisited and revised throughout the dissemination process), that may guide the manner in which project teams, community members, stakeholders, and research team members decide to disseminate a project’s findings.

Table 17. Dissemination of Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Anticipated Outcome/Process</th>
<th>Instruments and Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Understanding Dissemination</td>
<td>• Understanding dissemination and its importance for community engagement</td>
<td>• Meeting documents (agenda, registers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Establishing dissemination goals</td>
<td>• A clear and workable outline of the dissemination goals</td>
<td>• Outline of dissemination goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Adherence to the dissemination goals</td>
<td>• Meeting documents (agenda, registers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>Preparatory measures</td>
<td>• Concretised implementation plans</td>
<td>Project plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 1: Understanding Dissemination

What is a dissemination?

Dissemination is the process of sharing knowledge. It consists of the targeted distribution of information, including intervention materials to specific predetermined audiences, with the aim of this material being used by these audiences to enact meaningful social change. However, dissemination also extends beyond the distribution of materials and/or research outcomes, as it includes non-material education and engagement components (Schillinger, 2010). Dissemination is primarily concerned with channelling back into communities and broader society the information, findings, education, teachings, and data that have been obtained within community-engaged work. If dissemination is to be successful, information must be channelled in positive, creative and accessible ways (Southern California Clinical and Translational Science Institute - Office of Community Engagement, 2012).

Within community-engaged research, dissemination typically takes place after the data collection and analysis processes, but may occur earlier in the research process too. Consistent with the principles of CBPR and community engagement (outlined in the Introduction to this manual), the importance of actively engaging local community members in every step of the research process, including the final dissemination phase, cannot be overstated. Participants, community partners, community members, stakeholders, organisations and any other relevant parties must be involved in deciding on how the work should be disseminated, and ideally, each party should contribute to the development of the dissemination material as well. Community members should not only have a say in dissemination procedures but should drive such procedures. Further, community members must have access to any publication (such as academic publications, media coverage, and public exhibition spaces) that results from a project, especially as, traditionally, these outputs have rarely been made available to the very communities that they consider. For example, newspapers are unaffordable or inaccessible to some, and academic journals are generally not available to those outside of the academy. Efforts must, therefore, be made to provide all disseminated material to community members, including any educational components, such as lessons and experiences, which have been developed within a project (Microbicide Trials Network, 2016).
Why is dissemination important for community engagement?

Despite being vital in establishing trust between researchers and community members (see Introduction chapter), dissemination processes are often neglected or completely ignored within community-engaged research agendas. This is a consistent complaint among both community members and research participants. Certainly, many community members feel that the kinds of interventions communicated within the dissemination process are unattainable for many of those living in low socioeconomic areas, exacerbating the largely held perception - and practice - of research only functioning and being of any use to those in power. In this regard, community-engaged work is often understood as beneficial for researchers (and their institutional commitments) rather than to community members, which contradicts many of our own principles, such as respect for diversity, participation, collaboration, social justice and accountability (Bodison et al., 2015; Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2010).

Although community members are rarely under the illusion that community engaged work is an entirely altruistic endeavour, engaging in a process of dissemination addresses our concern with strengthening relations within a community, and ensuring that the research is relevant to the community. This helps to establish a form of trust between those living and working in the community, and outsiders who intend or aspire to work with the community. Such trust is essential in stimulating social change.

Beyond fostering relationships with community members, dissemination allows researchers to assess the usefulness of their research. Indeed, dissemination is a crucial determinant in separating community-based research from other less inclusive forms of academic inquiry, as it allows those who have been studied to access, as well as draw on a study’s findings in an attempt to improve their material and psychological well-being.

A process of dissemination that aims to be truly community engaged must involve community members and research participants throughout. Involving community members in this manner will also help to achieve the ultimate goal of dissemination, that is, people using what they have learned and/or taken from a study as a way to enact meaningful, and relevant social change, and to mobilise other populations to do so.
Ethics of dissemination

As with all stages of research, the ethics of dissemination must be considered fully. There are numerous points that dissemination teams must reflect on in this regard, including: ownership (to whom does the disseminated material, or its content, belong?), accreditation (have all of the relevant parties been credited for their work?), remuneration (have all of the relevant parties received some kind of remuneration, financial or otherwise, for their work?), consent (has relevant consent been obtained?), and permission (have the necessary permissions been acquired?). When dissemination involves anyone under the age of 18 years, a special set of ethical issues will come into play, and these may need to be taken to an ethics board. Everyone involved with dissemination should be represented and remunerated as fairly as possible, and on his or her own terms throughout the dissemination process. In short: no harm, exploitation, damage or unfair representation should take place at any point during the dissemination process.

Difficulties and challenges

Like all stages of research, the dissemination process is likely to be met with many difficulties and challenges — some of which are mentioned throughout this chapter and are, specifically, covered in Step 5. Through the dissemination process, you will experience many challenges that relate to interpersonal (such as community conflict, power struggles, infighting or simply certain people not working well with others), as well as institutional factors (such as challenges relating to bureaucracy or institutional grants). It is important to remember that most challenges cannot be foreseen and that you will learn to manage these with experience. You should be willing and ready to change the aims, methods, and expected outcomes of the dissemination procedure that you had planned. Indeed, flexibility must be incorporated into all aspects of community-engaged research.

With all of that being said, you must remember that challenges cannot always be compartmentalised, with many challenges remaining unresolved throughout dissemination. One such challenge relates to foreground the voices of community members, which is key to community research (Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2010). Indeed, this may not be an immediately addressable challenge, but it is one inherent to all community engagement enterprises where unequal displays of power should be monitored, and community voices strengthened. We need not to see the challenges inherent to dissemination as disruptive external forces that infect the dissemination process, but rather as a natural part of all community-engaged work. These challenges may then be used to improve future dissemination efforts (see Step 5).
Case Study: Example of community participation in dissemination

A considerable challenge that was experienced by those working on the SCRATCHMAPS project was that community members found the formal research reports to be too wordy, and felt that too much jargon was used within these reports. To address this challenge, the community research team planned and collectively developed an abridged report, which was more accessible to local community members. The abridged report included many visual images, and the results of the study were summarised succinctly.

Source: SCRATCHMAPS project

Step 2: Establishing Dissemination Goals

What are the goals of dissemination?

Every project will have its own set of dissemination goals. Dissemination goals must be understood as flexible. The need for changes may result from a host of factors, including certain procedures not working out, unexpected challenges, and/or people democratically changing how they plan to enact the dissemination process. With this in mind, all goals should be determined by the targeted audience, the project team (including researchers, participants, and community members), the central message/s that is/are being disseminated, and the kinds of community change and social mobilisation that is envisioned by the project team. Consulting around each of these issues can be very challenging, but doing so successfully will ensure the relevance of the dissemination process.

There are various aspects of the dissemination material, which should remain consistent across dissemination settings (The Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute, 2015). Certainly, the primary aim of all dissemination practice is to ensure that certain messages and research findings reach target audiences, who may then use this information to gain some kind of improved understanding of their lives, build social solidarity, and - most crucially - implement meaningful social change that is informed by the dissemination material.

It is important to keep in mind that the most effective dissemination processes are neither designed nor implemented in isolation. Community partners, stakeholders, participants, researchers as well as any other relevant social actors or organisations are able to play critical roles in dissemination. In short, dissemination should enable the broader community to learn about a particular project, and open up a space for an array of people to ask questions, challenge the research, offer suggestions or improvements, examine how the work can be improved, engage in social mobilisation, and contribute
to social change – all in an accessible manner (Microbicide Trials Network, 2016; National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, 2012).

When deciding on the aims of dissemination, it is important that the needs of the target audience are identified, including the advantages, disadvantages, risks, and costs incurred when making use of the disseminated material (The Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute, 2015).

In addition to the mechanisms that remain consistent across dissemination settings, there are also adaptable components within the dissemination material that should be modified to suit different contexts (The Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute, 2015), such as the language used to disseminate. Following this, researchers, community members, stakeholders and target audiences should identify all project-specific dissemination goals, and their adaptable components. Even before planning the specific dissemination procedure/s (see Step 3), participants must provide a description of their expectations (Narsavage & Lindell, 2001). As audiences should be able to use the disseminated material in some way, project-specific goals must take into account the utility of the disseminated materials, and how these can be measured or tracked. Community members may also wish to communicate that which they would like the dissemination process to achieve.

**What is the message to be disseminated?**

The central message/s that are to be disseminated when sharing research findings must be identified early on in the dissemination planning. There are two important considerations when designing the dissemination message: the first is concerned with what audiences should know about the study and how this is to inform any subsequent action, and the second is what audiences need to know in order to motivate them to use the message both in decision-making and in implementing social change initiatives. Different audiences will be interested in different aspects of a study, which will of course influence the content of the message, the form that it takes, and the kind of social action it attempts to catalyse (The Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute, 2015).

The dissemination message is likely to be effective (and reach a larger audience) if it is communicated and disseminated in different ways. The form that dissemination takes, along with the time and place of the dissemination message, is of central importance and must be decided upon democratically by research participants, audiences and stakeholders. It cannot be assumed that participants will see things in the same way; however, they can decide and perhaps reach a compromise through democratic decision-making. If the research, from the beginning, has been participatory in nature, this
will not be difficult, and will also ensure the relevance and accessibility of the dissemination material (Bodison et al., 2015).

The dissemination message should be repeated and consistent. Further, the avenue/s of dissemination must be appropriate to the message as well as the audience’s context - including their values, cultural norms, and needs, which should be determined before dissemination and may involve speaking to members of the community. For example, web-based dissemination will not be effective in reaching audiences with limited Internet access. Finally, the message should be designed by stakeholders, community members, participants and researchers (The Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute, 2015).

**Language of dissemination**

Considerations around language are very important when designing a dissemination message. The language of instruction, and the possible barriers to understanding that this holds must be considered at every stage of dissemination, with all data translated into the preferred language/s of the target audience (Southern California Clinical and Translational Science Institute - Office of Community Engagement, 2012).

Whenever appropriate, everything should be translated into numerous languages, so that as wide an audience as possible is reached. If local community members are not directly involved in translation, then they are at least able to evaluate the translations, as even the most accurate translations can be found wanting with respect to cultural relevance or contextual nuance. If possible, translators should be present throughout dissemination planning events, so that they get a feel for the dissemination message and ensure that nothing is lost. The presence of translators may also ensure that those involved with designing the dissemination message feel heard. It is therefore effective when local people disseminate the message to their particular social groups so that there is a level of interpersonal and cultural engagement, which cannot be replicated as well by outsiders (Social Planning and Research Council of British Columbia, 2013).

All languages are loaded with a particular history that is very often entangled with a country’s history of oppression. This is especially complicated in a country like South Africa, which boasts 12 official languages (including South African Sign Language). Language is, therefore, a particularly pertinent consideration when planning dissemination and it is important that research teams understand the consequences of choosing to disseminate in some languages and not others. Finally, the language of dissemination (as well as the tone in which it is communicated) should be accessible. Historically, professional and disciplinary languages have excluded certain groups of people, including those who have been unable to receive particular kinds of education, and those to whom the dissemination
language is secondary. The language by which material is disseminated should, therefore, be simple and direct so that all dissemination material is understood across a range of audiences. Indeed, if the information is inaccessible to audiences, it is unlikely that any kind of action or social change will occur. Disseminated materials should, therefore, be communicated in ways that are inclusive, understandable and that aim to assist audiences in implementing social action.

**Case Study:**

**Examples of different forms of dissemination**

The Community Storylines project involved participants using arts-based methods to communicate their lived experiences. What follows are two examples from this project that take careful consideration of language issues. The first example concerns the Performing Arts Group, who produced and performed a number of community plays. Participants co-created community plays. Participants co-created the script with the project facilitator in their primary language. The script relied on accessible, colloquial, poetic and entertaining language that was later performed in an exciting and visceral manner.

Source: Community Storylines Project
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Source: Community Storylines Project

A second example from the Community Storylines project may be noted in the public screenings of participants’ digital stories (which are 3-5 minute video clips of a participant from the community providing a voice over - with accompanying subtitles - to various photographs that participants had captured of life in their community). The language used within the digital stories was simple, to-the-point, highly accessible, and included a mixture of languages. After the screening, participants who were involved in producing the digital stories discussed with the audience the production process in an informal, yet insightful, manner.

Source: Community Storylines Project

**Step 3: Preparatory Measures**

**Planning dissemination**

Dissemination planning should focus on (National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, 2012):

- **Activities** – the actions around planning dissemination strategies
- **Outputs** – the desired products/materials of dissemination
- **Impacts** – the changes that occur because of dissemination activities and outputs. Impacts can be short- and/or long-term

The proposed audiences should be consulted throughout dissemination planning, outlining their views on the form, avenue, design, and tone of the material that is to be disseminated. During the planning, contextual factors (derived from the local community as well as broader a socio-political climate) and potential barriers to understanding or effective use must be identified, as these are crucial considerations when deciding on how to pursue dissemination processes. Further, the kinds of social, material, and interpersonal changes that may occur as a product of dissemination must be considered carefully (Planning NSW, 2003; The Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute, 2015).
The most critical questions that should be asked when developing a dissemination plan are outlined in the table 18. These can be used as a guide for developing a dissemination plan.

**Table 18. Questions for Developing a Dissemination Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Project overview</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ What drives the research being conducted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ What are the aims and objectives of the research project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Who is, or would, be interested in the outcomes of the study?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ How will it address the challenges or context that was identified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Dissemination goals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ What are you hoping to achieve by disseminating this research?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Target audiences</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Who are the groups or people that you intend to reach with your key messages or research results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Who can use this research?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Key messages</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Do the messages explain what the research results mean, why the findings are important, and what action ought to be taken as a result?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Are the messages clear, accessible, uncomplicated, contextually relevant and action-oriented?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Sources/messengers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ To ensure uptake of the research results, which individuals, groups or organizations that are regarded as credible with your target audience would you use as spokespeople to disseminate your messages or findings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ How can you get those people, groups or organizations “on board”?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Dissemination activities, tools, timing, and responsibilities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ What are the activities (e.g. community presentations) you will embark on to reach the target audience, and the instruments (such as printed materials or websites) that will support these activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ What is your expected timeline (what you will do first and when you will do it) and who will do what (assign responsibilities to team members)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ What methods are you going to use? (e.g., face-to-face community meetings or briefings are very effective in reaching decision makers).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Have all members of your collaborative research team committed to carry out at least one responsibility or task for implementing a dissemination activity, and have you scheduled report back meetings to make sure commitments are being met?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Budget</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Have you planned for the various budgetary requirements for dissemination (e.g., layout and printing, translation, equipment, and venue hire, travel, refreshments for planning meetings, etc.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Evaluation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Have you built in an evaluation plan right from the start?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ How will you evaluate the process, success or outcomes of your dissemination activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Have you selected measurable criteria for all your dissemination activities?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from the Canadian Health Services Research Foundation (2016).

Avenues of dissemination

There are five main avenues of dissemination, each of which has its own set of advantages and disadvantages (National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, 2012):

- In-person
- Print
- Web-based
- Art/performance
- Audio/visual

These avenues need not always be mutually exclusive. For example, a media release that serves to inform local media about ongoing projects and results (Social Planning and Research Council of British Columbia, 2013) is likely to make use of more than just one of these five avenues. The kind of dissemination avenue/s that is/are used depend not only on the specific project, but also on a host of other factors, including budget constraints, community receptiveness, and resource availability. The use of multiple dissemination avenues typically ensures that the constraints of one avenue are balanced by the advantages of another.
The most critical questions that should be asked when developing a dissemination plan are outlined in the table below. These can be used as a guide for developing a dissemination plan.

### Table 18

**Questions for Developing a Dissemination Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.     | **Project overview**  
  - What drives the research being conducted?  
  - What are the aims and objectives of the research project?  
  - Who is, or would, be interested in the outcomes of the study?  
  - How will it address the challenges or context that was identified? |
| 2.     | **Dissemination goals**  
  - What are you hoping to achieve by disseminating this research? |
| 3.     | **Target audiences**  
  - Who are the groups or people that you intend to reach with your key messages or research results?  
  - Who can use this research? |
| 4.     | **Key messages**  
  - Do the messages explain what the research results mean, why the findings are important, and what action ought to be taken as a result?  
  - Are the messages clear, accessible, uncomplicated, contextually relevant and action-oriented? |
| 5.     | **Sources/messengers**  
  - To ensure uptake of the research results, which individuals, groups or organizations that are regarded as credible with your target audience would you use as spokespersons to disseminate your messages or findings?  
  - How can you get those people, groups or organizations “on board”? |
| 6.     | **Dissemination activities, tools, timing, and responsibilities**  
  - What are the activities (e.g., community presentations) you will embark on to reach the target audience, and the instruments (such as printed materials or websites) that will support these activities?  
  - What is your expected timeline (what you will do first and when you will do it) and who will do what (assign responsibilities to team members)?  
  - What methods are you going to use? (e.g., face-to-face community meetings or briefings are very effective in reaching decision makers).  
  - Have all members of your collaborative research team committed to carry out at least one responsibility or task for implementing a dissemination activity, and have you scheduled report back meetings to make sure commitments are being met? |
| 7.     | **Budget**  
  - Have you planned for the various budgetary requirements for dissemination (e.g., layout and printing, translation, equipment, and venue hire, travel, refreshments for planning meetings, etc.)? |
| 8.     | **Evaluation**  
  - Have you built in an evaluation plan right from the start?  
  - How will you evaluate the process, success or outcomes of your dissemination activities?  
  - Have you selected measurable criteria for all your dissemination activities? |

Adapted from the Canadian Health Services Research Foundation (2016).

**Avenues of dissemination**

There are five main avenues of dissemination, each of which has its own set of advantages and disadvantages (National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, 2012):

- In-person
- Print
- Web-based
- Art/performance
- Audio/visual

These avenues need not always be mutually exclusive. For example, a media release that serves to inform local media about ongoing projects and results (Social Planning and Research Council of British Columbia, 2013) is likely to make use of more than just one of these five avenues. The kind of dissemination avenue/s that is/are used depend not only on the specific project, but also on a host of other factors, including budget constraints, community receptiveness, and resource availability. The use of multiple dissemination avenues typically ensures that the constraints of one avenue are balanced by the advantages of another.
In-Person

In-person dissemination processes entail interacting with people, and may involve answering people’s questions, and directing them towards additional material. Location is obviously very important when enacting in-person dissemination, and may include hosting educational meetings within the community (Filipovitch, Daci, Kramlinger, & Robison, 2012; National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, 2012).

Some examples of in-person dissemination include:

- **Public meetings** – these are open to all people living in a community and should offer the opportunity for engagement with the research material. Public meetings can be especially effective in collaboratively exploring and informing different ideas. In having a good experience of a public meeting, one may encourage other people to become more involved in community work, promote social cohesion, and/or engage with the disseminated material in ways that catalyse positive community change (Neighbourhood Planning, 2014). Public meetings can also include community-partner conferences. It is important to remember that they should be accessible, and rely on jargon-free language (Bodison et al., 2015).

- **Workshops** – these typically take place over half a day, and are attended by those who have been invited by the project team. They are designed to ensure that participants work collaboratively on particular tasks. Workshops do not necessarily aim to relay background information. Rather, they attempt to establish effective problem-solving techniques and help to build a sense of ownership among workshop attendees (Neighbourhood Planning, 2014).

- **Open days** – these represent a way of establishing informal contact with community members by presenting opportunities to ask questions and network with others in the community. Open days can publicise the kind of engagement that a project team hopes will occur at a later stage, thereby creating awareness around such engagement. Additional information (sometimes printed) can be provided at open days (Neighbourhood Planning, 2014).

- **Community fairs** – these should be fun, collaboratively organised, informal occasions that attempt to attract
people from all ages and backgrounds. Fairs generally function to foster interest in pertinent issues as well as establish interpersonal social networks.

*Image: Sharing finding of the safety and peace indicator development at a community fair*

**Print**

Print materials should be distributed to target audiences and placed in strategic locations, such as community notice boards, public centres and other areas within the community. It is important to find out which of these places require permission for the use of their space.

As printed material serves to capture the interests of the public, who may then seek out further information, all material must be pleasing to look at and relatively to the point, with only the most essential information included. Printed material should, therefore, follow a relatively simple design format that is able to relay information effectively and accessibly. The material should lend itself to quick and cheap production, with postcards and pamphlets serving as good examples in this respect. Some printed materials may require a form of subscription, either through email or through the postal service. Subscriptions of this nature have relatively low maintenance costs and they, generally, do not violate or infringe on any privacy laws. Subscriptions should be open to the public or targeted at a specific audience (Social Planning and Research Council of British Columbia, 2013).

**Some examples of print dissemination include:**

- **Public exhibitions** – these rely largely on visual communication and can be combined with other public events. Exhibitions can attract young people and other population groups who may not be as willing to engage in more traditional public platforms (Neighbourhood Planning, 2014).
- **Consultation documents** – these attempts to articulate, in detail, the findings, questions, and ways forward that have been identified and discussed within community-engaged research. Personal anxieties and communicative shortcomings relating to face-to-face interaction are often alleviated when using consultation documents.
- **Newsletters/magazines** – not to be understood as a form of engagement, newspapers, and magazines represent powerful means of supplementing engagement by informing people about meetings and workshops, as well as reporting research results. Newspapers and magazines should be succinct, aesthetically pleasing, colourful and lively.
- **Leaflets and posters** – these may be effective in marketing and conveying very simple messages.
Web-based material can be disseminated widely and can allow people to engage with information while occupying settings in which they are comfortable. Web-based documents also permit online-users to comment on and respond to various aspects of research. They also allow users to engage systematically with specific areas of the research that is of particular interest to them (Neighbourhood Planning, 2014).

As web-based dissemination may include downloadable files, photographs, videos, project updates, schedules, cost estimates, project findings, and much more, it is able to provide more information than many other avenues of dissemination. Websites should also be updated continuously and can allow people the opportunity to sign up for email updates, whereby their email addresses are databased. The nature of web-based material ensures a cost-effective way of delivering information to a variety of audiences (Filipovitch, Daci, Kramlinger, & Robison, 2012; Social Planning and Research Council of British Columbia, 2013).

However, web-based dissemination allows only those who have online access - that is, populations of relatively high socioeconomic status - to view the disseminated material. Further, the increasingly information-rich nature of the Internet may result in some of the disseminated material being lost or ignored if it is not marketed appropriately (National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, 2012).

Some examples of web-based dissemination include:

- **Websites** – these are advantageous because, although their initial expense is quite high, their maintenance costs are relatively minimal. In order to keep information about events topical and current, notices and banners can be displayed and updated on the website’s homepage. Websites may take the form of weblogs, which provide a direct link between the author and an audience.
They also do not require any coding ability and are very user-friendly (Social Planning and Research Council of British Columbia, 2013; The Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute, 2015).

- **Social media** – online social media platforms, such as Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram, are used more widely than ever before. Social media are relatively accessible, and allow users - who may be thought of as shy within interpersonal contexts - a platform to centre their voices and be heard (Neighbourhood Planning, 2014).

**Arts/Performance**

An especially effective means of dissemination is through art or arts-based/dramatic performance. Such art draws on a visual or kinetic language that is able to intuitively command audiences’ attention in ways that traditional spoken or written language-based dissemination often cannot (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006). There is no specific or direct way by which to conduct art-based dissemination practice, allowing project teams a creative and innovative way by which to communicate their dissemination materials. Project teams should work together in deciding the kind of art that will be most effective in reaching their dissemination goals, and indeed how such art may evoke action from and solidarity between audiences. The kinds of expenses and logistical constraints must also be considered in this respect. All arts- or performance-based dissemination should allow for a space where audiences are able to react to and comment on the art.

**Some examples of arts/performance dissemination include:**

- **Theatre** – dramatic performance allows dissemination messages to reach audiences in an especially visceral manner (see the example of the Community Storylines project in this chapter).
- **Poetry readings** – although relying on language, poetry differs from other traditional language-based forms of communication in that its looseness, playfulness and convention-defying characteristics allow the language to resonate with audiences in powerful and unique ways. The manner in which a poem is performed can also take on exciting meanings for audiences.
- **Art workshops** – audiences are able to make their own meanings creatively in this regard. The various kinds of artworks produced, may also ignite exciting discussion and allow for collaboration that may lead to meaningful transformation and social cohesion.
Audio-visual

Although one may disseminate material using modes that are either audio (such as radio or podcasts) or visual (such as billboards or GIF computer files), the combination of the two is especially effective with respect to direct or gut engagement. Audio-visual dissemination material typically takes the form of downloadable computer files, such as .mov video files. Again, audio-visual material is more accessible to those who have access to the kind of technology required to view such material.

Some examples of audio-visual dissemination include:

- **Movie files** – these are short film clips that are relevant, succinct and engaging. Copyright issues, as well as any potential psychological triggers, must be kept in mind when selecting movie files.
- **Television advertisements** – these are generally 15, 30 or 60 seconds in duration and can, if budget and the community allows, be produced in collaboration with an agency that specialises in marketing. Although costly, television advertisements can be very effective in reaching a wide audience (Social Planning and Research Council of British Columbia, 2013).
- **Television shows** – these are very expensive however they can be very influential. The television show Soul City is perhaps an instructive example of using a television show as a form of dissemination (see http://www.soulcity.org.za/).

The Process of Planning

The Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute (2015) describes a number of steps that can be taken during dissemination planning. These steps are not necessarily direct or straightforward and should be revisited continually throughout the planning process. It must be kept in mind that these steps will very likely differ from project to project:

1. **Procedure**

   Research participants and project stakeholders must be involved in strategising the dissemination procedure. Such involvement should include a description of dissemination plans, and how best to reach audiences. In addition to decisions around the quality of dissemination, the dissemination budget must be discussed between these two parties (National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, 2012). Stakeholders are especially important in this sense, as they often have intimate knowledge of the target audiences, and must therefore be engaged with the planning processes in order to ensure the strategic reach and success of the dissemination strategy. Stakeholders will likely have existing networks and resources from which to draw and bolster dissemination. Key stakeholder groups in this regard are those who know how to engage audiences with the research so that they might implement some form of social action. However, it is important that we are also critical of stakeholders, as they are likely to
represent conflicting interests which - when attempting to appease all of these interests - can become materially and politically costly (The Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute, 2015).

2. **Strategising**

Strategising involves designing a plan of action. Dissemination strategies refer to the directed and managed the dissemination of information. For example, how, why, and to whom information will be disseminated. Such strategies should be decided upon early on in the planning process. Strategies of this nature speak to the provision of information as a means of raising awareness around that with which particular community-engaged research is concerned. All of those who were involved with the research should design a strategy of dissemination collaboratively and democratically. A strategy will consider any events where material could be disseminated or launched, as well as the number of partners and community members that will be involved in disseminating the material and how, if at all, such dissemination will be maintained over time (National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, 2012).

The strategy of dissemination upon which participants, community members, researchers, and stakeholders decide should detail efforts through which audiences will be selected and how the message/s will be made relevant to this audience’s needs, beliefs, motivations, as well as various cultural and linguistic characteristics. The manner in which audiences are likely to use the disseminated material must then be considered. An understanding of the audience’s context is therefore crucial. Dissemination strategies should, as is emphasised throughout this chapter, make use of various avenues of dissemination – the use of which will likely increase the effectiveness of the overall dissemination.

The Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute (2015) suggests four questions that should be asked when planning a dissemination strategy:

- Who are the target audiences?
- How will the audiences receive information about the research evidence?
- What is the dissemination message?
- How will the effectiveness of the dissemination strategy be assessed?
- Every dissemination strategy will exhibit both strengths and weaknesses, and sometimes only trial and error are able to determine that which is best suited to a particular community. Monitoring the process of dissemination (See Step 4) will assist in this regard.

The National Institute for Environmental Health Sciences (2012) highlights some dissemination strategies:

- **Researchers to communities** – researchers may assist stakeholders and participants in creating an advisory board of community members that work to structure the research findings into a form that is appropriate for particular communities.
➢ **Communities to researchers** – community members should be involved in the research process so that they can, for example, identify which aspects of the research are appropriate for particular communities, determine which decisions will be most effective, ensure accessibility of the dissemination material, and identify what will be the most efficient or cost-effective ways of working with the community.

➢ **Communities to decision-makers** – community members may take on research findings as personal concerns, and later take these to policymakers.

➢ **Communities to schools or public health officials** – community members can enact changes in schools or in public health programmes.

3. **Goals**

   The goals of dissemination, that is, the kinds of social, interpersonal, and material changes and effects that the project team would like to see in the community, must be made clear during the planning stage. See Step 2 of this chapter for a more comprehensive description of dissemination goals.

4. **Change**

   Planning procedures must ensure that audiences are able to use the disseminated material to enact contextually relevant social change. Such change may, for example, result from mass social movements, local business, political engagement, civil resistance, and/or variations of community-engaged, grassroots projects. The kinds of change that a particular process of dissemination strives towards should be mapped out early on in the project and may be achieved most successfully by disseminating a combination of physical materials, interpersonal communication, performance, as well as educational and/or instructional teachings.

5. **Meaning**

   The ways by which disseminated material can be made meaningful to target audiences must be considered carefully. This will involve a series of community-engaged measures. In order to ensure that all that is disseminated holds some kind of relevance for the community, guidance should be sought from local people. Therefore, various fractions of a community must be consulted and spoken with, so that the disseminated material remains relevant across numerous social groups. Meaningful dissemination material will also allow community members to take such material seriously and to offer their genuine and engaging critique.

6. **Accessibility**

   All disseminated material must be as accessible to target audiences. Each of the five previous steps must be considered carefully with respect to how the dissemination material can be accessed by as many target audience members as possible. In this sense, accessibility refers to people being able to
get hold of the disseminated material, as well as this material being understood fully by target audiences (see Step 2’s Language of dissemination section). Simply put, target audiences should be able to access all facets of that which is being disseminated.

7. Dissemination avenues

The most appropriate dissemination avenue/s must be stated clearly from the start of any project. It is likely that the more avenues of which a project makes use, the more reach and effectiveness the material will have. However, the use of multiple dissemination avenues can become quite costly and complicated – especially when it comes to tracking or measuring influence. See Step 3 of this chapter for more detail on different kinds of dissemination avenues.

Case Study:

Example choosing an appropriate dissemination avenue

One of our key research activities of the SCRATCHMAPS project was the development of safety and peace indicators. As a group, we elicited the views of community members on what makes their community safe and peaceful, using a number of participatory research methods. These methods included essays written by grade 7 learners, brief conversations will community elders, the development of a “House of Peace and Safety” and performing peace songs. It was proposed that this entire process be pursued around the “16 Days of Activism against Violence” event that was hosted by SCRATCHMAPS. In this way research, action and dissemination occurred together.
It was proposed that the 16 Days against Violence SCRATCHMAPS Event take the form of a public concert. The event took place towards the end of November on a soccer field, and included a number of related activities that focused on “building a safe and peaceful Erijaville [the participants’ community]”. Some of the data collection and analysis (such as essay writing and conversations) took place before the event, while others occurred during the event itself. The main activity during the event was the building of the House of Peace and Safety, which included all of the ideas that were elicited through the research methods used prior to the event. Each brick included, and represented, an idea that emerged from the research process. The result was that people were able to see what community members understood to be important in building a safe and peaceful community. The event proved successful in making use of numerous ways to disseminate various aspects of the SCRATCHMAPS Project.

Image: House of Peace and Safety
Source: SCRATCHMAPS Project

Step 4: Implementation of Dissemination Plan

Establish an implementation team

An implementation team should consist of stakeholders, community members, researchers, and participants. Each individual member of this team should draw on his or her social and/or professional networks and experiences when designing implementation strategies. For example, web-based dissemination avenues may require someone who has a background in online coding. Ideally, community members will learn the skills required to maintain the dissemination process for as long as is necessary. Implementation tasks should then be appropriately divided among dissemination team members.

Teams can be arranged in leaderless structures or they can elect a leader/leadership committee. Sometimes leadership positions are not openly stated, however, certain team members become de facto leaders. Whatever the team structure, it is important that all decisions be arrived at democratically, where every member of the team has a say. Further, the team should consult the
broader community as well as target audiences when attempting to implement particular dissemination strategies. Whatever the structure, it is important that community voices are emphasised throughout, and that displays of power be observed carefully.

**Monitoring the implementation**

Once the dissemination procedure/s has/have been selected and carried out by the team, it is important that such enactment (as well as all preceding planning and engagement) is monitored (see Chapter 5 for a more detailed discussion on monitoring). Monitoring ensures that the implementation adheres to particular dissemination goals. This means that the target audience is reached successfully and that the agreed-upon message has been communicated. Monitoring will take place throughout the implementation of dissemination, and will include notes on how the dissemination process has deviated, if at all, from its initial conception, as well as if it has been successful, that is, if it has achieved that which it set out to do, and what sort of change (social, material and/or interpersonal) it has affected (Potter, 1999).

**Step 5: Evaluating Dissemination**

**What is evaluation?**

The effectiveness of dissemination is demonstrated through an evaluation process (see Chapter 5 for a more detailed discussion on evaluation). This can result in improved accountability, better funding and/or quality control, the kinds of social change that should be worked towards, and re-evaluated dissemination goals. Evaluation can also advance our knowledge of how to improve the next phase or next cycle of dissemination (National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, 2012).

Evaluating dissemination allows us to determine the value of this process, that is, how useful the process has been, and whether it has achieved its intended aims. Usefulness can relate to the organisation, implementation, and resultant action related to the process of dissemination. Where monitoring takes place throughout the dissemination process, evaluation occurs once the dissemination process is complete (Potter, 1999).

In attempting to determine effectiveness, the evaluation procedure measures the consequences and the outcomes (including social, educational, or ‘intangible’ outcomes) of dissemination in order to determine whether such dissemination has been of use to audiences. Evaluation can also determine how the dissemination process can be improved. It is important to gather a range of opinions and perceptions when attempting to evaluate dissemination – in this sense evaluation is a subjective procedure (Ovretveit, 2002).
Some examples of evaluation procedures include: tracking the progress of each dissemination outcome, noting down how time/money/resources could have been saved, noting what more could be done, noting that which was unnecessary, recording sustainability of the dissemination, noting what social change was, and was not achieved, examining the sorts of social cohesion that occurred, describing which goals were and were not achieved, and conducting focus groups.

Evaluations can compare various ‘before and after’ phenomena in order to assess any potential changes that have occurred because of the dissemination. Further, evaluators can compare one kind of dissemination with another, always looking at how time or money could be saved while still maintaining a measure of quality. Finally, evaluators should consider the sustainability of the dissemination, as well as any risks that were encountered (Ovretveit, 2002).

**Evaluation of dissemination successes and challenges**

Perhaps the most important aims of the oftentimes tiresome procedures that are involved with evaluation are to identify that which worked, that which did not work, and what can be improved in order to determine the most effective forms of dissemination.

It is important to keep these aims in mind as they remind the project team that there is not only one correct way by which to disseminate information. Some projects have stressed that dissemination planning was inadequate from the project’s inception and that the disseminated material was not positioned strategically (Chappell, 2008); while others have stated that dissemination was too costly in terms of finances and time (Filipovitch, Daci, Kramlinger, & Robison, 2012). The Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute (2015) also notes a number of other problems typical of dissemination, including: translating the evidence to accommodate diverse audience needs, ensuring accessibility, overcoming resistance to adoption of the disseminated information, motivating audiences, and issues relating to external validity.

Most, if not all, of the problems that are associated with dissemination, cannot be predicted from the outset of the dissemination planning. Further, many problems may relate to the particular dissemination context, such as a key team member losing his or her job, or a death in someone’s family. Whatever the case, evaluation (as well as monitoring) procedures help dissemination teams to improve the overall planning, implementation, and sustainability of the dissemination process.
**Case Study**

**Example of a problem associated with dissemination**

At the end of the Multi-Country Photovoice Project, there were a number of photographic exhibitions and the publication of a photobook. Both these dissemination strategies included photographs taken by the research participants, which were shared with various audiences. Immediately after the project, youth participants were interviewed about how they felt their work had been disseminated. The questions asked during these interviews revolved around both formative and summative evaluative areas of focus. Several years after the project, when many of the youth participants were young adults, participants were once again asked various questions around evaluating the dissemination processes of the project. In this sense, participants served as internal evaluators (see Chapter 5). Both the immediate and longitudinal evaluations that were employed in the Multi-Country Photovoice Project helped researchers, community members and participants to gain an understanding into different aspects of the dissemination process, some of which were more clearly identified at the time of the project, and others that were expressed more fully in hindsight.

Source: Multi-Country Photovoice Project

**CONCLUSION**

This chapter has attempted to outline some important goals, considerations, definitions, and challenges that project teams are likely to face when attempting to disseminate project material, which may include various material outcomes or educational facets of the research. The chapter set off by attempting to provide an explanation of dissemination, including why and how dissemination can, and should, be important and beneficial in the particular community in which it takes place. These benefits may relate to social change or strengthened feelings of unity in the community. Challenges and ethical considerations around dissemination are also explored. The chapter then considers the goals of dissemination, which must be clear from the outset of a project, and should consider carefully the kind of messages that are to be disseminated, as well as the language in which this message will be communicated. Next, preparation around dissemination is explored. This includes the dissemination avenues, and the process of dissemination itself, both of which dissemination project teams must consider. Following from this, the chapter explores the implementation of dissemination strategies, which includes monitoring this process. Finally, the chapter looks at how dissemination can be evaluated and, ultimately, improved.
CHAPTER 9

Phase 9: Sustainability Planning

Kasia Momsen and Naiema Taliep

Community-based participatory research (CBPR) involves a long-term process, and commitment, to sustainability (Hacker et al., 2012; Lazarus et al., 2012; Minkler & Wallerstein, 2011). Sustainability should be the vision driving the intervention or programme.

This chapter will explore various influencing factors to consider in the sustainability plan of a CBPR project. Many of the concepts mentioned here have been discussed in previous chapters, but are important for sustainability.

SUSTAINABILITY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

A commitment to the continuity of community engaged activities or projects beyond the formal completion of such activities, requires of us to frame an agenda that is based on community needs and develop a clear plan for the sustainability of the project.

Table 19. Steps in Sustainability Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Anticipated Outcome/Process</th>
<th>Instruments Sources and Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Defining Sustainability</td>
<td>• Have a clear understanding of the concept of sustainability</td>
<td>• Meeting documents (agenda, registers, minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Decide: (1) what specifically is intended to be sustained, and (2) for what purpose</td>
<td>• Notes, diary entries, photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Working definition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Understanding the community</td>
<td>• Schedule for assessing community needs</td>
<td>• Community profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Schedule for assessing community resources/assets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>Education and Training for Sustainability</td>
<td>• Ensure that multiple members have a deep understanding of the program or intervention</td>
<td>• A training and capacitation schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Reassessment) for sustainability</td>
<td>• Identify capacity-building factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Assist the community to mobilise resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Certificate ceremonies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Community ownership.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td>Monitoring, Evaluation and Adaptation (Reassess) for sustainability</td>
<td>• Choose your type of evaluation</td>
<td>• Monitoring and evaluation tool and schedule</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 1: Defining Sustainability

The first step when planning for sustainability is to have a clear understanding of this concept and to decide: (1) what specifically is intended to be sustained, and (2) for what purpose. Only after you clarify this, is it possible to start thinking about how the efforts and benefits of a project will be sustained. Formal sustainability planning should ideally occur before the start of a project or programme.

There is no consensus concerning the conceptual and operational definitions of sustainability (Hacker et al., 2012; Shediac-Rizkallah & Bone, 1998). Hacker et al. (2012) maintain that sustainability involves building capacity, and assisting the community to use their own data to enable them to carry on work after completion of the intervention. Winett, King and Altman (1989) argue that sustainability involves replication, adaptation, and innovation, so organisations need to repeat or replicate interventions; change or adapt interventions in order to continue to meet community needs, and show how the innovation can ensure sustainability.


Sustainability is the capacity of programs to continuously respond to community issues. A sustained program maintains a focus consonant with its original goals and objectives, including the individuals, families, and communities it was originally intended to serve… The key element of sustainability is providing continued benefits, regardless of particular activities delivered or the format (institutionalization versus independence) in which they are delivered.

Sustainability can take a variety of forms (Shediac-Rizkallah & Bone, 1998). This includes the continuation of an entire programme in its original form, or only parts of a programme. Also, while reference is sometimes made to project or programme sustainability exclusively, that is, the continuation of the intervention or programme itself, Mancini and Marek (2004) emphasise that it is not merely, or necessarily, the programme activities that ought to be sustained over an extended period, but rather
the benefits of the programme to those the project intended to serve. For example, the goal of community building can be sustained, rather than a particular intervention.

Furthermore, it is important to note that sustainability does not imply that a programme should be stagnant and never change (Bamberger & Cheema, 1990; Shediac-Rizkallah & Bone, 1998). In fact, change and adaptation can be essential to sustainability.

**Step 2: Understanding the Community**

The sustainability of project efforts relies heavily on how well a community is understood (Mancini & Marek, 2004). Understanding the community, and understanding the community context in which a programme operates, particularly the needs and resources of the given community, heavily influences the ability of programmes to achieve sustainability. We have already discussed how to understand a community in Chapter 1. In this chapter, we are going to outline how the previous steps are important for fostering sustainability.

Understanding the community may provide a guide for choosing and developing programmes that “connect” with the community, thereby ensuring programme relevance, and increasing community commitment. Community commitment and connection increases the capacity of programmes and facilitates the sustainability of programmes (Mancini, Martin, & Bowen, 2003). Furthermore, when programmes or projects fail to connect with communities, they ultimately fail to serve those they allegedly aim to serve (Altman et al., 1991). It is therefore crucial, for sustainability and general programme success, that our project goals address key community needs.

It is critical to involve key community members in programmes, to foster the support of community leaders, and to respect community members, community values, and culture (Mancini & Marek, 2004). The general principles, outlined in Chapter 1, highlight the importance of equity, participation, empowerment, reflexivity, co-learning, and co-construction of knowledge, valuing different worldviews and knowledges as well as inclusivity. All of these principles assist community engagement and subsequently contributes to increased sustainability.

Below are some suggestions of activities that can be included in your sustainability plan for the project or programme. Note that, while these activities may also be identified in the project or intervention plan, it is necessary to explicitly include it in the sustainability plan as well.
1. Develop a schedule for how often community needs will be assessed (note that this needs to happen regularly and continuously throughout the existence of project efforts)
2. Develop a schedule for how often community resources/assets will be assessed (this too needs to happen regularly and continuously)
3. Ensure that the project accounts for diversity in the community
4. Ensure that community members are involved in programme design and implementation

Step 3: Education and Training for Sustainability

In order to ensure sustainability, it is vital that strategies supporting capacity building be incorporated into the project planning (Lazarus et al., 2012). Capacity building and sustainability are interrelated, both influencing one another. Capacity building can be appreciated as both a contributing factor of sustainability and a product of it: while capacity building may come before sustainability, it is also true that sustainability fosters capacity building (Hacker et al., 2012).

Robertson and Minkler (1994, p. 303) define capacity building as the “nurturing of and building upon the strengths, resources and problem-solving abilities already present in individuals and communities”. Goodman et al. (1998, p. 259) define community capacity as “the characteristics of communities that affect their ability to identify, mobilise, and address social and public health problems”. The concept of capacitation links to the CBPR principle of participation, and is based on the idea that change is more likely to occur when those affected are involved in the change process (Goodman et al., 1998; Robertson & Minkler, 1994). Capacitation should happen throughout the entire research process or programme but should specifically be integral in sustainability planning.

A detailed discussion of the key characteristics of capacity building and our approach to education and training in general is presented in Chapter 2 of this Manual. In summary, it is important to note that community-based research prioritises a process of co-learning and facilitates reciprocal transfer of skills, knowledge, capacity, and subsequently, power (Israel, Schulz, Parker & Becker, 1998; Lazarus et al., 2012; Mikesell, Bromley, & Khodyakov, 2013). Community capacity building includes activities aimed at improving the ability and infrastructure of a community to encourage self-sufficiency and proficiency, in providing the intervention or programme activities after the conclusion of the project, and assisting the community to use its resources in ways that increase the quality of life within the community (Hacker et al., 2012; Ngunjiri, 1998). Sustainability should not be limited to the continuation of particular projects, but extend to involve a sustained community capacity to respond to emerging needs (Hacker et al., 2012).
A key question to answer is: What type of training do you think could help promote sustainability?

Case Study:
Example of training to promote sustainability

In the Themba ECD project, we envisioned that the ECD forum would be responsible for the sustainability of our efforts to strengthen the ECD centres. The ECD Forum consists of the owners/principals of the ECD centres. The ISHS seeks to support the forum in providing opportunities for information and knowledge dissemination, capacity development, sharing best practices, networking, and collective action. The forum will form the linkage between the ECD centres within the community and the multi-partnership delivery system and will play an important role in identifying the needs of the ECD centre, and by providing feedback on the effectiveness of the interventions. The facilitation of the ECD forum is also hoped to facilitate long-term sustainability of the implementation of the multi-partner intervention.

For the project intervention the teachers were receiving training on management and administration on a specific curriculum, and on how to create a positive learning environment. As a forum, we thought it could be useful to consider training in areas such as fund-raising, events planning, and how to establish an NPO, as we hoped that these skills would help the ECD principals to further develop their ECD centres. However, we realised that we should not impose what we think community participants need, but rather promote a process of ongoing evaluation of needs. We also noted that there were numerous agencies and organisations willing to provide free workshops and training, so these assets should be used where appropriate.

Source: Themba ECD Project

Image: Themba ECD Centre
In practical terms, the first thing to consider is what components of capacity building should be supported and sustained (Hacker et al., 2012). The following checklist could then be followed to enable capacitation: 1) ensuring that multiple members have a deep understanding of the programme or intervention, 2) identifying capacity-building factors, 3) assisting the community to mobilise resources, 4) conducting certificate ceremonies, and 5) promoting community ownership. We will discuss these in turn.

1. **Develop a deep understanding of programme or intervention by multiple members**

An understanding of the programme or intervention is essential for sustainability, because it allows for true ownership, and enables the community to adapt and develop the programme or programme efforts in a meaningful way. This understanding also increases the level of participation. If community participants do not understand the aims, nature, and workings of a programme or project, they will have difficulty in sustaining its efforts. This first aspect of capacitation is especially relevant when attempting to sustain specific parts of a project rather than the general benefits of a certain programme (e.g., the goal of community development).

2. **Identify capacity-building factors (i.e., type of structure and formal linkages, presence of champions for an innovation, effective leadership, resources, administrative policies, and procedures, and expertise)**

It is helpful to think about the capacity that already exist in communities, and which may require further strengthening during the course of the project. Identifying already existing capacities within a community is essential, because you first need to identify the resources community members possess before the resources can be mobilised. It is important to note that this can include both tangible resources (e.g., equipment) and intangible resources (e.g., knowledge, network connections).

The asset mapping conducted at the beginning of the research process (see Chapter 2) can be used to identify the above-mentioned factors. Numerous other ways can be used to help you identify capacities.
Case Studies:

Examples of capacity building

In the SCRATCHMAPS project, personal development plans were made for all of the community participants. The community participants had to draw a picture of themselves; on the one side of their picture, they wrote down their strengths and on the opposite side, they noted what they would still like to learn or develop. Throughout the project, they were encouraged to look at what they had achieved and where they still need to develop.

In the Themba ECD project, the members of the ECD forum were asked to write a profile on themselves, highlighting the skills and resources they possess. This was shared with the rest of the group to encourage the forum to draw upon each other’s skills and knowledge. This exercise can help the team to identify the skills that they could transfer to the rest of the group (resource mobilisation).

Source: SCRATCHMAPS Project and Themba ECD Project

Image: Community Research Team member developing his personal development plan

3. Mobilise resources

It is important to create opportunities or encourage community members to implement the skills and knowledge they learned in the intervention, or throughout the research project. Resource mobilisation involves encouraging community members to draw upon their own resources or assets to address a particular need or goal. Assets refer here to any tangible and intangible resources possessed by the community of participants. Tangible assets are things that can be directly or tangibly measured, including non-governmental or non-profit organisations, churches, events, campaigns, clinics and hospitals, schools, and specific people. Intangible assets could include things like values (e.g., hope, faith, and love), knowledge, relationships, or cohesion. Resource mobilisation can also refer to the mobilisation of skills and knowledge gained through an intervention itself, or through the research process.

CBPR aims to help individuals become aware of their surroundings and of themselves, and to identify their strengths in order to take action, and address the challenges experienced in their community.
Case Studies:
Examples of mobilising resources

In the SCRATCHMAPS project, the personal development plan exercise (see above section) informed the team that one community member was knowledgeable in using computers. An opportunity was created for him to transfer his skills to the other community members in a workshop. In this way, his skills (resources) were mobilised to capacitate others.

During this same project, participants also had to create a CV for themselves. They were encouraged to add all the training received and skills developed throughout the project. In this way, the skills and knowledge they obtained through the project could potentially help them to find employment.

In the Themba ECD project, the ECD forum members attended a project management workshop as part of their forum activities. The workshop was not part of the intervention but for general capacitation and training of the forum. The forum members were motivated to use the skills and knowledge they gained through the workshop to organise a fundraising event for the ECD forum. The idea of this fundraising task was to show the ECD principals and teachers how they could use their skills to tackle a common problem in their centres, that is, lack of funding. This skill would also be useful and necessary for the development of the ECD centres, and the forum as a whole. The structure of the forum itself also functioned as an asset, since the different members worked together to meet one common goal.

Source: SCRATCHMAPS and Themba ECD Projects

4. Conduct certificate ceremonies

It is necessary to ensure that the community benefits from the research project and process in a meaningful way. One of the major obstacles of capacitation, education, and training is that more often than not, the knowledge and skills community members acquire during a project (whether through the intervention directly or through their role as research partners) are not recognised by formal structures. You should strive, where possible, to facilitate formal recognition of the capacitation and training received by community members. This can be done by making use of services or organisations that can offer some form of accreditation. If this is not possible, there are other ways of acknowledging the knowledge and skills community participants have gained.
One way of doing this is through certificate ceremonies. Certificates not only serve to acknowledge the hard work of the community, but also provide proof that they have obtained certain knowledge or skills.

**Case Study:**

**Example of a certificate ceremony**

For a number of participants, in the SCRATCHMAPS project, receiving a certificate meant so much to them because it was the first time in their lives that they had ever received a certificate. Recognising the abilities and input from the community is essential for sustaining a positive relationship.

![Image: SCRATCHMAPS Project: Certification Ceremony 2012](image)

Adequate proof of obtaining certain skills can also help participants beyond the project. In SCRATCHMAPS, one participant obtained a job from a university as a data collector due to his experience in collecting data throughout the project. The project, therefore, helped in sustaining the participant’s livelihood by recognising his knowledge and skills.

### 5. Promote community ownership

CBPR nurtures community ownership. The success of community interventions is dependent on the degree to which the community through direct participation owns an intervention (Harvey, Garcia-Moreno, & Butchart, 2007; Israel, Schulz, Parker & Becker, 1998; Nation, Bess, Voight, Perkins, & Juarez, 2011). Community ownership has been cited as a vital mediator of community participation, programme effectiveness, and maintenance (Flynn, 1995). In other words, if a community feels that they own an intervention or programme, this helps to motivate community participation, produce an effective programme, and promote sustainability.
Lazarus et al. (2012) note that the concept of community ownership is used in a variety of ways and is seldom debated in practice. It is interesting to note that definitions of community ownership have primarily emphasised perceived or actual local control over programs (Flynn, 1995). Community ownership then refers to the need for communities to shape their own direction. It involves active decision-making in the planning and implementation of programmes by the community, as well as in the recommendations for long-term adoption and maintenance. In other words, ownership means that the community feel a sense of responsibility and control, and that they shape their own direction (Bracht et al., 1994; Thompson & Kinne, 1990). Community ownership may involve an incremental process throughout the programme.

![Simplified model of community organization process and outcomes in health education.](image)

You could use the following checklist to ensure that you are encouraging community ownership, by asking yourself: “Has the following been put in place”?

- Capacity building and training throughout the process.
- The development of local citizen or advisory boards (and the numerous task forces established by these boards) to oversee and assist in the implementation.
- Partnership agreements between the community and other partners, which spell out the roles and responsibilities of the respective parties during the programme incorporation phases.
- High levels of participation by community leaders in programme development and implementation (see Bracht et al., 1994; Lazarus et al., 2012; Taliep, 2015).
Step 4: Monitoring, Evaluation and Adaptation for Sustainability

Monitoring and evaluation is related to sustainability in two main ways: (1) monitoring and evaluation allows you to notice when there is a change in context or community needs, thereby signifying that adaptation of a programme (or element of a programme) is required, and (2) it is necessary to evaluate the project sustainability in itself. To ensure sustainability, evaluations must look at the intervention as well as any subsequent programme modifications, and should focus on measurable programme results (O’Loughlin et al., 1998). As an example, findings showing success can then be used as leverage for securing funding (Mancini & Marek, 2004).

Sustained programmes are usually flexible rather than static. The ability to adapt a project to meet dynamic community needs is termed programme responsivity. Since programme responsivity is a factor likely to influence sustainability, it is important to monitor and evaluate this phenomenon, asking, “Are the activities and priorities of the programme adjusted to address the evolving needs and contexts within the relevant community”? It is also vital to decide to what degree a programme or project can be modified to continually take into account changing community contexts (Mancini & Marek, 2004). General principles and strategies for evaluation and monitoring are appropriate when considering the evaluation of sustainability. See Chapter 5 for details of these principles and strategies.

1. Choose your type of evaluation
Always remember that the aim for this chapter is to think about how we can evaluate sustainability. This question should, therefore, guide your choice of type of evaluation.

2. Set up a monitoring system
The following steps should be followed when setting up a monitoring system (See Chapter 7 for a detailed discussion on setting up a monitoring and evaluation system):

- Collaboratively define goals, indicators, and targets.
- Select indicators.
- Disaggregate Indicators.
- Set targets.
- Determine data requirements.
- Determine the frequency of monitoring.

When monitoring or evaluating sustainability the first step is to define and decide on your indicators: what is to be sustained, how or by whom, how much and by when. These indicators can serve as
sustainability objectives to be monitored during and after the project period. Important categories of indicators include:

- The sustainability or maintenance of the benefits or target outcomes achieved through an initial programme.
- Level of ownership or institutionalisation of a programme within a community.
- Measures of capacity building in the recipient community.

External sources can help you to think about how to evaluate your specific indicators, for example, see Goodman and Steckler (1989), and Goodman, McLeroy, Steckler and Hoyle (1993), for their Level of Institutionalisation Scale. This provides a basis for developing quantitative measures of institutionalisation that can be repeated at different time periods to monitor changes in the degree of institutionalization of a programme within an organisation.

Step 5: Establishing Formal Structures

The different types of formal structures that could be developed to support sustainability include Non-profit Organisations, Non-governmental Organisations, Advisory Boards, Community Research Teams (see SCRATCHMAPS), and Youth Groups. Formal structures help communities to devise effective strategies in order to foster a sense of ownership (Taliep, 2015). Ownership, as we have mentioned, encourages sustainability. Formal structures are also useful in fostering teamwork and unity in a group of people. They encourage sustainability by creating a platform from which to engage in future endeavours; for example, external organisations are more likely to engage with established groups than individuals create.

The aim of formal structures could be to take a leading role in efforts to sustain a programme or achieve a broader community development goal. The formal structure could thus act as a hub for decision-making and actions. If a formal structure is needed, you need to consider how to assist the process of establishing this structure.

Formalisation of the structure can be achieved by:

- Getting to know the existing community structures or forum: In most communities, there might be structures that already exist or groups of people who already share a common goal and work towards their goal.
- Building or strengthening foundations: This can be achieved by strengthening existing relationships and capacity building workshops.
- **Defining roles and responsibilities**: To avoid conflict, it is important to clarify the roles and responsibilities within the group. Defining the roles and responsibilities ensures that each member knows what is expected of them.

- **Formalising the structure**: This can be done by adopting and creating a constitution or choosing an executive.

---

**Case Study:**

**Example of formalising a community structure**

In the Themba ECD project we tried to formalise the ECD Forum in the following ways:

- **Getting to know the existing community structures or forum**
  
  In our ECD project, we decided to team up with an existing forum, rather than try to establish a new forum. This resulted in us partnering with the forum rather than leading the forum.

- **Building or strengthening foundations**
  
  We hosted workshops and established a team culture:
  
  - Hosting workshops on the purpose of the forum
  
  As the forum already existed, we aimed to strengthen the structure that was already in place. In our first meeting, we decided to discuss what a forum is, why a forum is important, and how a forum could contribute to the goals of the project concerned (to improve their ECD centres).

  - Establishing Team Culture

  In order for a structure to work, it has to operate effectively. We tried to help the forum get to know each other and encouraged a feeling of unity by doing a series of team building activities throughout our facilitation of the forum. The forum also created a WhatsApp group to ensure that everybody was connected.

- **Defining roles and responsibilities**

  For the ECD project, we facilitated a process of clarifying roles and responsibility and who should be doing what. We also had a day where the forum members voted for their Executive. They also formalised a constitution. We had to make sure people understood what a constitution or executive was, and why it was important.

- **Formalising the structure**

  In the ECD example, we encouraged the forum as a whole to apply to be recognised as an NPO. We also encouraged each of the ECD centres to register as NPOs. To assist with this process, we introduced the idea and explained the process of applying: where to apply, what documents are needed and so on. In this sense training and capacitation was important. We also used our forum meetings to complete the forms and to decide who would submit the documents. Each forum member contributed to the cost of the submission.

Source: Themba ECD Project
Establishing a Non-Profit Organisation (NPO)

The South African Non Profit Organizations Act No 71, 1997 was instituted to create an enabling environment for non-profit organisations where principles of good practice are enabled and maintained, where the interests of government are protected in securing the provision of various services and accounting for the funding of this provision. The following extract outlining essential elements of NPOs, was taken from the webpage of the South African Department of Social Development (DSD) (www.gov.za/services/register-nonprofitorganisation).

Definitions

NPOs are civil society organisations that exist outside of the state and the market. NPOs are, by definition, ‘organisations’ that are ‘not for profit’ and are ‘service oriented’:

- **An organisation** is an organised body of individuals. An organisation should have recognized rules that guide its activities, roles, tasks, and responsibilities. These rules are drawn up in a constitution or other legal format.
- **Not-for-profit** denotes that the organisation’s members cannot extract financial surpluses from the organisation. All surpluses are treated as retained income to support the activities/services of the organisation.
- **Service-oriented** indicates that the focus of the organisation is the delivery of a service (or services) to a particular community, target group or group of individuals.

Potential Advantages of Contracting NPOs

- NPOs can offer services that are strategic, focused, innovative, responsive, sustainable, cost-effective, locally applicable and not connected to the government.
- NPOs can offer a means for inputs of outside resources such as material resources, and as donor financing.
- NPOs can contribute positively to policy development and programme planning by sharing practical knowledge of service provision and collaboration with communities.
- NPOs can enhance access to goods and amenities to the poor, disenfranchised and ‘hard to reach’ by working around the constrictions of current systems, structures, and infrastructures.
- When an NPO is located in a local community:
  - It is perchance the only worthwhile option for delivering services that are easily accessible, cost-efficient, reliable and sustainable.
  - It can provide support to participatory approaches to project development as well as service delivery. This could contribute to a greater sense of community ownership, which in turn can increase accountability and responsiveness.
  - It can foster community connectedness and tie together community capacity and probability to manage its own development processes.
  - Capacity and economic offshoots stay in the community and locals may develop new skills.

Potential Risks associated with working with NPOs

Most risks associated with NPOs can be addressed via suitable support, capacity building and training interventions. The following are of the key risks faced by NPOs:

- Insufficient capacity
- The small-scale nature of new NPOs might become an impediment for service delivery
- Compliance of NPOs to the service norms and standards
NPOs tend to work on a small-scale, which might be a challenge if large service delivery is required.
Some NPOs have inadequate management and administrative infrastructure to back expanded operations.
NPOs may have limited financial reserves to shield delays in financing flows.
Where NPOs are small or depend on individuals, loss of membership over time can lead to significant loss of organisational or service capacity. Low salaries can affect staff motivation and performance. Trained staff members may seek better employment opportunities elsewhere.

Registering your NPO is beneficial

Registering your NPO improves your credibility and funding opportunities, allows your organisation to open a bank account, and helps your organisation with tax incentives.

To register an NPO, you can submit your application at your nearest provincial Social Development office, post it to The Directorate, Non-profit organisations, Department of Social Development, Private Bag X901, Pretoria, 0001 or deliver it by hand to the Department of Social Development, 134 Pretorius Street, HSRC Building, Pretoria.

To register, you must be one of the following:

- A non-governmental organisation (NGO).
- A community-based organisation (CBO).
- A faith-based organisation (FBO).
- You can apply for registration in 2 ways:
  1. Register online @dsd.gov.za
  2. Post your application form and two copies of your NPO founding documents (constitution or deed of trust, and memorandum and articles of association).

To register your NPO you’ll need the following documents:

- A founding document /constitution. You can find a checklist on the website of the DSD (www.gov.za/services/register-nonprofitorganisation) to help you formulate your organisation’s constitution.
- A deed of trust (a written agreement used by trusts).
- The memorandum and articles of association (which sets out the mission of your NPO and monitors its growth).

Timeframe

- It may take approximately two months to process the entire registration.
- Once your application has been received, the department will send you an acknowledgement letter. A registration certificate will be issued if your application meets the requirements of the Non-profit Organisations Act, 1997.
Step 6: Sustaining Networks and Partnerships

A sustained partnership is widely recognized as fundamental to the sustainability of CBPR projects (Crisp, Swerissen, & Duckett, 2000; Hacker et al., 2012; Israel et al., 2010; Israel et al., 2006). Israel (2006, p. 1023) explains that a “partnership equitably involves all members in all aspects of the research process. All members contribute their expertise and share decision-making and ownership in projects aimed at both enhancing knowledge and improving the health of community members through interventions and policy and social change”. Fundamentally, enduring CBPR partnerships can provide communities with greater capacity to respond to future challenges.

An effective partnership or collaboration involves the identification of relevant stakeholders who could actively support programme goals, and the delineation of the responsibilities of the different partners (Mancini & Marek, 2004). This can be done through a network map, or asset mapping, where the strengths of each partner are identified (see Chapter 4). Each partner needs to understand his or her role in the partnership. It is pivotal that the various parties involved also have a shared vision in order to sustain the community effort (Goodman & Steckler, 1989). Stakeholder meetings are essential for this step.

According to Israel et al. (2006), three dimensions of a CBPR partnerships are important for sustainability: (1) sustaining relationships and commitments among the partners involved; (2) sustaining the knowledge, capacity and values generated from the partnership; and (3) sustaining funding, staff, programmes, policy changes and the partnership itself. Therefore, when thinking about how to sustain a partnership, it is necessary to think about the continuation of the network, as well as the knowledge emerging from the partnership. Research by Hacker et al. (2012) found that successful partnerships are characterised by mutual respect, shared vision, goals, and objectives (for each initiative). The
importance of continually revisiting goals, with changing needs and priorities, is imperative. Partnerships with these characteristics are more likely to have a lasting impact.

Assessing Programme Sustainability: Sustainability Assessment Tool

Public health programmes can deliver benefits only if they are able to sustain programmes, policies, and activities over time. Although numerous sustainability frameworks and models have been developed, there are almost no assessment tools that have demonstrated reliability or validity or have been widely disseminated. The Program Sustainability Assessment Tool (PSAT)\(^2\) is a new and reliable instrument for assessing the capacity for programme sustainability of various programmes. The questionnaire identifies core domains of a conceptual framework for programme capacity for sustainability. For a detailed discussion on the PSAT, see https://sustaintool.org/assess/. Schell et al. (2013) note that a programme should ideally maintain its sustainability outcomes, including activities community-level partnerships, administrative performances, benefits to its clients, as well as the core goals of the programme, which reflect the multiple ways that an intervention programme can continuously have its intended effects. They define sustainability capacity as the presence of structures and processes that enable a programme to mobilise resources to successfully implement and continue evidence-based policies and activities. Thus, sustainability comprises organisational and contextual elements that build the capacity for sustaining a programme over time (Schell et al., 2013). The PSAT was created to measure eight core sustainability domains as indicated in the below table. For an example of an adapted version of the PSAT, see Appendix 33).

\(^2\) Copyright 2012, Washington University, St. Louis, MO, under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 3.0 Unported License
**Table 20. Supporting the Core Sustainability Domains**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Capacity</th>
<th>Programme Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having the internal support and resources needed to effectively manage your programme</td>
<td>Assessing your programme to inform planning and document results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steps You Can Take to Help Build Organizational Capacity:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Steps You Can Take to Build Programme Evaluation Capacity:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Align the mission and goals of your programme with that of your organisation. If your programme is not aligned with your organisation, sustainability will be a challenge.</td>
<td>➢ Make sure that programme staff and/or data collectors are available to gather, analyse, and report programme evaluation data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Pinpoint opportunities to share human and resources across departments or programmes in your organisation staff.</td>
<td>➢ Develop a logic model and establish your data collection requirements on your envisaged outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Ensure that you provide ongoing training and capacitation opportunities to core staff members.</td>
<td>➢ Conduct frequent needs assessments to make sure that you meet your target population’s needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Retain essential experienced staff to complete the important operations of your program. High staff turnover may impede the ability to deliver consistent, high-quality services.</td>
<td>➢ Collect data on your priority population frequently to promote the need for and/or efficacy of your programme. You may also supplement your data with publicly available data sources such as census data, local clinic or police data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Hold regular meetings to assess evaluation data, and formulate a plan to make required programme changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communications</th>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic communication with stakeholders and the public about your programme</td>
<td>Organisation has clearly defined planning processes that guide their programme’s directions, goals, and strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steps You Can Take to Build Your Programme’s Communications:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Steps You Can Take to Build Strategic Planning:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Compile a communication and marketing plan to convey the goals, successes, and the need for your programme to diverse audiences (e.g., service providers, funders, media, etc.). Use different forms of communication (see Chapter 8) to tailor your messages to each audience.</td>
<td>➢ Conduct and align your strategic planning with your broader organisation and external partners to guarantee buy-in to programme aims, objectives, and direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Construct an internal communication plan. Make sure that organisational leadership knows of your programme’s processes, outcomes, and impacts.</td>
<td>➢ Make sure that your implementation plans clearly outlines roles and responsibilities of all programme staff and additional stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Identify strategic media contacts, and form and maintain consistent communication with them.</td>
<td>➢ Make use of the strategic plan to guide financial management decisions that influence the programme’s current and future needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Celebrate programmatic successes with all involved, especially staff that deliver and evaluate your programme.</td>
<td>➢ Assess and plan for sustainability on a regular basis as part of strategic planning actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships</td>
<td>Programme Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultivating connections between your programme and its stakeholders</strong></td>
<td><strong>Evaluating the programme to inform your planning and record results</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steps You Can Take to Help Your Organization Build Partnerships:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Steps You Can Take to Build Program Adaptation:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Perform a partner or stakeholder analysis. Identify which of them require</td>
<td>➢ Work with internal and outside partners to prioritise programme segments so that you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more time and energy to maintain their involvement, and who has the most</td>
<td>are prepared with expanded and downsized forms of programme activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>influence. Then use the findings from this analysis to draw up a stakeholder</td>
<td>➢ From time to time, review evaluation results to ascertain which segments of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management.</td>
<td>programme do not work so well, and need to be adapted or removed. Redirect resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Identify organisations and people who are not involved in programme</td>
<td>from ineffective or superfluous activities to other efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities, but are impacted by the challenges your programme addresses.</td>
<td>➢ Identify a key person who is in charge of remaining informed on the current best</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascertain how they could enhance or derive benefit from your programme,</td>
<td>practice evidence and research in your content area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and involve them in your programme.</td>
<td>➢ Engage regularly with your target population to ascertain how well the programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Identify the objectives for each partnership. (What your programme needs</td>
<td>aligns with their needs, or how it may be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from a partner, or what benefits can he/she or their organisation derive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from working with your programme?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Maintain and cultivate existing or new partnerships. Be attentive to how</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you keep your partners informed and how you show appreciation for their</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Stability</th>
<th>Environmental Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>**Establishing a consistent financial base from multiple sources through</td>
<td><strong>Leveraging internal and external support your programme</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustainability planning**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steps You Can Take to Help Your Organization Build Funding Stability:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Draw up a funding plan to provide a safety measure and make sure that</td>
<td>➢ Perform a Stakeholder Analysis to identify who you need to notify or influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fundamental infrastructure is kept (including a sufficient number of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qualified staff).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Incorporate both long and short-term goals for obtaining a diverse funding</td>
<td>➢ Develop an ‘ask’ and conversation topics, and identify the suitable decision-maker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>portfolio.</td>
<td>Your ‘ask’ refers to the action you want the decision maker to take for your</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Draw up a flexible funding plan, which can easily be adapted to trends,</td>
<td>programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new funding prospects, and unexpected shortages.</td>
<td>➢ Identify prospective decision makers to woe (policymakers, local city council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Explore diverse funding options: government grants, local community</td>
<td>members, state legislators, or school board members).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grants, foundations, business donors, individual sponsors, fundraising</td>
<td>➢ Identify prospective stakeholders, groups, and organisations to collaborate with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>events, private enterprise, and fees for service.</td>
<td>to expand your reach of decision makers (local business leaders, national coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>groups, political advocates, advocacy groups within your city, or different provinces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Case Study: Creating sustainability in the Building Bridges Programme

When the Shediac Declaration was imperative, and this prompted the community research team and programme leadership to assess their programme. This led to the development of the Building Bridges Programme, which aimed to address the challenges faced by the community. The programme was designed to involve stakeholders from various sectors, including policymakers, local city council members, state legislators, or school board members. Through a series of workshops and discussions, the programme was able to identify the key decision-makers who would be involved in the programme's success.

In terms of funding, the programme needed to ensure a consistent financial base from multiple sources. This was achieved through the establishment of partnerships with government funding bodies, local community grants, foundations, business donors, individual sponsors, fundraising events, private enterprise, and fees for service. The programme also drew up a flexible funding plan, which allowed for the adaptation of funding strategies as needed.

Action

Provide a list of action items for each of the steps outlined in the programme.

1. Perform a partner or stakeholder analysis.
2. Identify organisations and people who are not involved in programme activities.
3. Identify the objectives for each partnership.
4. Maintain and cultivate existing or new partnerships.
5. Draw up a funding plan to provide a safety measure.
6. Incorporate both long and short-term goals for obtaining a diverse funding portfolio.
7. Draw up a flexible funding plan.
8. Explore diverse funding options.
9. Identify prospective stakeholders, groups, and organisations.

Source: SCRATCHMAPS Programme Mentoring Programme
Sustainability Action Plan

When you compile your sustainability plan, ensure that you:

1. **Develop a sustainability goal for every sustainability domain you intend to address.**
   Your sustainability goal must outline the change you envisage to build capacity in a particular domain. Write the goal as a SMART goal (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound).

2. **Formulate action steps delineating how you envisage achieving each sustainability goal.**
   Action steps are diverse strategies or activities you will utilise to achieve your sustainability goal. You may require a few steps or many steps, depending on your goal. The more comprehensive your steps, the more straightforward they can be achieved.

3. **Ascertain who must be involved to ensure the success of each step.**
   Consider who needs to be involved in the implementation of the action steps. If you require their input or buy-in, clarify in the action steps how you will get them involved.

4. **Identify what resources you require to accomplish each action step.**
   Resources could be people, money, time, materials, venues, etc.

5. **Develop milestones in order to track your progress.**
   Milestones are ways you will assess your success in carrying out your action steps. It is useful to write milestones as numbers (e.g., three new grants compiled and submitted by end of 1st Quarter, one new champion employed and trained by end of 2nd Quarter) or as percentages.

---

**Case Study: Creating sustainability in the Building Bridges Programme**

Public health programmes at different levels and settings struggle to sustain their programme activities over the long term, and are often forced to shut down (Calhoun et al., 2014). Sustainability of the Building Bridges Mentoring Programme was imperative, and this prompted the community research team and programme facilitators (comprising 10 local community members) to establish the Building Bridges non-profit organisation (NPO).

Source: SCRATCHMAPS Programme

---

**Obstacles to Sustainability**

Sustainability is one of the main obstacles in community-engaged research. There are several difficulties in ensuring sustainability. Shediac-Rizkallah and Bone (1998) suggested that the following three major groups of factors influence sustainability: (1) project design and implementation factors, (2) factors within the organisational setting, and (3) factors in the broader community environment. The large investment of time required to undertake CBPR proves to be challenging, as well as was lack of funding (Hacker, 2012; Taliep, 2015). Research fatigue (when communities feel that they are over-researched, especially with little benefit to them) is often another challenge. This can be somewhat avoided with a
CBPR approach that tries to ensure mutual benefit. Below we talk about two of the main issues we have experienced in terms of sustainability.

Case Studies
Managing Conflict
In our projects, we identified conflict as a challenge. Ways to manage conflict was built into the SCRATCHMAPS project from the start. For instance, SCRATCHMAPS used a check-in process where community participants were given a space to say how they felt, and what they expected. Through this process of sharing, a safe space was established, and continuous communication was fostered. Participants were also encouraged to keep a journal or diary. This created an opportunity for everyone to reflect on their experiences throughout the project and to vent their feelings in a safe and private way. Reflexive spaces can help research projects or programmes to address issues as they come up. If you use spaces of reflection as data, however, you need to obtain permission from the community participants, in order to adhere to ethical codes of conduct.

In the Themba ECD Project, we tried to incorporate fun team building activities in some of our monthly meetings to build positive relationships between the different forum members. We also spoke about and practiced some conflict management skills in our first meeting with the forum. In particular, the forum practiced to actively listen to each other. We gave each forum member a number. This number represented the speaker number (another forum member) that each forum member had to listen to. After the speaker spoke, the forum member who had to listen to the speaker had to summarise the speaker's story and the point they were trying to convey. The forum members were encouraged not to give their own opinions when doing this. Through this active listening exercise, we attempted to practice how to listen more effectively.

Source: SCRATCHMAPS Project and Themba ECD Project

Case Studies:
Disappointment in project outcomes and sustainability
In the Multi-country Photovoice Project, we met up with youth participants a few years after the project and several of them expressed being disappointed because the initial social change momentum had slowed down, and they were unsure how to proceed. This is a challenge of sustainability: to ensure that the project is somehow “handed over”, and belongs to the community participants rather than the researchers and that they are equipped to take the project forward themselves or continue to respond to emerging community needs themselves.
In the Themba ECD project, we were also constantly challenged with the pace at which we had to deliver on what we had promised. We had a relationship with the ECD forum but the project took long to materialise because we had to wait for ethical clearance from the university before we could offer any training to the teachers. We also had to finish our baseline assessments before we could provide training that related to our intervention objectives. In an effort to prevent the ECD teachers from feeling frustrated with the long process, we made sure we were in constant and meaningful contact with them. We also ensured that the teachers understood the research process, and we kept them updated on our activities. In addition, we offered workshops on topics that were not related to our intervention objectives. For this project, we wanted to evaluate three areas: management and administration, the learning environment and child outcomes. Therefore, while we were conducting the baseline assessments, we organised a workshop on project management and event planning for the forum. We then proposed that the forum use the skills they had learned in the workshop to organise their own fundraising event. In this way, we managed to deliver something valuable while we completed the assessments our research demanded before we could implement our interventions.

Source: Multi-country Photovoice Project and Themba ECD Project

CONCLUSION

It is crucial to include a sustainability goal and plan when doing CBPR. Sustainability should be the vision driving the intervention or programme. This means that we must ensure that sustainability plans are built into our engagement activities right from the start. This chapter discussed six steps for sustainability: 1) Defining Sustainability, 2) Understanding the Community, 3) Education and Training for sustainability, 4) Monitoring, Evaluation, and Adaptation for sustainability, 5) Establishing a Formal Structure, and 6) Sustaining Networks and Partnerships. This chapter also provided some examples of the challenges we have experienced with promoting sustainability.
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