

The capacity to change within the eMgwenya community

By

Charmé Coetzer

**A mini-dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree**

Master of Arts in Research Psychology

in the Department of Psychology

Faculty of Humanities

at the

University of Pretoria

Supervisor: Professor M. Visser

May 2016

Table of Contents

Chapter 1	1
1.1. Outline of the study	1
1.2. Aim and Rationale.....	1
1.3. Theoretical approach	2
1.4. Research Methodology.....	3
1.5. Summary	4
Chapter 2	5
2.1. Defining community	5
2.2. Definition of capacity to change	6
2.2.1. Available resources (Capital).....	7
2.2.2. Operational definition of capacity to change	7
2.3. Theories of change	8
2.3.1. Three-step theory (Lewin, 1951)	8
2.3.2. Phases of change theory (Lippitt, Watson, & Westley, 1958).....	9
2.3.3. Collective self-efficacy (Bandura, 1982).....	9
2.3.4. Processes of change (Fullan, 1992, 2007)	10
2.3.5. Transtheoretical model.....	12
2.3.5.1. Levels of change.....	12
2.3.5.2. Change processes.....	14
2.3.5.3. Stages of change.....	15
2.4. The Community Readiness Model.....	16
2.4.1. Stages of change	17
2.4.2. Dimensions of capacity to change	18
2.5. Previous studies on community capacity to change.....	20
2.6. Context of eMgwenya	22

2.6.1. Changes in the economic situation	22
2.6.2. Amalgamation of municipalities	23
2.6.3. eMgwenya’s current situation	23
2.7. Summary	25
Chapter 3	26
3.1. Research methodology	26
3.1.1. Research design	26
3.1.2. Sampling and data collection strategies	27
3.1.2.1. Key informant interviews	27
3.1.2.2. Focus group discussions	28
3.1.3. The discussion guide	29
3.1.4. Data Analysis	31
3.1.4.1. Thematic analysis	31
3.1.4.2. Scoring process	31
3.1.5. The role of the researcher	34
3.1.6. Trustworthiness	35
3.1.7. Ethical Considerations	35
3.2. Summary	36
Chapter 4	37
4.1. Community efforts	38
4.2. Community knowledge of efforts	42
4.3. Leadership	45
4.4. Community climate	48
4.5. Community knowledge of issues	54
4.6. Resources	57
4.7. Effects of the promise	61
4.8. Highest and Lowest scores in terms of individual dimensions	63

4.9. Overall calculated score per dimension	65
4.10. Overall scores in terms of ‘capacity to change’	66
4.11. Summary.....	66
Chapter 5	67
5.1. Capacity to change with respect to stakeholder groups	67
5.1.1. Key informant interviews and town focus group.....	67
5.1.2. Township focus group.....	67
5.2. Strategies to increase the capacity to change	68
5.2.1. Leadership.....	69
5.2.2. Community efforts	69
5.2.3. Resources	70
5.3. Conclusion.....	73
5.4. Limitations	73
5.5. Value of the study	74
References	76
Appendix A Discussion Guide	82
Appendix B Anchor rating scale	84
Appendix C Scoring Sheet – Key informant interviews	87
Appendix D Scoring Sheet – Focus Group Discussions	88
Appendix E Letter of consent for key informant interviews	89
Appendix F Informed consent for focus group discussions	92

List of Tables

Table 2.4.1: Comparison of stages of change	18
Table 3.1.1 Example questions per dimension.....	30
Table 3.1.2 Final score indicating the stage of change	34
Table 4.1.1 Data evaluation of community efforts.....	41
Table 4.2.1 Data evaluation of Community knowledge of efforts.....	44
Table 4.3.1 Data evaluation of Leadership	48
Table 4.4.1 Data evaluation of community climate	52
Table 4.5.1 Data evaluation of community knowledge of issues.....	56
Table 4.6.1 Data evaluation of resources	61
Table 4.8.1 Dimension scores and overall score per group of stakeholders	64
Table 4.9.1 Average scores in descending order.....	65

Abstract

Successful change is dependent on the community's ability to adapt and adjust to new conditions. For this reason community capacity to change is a fundamental concept within the theory and practice of community development. In light of an extensive development plan namely the *eMgwenya Urban Renewal Project* that proposes many changes for the community of eMgwenya, the question pertaining to the degree of the eMgwenya community's capacity to change comes to the fore. This study made use of a case study research design to determine the eMgwenya Community's capacity to change. The Community Readiness Model was used as the assessment tool. Five key informant interviews were conducted. Additionally, a focus group discussion was conducted with community members from the town and township respectively. The results show that there is a difference in the level of the community's capacity to change between the town and the township. There are marked differences between the town and township in the way issues in the community are addressed. The findings suggest that *leadership, community efforts* and *resources* should be addressed to increase the community's capacity to change.

Chapter 1

1.1. Outline of the study

This study is set out as follows: in Chapter 1 an outline of the study is provided. The aim and rationale, as well as a brief overview of the theoretical approach and research methodology is provided. The literature review is presented in Chapter 2 and is offered in two parts: the first part discusses the necessary definitions of the concepts utilised in the study as well as the theory on which the study is based, while the second part provides a description of the study in context. In Chapter 3 the research methodology is discussed. Ethical considerations, data analysis as well as the role of the researcher is included in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 presents the thematic content analysis as well as the results based on the community capacity score as determined through the use of the Community Readiness Model. Chapter 5 discusses the conclusions drawn from the data analysis as well as the limitations of the study. The value of the study is also discussed.

1.2. Aim and Rationale

The ability to change and remain dynamic is a prerequisite for continued human existence. According to Megginson (1963, p. 4), commenting on Darwin's *Origin of Species*, "it is not the most intellectual of the species that survives; it is not the strongest that survives; but the species that survives is the one that is able best to adapt and adjust to the changing environment in which it finds itself".

This study is concerned with community change, in particular, the capacity of a community to change. Community capacity to change is a fundamental concept within the theory and practice of community development because successful change is dependent on the community's ability to adapt and adjust to new conditions (Plested, Edwards, & Jumper-Thurman, 2006). This study seeks to determine the capacity to change of the eMgwenya (previously Waterval Boven) community. The community of eMgwenya was selected for this study because an extensive development plan, namely the *eMgwenya Urban Renewal Project*, has been proposed for this community. The *eMgwenya Urban Renewal Project* intends to change the living conditions and functioning of the community of eMgwenya by providing housing; health care facilities; emergency services; social and community facilities; improved road access; water infrastructure upgrade; sewer infrastructure upgrade; and job opportunities through economic development. According to the proposed *eMgwenya Urban Renewal Project*,

economic development will be established by, inter alia, the construction of a hotel, golf course, casino and other tourist amenities. The *eMgwenya Urban Renewal Project* envisages that job opportunities will be created through the infrastructure upgrade and that residents of eMgwenya will be employed and trained in order to bring about the various infrastructure upgrades.

Given the intended community change discussed above, the question pertaining to the degree of the eMgwenya community's capacity to change comes to the fore. This is particularly important if one considers that the literature on the upliftment of communities points out that intended intervention plans often fail as a result of change agents not taking the community's capacity to change in consideration (Balint, 2006; Bopp, GermAnn, Bopp, Littlejohns, & Smith, 2000; Lovell, Kearns, & Rosenberg, 2011).

Although studies focusing on assessing a community's capacity to change have been previously conducted (inter alia Thompson & Pepperdine, 2003; McCoy, Malow, Edwards, Thurland & Rosendburg, 2007; Aboud, Huq Larson & Ottisova, 2010) no such studies have been conducted within the South African context. For this reason, research was undertaken in the eMgwenya community with the aim to determine the degree of the community's capacity to change, specifically in relation to the proposed *eMgwenya Urban Renewal Project*.

1.3. Theoretical approach

In this research the Community Readiness Model was used as the theoretical point of departure. According to Edwards et al. (2000), the Community Readiness Model is based on the Transtheoretical Model (Prochaska & DiClemente, 1983) which shows that the capacity to change is a crucial element underlying successful change.

The Community Readiness Model is an appropriate tool for the assessment and interpretation of the data of this study, since it was developed specifically to measure a community's current stage of change. The community stage of change is, in turn, an indication of the community's capacity to change. Furthermore, this study will determine the applicability of the Community Readiness Model in a culturally and socio-economically diverse South African Community.

Despite the importance of a community's capacity to change for successful community change, little research that actually *assessed* a community's capacity to change has been conducted. The focus in the available literature appears rather to be on strategies to *build* community capacity to change (see for instance Balint, 2006; Huebner, Mancini, Bowen & Orthner, 2009; Jones, Waters, Oka, & McGhee, 2010; Luque et al., 2010; Lovell et al., 2011).

Three studies that focused on the assessment of capacity to change are research by Aboud et al., (2010), McCoy et al. (2007) and Thompson and Pepperdine (2003). Of these, Aboud et al. (2010) and McCoy et al. (2007) used the Community Readiness Model as their assessment tool. These studies evaluated the community in relation to an intervention in order to ensure that the intervention could be accepted by the community. This does not necessarily imply that the communities should accept the intervention as is, but rather that the intervention can be adapted to fit the community through, inter alia, community participation (Bopp et al., 2000; Edwards, Jumper-Thurman, Plested, Oetting, & Swanson, 2000; Plested et al., 2006).

Within South Africa, this study is the first to employ the Community Readiness Model as a measuring instrument, and for this reason the study adds scientific value to the field of community psychology. It also renders it a foundational study within the South African context.

1.4. Research Methodology

This study follows a case study research design. According to Maree (2007, p. 75), a case study research design can be defined as “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context [...] where multiple sources of evidence are used”. In line with this definition the present study collected three sets of empirical data to investigate the capacity to change within the eMgwenya community’s present-day context.

For this study, data was collected from key informant interviews as well as from focus group discussions, using a discussion guide adopted from the Community Readiness Model. Purposive sampling was used to select five key informants for the key informant interviews. Since the community still perceives eMgwenya as consisting of ‘the formal town’ and the ‘township’, as was the case in the apartheid era, focus group discussions were conducted with participants from each respective perceived settlement. Snowball sampling (also referred to as chain referral sampling) was used to select the focus group participants. One focus group had four participants from the township and the other focus group had three participants from the formal town.

The discussion guide referred to above included the six dimensions of capacity to change as presented in the Community Readiness Model, namely *community efforts*, *community knowledge of efforts*, *leadership*, *community climate*, *community knowledge about the issue(s)*, *resources related to the issue(s)*. Each dimension must be scored according to an anchor rating scale. The overall score determines the community’s stage of change which in turn is an indication of the community’s capacity to change. However, according to the Community

Readiness Model, data obtained in terms of a specific dimension may be relevant to other dimensions as well. For this reason the data was first analysed using thematic analysis in order to assist with the scoring process.

Because two different data collection methods were used, the data from the key informant interviews and each focus group discussion were analysed and scored separately. In this way, three independent scores of capacity to change were obtained from the different role players in the community

The three scores allowed the researcher to identify similarities as well as differences of the perception of the community's capacity to change from the key informant interviews and focus group discussions.

1.5. Summary

In this chapter the reasons and motivations for assessing the eMgwenya community's capacity to change were provided. Motivation for using the Community Readiness Model as an assessment tool as well as a brief description of the research methodology were outlined. In the following chapter an overview of the literature that underpins this study is provided.

Chapter 2

In this chapter the following issues are discussed: the definition of ‘community’ and the definition and operationalization of ‘capacity to change’. A few theories of change will be outlined. The Transtheoretical model of Prochaska and DiClemente (1983) and the Community Readiness Model that builds on this model will be discussed in more detail. A summary of previous studies which measure a community’s capacity to change is also provided. Since theories of change, as referred to above, emphasise that context should be taken into consideration when examining the change process, this chapter concludes with an overview of the context of the eMgwenya community.

2.1. Defining community

‘Community’ is an abstract social construct (Mansuri & Rao, 2004). According to Edwards et al. (2000) and Visser and Moleko (2012), defining ‘community’ is a complex process. Various definitions of ‘community’ exist in the literature.

However, two common ways of defining community often appear in the literature: ‘community of place’ or ‘relational community’ (McMillan & Chavis, 1986). A community of place is described in terms of a shared geographical area and the social contexts in which people live. A town like eMgwenya may be regarded as a community of place which, in turn, can be broken down into smaller communities based on their shared geographical areas and social contexts such as schools, churches, suburbs or shops (Edwards et al., 2000; Heller et al., 1984; McMillan & Chavis, 1986; Visser & Moleko, 2012).

While defining community on the basis of shared geographical area might be intuitive and attractive, it simplifies the concept of community. Various systems of interaction exist within a community between cultural, social, political, psychological and ecological components (Visser & Moleko, 2012). These aspects should be taken into account, especially when changes occur within these systems.

For this reason it is important to consider the relational aspects within a community. A relational community is defined as a community where community members experience a sense of belonging; they have influence within the community and share common characteristics, values or interests that fulfil their individual needs. In other words, people in a community feel emotionally connected to one another (McMillan & Chavis, 1986; Sarason, 1974). This is referred to as a sense of community (McMillan & Chavis, 1986).

For the purpose of this study an amalgamation of the two common bases on which community is defined, as set out above, is proposed, i.e. community is regarded as a community of place, where a sense of community is experienced. Such a definition makes provision for the shared geographical location of a community but also incorporates the system of interaction between cultural, social, political, psychological and ecological components present within communities.

2.2. Definition of capacity to change

According to Bopp et al. (2000) the various definitions in the literature of community capacity to change makes it challenging to define, operationalize and measure. Bopp et al. (2000), for instance, state that capacity to change involves the community's characteristics, skills and energy needed to deal with challenges in respect of maintaining and enhancing their levels of well-being and prosperity.

Moscardo (2008) argues that capacity to change involves two elements: first, the collective knowledge within the community and second, the utilisation of this knowledge to define and solve problems within the community.

Huebner et al. (2009) also state that capacity to change consists of two elements: firstly, there is a shared responsibility among community members for their general welfare and secondly, a collective competence should be present which demonstrates the ability to use available opportunities to address the needs within the community and to confront situations which endanger the well-being of the community.

Luque et al. (2010) define capacity to change as the available organizational resources which a community can use to solve and address a collective problem such as maintaining the well-being of the community.

Thompson and Pepperdine (2003) state that community capacity to change encompasses social and human resources as well as the ability to act. More specifically, it is the ability of communities to understand and cope with empowering and restraining elements that drive the accumulation and decline of resources (or capital) to produce desirable outcomes.

Two common elements seem to emerge in all of the definitions offered above: those of 'available resources' and 'the community's ability to act'. According to the above discussion, available resources comprise elements such as characteristics, skills and energy needed (Bopp et al., 2000); social and human resources (Thompson & Pepperdine, 2003); collective

knowledge (Moscardo, 2008); shared responsibility (Huebner et al., 2009); and available organizational resources (Luque et al., 2010). The concept of ‘available resources’, however, requires further explanation.

2.2.1. Available resources (Capital)

It is customary within the field of community development to refer to ‘available resources’ as ‘capital’ (Huebner et al., 2009; Moscardo, 2008; Thompson & Pepperdine, 2003). Five types of capital are prevalent within the literature, namely natural, physical, financial, human and social capital (Moore, Severn, & Millar, 2006; Thompson & Pepperdine, 2003). Natural capital includes all the natural resources available to a community such as air, land and water. Physical capital includes all produced goods such as roads, transportation and harvested goods. Financial capital refers to monetary concepts such as budgets, savings, cash flows, funds and grants. Human capital, which is considered capital on an individual level (Thompson & Pepperdine, 2003) refers to levels of education, knowledge, skills and the health of community members (Moore et al., 2006; Thompson & Pepperdine, 2003). Social capital, which is considered capital on a community level (Thompson & Pepperdine, 2003), comprises the resources available through relationships and networks in the community (Huebner et al., 2009; Moscardo, 2008). More specifically, social capital refers to the norms within a community, the relationships between community members, the level of trust, as well as the cohesiveness of the community (Huebner et al., 2009; Mansuri & Rao, 2004; Moore et al., 2006; Moscardo, 2008). Social capital can therefore be regarded as the relational aspects of a community. Since relational aspects of a community can be equated to a sense of community (see 2.1 Defining community), social capital can also be regarded as a sense of community.

According to Huebner et al. (2009) social capital is an important aspect of capacity to change because it contributes to the community’s ability to act. The relationship between social capital and a community’s ability to act is reciprocal. On the one hand, social capital contributes to the community’s ability to act (Huebner et al., 2009) while on the other hand, the community’s ability to act contributes to the social capital or the sense of community (McMillan & Chavis, 1986).

2.2.2. Operational definition of capacity to change

Based on the discussion above, the following operational definition of ‘capacity to change’ is proposed for the purpose of this study: capacity to change is the reciprocal relationship between (1) the available capital within the community (where social capital is

emphasised) and (2) the ability and readiness of the community to act, with the aim to enhance and sustain their well-being.

This implies that certain factors should be present within a community. First, the community members should have an awareness of the issue(s) in the community. Second, the community members should feel a sense of responsibility towards solving the issue(s) and actively take part in solving the issue(s). Third, the community should have resources available, such as leadership, communication channels and finances to solve the issue(s). Last, the community climate, i.e. the attitudes and feelings towards the issue(s), should contribute to the change (Plested et al., 2006; Visser & Moleko, 2012).

It is believed that this operational definition of capacity to change necessitates the active involvement of community members in the process of change (Bopp et al., 2000; Edwards et al., 2000). Community change, especially sustainable change, cannot be executed by external agents and then handed to communities. Sustainable community change can only take place from within the community itself by adapting and adjusting to the environment in which it finds itself, in order to improve itself (Bopp et al., 2000).

However, as stated previously, change is a complicated process. Therefore it is important to understand change and the processes involved which effect change. Various theories to understand change have been developed and are discussed below.

2.3. Theories of change

Theories of change have been formulated with the purpose of answering the question “How does successful change happen?” (Kritsonis, 2005, p. 1). Some of the most recognized theories are summarised below.

2.3.1. Three-step theory (Lewin, 1951)

Lewin's (1951) theory suggests that change occurs in three steps. The first step toward change is to *unfreeze* the current situation or status quo (Kritsonis, 2005; Robbins, Judge, Odendaal, & Roodt, 2009). The status quo is held through the interaction of two types of forces, namely driving forces that promote change, and restraining forces (Robbins et al., 2009). The second step involves *movement*, i.e. changing from the current status quo to a new desired state. In this case, the driving forces outweigh the restraining forces (Kritsonis, 2005; Robbins et al., 2009). The third step, *refreezing*, involves the change to become the new status quo. According to Kritsonis (2005), Lewin's three-step change theory is a particularly “rational, goal and plan

orientated model” (p. 6) which is theoretically sound but simplified and difficult to implement because it fails to take the internal processes of the community (attitudes and experiences) into account.

2.3.2. Phases of change theory (Lippitt, Watson, & Westley, 1958)

Lippitt et al.’s (1958) phases of change theory is an extension of Lewin’s (1951) theory (Kritsonis, 2005). Lippitt et al. (1958) suggests that change involves an external change agent and that change involves seven steps, which are:

1. a diagnosis of the problem;
2. an assessment of the motivation and capacity to change;
3. an assessment of the resources and motivation of the change agent,
4. choosing of progressive change objects or that which needs to be changed;
5. selecting and clearly understanding the role and expectations of the change agent;
6. maintaining the change through, inter alia, communication and feedback; and
7. a gradual withdrawal of the change agent which will occur when the change becomes part of the norm (Kritsonis, 2005).

This theory places emphasis on the role of the change agent rather than the process or the dynamics in the community. As with Lewin’s (1951) theory of change, Lippitt et al.’s (1958) theory of change fails to take the internal processes in the community into account, which may cause resistance towards change (Kritsonis, 2005).

2.3.3. Collective self-efficacy (Bandura, 1982)

Social cognitive theory proposes that behavioural change closely relates to the strength of self-efficacy of the individual (Bandura, 1982; Kritsonis, 2005). Self-efficacy refers to peoples’ beliefs regarding their “ability to perform needed behaviours to achieve desired outcomes” (Passer & Smith, 2003, p. 445). People with low levels of self-efficacy tend to have self-doubts about their ability to master a task, and tend not to follow through. People with high levels of self-efficacy, however, will persevere until they achieve success. The level of self-efficacy is influenced by the following four determinants:

1. *performance attainment*, which refers to previous experiences;
2. *vicarious experience*, which refers to seeing similar others successfully perform a task;

3. *verbal persuasion*, which refers to the feedback and comment given by others; and
4. *physiological state*, which refers to the affective arousal such as stress and anxiousness when performing a task (Bandura, 1982; Passer & Smith, 2003).

Behavioural change of an individual is thus affected by personal traits, environmental influences and behaviour. The mutual interaction between these attributes is referred to as reciprocal determinism (Bandura, 1978).

Bandura (2001, 2002) expanded the concept of self-efficacy to community level, through the concept of ‘agency’. An agent is regarded as someone who intentionally influences his/her own and other people’s functioning and circumstances. There are three modes of agency: personal agency, proxy agency (where others act on behalf of a person to achieve their desired outcomes) and collective agency (which is achieved through group interaction).

The notion of collective agency is an important aspect because people live in interaction with others. In some cases, change is achieved by combining resources, including knowledge and skills to achieve desired outcomes. It is within this interaction that collective efficacy, which functions and operates similarly to self-efficacy on an individual level, emerges. As with self-efficacy, the stronger the collective efficacy, the greater the performance attainments and functioning of the community (Bandura, 2001, 2002).

Collective efficacy should be regarded as greater than the sum of the self-efficacy of individual members. It is an element that emerges which encompasses the integrative and interactive dynamics of a community. Social cognitive theory, therefore, seeks to integrate the internal processes and dynamics within the individual and the community, since it is individuals who act collectively to affect collective change (Bandura, 2001, 2002).

From the theories discussed above it seems clear that an integration of internal processes and dynamics within the community and environmental factors are important aspects within the change process. The change process appears to be an interrelated web of elements and factors that should be regarded contextually.

2.3.4. Processes of change (Fullan, 1992, 2007)

A theory of change which appears to incorporate the internal processes and dynamics within the community is presented by Fullan (1992, 2007). Although change agents can play a vital role in the initiation of change, Fullan (1992) argues that the essence of change lies in the

development of shared meaning towards an intervention. Furthermore, the factors that affect the successful change should be considered across various levels of systems, i.e. from the individual, the sub-community, and community, to larger systems such as the municipality, the province and the nation (Fullan, 2007). This is an important aspect to consider, because the interaction between these systems produces the requirements for change and non-change (Fullan, 1992).

Fullan (2007) states that change should be regarded as a process and not an event. He highlights four webbed processes of change, which should not be considered mutually exclusive (Fullan, 1992, 2007). These four processes of change are:

1. Active initiation and participation

This process deals with the motivation to commence or initiate change especially when there are many people involved. Initiation should start on a small scale and ripple through to the larger community because large scale change has often been found to be ineffective and impractical. Starting with small scale changes makes the change more manageable. This, in turn, paves the way for participation, initiative and empowerment. These are key factors in the process of change and are often only triggered when the change process has begun.

2. Pressure and support

The role of pressure and support (which may be internal or external) in the process of change are equally important. The reason for this is that pressure without support causes resistance and estrangement, whereas support without pressure causes aimlessness. It is therefore important to consider the interaction of pressure and support in the change process.

3. Changes in behaviour and beliefs

Changes in behaviour and beliefs seem to be reciprocal and continuous. It appears that people form new beliefs while actively working on an issue. In other words, it is through behavioural changes that beliefs also change, which in turn allows for further behavioural change.

4. Ownership

Ownership is synonymous with real change. Ownership refers to the understanding, skills and commitment towards change. It develops

progressively throughout the process of change and is the product of successful change.

The above processes should not be considered as a linear, but rather as entangled processes. There are multiple factors present within each process. Changes in one process affect the other processes, which alter previous decisions made. New factors may also surface, which should be taken into account. This means that change processes are considered interactive and continuous (Fullan, 2007).

The change agent can either come from internal or external sources. Furthermore, Fullan (2007) points out that community characteristics, such as leadership and shared meaning, are more important in the change process than the change agent itself. In this theory, community characteristics are the deciding factor in whether or not the community will implement change.

2.3.5. Transtheoretical model

The Transtheoretical Model was developed to create an integrated model for personal change that draws upon the entire spectrum of the major psychological theories regarding psychological and behavioural change (Edwards et al., 2000; Prochaska & Norcross, 2007). It provides an integrated approach to the change process that endeavours to disentangle the interrelated web of elements and factors involved in the process of change. An important aspect of the Transtheoretical Model is that it shows that capacity to change is a crucial element underlying successful change (Edwards et al., 2000). For this reason, the Transtheoretical Model is employed as the theoretical conceptualisation of this study.

The Transtheoretical Model has three main dimensions, i.e. levels, processes and stages of change (Prochaska & Norcross, 2007). Each of these dimensions is discussed below.

2.3.5.1. Levels of change.

The levels of change identified in the Transtheoretical Model describe change in human functioning on an individual level. The levels of change are represented in a hierarchical organisation of five distinct, but interrelated, levels of psychological problems:

1. Symptom/situational problems
2. Maladaptive cognitions
3. Current interpersonal conflicts
4. Family/systems conflicts
5. Intrapersonal conflicts

For an intervention to be successful, it is necessary that such intervention enters at the appropriate levels. Over time, interventions should aim to address all of the levels of change because change at one level is likely to produce change at another level.

To broaden the perspective to community level, it is considered suitable to regard the *levels of change* as presented in the Process-Person-Context-Time Model (PPCT) of Bronfenbrenner's Bioecological Theory (in Tudge, Mokrova, Hatfield & Karnik, 2009). This theory presents the interaction between the community and the ecological aspects; in other words, the *context* and *time* involved in change¹. These aspects are briefly discussed.

The context is regarded as a topological arrangement of four embedded systems, namely the microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem and macrosystem (Rosa & Tudge, 2013). The microsystem is any physical setting in which a community member engages directly in relation with other community members for a period of time, such as a school, church or home (Bronfenbrenner, 1977; Tudge et al., 2009).

The mesosystem is regarded a "system of microsystems" (Bronfenbrenner, 1977, p. 515) because community members spend time in more than one microsystem. The mesosystem is the interrelation between two or more microsystems. In other words, the mesosystem represents the relation between community members across various physical settings (Bronfenbrenner, 1977; Rosa & Tudge, 2013; Tudge et al., 2009).

The exosystem is considered a physical setting in which a community member is not directly situated and does not actively participate in, such as local government for private sector workers. The exosystem has an indirect influence on the micro- and mesosystems and vice versa (Bronfenbrenner, 1977; Rosa & Tudge, 2013; Tudge et al., 2009).

The macrosystem differs from the abovementioned systems in that it does not refer to a specific physical context (Bronfenbrenner, 1977; Rosa & Tudge, 2013; Tudge et al., 2009). The macrosystem is considered to be the overarching cultural and subcultural beliefs and norms encompassing any community. Bronfenbrenner (1977) refers to the macrosystem as a contextual 'blueprint'. The micro-, meso-, and exosystem are nested within the macrosystem and the interaction between these four systems are interrelated, i.e. change in one system necessarily affects all the other systems either directly or indirectly (Tudge et al., 2009).

¹ It should be noted, as required by Tudge et al. (2009), that this study merely discusses partial aspects of the PPCT.

The interaction between the micro-, meso-, exo and macrosystems occurs within a certain context of time. For this reason Bronfenbrenner and Morris (2006) emphasise the importance of *time*. Time, like context, is also divided into subfactors, namely, micro-, meso and macrochronological systems (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006; Rosa & Tudge, 2013; Tudge et al., 2009). The microchronological system refers to the course of time that occurs during specific interactions and activities. The mesochronological system refers to the extent the consistency in which microchronological system is experienced. The macrochronological system, which was termed the chronosystem in Bronfenbrenner's earlier works (Tudge et al., 2009), refers to specific historical times and events experienced in a lifetime (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006; Tudge et al., 2009).

In the same way that a personal intervention should enter at the appropriate level of change, community intervention should also enter at the appropriate systemic levels of change. As is the case with individual interventions, community interventions should also aim to address all of the systemic levels of change, because change in one system either directly or indirectly influences all the other systems, thus change in one system is likely to produce change in another system (Bronfenbrenner, 1977; Rosa & Tudge, 2013; Tudge et al., 2009).

2.3.5.2. Change processes.

Change processes are the direct and indirect actions that individuals or communities take to change their patterns of living. Change processes include, inter alia, consciousness raising, self- and/or environmental re-evaluation, and self and/or social liberation. Indeed, theorists agree that consciousness raising or awareness of the issue is a key factor in behavioural change. This is also the case in community change if one considers that one of the factors that contribute to a community's capacity to change is an awareness of the issue(s), as discussed in paragraph 2.2.2.

However, 'non-specific change processes' that form part of an individual's or a community's choice to change can also account for behavioural change. This fact illustrates that an intervention or an external change agent is not always necessary to produce change. A community may simply choose to change.

The optimal use of change processes in an intervention, however, requires an understanding of the *stages of change* through which individuals or communities progress.

2.3.5.3. Stages of change.

Stages of change represent the attitudes, intentions and behaviours in terms of a person's or community's capacity to change. Stages of change, therefore, consider the internal factors that influence change. Since change unfolds over time, each stage represents a time period wherein certain tasks must be completed before progression can be made to the next stage (Prochaska & Norcross, 2007). According to Prochaska and Norcross (2007) the time spent on each stage may vary, but there are no exceptions to the tasks that must be completed before progression can be made to the next stage.

Change occurs in a series of stages, i.e. pre-contemplation, contemplation, preparation, action and maintenance (Prochaska, DiClemente, & Norcross, 1992; Prochaska & Norcross, 2007). These stages are now highlighted. The hallmark of the pre-contemplation stage is resistance to acknowledging the issue. During the pre-contemplation stage, the people in a community have no awareness of the issue and no acknowledgement is given to the situation in which they find themselves. At this point, the individual regards the situation as normal and feels no need for change (Kritsonis, 2005; Prochaska & Norcross, 2007). For this reason, very few change processes occur during this stage. For progression to occur from the pre-contemplation to the contemplation stage there has to be an acknowledgement of the situation as problematic or unsatisfactory.

During the contemplation stage an awareness of the issue(s) emerges. The need to change is recognized but no commitment is made to bring about the change (Kritsonis, 2005; Prochaska & Norcross, 2007). The hallmark of this stage is the serious consideration of solving the issue(s) (Prochaska & Norcross, 2007). During this stage an evaluation of options occur, and through small changes the progression is made to the preparation stage.

In the preparation stage there is a readiness to change and the intention to bring about change (Kritsonis, 2005; Prochaska & Norcross, 2007). The hallmark of the preparation stage is the intention of taking immediate action as well as a few changes already having been made (Prochaska & Norcross, 2007). However, the envisaged goals has not yet been reached. Progression from the preparation stage to the action stage includes setting and prioritising goals as well as the devising of and dedication to an action plan.

The action stage represents the process of bringing about the change through direct changes (Prochaska & Norcross, 2007). The community is in the action stage when they successfully bring about change for a period of time. The change is regarded as successful when

the community has reached the envisaged goals as set out in the preparation stage. The hallmark of the action stage is modification through purposeful and direct actions. Action-orientated change processes, such as contingency management, as well as feedback and evaluation, are necessary skills that communities require in the action stage. According to Prochaska and Norcross (2007), this raises awareness of the possible challenges that might hinder the change from occurring, and also prevents relapses from occurring. This leads to the maintenance stage.

The maintenance stage follows the action stage. During this stage communities continuously work to prevent relapses from occurring, and to strengthen the gains achieved during the action stage (Prochaska & Norcross, 2007). During this stage, changes are reinforced to ensure that such changes are incorporated into the community's way of living (Kritsonis, 2005). The maintenance stage is therefore not static, but is hallmarked by continual change and avoidance of relapse (Prochaska & Norcross, 2007).

Relapse can occur, prematurely ending the action or maintenance stage and triggering a cyclical movement back to either the pre-contemplation or contemplation stages (Prochaska et al., 1992). Relapse is not necessarily negative, as it can be part of a community process to re-think the change that is about to occur. Learning by participating in the process of change allows communities to adopt various different actions to bring about change.

The Transtheoretical Model was specifically developed with respect to individual change (Edwards et al., 2000). Although there are parallels between individual and community capacity to change, community capacity to change involves more than the five stages identified in the Transtheoretical Model. To fill this gap, the Community Readiness Model was developed by researchers at the Colorado State University.

2.4. The Community Readiness Model

The Community Readiness Model is based on two research traditions: the psychological readiness for treatment, and community development (Edwards et al., 2000; McCoy, Malow, Edwards, Thurland, & Rosenberg, 2007). For the development of the Community Readiness Model, more than 5 000 key informant interviews were conducted in over 1 500 urban communities and 40 rural communities within the United States of America.

The Community Readiness Model discusses capacity to change in terms of nine 'stages of change' as well as 'dimensions of capacity to change'. A brief overview of each aspect is provided below.

2.4.1. Stages of change

As discussed above, there are more complexities involved with community change than in individual change. Therefore, Plested et al. (2006) expanded on Prochaska and DiClemente's stages in order to develop nine stages of community change rather than five. The stages in the Community Readiness Model are presented in comparison to the stages of change in the Transtheoretical Model.

Plested et al. (2006) suggest two stages, i.e. *no awareness* and *denial or resistance* for Prochaska and DiClemente's pre-contemplation stage. During the stage of *no awareness* the community does not have any knowledge of the need to change. The community climate may unintentionally encourage one group to change, for example a gender, race or social class, but not another. The *denial or resistance stage* is characterised by little to no recognition that the issue(s) is a local problem; in other words, there is no desire to change.

Plested et al. (2006) suggest two stages, i.e. *vague awareness* and *preplanning* for Prochaska and DiClemente's contemplations stage. *Vague awareness* is characterised by a general awareness that the issue(s) is a local problem within the community, but there is still no motivation and necessary leadership to encourage change. During the *preplanning stage* a clear recognition exists that the issue(s) is a problem. Discussion commences on how to solve the issue(s) but little action is taken to solve the issue(s).

Plested et al. (2006) suggest two stages, i.e. *preparation* and *initiation* for Prochaska and DiClemente's preparation stage. In the stage of *preparation* there is an intention to take immediate action and general information regarding the issue(s) is available; in the stage of *initiation* a few changes are attempted with moderate involvement from community members.

Plested et al. (2006) suggest two stages, i.e. *stabilization* and *confirmation*, for Prochaska and DiClemente's action stage. In the *stabilization stage* some efforts to affect change have commenced and are stable and constant, however, there is little evaluation of the effectiveness of these efforts. When efforts are in place which have been evaluated and modified, the community is considered to be in the *confirmation or expansion stage*. New efforts, along with the identification of required resources, are implemented. Formal data is regularly collected to assess the extent of the issue(s), and efforts are tailored to assess the causes of the issue(s).

The last stage as presented by Plested et al. (2006), i.e. *high level of community ownership*, is equated with Prochaska and DiClemente's maintenance stage. *High level of*

community ownership is achieved when there is a comprehensive understanding about the issue(s) within the community. The community experiences a sense of responsibility towards the issue(s) and its solution. Therefore the involvement of community members is high. Furthermore, the community leaders are supportive of the issue(s) as well as the efforts to address the issue(s). Evaluation is routinely conducted and the community is provided feedback through sources such as newspapers and the media. In other words, in this stage the community maintains the change since there is a feeling of responsibility and ownership toward the new way of functioning. A comparison of these stages of change is represented in Table 2.4.1.

Table 2.4.1: Comparison of stages of change

Transtheoretical Model Stages of change	Community Readiness Model Stages of change
Pre-contemplation	No awareness
	Denial/Resistance
Contemplation	Vague awareness
	Preplanning
Preparation	Preparation
	Initiation
Action	Stabilization
	Confirmation and expansion
Maintenance	High level of community ownership

2.4.2. Dimensions of capacity to change

The six dimensions of capacity to change identified by Plested et al. (2006) are used within the Community Readiness Model to assess a community's capacity to change. The dimensions of capacity to change are regarded as the main factors which drive the community's readiness and preparedness to take action. The level of presence of these dimensions are used to determine the present stage of change the community is in.

The six dimensions of the Community Readiness Model serve as a comprehensive tool to determine the community's capacity to change, their needs, and for developing strategies to address those needs. The six dimensions are the following:

1. *Community efforts*

This assesses the extent of the efforts, programs and policies of the community used in addressing the issue(s).

2. *Community knowledge of efforts*

This assesses to which extent the community members have knowledge of the efforts mentioned above. It also focuses on the accessibility and applicability of those efforts to all divisions of the community.

3. *Leadership*

This assesses to which extent leaders and influential members of the community support the efforts to address the issue(s).

4. *Community climate*

This assesses the community's attitude or mindset, such as helplessness or responsibility, toward the issue(s).

5. *Community knowledge about the issue(s)*

This assesses to which extent the community has knowledge of the issue(s), its causes, consequences and the impact on the community.

6. *Resources related to the issue(s)*

This assesses the extent of local resources available to address the issue(s) such as, inter alia, people, time, money and space.

The status of the community, with reference to each of the dimensions above, provides the basis for the community's overall capacity to change.

The Community Readiness Model serves as the assessment tool for this study. It is an appropriate tool since it is based upon a theory of change that emphasises the capacity to change and is tailored for research conducted within communities.

The theories of change discussed in this study show that change is a process. Some theories such as the Three-step change theory (Lewin, 1951) and the Phases of change (Lippitt et al., 1958) appear to describe change as a linear process. This becomes problematic when one considers the arguments presented by Bandura (1982, 2001) and Fullan (1992, 2007) which show that the change process is an interrelated web of elements that should be considered contextually. The Transtheoretical Model encompasses the various aspects of change since it places and emphasis on capacity to change within the change process; considers the context of the change process in terms of the various levels of change (interpreted in this study as the ecological aspects of Bronfenbrenner's PPCT Model); and presents the change process as a

cyclical process. Because the assessment tool, the Community Readiness Model is based upon the Transtheoretical Model and community development theory, it is appropriate that the Transtheoretical Model is the theoretical foundation of this study.

2.5. Previous studies on community capacity to change

There have been few studies focused on assessing the community capacity to change. These studies mainly focused on strategies to increase a community's capacity to change. Most of these studies were conducted in the United States of America and Australia.

McCoy et al. (2007) used the Community Readiness Model as a strategy to research the implementation of HIV/Aids interventions in three islands in the Caribbean: the St. Thomas, St. Croix and St. John Islands. In this research McCoy et al. (2007) used the Community Readiness Model to analyse the three communities' reaction to the implementation of interventions. This resulted in the researchers being able to offer guidance on how prevention strategies can be implemented effectively.

All three communities on these islands scored low in terms of *Community Climate*, and the highest in terms of *Knowledge of Community Efforts* to fight HIV/Aids. McCoy et al. (2007) rated the St. Thomas community at Stage 3 (*Vague Awareness*) of the change process whereas the St. Croix and St. Thomas communities were rated at Stage 4 (*Preplanning*). However, in order to create effective prevention efforts, attention needs to be given to the individual scores of each dimension. Because *Knowledge of Community Efforts* scored the lowest it was suggested that interventions should focus on addressing denial and stigma about HIV/Aids to ensure the success of interventions addressing HIV/Aids.

A study by Aboud et al. (2010) assessed the community's capacity to change to implement HIV/Aids preventative interventions in rural Bangladesh. This study employed a modified concept of the stages of change as presented in the Community Readiness Model to make it applicable to the Bangladeshi context.

Religious constraints within this community necessitated the assessment of the community's capacity to change. Aboud et al. (2010) conducted six focus group discussions with three professional groups which consisted of teachers, businessmen and drugstore vendors in 2005. In 2007 they conducted a single multi-professional group which included teachers, drugstore vendors and imams (persons who lead prayers in Mosques) to assess the changes that had occurred since 2005. Their findings showed that strong shared social norms within the

community created a barrier towards community change. Partnerships between the community and the change agent were therefore necessary to ensure successful community change.

Thompson and Pepperdine (2003) conducted a study to assess and develop the community's capacity to change in terms of riparian restoration in Australia. The study aimed to understand the opportunities and constraints associated with implementation of riparian restoration, to identify the main influencing factors of capacity to change, and to develop appropriate policies to address these factors. The study furthermore assessed the extent to which the community-based projects (which involved riparian restoration) had built community capacity to change.

Thompson and Pepperdine (2003) utilised the 'Capacity' Assessment Tool to assess the community's capacity to change. The Capacity Assessment tool identifies 35 dimensions of capacity to change that are categorised into five themes, i.e. *context, values and perceptions, communication and empowerment, program design and program delivery*.

Thompson and Pepperdine (2003) found that the specific identification of the various dimensions was not as important as the observation of these dimensions in their context. The reason for this is that a dimension may have a positive influence in one context while the same dimension may have a negative influence in another context. They therefore recommended, in respect of intervention design, that the interaction between the various dimensions be identified in order to produce the desired outcomes. This would mean that interventions made should follow an adaptive and flexible approach.

The findings of the study indicated an increase in community capacity primarily through an increase of community awareness, which gradually led to interest and ultimately to action, which contributed to cultural change in respect of riparian restoration.

In this study, the process of change is regarded as a cyclical process, as presented in the Transtheoretical Model. It was indicated that the Transtheoretical Model and the Community Readiness Model are suitable models for this study. The Community Readiness Model is employed to determine the community's stage of change which, in turn, is an indication of their capacity to change. The context of eMgwenya as it is relevant to this study, is discussed next.

2.6. Context of eMgwenya

The section that follows provides a brief overview of the town eMgwenya as it is relevant to this study. The research focuses on the capacity of eMgwenya to change in the light of the proposed changes.

The proposed intervention (*the eMgwenya Urban Renewal Project*) came about as a result of the steady decline of eMgwenya over the past two decades. The decline was a result of a combination of changes that resulted in the loss of economic sustainability. A brief overview of some of the factors that contributed to the loss of economic sustainability is provided.

2.6.1. Changes in the economic situation

eMgwenya (previously Waterval Boven) was established in 1894 as a result of the completion of a rack railway line by the *Nederlandsche-Zuid-Afrikaansche Spoorwegmaatschappij* (NZASM). Waterval Boven was to serve as a train servicing depot and shunting yard for the railway line between the Transvaal Republic and Mozambique. Shortly after the establishment of Waterval Boven, the railway populace numbered 3 500 residents, and by 1930 the small town was populated with steam locomotive drivers, firemen, guard cleaners, ‘wash-outs’ (persons responsible for cleaning the large steam trains) and their families (Redcliff Mountain Estate, n.d.; South African Tourism, n.d.).

The steam train was gradually phased out from 1966 onwards and in 1980 it was completely replaced by diesel and electric powered trains (Geyser, 1990). In time, the rail track was relocated, which eliminated the necessity for a train servicing depot and shunting yard. As a result, many families left their homes in search of work elsewhere (South African Tourism, n.d.).

During the height of the apartheid era, South African Railways (SAR), which owned and administrated Waterval Boven, decided to disinvest in Waterval Boven and to promote and foster Richards Bay as its export harbour for commodities instead of utilizing the Maputo Port (Geyser, 1990). With this decision, the use of Waterval Boven as a train depot fell away completely and left the town with few economic alternatives.

2.6.2. Amalgamation of municipalities

The disinvestment included the establishment of an independent municipality, which was amalgamated with the smaller municipalities of Dullstroom, Belfast and Machadodorp during the post-apartheid restructuring, and renamed Emakhazeni Local Municipality (‘Local Municipality | Statistics South Africa’, n.d.). In October 2009 Waterval Boven was renamed after its township, eMgwenya. Currently, Belfast is the municipal headquarters and eMgwenya can be viewed as a settlement within the new amalgamated municipal area (Chawenco Consultants, 2012; Emakhazeni Local Municipality, 2015).

The changes discussed above resulted in many people leaving eMgwenya. Those that remained had to find work in neighbouring towns, as no sufficient job opportunities remained within eMgwenya to sustain the remaining populace. Even though 70% of the current population over the age of 18 years have completed their matric certificate and are therefore considered well-schooled, 70% of eMgwenya’s working population (aged between 14 and 64 years) are unemployed (Chawenco Consultants, 2012). The available jobs in close proximity to eMgwenya are within the agricultural and mining sectors (Emakhazeni Local Municipality, 2015). These are not high-income jobs and for this reason eMgwenya remains a poor community.

The lack of income resulted in residents being unable to pay their rates and taxes, water and electricity, which in turn contributed to poor provision of municipal services. There is currently an inability to upgrade existing facilities such as roads, sewerage, the hospital and the holiday resort *Elandskrans*, for example (Chawenco Consultants, 2012).

2.6.3. eMgwenya’s current situation

The lack of economic growth and sustainability has had dire consequences for the infrastructure and provision of municipal services, such that the roads in eMgwenya have hardly any tar left, with grass growing in the worn-out patches and pot-holes. The hospital cannot provide for basic medical attention and is, for all practical purposes, non-functional. Refuse has not been removed by the removal company; members of the community arrange among themselves to remove their refuse. The holiday resort has closed down and has been vandalised since its closure. The sewerage works have not been maintained and the Elandsriver which borders the town, is polluted with raw sewerage (Emakhazeni Local Municipality, 2015; WB-Noka Development Consortium, 2011) .

It is against this social and economic background that a privately funded consortium named WB-Noka Development Consortium (henceforth WB-Noka), developed an extensive development plan in 2011 for the eMgwenya community: the *eMgwenya Urban Renewal Project* (WB-Noka Development Consortium, 2011). The project made provision for providing housing, health care facilities, emergency services, social and community facilities, improved road access, water infrastructure upgrade, sewer infrastructure upgrade and job opportunities over the course of seven years. Commencement of the project was subject to obtaining funding from external source(s), either locally or overseas.

Because the intended provision of services such as housing and infrastructure upgrade are considered ‘public services’, a public-private partnership (PPP) had to be entered into between WB-Noka and the Emakhazeni Local Municipality (WB-Noka Development Consortium, 2011). A PPP is defined by the World Bank Group (2015) as a "long-term contract between a private party and a government entity, for providing a public asset or service, in which the private party bears significant risk and management responsibility, and remuneration is linked to performance".

In order to obtain the PPP, the eMgwenya community’s consent for the proposed development needed to be obtained (personal communication, April 2016). This was done through a series of public participation meetings that were held in either the Alfred Nkosi or Funda Community Halls, where the proposed development was explained to, and discussed with members of the eMgwenya community. During the course of 2011, four community participation meetings were held, with two in 2012. Roughly 600 community members attended the last meeting of 2012 and by a show of hands, the majority of the community members indicated that they were in acceptance of the *eMgwenya Urban Renewal Project*. With this consent, the PPP agreement was entered into between WB-Noka and the Emakhazeni Local Municipality on 31 May 2013.

To obtain funding from external sources for the intended project proved to be more difficult than was initially believed. At the time of conducting the research for this study (late 2015 to early 2016) the project had not yet commenced as no funding could be secured.

Naturally, the proposed *eMgwenya Urban Renewal Project* created a sense of ‘great expectations’ among community members. Expressed in terms of the theories which underpin this study, an expectation of the provision of increased available capital that would provide the community with the ability to act, and consequently enhance their well-being, was created. The

fact that the project has not been realized to date, may have led to feelings of disappointment and resentment (personal communication, May 2015). Personal communication with members from the eMgwenya community indicate that the community's trust in the *eMgwenya Urban Renewal Project* and the municipality has eroded, which would mean, from a theoretical point of view, that the raised expectations and the later disappointment in this regard, had impacted on the community's social capital. As discussed in 2.2.1, social capital refers to the relational aspects of a community, such as the level of trust (Mansuri & Rao, 2004; Moore et al., 2006; Moscardo, 2008; Huebner et al., 2009).

Because social capital and the ability to act are inextricably linked, it adds to the necessity to study the eMgwenya community's capacity to change in light of the context discussed above.

2.7. Summary

In this chapter the relevant literature was discussed and working definitions of 'community' and 'capacity to change' were provided. Some theories of change were also discussed. As per the Transtheoretical Model that forms the theoretical foundation of this study, the context of the eMgwenya community was given, with a brief description of how it relates to the theory. In the following chapter the research methodology employed to answer the research question, i.e. to what degree does the eMgwenya community have the capacity to change, is provided.

Chapter 3

The chapter provides an outline of the research methodology, the ethical considerations and the credibility and trustworthiness of the results of this study.

3.1. Research methodology

This study used both qualitative and quantitative methods to answer the research question which is: To what degree does the eMgwenya community have the capacity to change? The interviews conducted with eMgwenya community members constitute the qualitative aspect of the study, while the quantification of the qualitative data constitutes the quantitative aspect.

3.1.1. Research design

A case study research design was employed due to various aspects that rendered it particularly suitable to the current study. These aspects, together with their relevance to the current study, are discussed below.

A case research design is an empirical investigation of a contemporary phenomenon (the ‘case’) within its real-life context, of which the boundaries between the case and its context are not clearly distinguishable (Maree, 2007; Yin, 2013). The ‘case’ in this study is the eMgwenya community’s degree of capacity to change. This is directly linked to the current social context of the same community. The difficulty in distinguishing clear boundaries between the ‘case’ and its context should be self-evident. The ‘fuzziness’ of these boundaries is further complicated by the fact that the proposed intervention, the *eMgwenya Urban Renewal Project* (discussed in Chapter 2), forms part of the social context of the eMgwenya community in the sense that an expectation for positive change was raised in the community during the time when the *eMgwenya Urban Renewal Project* was discussed with the community. The case, its context, and the proposed intervention are therefore embedded in one another with no clear boundaries between them readily distinguishable.

Case study research design makes provision for the integration of multiple sources of evidence, which could be qualitative and quantitative data (Maree, 2007). Various sources of data were used. Empirical data was collected from three different groups to investigate the capacity to change within the eMgwenya community’s present day context. Data of key informant interviews and focus group discussions were used as qualitative data. This data was

then quantified by means of a scoring sheet and anchor rating scale, as determined by the Community Readiness Model.

According to Maree (2007), case study research cannot be generalised, but it provides in-depth insights into the case. This is precisely the aim of the research undertaken in this study: to gain a deeper, holistic insight and understanding of the eMgwenya community's capacity to change. The way in which this research was conducted to achieve this aim, is set out in the following section.

3.1.2. Sampling and data collection strategies

To gain a deeper, holistic insight and understanding of the eMgwenya community's capacity to change, key informant interviews and focus group discussions were conducted with selected stakeholders and community members. Different sampling methods were employed with regard to the key informant interviews and the focus group discussions, as follows:

3.1.2.1. Key informant interviews

This study utilised purposive sampling as a sampling strategy to select participants for the key informant interviews. Purposive sampling allows the researcher to select participants according to pre-selected criteria relevant to the research question (Maree, 2007). According to Plested et al. (2006) participants who represent different segments of the community, such as government, school and/or law enforcement, are necessary to conduct a successful assessment of a community's capacity to change, because such participants are likely to have knowledge, experience and insight to assist with the research (Maree, 2007). Five participants are regarded as sufficient to assess the community's capacity to change, according to Plested et al. (2006).

In line with the criteria provided in the preceding paragraph, five key informants from different segments of the community were selected: (1) the local municipal operations manager; (2) the secretary of the Rate Payers Association; (3) the principal of the primary school; (4) a prominent business owner; and (5) the chief of police. All five agreed to participate in the study.

The researcher telephonically contacted each of the key informants to request an interview. During these conversations the researcher explained the purpose of the study. The purpose of the study was also set out in a letter and each participant was required to read the letter before the commencement of the interview (see Appendix E). The researcher used the discussion guide adapted from the Community Readiness Model (see 5.5.Appendix A) to

conduct a semi-structured interview in eMgwenya at a location of the key informant's choice². The interview was conducted in either Afrikaans or English, depending on the preference of the key informant. The interviews lasted between thirty to sixty minutes. The interviews were voice-recorded with the permission of the key informant. The recordings were transcribed by the researcher for interpretation.

3.1.2.2. Focus group discussions

Despite the fact that key informant interviews are deemed sufficient to conduct a reliable assessment of a community's capacity to change (Plested et al., 2006), it was considered beneficial to conduct additional focus group discussions. In Chapter 1, mention was made of the fact that the eMgwenya community still perceives itself as consisting of 'the formal town' (Waterval Boven) and the 'township' (eMgwenya). For this reason two focus group discussions were conducted – one with participants from the formal town, and one with participants from the township. These focus group discussions assisted in gaining an in-depth view of the community's perceptions regarding change. Focus group discussions were used because they provide rich information which may be difficult to obtain through other data collection strategies (Henning, Van Rensburg, & Smit, 2004; Maree, 2007). Group interaction yields a wider range of responses than individual interviews (Maree, 2007).

This study used snowball sampling, also referred to as chain referral sampling (Maree, 2007; Sadler, Lee, Lim, & Fullerton, 2010) to select the focus group participants. Snowball sampling is a useful sampling technique when a hard-to-reach target group is researched. This sampling technique involves finding a particular individual within the target group to recruit participants through his/her social networks (Sadler et al., 2010). To set up the two focus group discussions, the researcher contacted a member of the community to recruit the participants from both the town and township. No specific requirements were stipulated by the researcher for a community member to participate in any one of the two focus group discussions. Because no specific requirements were stipulated, only the gender and place of residence was known to the researcher. No other personal information was required or revealed during the focus group discussions.

As was the case with the key informant interviews, the researcher used the discussion guide adapted from the Community Readiness Model to conduct the focus group discussions at

² Exact locations are not given because they could reveal the participants' identity.

a location of the participants' choice in eMgwenya³. The purpose of the study was explained in a letter to the selected participants. Each participant was given time to read this letter before the commencement of the focus group discussion (see Appendix F). The purpose of the study was also explained verbally in each focus group.

The focus group discussion with community members who reside in the township had four participants, of which three were male and one was female. The focus group discussion was conducted in both Afrikaans and English. When participants spoke a language other than Afrikaans or English, another participant translated it into either Afrikaans or English so that the researcher understood what was being said.

The focus group discussion with community members who reside in the formal town had three participants, of which two were male and one was female. This focus group discussion was conducted in Afrikaans.

The focus group discussions lasted between thirty to forty minutes and were voice-recorded with the permission of the participants. The recordings were transcribed by the researcher for interpretation.

3.1.3. The discussion guide

The Community Readiness Model provides a discussion guide consisting of thirty questions, structured according to the six dimensions of capacity to change. According to Plested et al. (2006) it is not necessary to ask all the questions as they appear in the discussion guide, but those essential for scoring (rendered in bold font in the Community Readiness Model's discussion guide) should be included in the discussions. According to Plested et al. (2006), the discussion guide may be tailored according to the contemporary phenomenon being investigated.

The discussion guide (see Appendix A) used for the interviews as well as the respective focus group discussions consisted of the questions considered essential for scoring, with the addition of one other question from the Community Readiness Model's dimension *Community Climate*, namely, "Tell me about the people in eMgwenya". The order of the questions were kept as they appear in the Community Readiness Model's discussion guide. The discussion

³ Exact locations are not given because they could reveal the participants' identity.

guide (henceforth ‘customised’ discussion guide) was customised for the current research in the following way:

As per the Plested et al. (2006) suggestion, the dimensions *community efforts* and *community knowledge of efforts* were combined to ease the flow of the discussion;

With the assistance of a linguist, the register of the questions in the discussion guide were changed from formal to informal. This was considered necessary because it was anticipated that non-mother-tongue speakers of English would find the formal register difficult to understand.

The questions of the customised discussion guide pertain to a large collection of community issues such as housing; health care facilities; emergency services; social and community facilities; improved road access; water infrastructure upgrade; sewer infrastructure upgrade; and job opportunities. For this reason, the researcher explained to all participants at the commencement of the interview, or focus group discussions, what is meant by ‘issues’. The participants were also reminded about what the issues referred to throughout the course of the interview and focus group discussions. Participants were also requested to add any issues they felt were important to the discussion.

A total of twenty-two questions were asked. Table 3.1.1 shows a breakdown of the number of questions asked, and some examples of questions asked in relation to the six dimensions of the Community Readiness Model.

Table 3.1.1 Example questions per dimension

Dimension	Number of questions	Example of questions asked
A & B Community Efforts and Community Knowledge of the Efforts	7	Is someone doing something about the issues? Do you think people know that something is being done?
C Leadership	3	What are the leaders doing about these issues? Are they helping the people who are doing something about it?
D Community climate	3	Tell me about the people of eMgwenya. Is the community helping? How?
E Knowledge about the issue	4	How would you find out about these issues?
F Resources	5	Do you know of people who are trying to get the money to help with these issues?
TOTAL NUMBER OF QUESTIONS	22	

3.1.4. Data Analysis

The Community Readiness Model requires that each dimension be scored according to an anchor rating scale. The overall score determines the community's stage of change, which in turn is an indication of the community's capacity to change. However, data obtained in terms of a specific dimension may be relevant to other dimensions as well. For this reason the data was first analysed in terms of thematic analysis, in order to assist with the scoring process.

3.1.4.1. Thematic analysis

Thematic analysis involves the establishment of codes or themes where the frequency of the themes is determined alongside an analysis of the meaning of the themes within their context (Marks & Yardley, 2004). A theme is considered a specific pattern within the data and can refer either to the manifest content of the data (which is directly observable), or the latent content of the data (which is inferred by the researcher). The aim of thematic analysis is to interpret the latent themes within the manifest themes.

For the purpose of this study, themes were identified in the following way: data corresponding to any one of the six dimensions of the Community Readiness Model, was coded as a theme. This method is referred to as deductive coding and is used to identify themes derived from theoretical ideas (Marks & Yardley, 2004) Inductive coding was used to code themes within the raw data that did not correspond to any of the six dimensions.

The thematic analysis of the data proceeded in the following way: (1) all the transcripts were read to get a general idea of the content and possible themes; (2) units of meaning, such as sentences or phrases, were identified; (3) the units of meaning were coded, by making use of deductive and inductive coding.

The application software, Atlas.ti version 6.2, was used to assign codes to identified units of meaning within the transcripts of the interviews and focus groups discussions. A feature of the application allows for data clustering by grouping all similarly assigned codes. The user is then able to view the clusters according to the assigned codes, either per transcript, or per transcript set.

3.1.4.2. Scoring process

Data from the key informant interviews and focus group discussions was scored separately by making use of the anchor rating scale as it is set out in the Community Readiness

Model. In this way, three independent scores of capacity to change were obtained. The three scores allowed the researcher to identify similarities as well as differences of the perception of the community's capacity to change within different groups of stakeholders. The data that was coded by making use of inductive coding was not quantified (scored), as it did not correspond with any of the six dimensions of the Community Readiness Model. This data forms part of the findings presented in Chapter 4.

Scoring of the data, in terms of the requirements of the Community Readiness Model, was done in the following way:

Scoring was done making use of the anchor rating scale (see 5.5.Appendix B). The anchor rating scale is structured, like the discussion guide, according to the six dimensions of capacity to change, and has nine anchored rating statements associated with each dimension. The statements in the anchored rating scale score the community's stage for capacity on the continuum between 'no awareness' on the one end, and 'high level of community ownership' on the other end (see Table 3.1.2 below).

Each of the six dimensions in the data was scored in terms of the nine anchored rating statements. Scoring was done by working systematically through statements one to nine. If the information in the data exceeded that of the statement, i.e. the information in the data was qualitatively more than what was given in the statement, no score was awarded. In other words, if the information in the data for the dimension *Community efforts* for example, indicated that there was an awareness of the need for efforts to address the issue, then no score was allocated for statement one: *'No awareness of the need for efforts to address the issue'*. The data for the dimension *Community efforts* was then evaluated in terms of statement two (*No efforts addressing the issue*), and if the data indicated that the community exceeded this statement, in other words, that there are efforts addressing the issue, the data was evaluated in terms of statement three. A score was allocated when the information in the data did not exceed a particular statement of the anchor rating scale, but surpassed all prior statements. If, for example, the information in the data for the dimension *Community efforts*, did not surpass statement six (*Efforts (programs/activities) have been implemented*), then a score of 6 was allocated for this particular data for the dimension *Community efforts*.

Making use of the scoring process as set out above, each key informant interview and focus group discussion was scored separately by two scorers: the researcher, and a research assistant. The two scorers worked independently, and read through each interview and its

respective thematic analysis to gain an in-depth understanding of the interviews. The scorers familiarised themselves with the anchored rating scale, and commenced systematically scoring individually each of the six dimensions i.e. *community knowledge of efforts, leadership, community climate, knowledge about the issue(s), and resources for prevention efforts* for each interview and each focus group. The scorers worked systematically through the nine anchored rating statements, as is required. The scores for each dimension were recorded on the scoring sheet (see Appendix C and Appendix D) of the Table labelled ‘individual scores’.

Once the separate scoring had been completed, the scorers met to compare and discuss their respective score-allocations. The purpose of this discussion was to reach a consensus about the scores and to allocate a final score to each dimension. In this discussion, the scorers ensured that statements were not overlooked and that the community perceptions had been reliably scored. Although there were some differences in the initial individual scoring of the dimensions, the total overall scores were the same for both scorers. The agreement of the total overall scores indicated that the scoring was reliable. Once the scorers’ initial differences in the interpretation and scoring of the data, as well as motivations for the final score were agreed upon, the data was documented.

The final, agreed upon scores for each dimension for the individual interviews were totalled and then divided by the number of interviews (i.e. five), resulting in five average scores for each dimension in terms of the stages of change (as defined by Plested et al. (2006)). These five scores were then totalled and divided by the number of dimensions (i.e. six), in order to obtain an average overall score of the community’s stage of change. The scores for each dimension were recorded on the scoring sheet (see Appendix C) in the Table labelled ‘combined scores’. According to Plested et al. (2006) final scores should be rounded down. Thus, a score of between 3.0 and 3.9, for example, was considered at stage 3.

For each focus group discussion, the same process was followed, but the total for each dimension was not divided by the number of participants. This provided a single score for each dimension. The scores for the six dimensions were totalled and divided by the number of dimensions, i.e. six. In this way, the scoring for the focus group was done in the same way as would be the case for a single interview (see 5.5.Appendix D).

Table 3.1.2 Final score indicating the stage of change

Score	Stage of readiness
1	No awareness
2	Denial/Resistance
3	Vague awareness
4	Preplanning
5	Preparation
6	Initiation
7	Stabilization
8	Confirmation and expansion
9	High level of community ownership

3.1.5. The role of the researcher

The subjectivity of the researcher cannot be eliminated in qualitative research because the researcher forms part of the research instrument (Maree, 2007). It was therefore important for the researcher to be reflexive, which “provides an opportunity for the researcher to understand how her [...] own experiences and understandings of the world affect the research process” (Morrow, 2005, p. 253).

The researcher in this study wore two hats in respect of the eMgwenya community. The first hat was that of the researcher of the current study. The second hat, that of consultant for WB-Noka, the implementing company. As the consultant of WB-Noka, the author was tasked with measuring the social and economic impact of the *eMgwenya Urban Renewal Project*, and to measure the poverty levels of the eMgwenya community for the duration of the project. The author’s role as a WB-Noka consultant provided knowledge about the community’s living conditions prior to the commencement of the current study. This knowledge had some influence on her expectation of the findings of this study. Her previous knowledge contributed to a preconceived idea that this study would show a low capacity to change. During the early stages of data collection the researcher realized that she had this preconceived idea. This awareness cautioned the researcher not to approach the analysis and interpretation of the data from a preconceived perspective, but to assess the data with an open mind and as objectively as

possible. This required some additional strategies to enhance the credibility and trustworthiness of the data interpretation.

The researcher's previous involvement with the community, could have influenced the participant's perception of her. They could have linked her with the proposed project. This could have influenced the data collected. But since the researcher's consulting work was done four years prior to the data collection of this study and the researcher had no contact with the eMgwenya community during the four year period, this influence may have limited influence on the data received.

3.1.6. Trustworthiness

In qualitative research, trustworthiness encompasses three concepts: credibility, transferability and dependability (Pitney & Parker, 2009). The trustworthiness of the study was assured in the following way. The credibility of the study, i.e. the authenticity of the findings, was assured by voice-recording and transcribing the data word-for-word. The transferability of the study, i.e. the ability to apply the findings of the study to similar contexts, was assured by using multiple sources of data to get the perspectives of a wide variety of stakeholders. Additionally, more than one data gathering strategy was used, being interviews as well as focus group discussions. The dependability of the study, i.e. the ability of the study to be clear and appropriate, was assured by having two scorers independently score the community's stage of change, and reaching consensus where differences occurred. These measures, according to Pitney and Parker (2009) contribute to assuring the trustworthiness of a study.

3.1.7. Ethical Considerations

The following steps were taken to ensure that the study complied with the Protection of Personal Information Bill (2009). The research proposal was ethically cleared by the Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Humanities, University of Pretoria.

A letter providing information about the study and an informed consent form were given to the participants of the key informant interviews and focus group discussions (see 5.5.Appendix E and 5.5.Appendix F). The informed consent form was signed by the participants to confirm their agreement that they voluntarily participate in this study and that the interviews could be voice recorded.

By signing the letter, the key informants and the focus group participants provided informed consent to participate in the study. The signed consent forms and all other records,

such as interviews and focus group transcripts, will be kept at the Department of Psychology in a secure file for a period of fifteen years.

Although participation was not anonymous, the information obtained through the interviews and focus groups is confidential. Analyses and reporting did not reveal the identity of the participants. Code names were assigned to participants on all of the researcher's notes and transcriptions. Distinctive features of the participant, such as stuttering, for example, were not identified so as to avoid association of any statement(s) with a particular participant.

3.2. Summary

This chapter has provided an outline of the research methodology, the ethical considerations and the credibility and trustworthiness of the results of this study.

Chapter 4

In this chapter the data and scoring analyses are presented. The analysis and scoring were done in terms of the six dimensions identified in the Community Readiness Model, namely *community efforts*, *knowledge of community efforts*, *leadership*, *community climate*, *community issues*, and *resources*. The thematic analysis of the key informant interviews and the focus group discussions were integrated into the analysis of the data in order to present the eMgwenya community's view as a whole for each of the six dimensions. The scoring, however, was done separately for each group of stakeholders so that the similarities and differences across the three groups of stakeholders are distinguishable.

For ease of reading, quotations and translations of the quotations from Afrikaans to English, are presented in the following way:

Direct speech quotations in English are rendered in quotation marks, e.g. "Nothing". Direct speech quotation in Afrikaans are rendered in Italic font and quotation marks, followed by the English translation in round brackets, e.g. "*Niks nie*" (Nothing).

Direct speech quotations from the data are referenced in terms of participants' assigned code names as well as their stakeholder group identity (e.g. Voice006, key informant).

In 4.1 to 4.6 below, the data and scoring is discussed in terms of each of the six dimensions of the Community Readiness Model. The data that substantiates the relevant dimension is presented first, where- after the scoring of the particular dimension is provided. Because the key informant interviews, the township focus group discussion, and town focus group discussion were scored independently, a discussion of the score for each respective group of stakeholders is provided. Please note that the score for the five key informant interviews is a calculated average score (see Table 4.8.1) but that the score for each focus group is an awarded score and not a calculated average.

In 4.7 the data supporting the identified inductive theme, namely *the effects of the promise*, is presented and discussed.

The overall score for each respective group of stakeholders is presented and interpreted in 4.9 and 4.10

4.1. Community efforts

The dimension *community efforts* is concerned with the extent of community efforts in addressing issues within the community. When asked whether somebody was addressing the issues in the community, some contrasting responses were received from participants. On the one hand, many of the participants emphatically stated that there are no efforts being made to address any of the issues in the community, as can be seen from statements such as:

	Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖	Voice007	Key informant	“Absolutely not”
❖	Voice018	Key informant	“Niks nie” (Nothing)
❖	Voice009a	Township focus group	“Niemand wat ons help” (Nobody that helps us)
❖	Voice020c	Town focus group	“Nee niks. Geen” (No nothing. Nothing)

On the other hand, some participants did feel that minor efforts to address the issues are present in the community. These efforts include the construction of houses and roads by Nkomati Mine, a feeding scheme at the school, and RDP housing projects. Representative comments included:

	Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖	Voice006	Key informant	“Nkomati mine is doing. They are erecting houses, building streets and pavement”
❖	Voice008	Key informant	“Ons het byvoorbeeld 'n voedingskema by die skool” (We have, for example, a feeding scheme at the school)
❖	Voice018	Key informant	“Ons [die gemeenskapslede] doen RDP behuising projekte in die swart woongebied. Wat ons help inisieer. Wat ons leë erwe geïdentifiseer het” (We [the community members] are doing RDP housing projects in the township. That we help initiate. We have identified empty properties)

There were also contrasting views about the willingness of community members to participate in efforts. On the one hand, indications were that community members are not willing to get involved in community efforts and that they are not present to help with community efforts. Consider the following statement: “die ouens is nie meer bereid om betrokke

te raak nie [...] Die ouens daag nie op nie” (the community members are not willing to get involved any more [...] they don’t show up) (Voice008, key informant).

On the other hand, there were indications that some community members are willing to participate in efforts. Consider the following statements:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
Voice018	Key informant	<i>“Die manne kom hier bymekaar en dan bespreek hulle en dan besluit hulle ok môre gaan brou ons Thusong”</i> (The men gather here and then they discuss and decide OK tomorrow we will organise Thusong)
❖ Voice006	Key informant	<i>“They are willing, not all of them, but some of them are willing to do something”</i>

These efforts were, however, hampered by a lack of resources as is evident from the following comment: “the community is helping [with efforts to address the issues] but has a lack of resources” (Voice017, key informant).

A clear and prevalent issue regarding efforts in the community is that agents such as the municipality, WB-Noka and a political party, namely Ubuntu (who advocates the philosophy of contributionism), make many undertakings to assist the community, but these undertakings have to date (2016), not been fulfilled.

The efforts put forward by the municipality are limited, according to the participants. One of the reasons for the inadequacy of the municipality to address the issues within the community is the structuring of the municipality. In 2.6.2 mention was made that the Emakhazeni Local Municipality consists of four smaller settlements, i.e. Belfast, Dullstroom, Machadodorp and eMgwenya. The municipal headquarters are located in Belfast and the tourist attractions are mainly located in Dullstroom. The effect of the structure of this municipality is that a majority of the funds are invested in Belfast and Dullstroom, whereas limited funds are invested in eMgwenya and Machadodorp. This is evident from the following statements by participants:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice018	Key informant	<i>“Ous en Machado is maar bietjie aan die agterspeen”</i> (We and Machado are getting the worst share)
❖ Voice020a	Town focus group	<i>“Machadodorp en Waterval Boven, hulle is maar hier agterlangs”</i> (Machadodorp and Waterval Boven, they are in the back line)

WB-Noka could not fulfil their undertaking to address the issues in the community, even though they “stood up and presented: this is what’s happening to the town. This is it” (Voice 007, key informant).

In the same way, the Ubuntu party promised to address the issues in the community, but none of these undertakings have been fulfilled. This is evident when one considers statements such as:

	Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖	Voice018	Key informant	“ <i>Nee nog nie op die oomblik nie maar hy [Ubuntu] het groot planne</i> ” (No not yet but he [Ubuntu] has big plans)
❖	Voice009a	Township focus group	“We’ve heard stories like that because they say they [Ubuntu] want to provide Boven with free electricity”
❖	Voice020a	Town focus group	“ <i>Ons weet van Ubuntu want ons het hom al gesien en dis hoe ver dit gegaan het</i> ” (We know about Ubuntu because we have seen him but that’s how far it’s gone)

It seems that efforts to address the issues in the community “has been thought of and spoken about and rumoured about. But it’s not come to fruition” (Voice007, key informant). The effect of promises made and the non-fulfilment thereof, as discussed above, is discussed in detail 4.4 and 4.7.

In the presentation of the data in the section above, the data for key informant interviews and the two focus group discussions were combined in order to present the community’s views as a whole. As previously stated, the scoring was done separately for each group of stakeholders so that the similarities and differences across the three groups of stakeholders could be distinguished.

In 3.1.4.2 the scoring process was explained. Recall from this explanation that scoring a dimension is done by systematically evaluating each statement of the anchor rating scale in terms of the data. The score associated with a particular statement is awarded when the data qualitatively exceeds all previous statements, but not the one associated with the score that is awarded.

Scoring in terms of the dimension *community efforts* is provided in the Table below for each group of stakeholders. The first four statements of the anchor rating scale for the dimension *community efforts* are given in Table 4.1.1.

Table 4.1.1 Data evaluation of community efforts

Dimension A: Community efforts		Data Evaluation		
Score	Qualitative statement	Key Informant Interview	Township Focus Group	Town Focus Group
1.	No awareness of the need for efforts to address the issue.	Exceed	Exceed	Exceed
2.	No efforts addressing the issue.	Exceed	Does not exceed	Exceed
3.	A few individuals recognize the need to initiate some type of effort, but there is no immediate motivation to do anything.	Does not exceed	-	Does not exceed
4.	Some community members have met and have begun a discussion of developing community efforts.	-	-	-

From Table 4.1.1 it can be seen that the key informant interview score is 3. This score is the rounded down score from 3.6 which is the calculated average score for the five key informant interviews (see Table 4.8.1). The township focus group was awarded a score of 2. A score of 2 was awarded for this group because the data contains no evidence of any community efforts. This is evident from the following statements:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice009a	Township focus group	“No presently we are still... there was a rumour of WB Noka. We are still waiting for that project to come and develop Waterval Boven for us... <i>Niemand wat ons help</i> ” (Nobody is helping us)
❖ Voice009d	Township focus group	“No one”

The difference in scoring may provide some explanation for the contrasting information received in terms of community efforts within the society, as was stated at the onset of the discussion, but it must be pointed out that the contrast in information cannot be ascribed to this lack of effort within the township focus group only, because contrasting evidence regarding *community efforts* also exists within the data of the other two groups of stakeholders.

Overall, there appear to be opposing perceptions regarding the community efforts. On the one hand it appears that no efforts are addressing the issues within the community, whereas on the other hand, there appear to be some minor efforts (from internal and external agents) that address the issues. It can be concluded that although a few individuals recognize the need to initiate some type of effort, resources are too limited to effect sustainable change.

4.2. Community knowledge of efforts

This dimension is concerned with the extent to which the community members have knowledge of the efforts discussed above in the dimension *community efforts*. A great deal of the community's knowledge is based on hearsay. Consider the following statements:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice007	Key informant	“There has been thought of and spoken about and rumoured about”
❖ Voice008	Key informant	“’n Ou hoor baie dinge wat in die dorp, in die gemeenskap aan die gang is” (A person hears about many things that are going on in the town and in the community)

Despite the many rumours in the community, it would appear that the community is very knowledgeable about existing efforts, as can be seen from the following statement: “they know something is being done” (Voice017, key informant). The community is also knowledgeable about the absence of (any) efforts, as is evident from statements such as:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice007	Key informant	“They know that nothing is being done”
❖ Voice020c	Town focus group	“Ek glo baie weet [dat niks gedoen word nie] want dis hoekom hulle die munisipaliteit afgebrand het” (I think many know [that nothing is being done], that's why they burned down the municipality)

Although the community is knowledgeable about the efforts by external agents, particularly those of WB-Noka, the community is not informed of the reasons why these undertakings have not been fulfilled. This is largely attributed to a lack of communication between the leaders, such as the municipality and the community. Although some participants felt that there were communication channels between the municipality and the community, other participants felt that the communication channels were insufficient to discuss the issues

in the community. In some cases there seemed to be a complete lack of communication. This is evident from the following statements:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice018	Key informant	“ <i>Ons [gemeenskapslede] hou meetings met hulle [die munisipaliteit] [...] so elke drie maande</i> ” (We [community members] hold meetings with them [the municipality] [...] about every three months)
❖ Voice008	Key informant	“ <i>Daar word nie genoeg [...] kommunikasiekanale geskep</i> ” (There aren’t enough [...] communication channels created)
❖ Voice007	Key informant	“Not one question has ever been answered about WB-Noka”
❖ Voice009c	Township focus group	“They don’t voice out the reason, the people who want to help us”

There is also an indication that information given by the municipality to the formal town differs from information given to the township, in the sense that information is withheld at the discretion of the municipality. It was stated that when the municipality calls a community meeting, the meeting is segregated between the town and the township. “They [the municipality] have a meeting for Waterval Boven, the town, and then they have a meeting for eMgwenya [...]. [They] do it because there are things down there [the township] that they [the municipality] don’t want them [the township] to know” (Voice007).

When community members want to obtain information about efforts, difficulties are encountered such as conflict elicited, no action taken, or the responsibility being placed on WB-Noka. Consider, for example, the following statements:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice009b	Township focus group	“If we ask that then it provoke. They start a fight”
❖ Voice020a	Town focus group	“ <i>As jy navrae doen [...] word daar net vir jou gesê ‘ja, ons stuur iemand</i> ” (If you enquire [...] you are told ‘yes, we’ll send someone’)
❖ Voice009a	Township focus group	“ <i>Hulle [die munisipaliteit] sê Noka het gepromise dat eendag sy sal terugkom by Boven om Boven te kom mooi maak</i> ” (They [the municipality] say that Noka promised that she will one day come back to Boven to make Boven beautiful)

Another factor that contributes to the lack of communication within the community is the poor attendance of community meetings as well as the unwillingness of the community members to attend the community meetings. This is evident from the following statements:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice007	Key informant	“Hardly anyone comes”
❖ Voice008	Key informant	“Die ouens is nie meer bereid om betrokke te raak nie” (The community members are not willing to get involved any more)

The scoring process in terms of the dimension *community knowledge of efforts* is provided in Table 4.2.1 in which the first five statements of the anchor rating scale for the dimension *community knowledge of efforts* are given.

Table 4.2.1 Data evaluation of Community knowledge of efforts

Dimension B: Community knowledge of the efforts		Data Evaluation		
Score	Qualitative statement	Key Informant Interview	Township Focus Group	Town Focus Group
1.	Community has no knowledge of the need for efforts addressing the issue.	Exceed	Exceed	Exceed
2.	Community has no knowledge about efforts addressing the issue.	Exceed	Exceed	Exceed
3.	A few members of the community have heard about efforts, but the extent of their knowledge is limited.	Exceed	Does not exceed	Does not exceed
4.	Some members of the community know about local efforts.	Does not exceed	-	-
5.	Members of the community have basic knowledge about local efforts (e.g., purpose).	-	-	-

From Table 4.2.1 it can be seen that the key informant interview score is 4. This is the calculated average score for the five key informant interviews (see Table 4.8.1). Both focus groups were awarded a score of 3. The reason for the difference in the scores is that most of the

key informants described the community as having basic knowledge about the efforts (consider Voice017 and Voice018), whereas some key informants described the community as having no knowledge or very limited knowledge of the issues in the community (consider Voice007 and Voice008).

In light of the discussion above it seems that some members of the community know about local efforts, but the extent of their knowledge is limited because of various communication issues in the community.

4.3. Leadership

The dimension *leadership* is concerned with the extent to which leaders and influential members of the community support the efforts to address the issue(s).

From the data it appears that there are no clear and definite leaders in the community. Some participants emphatically answered “no, none” (Voice007, key informant), “*nee*” ‘no’ (Voice020a, town focus group) when asked whether there are community leaders. Other participants attributed leadership to the municipality and the political leaders. In most of the interviews the municipality and chairpersons of community forums and prominent community members were considered community leaders. However, an issue with the community forums and prominent community members was that community members did not know who to turn to regarding issues in the community because one day it is this ‘leader’ and the next day it is another ‘leader’. Consider the following statements in this regard:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice009a	Township focus group	<p>“<i>Daarso hy kan nie mooi kom nie want almal baklei vir daarso. Net soos die mense kry geld... maar ons weet nie mooi nie. Maar vandag jy kry hierdie groep. Ander dag dis hierdie groep. So dan jy kan nie verstaan watter een moet... As jy probleem het om saam te praat, jy sien, hulle's so.</i>”</p> <p>(You can't know that accurately because everyone is fighting for leadership. When people get money... but we do not know enough. But today you get this group. Another day it's this group. So you cannot understand which one, if you have an issue, to talk to, you see. They're like that.) (Idiomatic translation)</p>

There are, however, a number of people who fulfil leadership positions in the community, such as the school principal. Some leadership positions, such as the chairperson of the Rate Payers Association, a community forum created by members of the community, as

well as members of the community who get together to discuss efforts with the aim to address issues, are done on a voluntary basis⁴.

The leaders, especially the municipality, are aware of the issues but participants perceive that they disregard the issues. Consider the following statement:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice007	Key informant	“the people [...] that are supposed to be defending and looking after this town have turned their back on this town [...] they [the municipality] are either unwilling or incapable”

A number of reasons for the apparent disregard by leaders with respect to community issues became evident in the data. These include a lack of resources, the structure of the municipality, shifting the responsibility to WB-Noka, and dishonesty among municipal leaders. Evidence from the data for each of these aspects is provided below.

Leaders are inhibited by a lack of resources. This view is supported by the following opinions:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice006	Key informant	<i>“what is inhibiting them not to do... they are suppose... maybe it is financial budget constraints and land actually [...] they tell the community we cannot do because we don't have enough”</i>
❖ Voice008	Key informant	<i>“Hulle [die leiers] staan by 'n blokkasie”</i> (They [the leaders] are standing at a blockage)
❖ Voice020c	Town focus group	<i>“Hulle is bekommerd maar hulle hande is ook afgekap”</i> (They are worried but their hands are tied)

The structure of the municipality also contributes to municipal leaders turning a blind eye to pressing community issues, because the municipality is structured in such a way that it is responsible for service delivery to a number of widely geographically spread settlements, namely the settlements of eMgwenya, Belfast, Dullstroom and Machadodorp. This fact necessitates that available municipal resources such as tools, equipment and road equipment have to be shared among the designated settlements. The effect of this situation on the eMgwenya community is that nothing gets done. Consider the following statements:

⁴ Direct quotations are not given in this passage in order to protect the confidentiality of the participants.

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice020c	Town focus group	<p>“Dit [die gereedskap] kom van die een munisipaliteit na hierdie en toe een dan is dit stukkend of so iets”</p> <p>(It [the equipment/tools] comes from the one municipality to this one and then it is broken or something like that)</p>
❖ Voice009a	Township focus group	<p>“... al ons tools, soos hierso ons bly by Boven, jy't gesien dit gekyk hierdie kant. Daar's plastiek sakkies by die deur die hele pad. Ons het ons trok hierso maar as jy vra hulle moet elke Maandag die vuilgoeters optel of Donderdag of Vrydag vandag. Daar's nie trok'ie. Die trok is by Belfast.”</p> <p>(... all our tools, like here in Boven, you saw what it looked like this side. There's little plastic bags everywhere. We have a truck here but if you ask them... they must come and pick up the rubbish every Monday or Thursday or Friday today. There's no truck. The truck is at Belfast.)</p>
❖ Voice020a	Town focus group	<p>“Hulle het vir my gesê hulle is besig met dit maar hulle wag vir die... Die back actor om hier te kom oop grou [...]. Hulle moet nou 'n back actor kry en die back actor moet van Belfast af kom.”</p> <p>(They [the municipality] told me that they are busy with it but they are waiting for... the back actor to come and dig here [...]. They must get a back actor and the back actor must come from Belfast.)</p>

In terms of shifting the responsibility to WB-Noka as a reason for leaders to disregard the issues in the community, it was stated that “as jy gaan warra-warra oor jou huis daarso by die stadsraad hulle sê ‘Noka het gepromise, Noka gaan kom’” ‘if you go and warra-warra [complain] about your house at the municipality they say ‘Noka promised, Noka is going to come’” (Voice009a).

There is a strong indication in the data that leaders are regarded as being dishonest and only support efforts that benefit themselves rather than address the issues in the community. This is illustrated by the following statements:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice008	Key informant	<p>“As dit in hulle eie belang is, ja. As dit in die breër belang is, nee, glad nie”</p> <p>(If it is in their own interest, yes. If it is in for the broader interest, no, not at all)</p>
❖ Voice009d	Township focus group	<p>“The problem is they [the leaders] get the money then they forget about us”</p>
❖ Voice020b	Town focus group	<p>“So almal weet die geld word gesteel en almal praat daaroor”</p> <p>(So everyone knows that the money is being stolen and everybody talks about it)</p>

Scoring in terms of the dimension *leadership* is provided in Table 4.3.1 below, in which the first three statements of the anchor rating scale for the dimension *leadership* are provided.

Table 4.3.1 Data evaluation of Leadership

Dimension C: Leadership (includes appointed leaders & influential community members)		Data Evaluation		
Score	Qualitative statement	Key Informant Interview	Township Focus Group	Town Focus Group
1.	Leadership has no recognition of the issue.	Exceed	Does not exceed	Does not exceed
2.	Leadership believes that this is not an issue in their community.	Does not exceed	-	-
3.	Leader(s) recognize(s) the need to do something regarding the issue.	-	-	-

The data presented in terms of the dimension *leadership* indicates that the formal and political leaders have no recognition of the issue, or they believe that it is not their responsibility to address the issue. In line with the statements of the anchor rating scale, a score of 1 was awarded for the township focus group and the town focus group. The data from the key informant interviews indicated that a minority of leaders recognise the issues in the community, but that their attempt(s) to support the efforts to address these issues are extremely impeded by various factors, as discussed above. For this reason, the key informant interview score is 2. This score is the rounded down score from 2.4, which is the calculated average score for the five key informant interviews (see Table 4.8.1).

4.4. Community climate

This dimension is concerned with the community's attitude or mindset, such as helplessness or responsibility, toward the issue(s). The community has been waiting a long time for the *eMgwenya Urban Renewal Project* to commence. They anticipated many positive changes, but the anticipation has remained too long and has turned into hopelessness, distrust and despondency. This is clear when the following statements are considered:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice006	Key informant	"They are happy but they agonise who come once who don't fulfil that promise whilst they think that person is not fulfilling that promise maybe, like the group you spoke of, when did they start promising?"
❖ Voice007	Key informant	"Here was great jubilation when WB-Noka came riding into town [...]. Now the people feel even more helpless than they did"
❖ Voice008	Key informant	" <i>Mense raak opgewonde net om weer teleurgesteld te raak</i> " (People got excited only to be disappointed again)

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice018	Key informant	“ <i>WB-Noka het nou al bietjie lank gevat [...] Dis nou al vier jaar wat [iets] sou gebeur het</i> ” (WB-Noka has taken a bit long [...]. It’s now been four years that [something] would have happened)
❖ Voice009a	Township focus group	“ <i>En nou ons grootste probleem is ons wag nog steeds vir WB-Noka</i> ” (And now our biggest problem is we are still waiting for WB-Noka)
❖ Voice020c	Town focus group	“ <i>Ek dink daar is wel ’n gevoel van moedeloosheid [...] nie teenoor die mense nie [maar teenoor] die dienste en daai goed</i> ” (I think there is definitely a feeling of despondency [...] not towards the people [but towards] the services and those things)

In other words, the community does not take responsibility for the issue because they were told that external agents would assist them, and a sense of helplessness prevails. This is evident when the following statements are considered:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice007	Key informant	“They feel helpless [...] now there is apathy in this town”
❖ Voice008	Key informant	“ <i>...want baie van die situasies is dat armoede so groot geraak het</i> ” (...because many of the situations is that poverty has gotten out of hand)
❖ Voice017	Key informant	“They have the mentality that the ‘government must give it to them’”
❖ Voice009a	Township focus group	“ <i>Almal wag vir daai ding [WB-Noka] om the kom</i> ” (everybody is waiting for that thing [WB-Noka] to come)

A participant (Voice008, key informant) particularly stated that the community has an attitude of helplessness rather than a sense of responsibility towards the issues.

In contrast to the view that the community has a sense of helplessness there is also a view that the community has a sense of responsibility toward the issues, as stated: “they [the community members] are helping really helping themselves [...] they make [a] plan for themselves” (Voice006, key informant). Community members take responsibility by helping and providing funds, volunteering and also providing tools and equipment. Consider the following statements in this regard:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice018	Key informant	“ <i>Ons het nou baie nuwe intrekkers ook wat handjie bysit. Wat bietjie kapitaal het. Help goed koop en alles</i> ” (We currently have lots of new residents who are helping. That have a bit of capital. Helps buy things and everything)
❖ Voice020a	Town focus group	“ <i>As daar iets stukkend of gebreek is soos 'n waterlyn, vat ons vir hulle [die munisiplaiteit] 'n generator uit, ons gee vir hulle grinder disks, ons help waar ons kan</i> ” (If anything is broken like a waterline, we take a generator to them [the municipality], we give them grinder discs, we help where we can)

Although certain community members take responsibility for the issues in the community, resources still remain a strong inhibiting factor, which may explain the sense of helplessness that is experienced by some community members. As stated above, poverty is an enormous issue in the community because of a lack of employment opportunities. When participants were asked what makes it difficult for the community members to take responsibility for the issues, the answers were emphatically “work” (which includes finances) and “houses”. Consider the following statements:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice006	Key informant	“... are struggling with... jobs is a problem, ja... uhm... place where to reside is also a problem, really”
❖ Voice007	Key informant	“lack of employment opportunities”
❖ Voice008	Key informant	“ <i>werksgeleenthede</i> ” (job opportunities)
❖ Voice018	Key informant	“ <i>Ek dink maar die groot probleem hierso is finansies. Veral die afgetrede spoorwegwerkers</i> ” (I think the big problem here is finances. Especially the retired railway workers)
❖ Voice009Chorum	Township focus group	“work and houses”
❖ Voice020a	Town focus group	“ <i>Die ding waarmee die mense die meeste in die dorp sukkel is werkloosheid</i> ” (The thing that people in town are struggling with the most is unemployment)

There are also two contrasting views regarding the sense of community within the data. On the one hand participants stated that they live very isolated from one another and that a sense of community is absent. It was indicated that not enough opportunities are created to foster a sense of community. Another factor which may contribute to the lack of sense of community is

the segregation between the town and the township, which is “also not good” (Voice007, key informant). The community is still segregated in terms of race, and the white people are considered “still very conservative” (Voice017, key informant). Consider the following statements:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice007	Key informant	they're all just like [...] little rats in their own little holes [...] up here [the town] there is no feeling of community
❖ Voice008	Key informant	<p><i>“Elkeen raak [...] selfgesentreerd om sy eie belange te beskerm [...] en die gevoel van gemeenskap het verlore geraak [...] daar's darem 'n samekoms van... en 'n geleentheid wat geskep word en ek dink nie daar word genoeg in die dorp sigself gedoen nie”</i></p> <p>(Everyone becomes [...] self-centred to protect their own interest [...] and the sense of community] is lost [...] at least there is a gathering of... and an opportunity that is created, and I don't think there is enough done in the town itself)</p>

On the other hand, participants indicated that there is a strong sense of community. The community is a close-knit community where everyone knows everyone else. Also, in times of need their neighbour is their best source of help. This is evident from the following statements:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice018	Key informant	<i>“Ons gemeenskappie werk nogal goed saam”</i> (Our little community works well together)
❖ Voice009a	Township focus group	<i>“Ons ken [elk]een mekaar hierso by Boven. Dis een familie, swart en wit. Ons ken almal [by hulle] name”</i> (We know each other here in Boven. It's one family, black and white. We know everyone by name)
❖ Voice020a	Town focus group	<i>“Iets wat die dorp eintlik uniek maak is omdat ons... omdat dit so klein gemeenskap is almal ken almal”</i> (Something that makes this town unique is because we... because it is such a small community everyone knows everyone)
❖ Voice020b	Town focus group	<i>“Jou buurman gaan jou meer hulp gee as wat jy by die munisipaliteit gaan kry”</i> (Your neighbour is going to offer you more help than what you would get at the municipality)

The scoring process in terms of the dimension *community climate* is provided in Table 4.4.1 in which the first five statements of the anchor rating scale for the dimension *community climate* are given.

Table 4.4.1 Data evaluation of community climate

Dimension D: Community climate		Data Evaluation		
Score	Qualitative statement	Key Informant Interview	Township Focus Group	Town Focus Group
1.	The prevailing attitude is that the issues are not considered, unnoticed or overlooked within the community. "It's just not our concern."	Exceed	Exceed	Exceed
2.	The prevailing attitude is "There's nothing we can do," or "Only 'those' people do that," or "We don't think it should change".	Exceed	Does not exceed	Exceed
3.	Community climate is neutral, disinterested, or believes that the issue does not affect – the community as a whole.	Does not exceed	-	Exceed
4.	The attitude in the community is now beginning to reflect interest in the issue. "We have to do something, but we don't know what to do."	-	-	Exceed
5.	The attitude in the community is "we are concerned about this," and community members are beginning to reflect modest support for efforts.	-	-	Does not exceed

From Table 4.4.1 it can be seen that the key informant interview score is 3. This score is the rounded down score from 3.6 which is the calculated average score for the five key informant interviews (see Table 4.8.1). The township focus group was awarded a score of 2 and the town focus group was awarded a score of 5.

The data of the key informant interviews shows a spectrum of contrasting perspectives. On the one hand, some participants provided a positive notion about the community's climate, as represented by the statements given above (see Voice006, Voice17 and Voice018). These statements give the notion that community members start moderate support efforts but they are not always sure what to do and are impeded by resources.

On the other hand, some participants provide a negative notion about the community's climate. The community is described as despondent and helpless and that the community members live very isolated from one another. This is evident from the statements above (see Voice007 and Voice008). Also consider the following:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice007	Key informant	“Now the people in the town are more depressed now than they were before [...] all very isolated [...] they feel that helplessness”
❖ Voice008	Key informant	“...iemand moet iets vir my gee [...] die mense het nie meer die vrymoedigheid om bymekaar uit te kom nie” (...somebody has to give me something [...] people don't have the confidence any more to get together)

Taking cognisance of the discussion above in terms of anchor rating statement 3, i.e. *community climate is neutral, disinterested, or believes that the issue does not affect the community as a whole* is not regarded as an accurate reflection of the community's climate in terms of the key informant interview data. The reason for this may be attributed to the fact that scores are rounded down (see the discussion in 5.4). The calculated average score for the key informant interviews is 3.6 which was rounded down to 3 (see Table 4.8.1). In light of the discussion above it is considered more applicable to describe the community's climate with a score of 4. In other words, the prevailing attitude in this group of stakeholders is that the community shows an interest in the issues but is unsure of what to do about them.

In the township focus group data, strong emphasis was placed on an external agent to address the issues in the community and to provide the necessary resources. For this reason the prevailing attitude in this group of stakeholders was considered to be 'there's nothing we can do'. This is evident when considering the statements above (see Voice009) as well as the following:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice009a	Township focus group	“Hulle [die munisipaliteit] sê Noka het gepromise dat eendag sy sal terugkom by Boven om Boven te kom mooi maak” (They [the municipality] say that Noka promised that she will one day come back to Boven to make Boven beautiful)

In the town focus group data, the notion of the community's climate reflects an attitude of concern and community members produce moderate efforts to address these issues. Community members show concern toward one another and to the issues in the community. This is evident from the statements given above (see Voice020). Also consider the following statements:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice020a	Town focus group	“ <i>Hierdie nogal 'n redelike gehegte gemeenskap</i> ” (This is quite a close community)
❖ Voice020c	Town focus group	“ <i>As jy so bietjie in die moeilikheid trap daar is mense wat jou sal help</i> ” (If you are in a bit of trouble there are people who will help you)
❖ Voice020b	Town focus group	“ <i>Ons [is] 'n close gemeenskap [...]</i> ” (We are a close community)

The contrasting information received in terms of community climate clarifies the contrasting scores obtained in terms of each respective group of stakeholders. The contrasting perspectives regarding the community’s climate makes it difficult to give an exact description of the prevailing attitude towards the issues in the community. On the one hand there appears to be an attitude that “there’s nothing we can do and WB-Noka (or someone else) must help us”. On the other hand, the attitude in the community is that the issues are a concern and that modest support for efforts is considered.

4.5. Community knowledge of issues

This dimension concerns the extent to which the community has knowledge of the issues, and the accessibility and availability of information regarding the issues.

The community knowledge of the issues is evident, “people just have to look outside the window” (Voice007, key informant). Almost all the participants indicated that the community is very knowledgeable about the issues in the community and that the knowledge regarding the issues extends beyond the community and the town. This is evident from the following:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice006	Key informant	“They know they have these problems”
❖ Voice018	Key informant	“ <i>Ag, 80% weet van die probleem</i> ” (Ag, 80% of them know about the problems)
❖ Voice009b	Township focus group	“Eh (yes) they do”
❖ Voice020c	Town focus group	“ <i>Almal weet dit. Dis nie net Boven se mense nie</i> ” (Everyone knows about it. It is not just Boven’s people)

However, access to formal information regarding the issues in the community is lacking. The community can get information at the municipality but the accuracy of this information is doubted. Consider the following statements in this regard:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice007	Key informant	“The people have access to information on nothing [...] there is no communication”
❖ Voice006	Key informant	“I think the municipality knows”
❖ Voice017	Key informant	“You can go to the municipality to find out about the issues”
❖ Voice020a	Town focus group	<p><i>“Jy kan seker maar by die munisipaliteit gaan aanvra. Maar uhm... as jy iemand gaan kry wat vir jou die regte antwoorde gaan gee is ’n ander kwessie”</i></p> <p>(You can probably go enquire at the municipality. But uhm ... Whether you're going to find someone who will give you the right answer is another matter)</p>

The most accessible information is obtained via word of mouth. The participants indicated that the best way to gain information about the issues in the community is talk to the various businesses and people in the community. Although there is an information centre in eMgwenya, the centre may not be able to give information regarding the issues in the community. Representative comments include:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice008	Key informant	<p><i>“Ek het maar met die mense, besighede begin praat”</i></p> <p>(I started talking to the people [and] the businesses)</p>
❖ Voice009a	Township focus group	<p><i>“...om saam met die mense te praat”</i></p> <p>(...to talk with the people)</p>
❖ Voice020a	Town focus group	<p><i>“Hulle [die inligtingsentrum] gaan vir jou inligting gee van gastehuisse... hier is nie ’n inligtingsforum wat jou inligting gaan gee van finansies of behuising of sulke goed nie”</i></p> <p>(They [the information centre] are going to give you information about guesthouses [...] there is no information forum that will give you information about finances or housing or those kind of things)</p>

The community’s knowledge regarding the issues is also hindered due to the lack of communication, as was discussed in 4.2. This fact is emphasised by the following statements:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice007	Key informant	“There is no channel of communication in this town”

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice008	Key informant	<p>“<i>Ek dink dit is inligting, inligting en kennis wat nie reg gekanaliseer word nie</i>”</p> <p>(I think it is information, information and knowledge that is not being channelled correctly)</p>

The scoring process in terms of the dimension *community knowledge of the issues* is provided in Table 4.5.1 in which the first five statements of the anchor rating scale for the dimension *community knowledge of the issues* are given.

Table 4.5.1 Data evaluation of community knowledge of issues

Dimension E: Community knowledge of the issues		Data Evaluation		
Score	Qualitative statement	Key Informant Interview	Township Focus Group	Town Focus Group
1.	Not viewed as an issue.	Exceed	Exceed	Exceed
2.	No knowledge about the issue.	Exceed	Exceed	Exceed
3.	A few in the community have some knowledge about the issue.	Exceed	Exceed	Exceed
4.	Some community members recognize the signs and symptoms of this issue, but information is lacking.	Exceed	Does not exceed	Does not exceed
5.	Community members know that the signs and symptoms of this issue occur locally, and general information is available.	Does not exceed	-	-

From Table 4.5.1 the score for the key informant interviews is 5. This score is the calculated average score for the five key informant interviews (see Table 4.8.1). The township focus group and town focus group were awarded a score of 4 each. The reason for the difference in scores can be attributed to prominent comments in the township and town focus group data stating that access to formal information is limited (consider the comments of Voice009 and Voice020 above). Therefore, the township and town focus group did not entirely reflect the statement presented in statement 5 of the anchor rating scale.

From the discussion above and interpretation of the scores it is concluded that community members are knowledgeable about the issues and general information is available,

but that formal and accurate information is lacking. The main cause of this situation seems to be a lack of communication between the community and the municipality.

4.6. Resources

‘Resources’ refers to the extent to which people, time, money and space are available to address the issue(s). The presentation above shows that the lack of available resources is an enormously inhibiting factor in that it inhibits the efforts put forward by community members and the leaders to address the issues in the community. It also influences the community climate. Participants report that people feel helpless because they have limited resources with which to implement changes.

The most prevalent shortage of resources is finance, expressed as follows:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice018	Key informant	“Die groot probleem hierso is finansies” (The big problem here is finances)

This can be attributed to a number of reasons. In the first instance, the shortage of finance can be attributed to the socio-economic situation in the community. There is a low level of economy in eMgwenya. Participants attributed this to the placement of the Machado Toll Plaza, as can be seen from the following statements:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice018	Key informant	“There is no economy left in this town [...] it is cut-off economically and socially from the rest of Mpumalanga [...] the placement of that tollgate [...] the decision to place that tollgate in that position has effectively cut this town off”
❖ Voice020a	Town focus group	“Hierdie tolhek is baie duur [...] hy’t ons keel afgesny” (This tollgate is very expensive [...] it has cut our throat)

The Machado Toll Plaza is the second most expensive tollgate in South Africa and is located very near the entrance of eMgwenya. Consequently, traffic diverts away from eMgwenya to avoid the toll. For this reason the toll has had a serious impact on eMgwenya’s economy because participants indicated that now tourists do not frequent eMgwenya. The toll also impacts the functioning of the municipality because the municipality does not have sufficient funds to travel through the tollgate more than twice a month. This is evident from the following statements:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice007	Key informant	“They [the municipality] cannot afford to come through the tollgate more than twice a month”
❖ Voice008	Key informant	“Die tolhek is 'n groot oorsaak van kostes” (The toll is a major cause of costs)
❖ Voice018	Key informant	“...tweede duurste tolhek in Suid Afrika” (...second most expensive tollgate in South Africa)
❖ Voice020c	Town focus group	“Hier's te min voete” (There are too few feet)

In the second instance, the shortage of finances can be attributed to the fact that a large proportion of the community are pensioners with limited finances. Statements that support this are as follows:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice007	Key informant	“The largest [...] income earner is the pensioner in this town”
❖ Voice008	Key informant	“Hier is vreeslik baie pensioenarisse” (There are many pensioners here)

Other factors mentioned by participants that contribute to the shortage of finance are:

1. The structure of the municipality (see the discussion in 4.1) – resources are allocated rather to Belfast and Dullstroom, and not to eMgwenya;
2. The shift of responsibility from the municipality to WB-Noka (see the discussion in 4.2 and 4.3) - The municipality is waiting for WB-Noka and therefore does not allocate funds to eMgwenya.
3. The indication that the community leaders, especially the municipality, are dishonest (see the discussion in 4.3) – it seems that available funds are stolen.
4. A lack of employment opportunities (see the discussion in 4.4).

Another resource that was highlighted by the participants as extremely deficient is housing. A shortage of land and the environmental design impedes efforts to construct new houses since it is too expensive to build on the mountains. This is evident from the following statements:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice006	Key informant	“An inhibiting factor is the [...] environmental design... its mountainous”
❖ Voice017	Key informant	“There is no land to expand the town. It is too expensive to build on Noord- and Suidheuwel”

Other resources that were highlighted by the participants as extremely deficient are tabulated below:

Resource	Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ water quality and quantity	Voice020a	Town focus group	“ <i>Ons sit kort-kort sonder water [...] die water gehalte is glad nie goed nie</i> ” (We are regularly without water [...] the water quality is not good at all)
❖ the condition of the roads	Voice020c	Town focus group	“ <i>Die paaie is 'n groot probleem</i> ” (The roads are a major problem)
❖ alternate roads that bypass the tollgate	Voice007	Key informant	“It's like in a bad state of repair”
❖ equipment	Voice009a	Township focus group	“ <i>Daar's nie trok 'ie. Die trok is by Belfast</i> ” (There's no truck. The truck is at Belfast)
❖ knowledge	Voice009a	Township focus group	“ <i>Ek dink in 'n mate ook die know-how</i> ” (I think to a certain extent also the know-how)

Some limited resources are, however, available in the community, both internally and externally. Internal resources include churches and welfare organisations. Consider the following statements:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice007	Key informant	“There's quite a large religious community”
❖ Voice008	Key informant	“ <i>As dit nie vir die kerke en vir die welsyn organisasies is nie, dan sal dit baie slegter gaan met baie, baie mense in die gemeenskap</i> ” (If it were not for the churches and welfare organizations then it will be much worse for many, many people in the community)

The community members are also a resource in themselves. As discussed above, there are many new residents in the community who assist by volunteering and providing funds. There are also community members who form lift clubs to travel to either Nelspruit, Witbank or Middelburg do to grocery shopping. Collecting and removal of garbage is done by

community members using their own vehicles. Other community members pilot projects to get funding for a new school fence. Consider the following statements:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice018	Key informant	<p><i>“Een keer ’n maand maak hulle sulke groepies en dan koop hulle... Doen hulle inkopies [...]dienste beskikbaar gestel, bakkies gery en die vullis kom oplaai”</i></p> <p>(Once a month they make these groups and then they buy... They go shopping [...] made their services available, drove bakkies and came to pick up the garbage)</p>
❖ Voice008	Key informant	<p><i>“... loods ook projekte. Soos ons is nou besig by die skool om te kyk of ons kan borge kry want die skool het ook nie ’n ordentlike heining nie”</i></p> <p>(... also pilot projects. Like we are now working with the school to see if we can get sponsors because the school also does not have a decent fence)</p>

eMgwenya also has a physical resource in the sense that it has a scenic and beautiful environment, as is seen from the following statements:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice007	Key informant	<p>“It’s beautiful! It’s got heritage. It’s beautiful”</p>
❖ Voice008	Key informant	<p><i>“Dis ’n mooi uitsig. Dis mooi gedeelte. Dit het historiese waarde”</i></p> <p>(It’s a beautiful view. It’s a beautiful part. It has historical value)</p>
❖ Voice020b	Town Focus group	<p><i>“Dit is vir my ’n verskriklike mooi omgewing hierso”</i></p> <p>(It is, to me, a very beautiful environment here)</p>

External resources include Trans African Concessions (Trac), who assisted with the maintenance work of the grass; Nkomati Mine, which constructed houses and roads in the community; Sappi Ltd, who tested the water quality; and the Ubuntu group that run a soup kitchen and remove the garbage. This is evident from the following statements:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice006	Key informant	<p>“Trac the company that maintain the N road, the N4 road. You know they assist us”</p>
❖ Voice017	Key informant	<p>“Nkomati mine has built roads in eMgwenya”</p>
❖ Voice018	Key informant	<p><i>“Hulle [Sappi] toets ons water elke week. So en dan hulle kan dadelik sien as daar riool inloop. Ons rioolwerke is langs die rivier”</i></p> <p>(They [Sappi] test our water every week. So then they can immediately see if there is sewerage. Our sewage works is along the river)</p>
❖ Voice009a	Township focus group	<p>“Now they [Ubuntu] are having a kitchen in the [...] town hall there on the other side of town [...] They just barge in and clean it”</p>

The scoring process in terms of the dimension *resources* is provided in the Table 4.6.1 in which the first four statements of the anchor rating scale for the dimension *resources* are given.

Table 4.6.1 Data evaluation of resources

Dimension F: Resources		Data Evaluation		
Score	Qualitative statement	Key Informant Interview	Township Focus Group	Town Focus Group
1.	There is no awareness of the need for resources to deal with this issue.	Exceed	Exceed	Exceed
2.	There are no resources available for dealing with the issue.	Exceed	Exceed	Exceed
3.	The community is not sure what it would take, (or where the resources would come from) to initiate efforts.	Does not exceed	Does not exceed	Does not exceed
4.	The community has individuals, organizations, and/or space available that could be used as resources.	-	-	-

From Table 4.6.1 the score for the key informant interviews is 3. This score is the calculated average score for the five key informant interviews (see Table 4.8.1). The township focus group and town focus group were awarded a score of 3. This shows an agreement regarding the resources across all three groups of stakeholders. From the discussion above it is clear that even though there are resources in the community, these resources are not sufficient to affect sustainable change. For this reason it is concluded that, in line with statement 3 of the anchor rating scale, the community is not sure where the resources will come from to initiate efforts.

4.7. Effects of the promise

This theme concerns the effect on the community of WB-Noka's failure to meet the undertakings as set out in the *eMgwenya Urban Renewal Project*.

The prospect of the *eMgwenya Urban Renewal Project* created excitement and anticipation which is evident from the following statements:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice006	Key informant	“If one says I am coming to rescue there is no way to... you will be happy”
❖ Voice007	Key informant	“There was jubilation when WB-Noka came riding into town [...] they then built up the hope of everyone in this town”

The joy that was experienced in the community can be attributed to the perception among community members that the *eMgwenya Urban Renewal Project* would solve their problems or “rescue” (Voice006) them. Many statements from the data attest to this perception:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice006	Key informant	“They think that their problem will be solved”
❖ Voice007	Key informant	“The solution came, in their hearts, five years ago with talk of WB-Noka”
❖ Voice008	Key informant	“ <i>Almal het hierdie verwagting gehad hier kom WB-Noka, ons gaan werksgeleenthede hê, ons gaan alles...</i> ” (Everyone had this expectation here comes WB-Noka, we will have jobs, we will [have] everything...)

The fact that the project has not commenced to date, has led to feelings of anxiousness and even disappointment and depression. This is clear when the following statements are considered:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice007	Key informant	“Now the people of the town are more depressed now than they were before”
❖ Voice008	Key informant	“ <i>Almal het hierdie verwagting gehad hier kom WB-Noka, ons gaan werksgeleenthede hê, ons gaan alles... En jaar na jaar...</i> ” (Everyone had this expectation here comes WB-Noka, we will have jobs, we will [have] everything all. And year after year...)
❖ Voice018	Key informant	“ <i>Seker maar teleurgesteld want hier sou soveel goed gebeur het. En hier gebeur niks nie</i> ” (Probably disappointed because so many things would have happened here. And nothing happens here)
❖ Voice009a	Township Focus group	“ <i>En nou ons grootste probleem is ons wag nog steeds vir WB-Noka</i> ” (And now our biggest problem is we are still waiting for WB-Noka)

The feelings of disappointment and disillusionment led to feelings of distrust. When the participants were asked how the community would feel about receiving external help they answered:

Speaker	Stakeholder group	Comment
❖ Voice007	Key informant	“Complete distrust”
❖ Voice008	Key informant	“...wantrouig. As gevolg van teleurstellings in die verlede dink ek sê hulle ‘oh dis nog ‘n fly-by-night soos hulle maar praat’” (...distrustful. As a result of disappointments in the past I think they say ‘oh it’s another fly-by-night the way they talk’)
❖ Voice009a	Township Focus group	“Hulle het al baie gepraat; kan nie iemand trust nie” (They have already talked a lot; can’t trust anyone)

This data presented above confirms the discussion in 2.6.3 that the community’s trust in the *eMgwenya Urban Renewal Project* and the municipality has eroded, which means that the promise to renew eMgwenya has negatively impacted on the community’s social capital.

In 4.2 and 4.3 the transferral of the responsibility for municipal services and the development of eMgwenya to WB-Noka was discussed. This issue is raised here again, as it has relevance for the dimension *effects of the promise*. The municipality does not develop eMgwenya because it was promised to be undertaken by WB-Noka at the signing of the PPP agreement to renew eMgwenya, and “that is why they never spent and decided not to spend a single cent, in five years, on this town”. The failure to meet the undertakings made in the *eMgwenya Urban Renewal Project* also had a negative effect on the community’s resources (see discussion in 4.6)

The discussion regarding the *effects of the promise* concludes the discussion of the findings of the data and the scores awarded to the individual dimensions of the Community Readiness Model. In the following section the significant scores, such as the highest and lowest dimension score, as well as the significant scores in terms of the overall calculated scores for each dimension is presented and discussed. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the overall scores in terms of the community’s capacity to change.

4.8. Highest and Lowest scores in terms of individual dimensions

At the outset of this study, it was stated that the scoring for the three different stakeholder groups would be done individually in order to highlight similarities or differences between the three groups of stakeholders. Possible reasons for the different scores were discussed in 4.1 to 4.6.

It is, however, also necessary to gain a view of the overall scores across the three groups of stakeholders in terms of each dimension, in order to gain a view of each dimension’s role in

the community's capacity to change. Table 4.8.1 presents the scores for each dimension, as well as the overall score for each respective group of stakeholders.

Table 4.8.1 Dimension scores and overall score per group of stakeholders

	Key Informant Interviews	Township Focus Group	Town Focus Group
Dimension A: Community efforts	3,6	2	3
Dimension B: Community knowledge of efforts	4	3	3
Dimension C: Leadership	2,4	1	1
Dimension D: Community climate	3,6	2	5
Dimension E: Community Knowledge of issues	5	4	4
Dimension F: Resources	3	3	3
Total Overall Score	<u>3,6</u>	<u>2,50</u>	<u>3,17</u>

The key informant interviews and the township focus group scored highest on *community knowledge of issues*. Although community members are aware of the issues, knowledge of the issues is mostly obtained through word of mouth. Accurate and formal information is difficult to obtain because there are not sufficient communication channels between the community and the municipality and/or external agents.

The town focus group scored highest on *community climate* and second highest on *community knowledge of issues*. The reason for this difference may be attributed to the various contrasting perspectives regarding the community's climate within the data. From the town focus group's statements it seems that the issues are a concern and modest support for efforts is considered. The community climate in the township focus group rated low. They may not experience such co-operation to address their issues. On the other hand, from the key informant interviews and township focus group's statements, it seems that the community needs an external agent to help them.

All three groups of stakeholders scored lowest on *leadership*. It appears from the data that very little co-ordinated leadership is present in the community. Leadership is also extremely impeded by a lack of resources.

The discussion above focused on a particular dimension for a particular group of stakeholders. It is, however, also necessary to glean a view of the average, calculated scores for each dimension for all three groups of stakeholders combined. This view is presented below.

4.9. Overall calculated score per dimension

In Table 4.9.1 the average calculated scores for each of the six dimensions is provided in descending order.

Table 4.9.1 Average scores in descending order

	Stakeholder group			
	Key Informant	Township focus group	Town focus group	Average of stakeholder group
Dimension C: Leadership	2,40	1,00	1,00	1,47
Dimension A: Community efforts	3,60	2,00	3,00	2,87
Dimension F: Resources	3,00	3,00	3,00	3,00
Dimension B: Community knowledge of efforts	4,00	3,00	3,00	3,33
Dimension D: Community climate	3,60	2,00	5,00	3,67
Dimension E: Knowledge of community issues	5,00	4,00	4,00	4,33
Total Overall Score	<u>3,60</u>	<u>2,50</u>	<u>3,17</u>	<u>3,11</u>

From Table 4.9.1 it can be seen that average, calculated score for the dimensions *Leadership*, *Community efforts*, and *Resources* are the lowest scores of the six dimensions, i.e. 1.47, 2.87 and 3 respectively. The total average scores for these three dimensions are also lower than the total overall score of 3.11. The implication of this is that strategies aimed at increasing the eMgwenya community's level of leadership and community efforts should be developed

and implemented first, before the overarching intervention is embarked upon i.e. the planned *eMgwenya Urban Renewal Project*.

4.10. Overall scores in terms of ‘capacity to change’

The overall score for the key informant interviews and the town focus group is 3. According to the Community Readiness Model, this would mean that the community is at Stage 3, *Vague awareness*. As described by Plested et al. (2006), in this stage community members begin to recognize that issues are a local problem. The reasons for the occurrence of the issues tend to be vague and stereotyped and “no identifiable leadership exists or leadership lacks energy or motivation for dealing with this problem” (Plested et al., 2006, p. 34). This supports the fact that all three groups of stakeholders scored lowest on *leadership*. This statement by Plested et al. (2006) is supported by evidence from the data, as discussed in 4.9.

The overall score for the township focus group is 2. According to the Community Readiness Model, this would mean that the township community is at Stage 2, *Denial or resistance*. In this stage there is very little recognition that the issues are a local problem and no ownership of the issues is taken. There is an overarching feeling that nothing can be done to change the situation. The reason for the difference in the total overall score in the township focus group may be attributed to a lack of ownership of the issues by community members in the township. In the township focus group data, prominent statements were made that an external agent must come to develop the community and that the community members are simply waiting for an external agent.

4.11. Summary

The data indicates that the eMgwenya community’s capacity to change is low. Considering that an approved intervention plan exists for this community, namely the *eMgwenya Urban Renewal Plan*, the question arises as to how the level for the community’s capacity to change can be increased. This issue will be addressed in the following chapter, after a discussion of the results in terms of each stakeholder group has been provided.

Chapter 5

In this chapter the results of the different stakeholder groups and the role of the different dimensions in the capacity to change are discussed. Strategies for improving dimensions with scores lower than the average calculated score are discussed, after which the limitations of the study are presented. The study concludes with the practical value of the study.

5.1. Capacity to change with respect to stakeholder groups

In the previous chapter it was shown that there are differences in the dimensions of capacity to change among the three groups of stakeholders. It was determined that the scores for the key informant interviews, the township focus group and the town focus group, were 3, 2 and 3 respectively. The segregation between the town and the township is reflected in these differing scores. The differences between the three groups of stakeholders is summarised below.

5.1.1. Key informant interviews and town focus group

A few community members recognize the need to initiate some type of effort, but they are not sure where the resources to initiate these efforts would come from. The community's awareness that they need to take ownership of the issues is increasing, although they are not always sure how to empower themselves to address the issues in the community. This has resulted in the *community climate* being the highest score in the town group.

Leadership implements very little effort. The reason for this can be attributed to the fact that the 'leaders' are poorly defined within the community. The formal leaders, who are the political leaders, do not contribute to the development of the town. The internal leaders on the other hand, do not have the necessary resources, including knowledge and skills, to address the issues in the community. The lack of communication between the leaders and the community, as well as between community members themselves, contributes to the lack of leadership.

5.1.2. Township focus group

The township focus group differs from the key informant and town focus groups. The community members perceive that there are no efforts being made to address the issues and they do not know where the resources would come from to initiate any efforts. They do not take ownership of the issues and there is a prevalent feeling of helplessness and powerlessness. Possible reasons for the sense of helplessness are the lack of resources and lack of community participation. The participants from the township do not take ownership of the issues because

they are waiting for either a leader(s) or an external agent to supply them with the necessary resources to solve the issues in the community.

The most prevalent difference between the town and the township is the way in which they address the issues. In the town, members started to work together to help each other to address their issues. In the township on the other hand, the community mobilised themselves in a protest action in an effort to voice their dissatisfaction on the pressing issues of contaminated drinking water and poor municipal services. This resulted in the community engaging in violent and destructive protests during January and February 2016, demanding to see the mayor and municipal officers (Mkhaliphi, 2016; SABC Digital News, 2016; Sengwayo, 2016). During the protests the municipal offices, the community hall, fire station and clinic were vandalized and burnt (Mlangeni, 2016; Sengwayo, 2016). Roads were damaged and closed down with stones and debris (Sengwayo, 2016). This shows that there is leadership and participation in this community, and that they had voiced their dissatisfaction to get the attention of political leaders. Unfortunately, this action diminished the already limited available resources. It is estimated that repair of the damage caused by the protests is in the region of R10 million (De Villiers, 2016). In this community, particular attention should be given to the dimensions *Leadership*, *Community efforts* and *Resources*, because these dimensions scored lower than the total overall score (see Table 4.8.1). The challenges for increasing the level of these two dimensions are discussed in the following sections.

5.2. Strategies to increase the capacity to change

The Community Readiness Model provides stage-appropriate strategies to increase the community's capacity to change. If certain dimensions' scores are lower than the overall score it is suggested that particular attention be given to those dimensions before an intervention is implemented (McCoy et al., 2007; Plested et al., 2006).

In the case of the eMgwenya town, which is at Stage 3, *Vague Awareness*, the Community Readiness Model recommends that the community's awareness of the issues should be raised (Plested et al., 2006). The Community Readiness Model recommends that the awareness that the issues exist in the community should be raised when a community is at Stage 2, *Denial or Resistance*. These strategies may not be applicable to this community since the community scored high on community knowledge of efforts and community knowledge of issues. Strategies should rather focus on increasing the level of leadership, community efforts and resources. This would imply that strategies aimed at increasing the eMgwenya

community's level of *leadership, community efforts and resources*, should be developed and implemented (before interventions on all levels are implemented). This aspect is briefly discussed below.

5.2.1. Leadership

The data indicated that there are community members who perform leadership roles within the eMgwenya community. The school principal, the chairperson of the Rate Payers Association, a community forum created by members of the community, as well as members of the community who get together to discuss efforts with the aim to address issues, are fulfilling leadership roles. Their efforts to address issues are however, impeded by the fact that their efforts are uncoordinated and fragmented due to poor and unproductive communication between municipal officers and community members as well as between the community members themselves (see the discussion in 4.2 and 4.5 as well).

Efforts by community members and forums could also be impeded by the community's perception of what 'leadership' means. Most community participants seem to understand 'leadership' as 'the municipality' and 'political leaders'. The fact that the community regards this type of leadership as non-existent, inefficient and/or dishonest (discussed in 4.3), has a negative influence on the community's functioning. However, it is possible that the community's perception of 'leadership' results in efforts by community members and forums not being recognized sufficiently. It is possible that a change in the perception of what is meant by 'leadership' could lead to greater recognition of existing and available leadership within the community.

It should also be borne in mind that the development of strong leadership within the eMgwenya community is problematic, because any efforts, whether by the municipality, political leaders or community leaders, are hampered by a lack of resources, particularly financial resources, and are therefore limited in nature.

From the discussion above, it seems that improved communication, a change in perception of the meaning of 'leadership' and the availability of increased financial means are aspects which should be addressed for increasing the level of *Leadership*.

5.2.2. Community efforts

Even though there are efforts put forward in the community by external agents and community members themselves, there is a strong perception that nothing is being done, possibly because the efforts are uncoordinated and fragmented (as is the case with leadership).

Efforts made in the community are not sustainable ones. This situation is brought about by the fact that the biggest issue in the eMgwenya community is poor infrastructure (see 2.6.3). The responsibility for adequate infrastructure rests squarely on the shoulders of the municipality who, for various reasons, have been unable to fulfil their responsibilities (see the discussion in 4.3). Shortages in terms of infrastructure cannot, and may not legally be addressed by members of the community. The result of this situation is that efforts initiated by community members, such as replacing a faulty streetlight bulb, can only be temporary, individual changes. The unsustainability of efforts made by community members might explain why there is a perception in the community that no efforts are being implemented.

Inadequate financial resources also limit the extent to which community efforts can be executed and sustained. A community consisting of a large proportion of pensioners and unemployed people simply cannot bring about extensive community changes and/or sustain this over a lengthy period of time.

The above discussion shows that improved coordination of community efforts, improved municipal leadership, and availability of increased financial means are aspects which should be addressed for increasing the level of *Community Efforts*.

5.2.3. Resources

The data has shown that the eMgwenya community's available capital is, for various reasons, extremely limited, such as the structure of the municipality; the shift of responsibility from the municipality to WB-Noka; the perception that the community leaders, especially the municipality, are dishonest as well as a lack of employment opportunities (as discussed in Chapter 4).

In 2.2.1 it was explained that resources are regarded in terms of five types of capital: natural; physical; financial; human; and social capital. From the discussion in 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 above, it is clear that capital, specifically financial capital, is much needed in the eMgwenya community to adequately bring about community change. However, the data indicated that the eMgwenya community not only lacks financial capital, but also physical, natural and human capital.

In terms of physical capital there is a serious lack of housing in the community, and in infrastructure and roads. In terms of natural capital there is often a shortage of water and the water quality is questionable. There is a shortage of available land to expand the physical capital such as housing.

Natural capital is available in eMgwenya since it is a scenic environment with much natural beauty, as mentioned in 4.6. One might think that this available resource, such as the tourist resort which was mentioned in 2.6.3, should be utilised and developed to stimulate some economic growth for the community, but physical capital is needed to make use of this particular natural capital. It is estimated that the cost of upgrading and reinstating the currently vandalised tourist resort would range between R8 million and R16 million (personal communication, May 2016). Upgrading and reinstatement of the tourist resort would, however, not be a guarantee for improved economy in eMgwenya, because the supporting facilities for the envisaged tourist resort visitors, such as grocery stores, restaurants, and medical and/or emergency services remain lacking.

Human capital also appears to be lacking in some instances because the knowledge required to address certain issues is not present, especially within the municipality.

The segregation of the eMgwenya community between the town and the township seems to impact negatively on social capital in the community. The data shows that contradictory perceptions exist in the community with regard to social capital. On the one hand some community members perceive that people are living very isolated from one another and the sense of community is lost, indicating that social capital is limited. On the other hand, there is the perception of a strong sense of community because neighbours were shown to be the most reliable resource in the community. The community regard themselves as a ‘close-knit’ family, irrespective of race. Consequently, the availability of social capital can be regarded as adequate.

The segregation of the community, though not necessarily in terms of race, but rather as distinct sub-communities, may be a reason why there are opposing perspectives of the community’s social capital. This statement is supported by the variable scores (3, 2 and 5 respectively for the key informant interviews, township focus group, and town focus group discussion) in terms of community climate (see also 4.4).

It seems that financial capital is the resource that is most needed to bring about improvement in terms of *Resources* in the eMgwenya community. The municipality needs to be alerted of the lack of resources in this community, or funding for the community should be provided by an external agent. However, the preceding discussions in terms of *Leadership*, *Community efforts* and *Resources* illustrates that these three dimensions are interrelated. Community leaders fail to lead because they are inhibited by a lack of resources. Then again, efforts are lacking because leadership and resources are absent. The interrelatedness is also

evident when one considers that the provision of sufficient financial resources (by, for instance an external agent) would necessitate strong leadership within the community to manage such resources in a productive manner. The interrelatedness can also be described in terms of Bronfenbrenner's (in Tudge et al., 2009) ecological systems discussed in 2.3.5.1. The eMgwenya community is a microsystem that is waiting for the necessary resources to be supplied by an exosystem. However, the eMgwenya community (the microsystem) is living in relative isolation because of limited interaction and limited exchange of resources between themselves and neighbouring communities (such Dullstroom, Belfast and Machadodorp, the mesosystem), as well as the municipality and external agents (the exosystem).

It should be evident that the task of increasing the level of leadership, community efforts and resources in eMgwenya is not an easy one. Obtaining funding would certainly be a first step in addressing the issues in the eMgwenya community. Additionally, strategies to improve the level of leadership and community efforts will have to accompany obtaining of funds if the success for application of funds is to be ensured.

Until such time that efficient municipal services and adequate funds can be made available by the municipality, the real challenge for the eMgwenya community seems to be the development of strategies for empowering the community, without totally relying on, and/or waiting for, external agents and financial resources. The level of leadership and community efforts will have to be increased *internally*. Suggestions for, or the investigation of existing strategies for this purpose falls outside the scope of this study, but educational programs, aimed at, for instance, educating community members on how to purify water by boiling it, or by making use of DIY water filters⁵, growing vegetables in pot plant holders for own household use, and the development and use of biogas⁶, could benefit the community. Additionally, the development of communication skills in order to engage in peaceful negotiations with municipal leaders could make a difference in the community. It is suggested that such alternatives should be investigated. The process of implementing such alternatives would aid in increasing the level of leadership, community efforts and community climate within the eMgwenya community.

⁵ See for instance: <http://prepared-housewives.com/how-to-filter-and-purify-water/> and <http://www.enviroalternatives.com/watermethods.html>

⁶ See for instance: <http://www.unisa.ac.za/news/index.php/2014/07/biogas-a-sustainable-energy-source/>

5.3. Conclusion

This study has shown that there is a reciprocal relation between available capital and the ability and readiness of the community to act. The available capital in the eMgwenya community, in all its forms, is limited and therefore the community's ability to act is also limited. This finding is in line with the operational definition of capacity to change that was proposed in 2.2.2 for use in this study, namely: "capacity to change is the reciprocal relationship between (1) the available capital within the community (where social capital is emphasised) and (2) the ability and readiness of the community to act, with the aim to enhance and sustain their well-being".

5.4. Limitations

A limitation in this study that should be taken into account was that the discussion guide provided in the Community Readiness Model was not always appropriate for use in this community. The discussion guide is accompanied by many assumptions. In some instances, this made interviewing very challenging. For example, the question "Is someone doing something about the issues? What is being done?" presupposes that some efforts were in place to address the issues in the community. If a participant indicated that nothing was being done to address the issues, then the question: "How long have you/someone been trying to do something about the issue?" becomes superfluous. Because both questions are essential for scoring and could not be omitted, the impression that the interviewer was not paying attention to a participant might have been created. This could have led to a negative rapport between the interviewer and the participant. For this reason, the researcher adapted the questions according to the context of the interviews/discussion; for example, "How long have you/someone been trying to do something about the issue" or "For how long has nothing been done?"

Another problem experienced in terms of the Community Readiness Model was the issue of rounding down average scores, as was discussed in 4.4. It is suggested here that the decision to round down (or up) should be left to the discretion of the researcher.

A further problem with rounding up (or down) to the nearest integer is that no provision is made by the Community Readiness Model for a .5 score in the final calculated average. Allowing a .5 score might have been beneficial for the overall scoring, as it was found in this study that in some instances the community's level for a dimension (or even overall score) lay between two consecutive stages of the Community Readiness Model.

Another limitation of the study was the fact that the focus group discussions consisted of small numbers of participants. This limited the range of responses in the focus group discussions. It was difficult to find participants to participate in the study. The negative association that the community members have with the *eMgwenya Urban Renewal Project* might have contributed to this situation. The choice of participants therefore influenced the data. If other participants had been used, the results could have been different, as perceptions may differ.

5.5. Value of the study

As discussed in 3.1.2, the Community Readiness Model regards five key informants as sufficient to assess a community's capacity to change, because such participants are likely to have the knowledge, experience and insight to assist with the research. However, for this study it was considered beneficial to also conduct focus group discussions with each respective sub-community in order to ensure that a wide variety of perceptions was gained. This decision proved valuable to the study. In Table 4.8.1 it can be seen that key informants scored higher in four out of the six dimensions than the data from the focus groups.

It is possible that the key informants' knowledge and experience provided a certain perspective of the community that may not always have reflected the community as a whole. The addition of the focus group discussions allowed the researcher to examine the differences in the different sectors of the community, regarding its capacity to change.

The majority of the eMgwenya community resides in the eMgwenya township. Using multiple sources of data thus contributed to the value of the study. It is therefore suggested that when utilising the Community Readiness model to determine a community's level for capacity, the demographics of a community be considered and that multiple sources of evidence be considered particularly when a community is a multi-dimensional one.

The practical value of this study lies in its informing interventions of the strategies needed on different levels of the community to ensure success of the overall intended intervention. In 5.2 it was indicated that the recommended strategies of raising the community's awareness of issues in the community for the respective stages (*Denial or Resistance*, and *Vague Awareness*) are not necessarily applicable to this community. It appears that the Community Readiness Model assumes that community members will try to resolve issues if they are aware of them, and that leadership and resources would be available to do so. This study has shown that members of the eMgwenya community possess adequate knowledge of issues

within the community, but inadequate leadership and limited resources inhibit the establishment of effective community efforts. This finding illustrates the value of taking the various dimensions of capacity to change into consideration when planning any intervention. The application of the Community Readiness Model in terms of the eMgwenya community furthermore illustrates that this model is adaptable and applicable to the context of this study.

An assessment of the effectiveness of such strategies may be foundational to the South African context since many other studies that assess the effectiveness of strategies to increase community capacity to change have mainly been conducted in America and Australia (see for instance Balint, 2006; Huebner et al., 2009; Jones et al., 2010; Lovell et al., 2011; Luque et al., 2010). Such a study will further contribute to the applicability of the Community Readiness Model in the South African context.

References

- Aboud, F., Huq, N. L., Larson, C. P., & Ottisova, L. (2010). An assessment of community readiness for HIV/AIDS preventive interventions in rural Bangladesh. *Social Science & Medicine*, 70(3), 360–367. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.10.011>
- Balint, P. J. (2006). Improving Community-Based Conservation Near Protected Areas: The Importance of Development Variables. *Environmental Management*, 38(1), 137–148. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-005-0100-y>
- Bandura, A. (1978). The self system in reciprocal determinism. *American Psychologist*, 33(4), 344.
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37(2), 122–147. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.37.2.122>
- Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 1–26.
- Bandura, A. (2002). Social cognitive theory in cultural context. *Applied Psychology*, 51(2), 269–290.
- Bopp, M., Germann, K., Bopp, J., Littlejohns, L. B., & Smith, N. (2000). *Assessing community capacity for change*. Alberta: David Thompson Health Centre.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *American Psychologist*, 32(7), 513.
- Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (2006). The Bioecological Model for Human Development. In W. Damon & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology* (6th ed, pp. 793–828). Hoboken, N.J: John Wiley & Sons.
- Chawenco Consultants. (2012). *eMgwenya Urban Renewal Survey Report*. Unpublished manuscript, Johannesburg.

- De Villiers, M. (2016, January 21). Waterval Boven protest causes millions in damage. Retrieved 7 May 2016, from <http://citizen.co.za/954450/waterval-boven-protest-causes-millions-in-damage/>
- Edwards, R. W., Jumper-Thurman, P., Plested, B. A., Oetting, E. R., & Swanson, L. (2000). Community readiness: Research to practice. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 28(3), 291–307.
- Emakhazeni Local Municipality. (2015). IDP 2015/2016.
- Fullan, M. G. (1992). *Successful school improvement: the implementation perspective and beyond*. Buckingham [England] ; Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Fullan, M. G. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change* (4th ed). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Geyser, F. (1990). *Boven se storie in beeld en woord*. Unpublished manuscript, Waterval Boven.
- Heller, K., Price, R. H., Reinhartz, S., Riger, S., Wandersman, A., & D'Aunno, T. A. (1984). *Psychology and community change, challenges of the future* (2nd ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Henning, E., Van Rensburg, W., & Smit, B. (2004). *Finding your way in qualitative research*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Huebner, A. J., Mancini, J. A., Bowen, G. L., & Orthner, D. K. (2009). Shadowed by War: Building Community capacity to Support Military Families. *Family Relations*, 58(2), 216–228.
- Jones, P. R., Waters, C. M., Oka, R. K., & McGhee, E. M. (2010). Increasing Community Capacity to Reduce Tobacco-Related Health Disparities in African American Communities. *Public Health Nursing*, 27(6), 552–560. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1525-1446.2010.00882.x>

- Kritsonis, A. (2005). Comparison of Change Theories. *International Journal of Scholarly Academic Intellectual Diversity*, 8(1), 1–7.
- Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Lippitt, R., Watson, J., & Westley, B. (1958). *The Dynamics of planned change*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Local Municipality | Statistics South Africa. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.statssa.gov.za/?page_id=993&id=emakhazeni-municipality
- Lovell, S. A., Kearns, R. A., & Rosenberg, M. W. (2011). Community capacity building in practice: constructing its meaning and relevance to health promoters. *Health & Social Care in the Community*, 19(5), 531–540. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2524.2011.01000.x>
- Luque, J., Martinez Tyson, D., Lee, J. H., Gwede, C., Vadaparampil, S., Noel-Thomas, S., & Meade, C. (2010). Using social network analysis to evaluate community capacity building of a regional Community Cancer Network. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 38(5), 656–668. <http://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20386>
- Mansuri, G., & Rao, V. (2004). Community-Based and -Driven Development: A Critical Review. *The World Bank Research Observer*, 19(1), 1–39. <http://doi.org/10.1093/wbro/lkh012>
- Maree, K. (Ed.). (2007). *First steps in research* (1st ed). Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Marks, D., & Yardley, L. (Eds.). (2004). *Research methods for clinical and health psychology*. London ; Thousand Oaks, Calif: SAGE.
- McCoy, H. V., Malow, R., Edwards, R. W., Thurland, A., & Rosenberg, R. (2007). A Strategy for Improving Community Effectiveness of HIV/AIDS Intervention Design: The Community Readiness Model in the Caribbean. *Substance Use & Misuse*, 42(10), 1579–1592. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10826080701212535>

- McMillan, D. W., & Chavis, D. M. (1986). Sense of Community: A Definition and Theory. *Journal of Community Psychology, 14*(1), 6–23.
- Megginson, L. C. . (1963). Lessons from Europe for American Business. *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly, 44*(1), 3–13.
- Mkhaliphi, M. (2016, January 8). Waterval Boven calm following protests. Retrieved 15 January 2016, from <http://www.sabc.co.za/news/a/9a4d05804b3c5914a310eb445cadceaa/Waterval-Boven-calm-following-protests-20160801>
- Mlangeni, T. (2016, January 15). 7 in court after Waterval Boven protest. Retrieved 6 May 2016, from <http://citizen.co.za/945108/945108/>
- Moore, S. A., Severn, R. C., & Millar, R. (2006). A Conceptual Model of Community Capacity for Biodiversity Conservation Outcomes. *Geographical Research, 44*(4), 361–371. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-5871.2006.00407.x>
- Morrow, S. L. (2005). Quality and trustworthiness in qualitative research in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*(2), 250–260. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.52.2.250>
- Moscardo, G. (2008). *Building community capacity for tourism development*. Wallingford: CABI.
- Passer, M., & Smith, R. (2003). *Psychology: the science of mind and behavior* (2nd ed.). Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Pitney, W. A., & Parker, J. (2009). *Qualitative research in physical activity and the health professions*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Plested, B. A., Edwards, R. W., & Jumper-Thurman, P. (2006). *Community readiness: a handbook for successful change*. Tri-Ethnic Center for Prevention Research. Retrieved from

http://www.nami.org/Content/NavigationMenu/NAMI_Center_for_Excellence/Tools_for_Excellence/CommunityReadinessHandbook.pdf

- Prochaska, J. O., & DiClemente, C. C. (1983). Stages and processes of self-change in smoking: Toward an integrative model of change. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 47(9), 1102–1114.
- Prochaska, J. O., DiClemente, C. C., & Norcross, J. C. (1992). In search of how people change: applications to addictive behaviors. *American Psychologist*, 47(9), 1102–1114.
- Prochaska, J. O., & Norcross, J. C. (2007). *Systems of psychotherapy: a transtheoretical analysis*. Australia: Thomson/Brooks/Cole.
- Protection of Personal Information Bill (2009).
- Redcliff Mountain Estate. (n.d.). History of Area, Waterval Onder, Elands Valley, Mpumalanga, South Africa. Retrieved 10 February 2013, from http://redcliffestate.co.za/OLDSITE/history_of_area.htm
- Robbins, S. P., Judge, T. A., Odendaal, A., & Roodt, G. (2009). *Organisational behaviour: global and Southern African perspectives*. Cape Town: Pearson Education South Africa.
- Rosa, E. M., & Tudge, J. (2013). Urie Bronfenbrenner's Theory of Human Development: Its Evolution From Ecology to Bioecology: The Evolution of Urie Bronfenbrenner's Theory. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 5(4), 243–258. <http://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12022>
- SABC Digital News. (2016). *Waterval Boven protesters torch municipal buildings*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VwJJPPgRSv4>
- Sadler, G. R., Lee, H.-C., Lim, R. S.-H., & Fullerton, J. (2010). Recruitment of hard-to-reach population subgroups via adaptations of the snowball sampling strategy: Hard-to-reach populations. *Nursing & Health Sciences*, 12(3), 369–374. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1442-2018.2010.00541.x>

- Sarason, S. B. (1974). *The psychological sense of community: Prospects for a community psychology*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sengwayo, N. (2016). Protesters burn clinic, municipal offices, fire station. Retrieved 21 February 2016, from <http://www.news24.com/SouthAfrica/News/mpumalanga-protesters-burn-clinic-municipal-offices-fire-station-20160114>
- South African Tourism. (n.d.). Historical Waterval Boven. Retrieved 10 February 2013, from <http://www.southafrica.net/trade/en/articles/entry/article-southafrica.net-historical-waterval-boven>
- Thompson, D., & Pepperdine, S. (2003). *Assessing community capacity for riparian restoration*. Canberra: Land & Water Australia.
- Tudge, J. R., Mokra, I., Hatfield, B. E., & Karnik, R. B. (2009). Uses and misuses of Bronfenbrenner's bioecological theory of human development. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 1(4), 198–210.
- Visser, M., & Moleko, A.-G. (Eds.). (2012). *Community psychology in South Africa* (2nd ed). Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- WB-Noka Development Consortium. (2011). WB-Noka eMgwenya Urban Renewal Project Business Plan.
- World Bank Group. (2015). What are Public Private Partnerships? | Public Private Partnerships | World Bank. Retrieved 11 April 2016, from <http://ppp.worldbank.org/public-private-partnership/overview/what-are-public-private-partnerships>
- Yin, R. K. (2013). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Retrieved from https://nls.ldls.org.uk/welcome.html?ark:/81055/vdc_100025422049.0x000001

Appendix A Discussion Guide

Question number	COMMUNITY EFFORTS (programs, activities, policies, etc.) AND COMMUNITY KNOWLEDGE OF EFFORTS
1	Is [the issue] a problem? If yes show how big (using a scale from 1 to 10)
2	Is someone doing something about [the issue?] What is being done?
3	How long have you/someone been trying to do something about [the issue]?
4	Do you think that other people know about the issue? How much do you think they know?
5	Do you think people know that something is being done?
6	What do you like about what is being done?
7	What do you dislike about what is being done?
LEADERSHIP	
12	Do you think the leaders in this community are worried about the issue? Show how much.
13	What are the leaders doing about [the issue]? Are they helping the people who are doing something about [the issue]?
14	Will the leaders help if somebody wants to do more? Please explain
COMMUNITY CLIMATE	
15	Tell me about the people in eMgwenya
17	Is the community helping? How?
18	What are the people struggling with? What makes it difficult to solve the issue?
KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THE ISSUE	
20	Do you think people know a lot about [the issue]? How much? What do you think they know?
21	How would you find out about [the issue]?
22	Do you think someone counted how many people have [the issue]? Do you know how many?
23	Where can people find this information?

	RESOURCES FOR PREVENTION EFFORTS (time, money, people, space, etc.)
24	Where can a person find help? Why do they go there?
26	How do you think people feel when somebody tries to help? Why do you think they feel this way?
28	Do you know of people who are trying to get the money to help with [the issue]?
29	Do you think someone is checking on the quality of the people who are trying to help? Show how good you think the checking is.
30	Do you think the checking helps to make things better?

Appendix B Anchor rating scale

Dimension A: Existing community efforts	
Score	Qualitative statement
5.	No awareness of the need for efforts to address the issue.
6.	No efforts addressing the issue.
7.	A few individuals recognize the need to initiate some type of effort, but there is no immediate motivation to do anything.
8.	Some community members have met and have begun a discussion on developing community efforts.
9.	Efforts (programs/activities) are being planned.
10.	Efforts (programs/activities) have been implemented.
11.	Efforts (programs/activities) have been running for several years.
12.	Several different programs, activities and policies are in place, covering different age groups and reaching a wide range of people. New efforts are being developed based on evaluation data.
13.	Evaluation plans are routinely used to test effectiveness of many different efforts, and the results are being used to make changes and improvements.
Dimension B: Community knowledge of the efforts	
Score	Qualitative statement
6.	Community has no knowledge of the need for efforts addressing the issue.
7.	Community has no knowledge about efforts addressing the issue.
8.	A few members of the community have heard about efforts, but the extent of their knowledge is limited.
9.	Some members of the community know about local efforts.
10.	Members of the community have basic knowledge about local efforts (e.g. purpose).
11.	An increasing number of community members have knowledge of local efforts and are trying to increase the knowledge of the general community about these efforts.
12.	There is evidence that the community has specific knowledge of local efforts including contact persons, training of staff, clients involved, etc.
13.	There is considerable community knowledge about different community efforts, as well as the level of program effectiveness.
14.	Community has knowledge of program evaluation data on how well the different local efforts are working and their benefits and limitations.

Dimension C: Leadership (includes appointed leaders & influential community members)	
Score	Qualitative statement
4.	Leadership has no recognition of the issue.
5.	Leadership believes that this is not an issue in their community.
6.	Leader(s) recognize(s) the need to do something regarding the issue.
7.	Leader(s) is/are trying to get something started.
8.	Leaders are part of a committee or group that addresses this issue.
9.	Leaders are active and supportive of the implementation of efforts.
10.	Leaders are supportive of continuing basic efforts and are considering resources available for self-sufficiency.
11.	Leaders are supportive of expanding/improving efforts through active participation in the expansion/improvement.
12.	Leaders are continually reviewing evaluation results of the efforts and are modifying support accordingly.
Dimension D: Community climate	
Score	Qualitative statement
1.	The prevailing attitude is that it's not considered, or is unnoticed or overlooked within the community. "It's just not our concern."
2.	The prevailing attitude is "There's nothing we can do," or "Only 'those' people do that," or "We don't think it should change."
3.	Community climate is neutral, disinterested, or believes that the issue does not affect the community as a whole.
4.	The attitude in the community is now beginning to reflect interest in the issue. "We have to do something, but we don't know what to do."
5.	The attitude in the community is "We are concerned about this," and community members are beginning to reflect modest support for efforts.
6.	The attitude in the community is "This is our responsibility" and is now beginning to reflect modest involvement in efforts.
7.	The majority of the community generally supports programs, activities, or policies. "We have taken responsibility."
8.	Some community members or groups may challenge specific programs, but the community in general is strongly supportive of the need for efforts. Participation level is high. "We need to keep up on this issue and make sure what we are doing is effective."
9.	All major segments of the community are highly supportive, and community members are actively involved in evaluating and improving efforts and demanding accountability

Dimension E: Community knowledge about the issue	
Score	Qualitative statement
1.	Not viewed as an issue.
2.	No knowledge about the issue.
3.	A few in the community have some knowledge about the issue.
4.	Some community members recognize the signs and symptoms of this issue, but information is lacking.
5.	Community members know that the signs and symptoms of this issue occur locally, and general information is available.
6.	A majority of community members know the signs and symptoms of the issue and that it occurs locally, and that local data are available.
7.	Community members have knowledge of, and access to, detailed information about local prevalence.
8.	Community members have knowledge about prevalence, causes, risk factors, and consequences.
9.	Community members have detailed information about the issue as well as information about the effectiveness of local programs.
Dimension F: Resources related to the issue (people, money, time, space, etc.)	
Score	Qualitative statement
5.	There is no awareness of the need for resources to deal with this issue.
6.	There are no resources available for dealing with the issue.
7.	The community is not sure what it would take, (or where the resources would come from) to initiate efforts.
8.	The community has individuals, organizations, and/or space available that could be used as resources.
9.	Some members of the community are looking into the available resources.
10.	Resources have been obtained and/or allocated for this issue.
11.	A considerable part of support of on-going efforts is from local sources that are expected to provide continuous support. Community members and leaders are beginning to look at continuing efforts by accessing additional resources.
12.	Diversified resources and funds are secured and efforts are expected to be ongoing. There is additional support for further efforts.
13.	There is continuous and secure support for programs and activities, evaluation is routinely expected and completed, and there are substantial resources for trying new efforts.

Appendix C Scoring Sheet – Key informant interviews

Scorer #1: Researcher **Date:** 13-Apr-16

INDIVIDUAL SCORES

Interviews	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	TOTAL	Average Overall Community Readiness Score:
Dimension A	3	3	3	3	4	16	3,2
Dimension B	5	3	3	3	3	17	3,4
Dimension C	4	1	3	3	4	15	3
Dimension D	4	2	2	2	5	15	3
Dimension E	4	4	4	4	5	21	4,2
Dimension F	3	3	2	3	3	14	2,8
TOTAL Calculated Score							3,27

Scorer #2: Research Assistant **Date:** 17-Apr-16

INDIVIDUAL SCORES

Interviews	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	TOTAL	Average Overall Community Readiness Score:
Dimension A	4	3	4	3	4	18	3,6
Dimension B	8	2	3	5	5	23	4,6
Dimension C	3	1	3	4	1	12	2,4
Dimension D	4	2	3	5	5	19	3,8
Dimension E	6	4	6	6	7	29	5,8
Dimension F	4	2	2	2	5	15	3
TOTAL Calculated Score							3,87

COMBINED SCORES

Interviews	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	TOTAL	Average Overall Community Readiness Score:
Dimension A	4	3	4	3	4	18	3,6
Dimension B	5	2	3	5	5	20	4
Dimension C	3	1	3	4	1	12	2,4
Dimension D	4	2	3	4	5	18	3,6
Dimension E	6	4	5	5	5	25	5
Dimension F	4	2	2	3	4	15	3
TOTAL Calculated Score							3,6

Appendix D Scoring Sheet – Focus Group Discussions

Scorer #1:

Researcher

Date:

13-Apr-16

INDIVIDUAL SCORES

Focus group	Township	Town
Dimension A	2	3
Dimension B	3	3
Dimension C	3	3
Dimension D	2	5
Dimension E	4	4
Dimension F	3	3
TOTAL Calculated Score	2,83	3,50

Scorer #2:

Research Assistant

Date:

13-Apr-16

INDIVIDUAL SCORES

Focus group	Township	Town
Dimension A	2	2
Dimension B	4	4
Dimension C	1	1
Dimension D	2	5
Dimension E	6	5
Dimension F	2	2
TOTAL Calculated Score	2,83	3,17

Combined scores

Focus group	Township	Town
Dimension A	2	3
Dimension B	3	3
Dimension C	1	1
Dimension D	2	5
Dimension E	4	4
Dimension F	3	3
TOTAL Calculated Score	2,50	3,17

Appendix E Letter of consent for key informant interviews



UNIVERSITEIT VAN PRETORIA
 UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA
 YUNIBESITHI YA PRETORIA

Faculty of Humanities
 Department of Psychology
Informed Consent Letter

An assessment of the eMgwenya community's capacity to change.

Principal Researcher	
Name	Charmé Coetzer
Department	Psychology
Phone	082 564 5651
E-mail	charme@chawenco.co.za

Background

You are hereby invited to take part in a research study. Before you decide whether or not to participate in this study, it is important that you understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take the time to read the following information carefully. Feel free to ask the researcher if anything is unclear or should you require more information.

The purpose of this study is to assess the degree to which the eMgwenya community has the capacity to change since a development intervention, namely the eMgwenya Urban Renewal Project, aims to change the functioning of the community of eMgwenya by providing the following: housing, health care facilities, emergency services, social and community facilities, improved road access, water infrastructure upgrade, sewer infrastructure upgrade and job opportunities through economic development. Although the eMgwenya Urban Renewal Project aims to change the eMgwenya community the question arises as to whether this community can mobilize and enter into a process of change, since change is a complex process. Therefore, the aim of this study is to assess the degree to which the eMgwenya community has the capacity to change.

This study will contribute to the researcher's completion of her Master's Degree in Research Psychology at the University of Pretoria.

Study Procedure

The researcher will contact you to arrange a suitable time, date and location for a group interview (focus group). The interview will last approximately 60 (sixty) minutes and will consist of a number of questions regarding the eMgwenya (and Waterval Boven) community. For record purposes the interview will be video and voice recorded and transcribed.

Confidentiality

Since the interview will be video and voice recorded, your comments will not be anonymous. Every effort will be made by the researcher to preserve your confidentiality including the following:

1. Assigning code names/numbers for participants that will be used on all researcher notes and documents.
2. Notes, interview transcriptions, and transcribed notes and any other identifying participant information will be kept in a locked file cabinet in the personal possession of the researcher. This information must be stored for a period of 15 (fifteen) years for archiving purposes, whereafter all materials will be destroyed.

The researcher and the members of the researcher's committee will review the researcher's collected data. Information from this research will be used solely for the purpose of the requirements of this study and any publications that may result from this study. Any final publication will not contain the names of participants involved in this study.

Each participant has the opportunity to obtain a transcribed copy of their interview. Participants should tell the researcher if a copy of the interview is desired. Participant data will be kept confidential.

Voluntary Participation

Your participation in this study is voluntary. It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part in this study. If you do decide to take part in this study, you will be asked to sign a consent form. If you decide to take part in this study, you are still free to withdraw at any time and without giving a reason. You are free to not answer any question or questions if you so choose. This will not affect the relationship you have with the researcher.

Consent

By signing this consent form, I confirm that I have read and understood the information and have had the opportunity to ask questions. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without giving a reason and without cost. I understand that I will be given a copy of this consent form. I voluntarily agree to take part in this study.

Participant's signature

Date

Researcher's signature

Date

Appendix F Informed consent for focus group discussions



UNIVERSITEIT VAN PRETORIA
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA
YUNIBESITHI YA PRETORIA

Faculty of Humanities

Department of Psychology

Informed Consent Letter – Focus group

An assessment of the eMgwenya community's capacity to change.

Background of Principal Researcher

Principal Researcher	
Name	Charmé Coetzer
Department	Psychology
Phone	082 564 5651
E-mail	charme@chawenco.co.za

Background

You are hereby invited to take part in a research study. Before you decide whether or not to participate in this study, it is important that you understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take the time to read the following information carefully. Feel free to ask the researcher if anything is unclear or should you require more information.

The purpose of this study is to assess the degree to which the eMgwenya community has the capacity to change since a development intervention, namely the eMgwenya Urban Renewal Project, aims to change the functioning of the community of eMgwenya by providing the following: housing, health care facilities, emergency services, social and community facilities, improved road access, water infrastructure upgrade, sewer infrastructure upgrade and job opportunities through economic development. Although the eMgwenya Urban Renewal Project aims to change the eMgwenya community the question arises as to whether this

community can mobilize and enter into a process of change, since change is a complex process. Therefore the aim of this study is to assess the degree to which the eMgwenya community has the capacity to change.

This study will contribute to the researcher's completion of her Master's Degree in Research Psychology at the University of Pretoria.

Study Procedure

The researcher will contact you to arrange a suitable time, date and location for a group interview (focus group). The interview will last approximately 60 (sixty) minutes and will consist of a number of questions regarding the eMgwenya (and Waterval Boven) communities. For record purposes the interview will be voice recorded and transcribed.

Confidentiality

Since the interview will be a group interview and voice recorded, your comments will not be anonymous. Every effort will be made by the researcher to preserve your confidentiality including the following:

1. Assigning code names/numbers for participants that will be used on all researcher notes and documents.
2. Notes, interview transcriptions, and transcribed notes and any other identifying participant information will be kept in a locked file cabinet in the personal possession of the researcher. This information must be stored for a period of 15 (fifteen) years for archiving purposes, whereafter all materials will be destroyed.
3. The participants agree to keep the discussion confidential.

The researcher and the members of the researcher's committee will review the researcher's collected data. Information from this research will be used solely for the purpose of the requirements this study and any publications that may result from this study. Any final publication will not contain the names of participants involved in this study.

Each participant has the opportunity to obtain a transcribed copy of their interview. Participants should tell the researcher if a copy of the interview is desired. Participant data will be kept confidential.

Voluntary Participation

Your participation in this study is voluntary. It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part in this study. If you do decide to take part in this study, you will be asked to sign a

consent form. If you decide to take part in this study, you are still free to withdraw at any time and without giving a reason. You are free to not answer any question or questions if you choose. This will not affect the relationship you have with the researcher.

Consent

By signing this consent form, I confirm that I have read and understood the information and have had the opportunity to ask questions. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without giving a reason and without cost. I understand that I will be given a copy of this consent form. I voluntarily agree to take part in this study.

Participant's signature _____ Date _____

Researcher's signature _____ Date _____