Historically disadvantaged youth negotiating for resilience resources to navigate towards violence prevention

Y Coetzer

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4947-3234

Mini-dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree Masters of Arts in Positive Psychology at the Vaal Triangle Campus of the North West University

Supervisor: Prof LC Theron

Graduation: May 2018
Student number: 12385409
DEDICATION

I dedicate this study to my beloved husband, Gert.

Thank you for loving me unconditionally and supporting me in everything I do.

Without your loving support and constant faith in me,
I would never have even thought of taking on an endeavour such as this.

Your constant inspiration allowed me to muster
the confidence to take charge of developing and sharing my gifts.

You truly are my lover and my friend.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, and foremost, thank you Heavenly Father for giving me this gift to further develop the talents You have imparted to me. Your unconditional love, wisdom and peace enabled me to complete this journey with great joy. I pray that I will follow Your guidance in the times ahead so that the knowledge gained through this study will be used for good in Your kingdom.

My precious children, Carla and Christiaan – thank you for being so understanding when our play-time had to be cut short to make room for mom’s study-time. Your gracious selflessness highlights the beautiful character inside of you. May you reap abundant blessings for the seeds of love and support you have sown in my life.

Prof. Linda Theron – thank you for your excellent guidance throughout this study. Your expertise is invaluable and I am honoured to have been on the receiving end of it. A special thanks for the learning opportunities you gave me during the course of my study. It means a lot to me.

Thank you to every young woman and young man who invested their time and energy to share their views on violence prevention. Without you I would not have been able to conduct this study.

I am very grateful to Mr. Deon Erwee and the Bethlehem Child and Family Welfare Centre for allowing me to use their premises as the research site for this study.

The project Networks for change and well-being: ‘Girl-led’ from the ground up policy-making to address sexual violence in Canada and South Africa, particularly Prof. Linda Theron, for financial help.
PREFACE AND DECLARATION

The article format was chosen for the current study. The researcher Yolandé Coetzer, conducted the research and wrote the article. Prof. Linda Theron was the supervisor. One article was written and will be submitted for publication in the following journal:

Article:  
Youth & Society

I, Yolandé Coetzer, declare that

Historically disadvantaged youth negotiating for resilience resources to navigate towards violence prevention

is my own work and that all the sources I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.

Name

1 November 2017

Date
DECLARATION OF LANGUAGE EDITOR

GENEVIEVE WOOD
P.O. BOX 511 WITS 2050 | 0616387159

EDITING CERTIFICATE
LANGUAGE EDITING SERVICES

Date: 2017/10/16

This serves to confirm that the document entitled:

HISTORICALLY DISADVANTAGED YOUTH NEGOTIATING FOR RESILIENCE RESOURCES
TO NAVIGATE TOWARDS VIOLENCE PREVENTION

HAS BEEN LANGUAGE EDITED ON BEHALF OF ITS AUTHOR

Yolande Coetzee

Genevieve Wood
PhD candidate
Wits University
SUMMARY

This phenomenological study applied participatory visual methods to explore the social ecology of resilience in a rural Free State community. The purpose of this study was to investigate how visual messages created and delivered by South African youth within a rural Free State community can lessen violence aimed at them. Eleven historically disadvantaged young women ($n=6$) and men ($n=5$) aged 18-24 participated in this study. Their messages foreground resilience resources. In particular, they indicate that protective strategies, facilitated by various stakeholders in their social ecology (i.e., parents, police services, community policing, public service departments), are needed to support and educate youth to avoid violence. The findings of this study were in agreement with existing literature that reported that resilience is a dynamic, socio-ecological, transactional process between young adults (negotiating for protective factors) and their social ecology (the ability of the community to supply these protective factors that could better protect young adults from being exposed to violence). The findings included previously under-emphasized protective factors, namely supportive parenting, to guide young men toward socially appropriate life decisions that would better protect them from becoming involved in cycles of violence. In summary, my study promoted understanding of the protective factors historically disadvantaged young adults need in order to be better protected against violence in their community as well as facilitated dialogue between young adults and their social ecology in the hope to activate social change. Nevertheless, the dialogue had limited effect as youth reported no change in response to communication of their messages.
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Figure 1. Overview of Chapter 1.
1. **INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE FOR THIS STUDY**

1.1 Introduction

Violence against youth is a harsh reality in South Africa (SA) and is characterised by a long history of violence perpetrated against most of SA’s young people. According to statistics presented by Statistics South Africa (SSA) (2016), 53.4% of youth between the ages of 16-24 years have been victims of assault crimes in 2013/2014. In 2013, more than a third of all deaths of people between the ages of 15 and 29 years were due to violent acts (Idris, 2016). According to the Optimus Study South Africa: Technical Report (Artz et al., 2016), one in every three young people experience some form of sexual abuse before the age of 17. In 2016 alone, a total of 351 214 cases of sexual abuse was reported among 15-17 year-olds.

Population-based prevalence studies have shown that the most common forms of violence against youth reported in SA are physical and sexual violence in the home and community (Mathews, Jamieson, Lake, & Charmaine, 2014). Whilst absolute numbers are unreliable due to under-reporting (People Against Suffering, Oppression and Poverty [PASSOP], 2013), young women, particularly, are at risk and are exposed to gender-based violence acts against them that range from sexist remarks to unwanted sexual touching, and to rape itself (Le Roux, 2016). Young men, on the other hand, are mostly exposed to physical violence such as assault and/or homicide. According to the World Health Organization (WHO) (*Global Status Report on Violence Prevention*, 2014), young men represent 83% of homicide victims.

Swartz and Scott (2014) state that township youth are especially vulnerable to physical and sexual violence. They argue that youth living in townships are not only faced with the adversity of violence, but note that they also have to face other dehumanising conditions daily,
for example: poor schooling, impaired parenting, a history of dehumanising racial subjugation, struggles for survival, the physiological effects of poverty, the absence of recreation and the widespread availability of alcohol and drugs. Ceccato and Ceccato (2017) explain that in such deprived settings, violence is an indicator of social disorganisation. They argue that increased levels of violence would be expected where chronic socio-economic inequality remains as a fuel for severe social disorder. In these social contexts there usually is little or no access to dispute resolution structures (e.g., conflict resolution mediators) in order to assist in mediating conflicts among community members. Violence may therefore be seen as the only possible means by which to solve a problem.

Violent crimes are not only perpetrated against youth, but also by youth, for several reasons. One of the main reasons suggested in research is that exposure to violence as a child or young adult increases the risk that they will exhibit violent behaviour themselves at a later stage (Idris, 2016; Leoschut & Burton, 2006). Also, society does not value all of its citizens as equal stakeholders. In most communities, the youth are the least valued stakeholders, and their voices are stifled by other interest groups, and adults generally, who are accepted as having a more prominent stake in society. According to Simpson (1993), black township youths have historically been excluded from the key sources of power and authority in SA society, such as education processes, formations of youth’s political rights, wealth creation processes and economic power decisions. This leaves historically disadvantaged young adults frustrated and generally disempowered. Without the resources or platforms to have historically disadvantaged young adults’ voices heard, some might resort to violence to express their discontent and to try to bring about change (Helgeson & Schneider, 2015).

A growing body of research suggests that violence against youth is an interplay between individual, relational, communal and societal risk and protective factors that affect youth
throughout all their life stages (David-Ferdon & Simon, 2014). Therefore, any comprehensive violence prevention strategy ought to identify the ways in which to mitigate against these risks (Global Status Report on Violence Prevention, 2014). Attention should be given to both risk and protective factors in order to reduce youth violence, where identifying protective factors is most important in directly reducing violence, or buffering against risk factors of violence (David-Ferdon & Simon, 2014). Interestingly, protective factors have not been studied as extensively, or rigorously as risk factors. Far too often, societies wait until violence occurs before they act, instead of working to prevent it before it starts. Responses to violence are critical, but they ought not to take the place of prevention initiatives (David-Ferdon & Simon, 2014).

1.2 Rationale for this Study

According to social ecological resilience theory (SERT) (Ungar, 2011), it is important to expose what young adults think their communities should do when facing adversity because social ecological role-players have a duty to champion resilience. Furthermore, Theron (2015) states that the resilience of marginalised, majority-world youth is not fully understood, because extant theories of resilience privilege the voices of minority-world young people, thereby creating a barrier for marginalised, majority-world youth to facilitate resilience within their own context. The inference can be made that historically disadvantaged youth’s voices regarding strategies to better protect them against violence are not being heard in the way that they should, and warrants that their messages be explored so that meaningful solutions in their social ecology (SE) can be achieved. As part of this, the insights of young adults need to be respected, as would be done with any other stakeholders in their communities. Put differently, their voices, as it were, need to be made audible in order to prioritise contextually appropriate violence prevention strategies, as recommended by David-Ferdon and Simon (2014).
Heeding these arguments, I formulated my research questions and conducted a literature review related to literature on the resilience of marginalised, majority-world SA young adults (i.e. historically disadvantaged young adults, self-identified as coloured or black), living in rural communities where violence is prevalent. In Chapter 2, I discuss and answer these research questions in detail. A review of the SA resilience-focused literature (see Table 1) indicates that resilience research in SA is increasing its focus on the interaction between risk and protective factors within communities, and how these interactions can be used to enable youth to negotiate for, and navigate towards contextually appropriate resilience resources. However, there is very little understanding of protective factors that protect young adults (between the ages of 18-24 years) against violence or that limit young adults’ exposure to violence.

Studies that do focus on protective factors in regards to violence included mainly young children (between the ages of 5 – 11), adolescents (12 – 17 years) and adults (25 and older). Only four SA studies were found that studied marginalised youth between the ages of 12 and 24, but with the focus on restorative justice, and the effects of violence exposure on youth and not on protective factors (Clark, 2012; Lamb & Snodgrass, 2013; Leoschut, 2008; Phasha, 2010). Four other SA studies were found that focused their attention on protective factors that enable resilience in the face of violence, but these studies focused on adults (ages 25 and above), families and adolescents (ages 13 – 19) (Ebersöhn, Nel, & Loots, 2017; Mampane, 2014; Vermeulen & Greeff, 2015; Ward, Martin, Theron, & Distiller, 2007). Another limitation in current SA resilience-focused literature is that most studies focus on protective factors that can support victims of violence after they have been exposed to violence, and not so much on protective factors that could be implemented prior to violence exposure, in order to diminish, or limit violence against people in general (Ebersöhn et al., 2017; Vermeulen & Greeff, 2015; Mampane, 2014; Ward et al., 2007). Thus, highlighting a clear gap in literature, there is a need to
hear from historically disadvantaged young adults regarding what contextually appropriate protective factors they need from their communities in order to better protect them against violence aimed at them.

Above I mentioned a review of SA literature. To review the literature I conducted an electronic search, using the terms resilience/resiliency/resilient, and violence, and youth/adolescence/young adults, and rural in the title and/or abstract and/or key words. I scanned the abstracts to check for a SA research site or that participants are South African. I did this repeatedly from November 2016 to June 2017. The databases included EBSCOhost, JSTOR, ScienceDirect, Google Scholar and SAePublications for the period 2000-2017. I only included literature post-2000, due to minimal socio-ecological conceptualisations of resilience prior to this period (Masten, 2014a). See Table 1 for the references to these studies.

Table 1

**Summary of South African studies: Literature pertaining to South African studies of young adults, violence and resilience: 2000 – 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/s</th>
<th>Aim of study</th>
<th>Focus of study</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Conceptualisation of resilience</th>
<th>Findings relating to resilience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ebersöhn, L., Nel, M., &amp; Loots, T. - 2017</td>
<td>Identifying indicators of risk and resilience</td>
<td>Youth (13-19 years)</td>
<td>25 young people in rural school - Mpumalanga</td>
<td>Qualitative study - Instrumental case-study design</td>
<td>Trait &amp; process-oriented</td>
<td>Individual resilience amplified by utilising resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mampane, M. R. - 2014</td>
<td>Identifying, describing, analysing and discussing the possible contribution of protective factors to the resilience of township middle-adolescent learners</td>
<td>Grade Nine middle-adolescent learners (14-16 years) from two township schools in Mamelodi. Schools who have been exposed to violence and academic challenges</td>
<td>291 learners in Grade Nine (185 males and 106 females of whom 51% lived in formal and 49% in informal housing structures)</td>
<td>Quantitative study - R-MATS questionnaire</td>
<td>Person-ecological transaction</td>
<td>SE transaction-Interaction between internal and external social resilience resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Sample Description</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamb, S. &amp; Snodgrass, L. - 2013</td>
<td>Exploring the conflict stories of young, SA adults that reflect the normalisation of violence and the resilience they negotiate</td>
<td>Qualitative study - Person-ecological transaction</td>
<td>Young adults (18-25 years), male and female students in the Eastern Cape</td>
<td>Young people can construct creative coping strategies notwithstanding the hardships of their environments, pointing to the social nature of resilience and its roots in family or community values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choe et al. - 2012</td>
<td>Examining how violence exposure contributes to SA adolescents’ participation in youth violence</td>
<td>Quantitative study - Protective model of resilience</td>
<td>Zulu adolescents (18-21 years) in township high schools around Durban</td>
<td>Resilience conceptualised as adult involvement moderating negative effects of violence exposure on violent behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward et al. - 2007</td>
<td>Investigating the extent to which children’s individual, family, school, and peer group characteristics influence resilient responses to violence exposure</td>
<td>Quantitative study - Multidimensional factors - SE transaction</td>
<td>Grade Six students living in a high-violence community in Cape Town</td>
<td>Resilience conceptualised as ordinary supportive functions carried out by the children’s social contexts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be deduced from Table 1, not only are SA studies of resilience (particularly among young adults) in the face of violence not very prevalent, but those studies that have been conducted neglected participatory visual methods (PVM).

2. PURPOSE STATEMENT

The purpose of this phenomenological study is to use PVM to explore the SE of resilience in a Free State (FS) community, in order to understand the messages historically disadvantaged young adults have for their community regarding the protective factors they need to be better protected against the violence to which they are subjected, as well as to determine whether their messages bring about social change. Resilience as a phenomenon, as well as research to better
understand and develop resilience, is innovative in the field of positive psychology (PP) because: it forms one of the four pillars in PP; includes a focus on both the good and the bad; concentrates on individual and contextual strengths and challenges; and examines how to improve life for all people (Wissing, 2013; Wong, 2011). Masten (2011), echoes this where she states that resilience researchers strive to make a positive difference by focusing research on investigating, developing and evaluating knowledge and interventions that aim to protect people from adversity and other societal risks.

The aims of this mini-study are as follows, to: (1) contribute in finding contextually appropriate protective factors that will better protect historically disadvantaged young women and young men in a rural FS community against violence; (2) create a platform from which historically disadvantaged young adults can engage in dialogue with SE stakeholders in order to prompt social change regarding violence prevention (Schartz & Walker, 2005); and in so doing (3) try to improve the lives of historically disadvantaged young adults in this FS community.

3. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

My purpose statement translates into the following primary and secondary research questions:
4. **CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

This study is underpinned by Ungar’s (2011) Social Ecology of Resilience Theory (SERT). This theory of resilience is defined as the capacity of individuals, experiencing significant adversity, to navigate their way to the specific psychological, social, cultural/contextual, and physical resources that sustain their well-being, as well as the ability of communities to co-negotiate for, and/or provide these resources in culturally and contextually meaningful ways (Ungar, 2012). This process involves individuals managing to successfully navigate and negotiate their way towards meaningful resources, but it is not complete without families, communities and
governments providing resilience-supporting resources to individuals in culturally and contextually meaningful ways that reflect the preferences of the individuals who need them. It is, therefore, important to consider whether/how what could protect young men against violence applies to young women too (Jefferis, 2016). Therefore, resilience is a context-and person-sensitive process shared by the individual as well as the individual’s SE, where the SE proves to be the most important component in the relationship that leads to recovery and sustainable well-being (Ungar, 2012; Ungar, Ghazinour, & Richter, 2013).

According to Ungar (2011), when studying resilience “… researchers must focus simultaneously on the individual (and the change that occurs) as well as the nature of protective mechanisms that interact with risk factors to mitigate their impact” (p. 4). This is called decentrality. In other words, this means moving away from a single focus on the change within an individual towards the interaction between individuals and their SE that facilitate and support the needed change. Nevertheless, many resilience studies still focus on individuals (Van Rensburg, Theron, & Rothmann, 2015). Because my study focuses on the SE within a rural FS community and seeks to understand, from the perspective of historically disadvantaged young adults, how their communities can do more to limit violence against young adults, it addresses the aforementioned gap.

Another principle to take note of when studying resilience is complexity. According to Ungar (2011), one cannot simply classify a person as resilient in all contexts at every point in time in an individual’s life. The reason for this is the shifting contexts of a person’s life. A resilient child in his/her current context might not be as resilient when he/she has to move to a new school, or if his/her parents get divorced, especially if there aren’t enough culturally and/or contextually meaningful resources available for the child from which to draw. Therefore, there is a need to develop contextually as well as temporally specific models to explain resilience-
related outcomes. Similarly, gender dynamics add to the complexity of resilience and so it is important to better understand young women’s protective needs, compared with young men (Jefferis, 2016).

Ungar (2011) points to the inclusion of atypical resilience processes or atypicality as a third principle to include when studying resilience. Atypicality refers to when individuals, communities, societies, etc. find ways of coping with and protecting themselves against adversity, even though these protective processes might have negative consequences, or be different from processes advocated by mainstream communities (Malindi, 2014; Malindi & Theron, 2010). Findings in a study done by Wang and Ho (2007) indicated that young women in urban contexts increasingly behave violently towards their male partners to cope with a culturally embedded gender-bias that threatens to disempower young women when they enter relationships. This use of violence is functional, because it helps these young women to maintain personal coherence and resist negative stereotypes imposed on them by the young men. It is possible that my study could uncover similar atypical processes.

In resilience research, it is important to understand that there are conventional and unconventional pathways to resilience, and that what works well in one context might be detrimental in other contexts (Ungar, 2011). In my view, atypical resilience can also be described as ‘normal’ behaviour in an ‘abnormal’ environment. Therefore it is imperative that we understand the use of protective processes within the specific contexts it is applied, and not to draw conclusions based solely on generalised assumption (Jefferis, 2016).

Lastly, the principle of cultural relativity makes an important contribution in a resilience study (Ungar, 2011). Culture defines who we are, and why we do what we do. It is a shared knowledge, expectation and understanding of the world (Panter-Brick, 2015). Therefore, in order to understand resilience, we need to understand the meanings specific cultures give to daily
practices, values, beliefs and customs, as well as their use of language. What one culture might view as ‘underdeveloped’ might be seen as normative in a different culture. However, my study did not focus on the cultural lens of the historically disadvantaged young adults, but rather their contextual lens, as young adults living in a rural, township community. I recognise that this is a limitation.

The SERT is applied in my study by means of hearing from the historically disadvantaged young adults about the contextually meaningful psychological, social, cultural, and physical resources they might need from their SE to better protect them against violence to which they are subjected. Discussions between the historically disadvantaged young adults (young men and young women) and their SE will potentially present a pathway for them to navigate their way to available protective factors and negotiate for contextually meaningful resources. How the community responds and interacts in the negotiation process is an important factor in my study.

4.1 Clarification of Central Concepts

4.1.1 Resilience

Masten (2014b) defines resilience as:

The capacity of a dynamic system to adapt successfully to disturbances that threaten system function, viability, or development. (p. 10)

In addition, this capacity to adapt is informed by ecological systemic resources (Masten, 2011; Rutter, 2013). This aligns with SERT (Ungar, 2011; Ungar, 2012), which frames my study theoretically and underpins it in order to gain knowledge as to what the capacity of a rural FS community is to enable processes that can better protect historically disadvantaged young adults
against violence, thereby supporting the resilience processes of young adults threatened by violence.

4.1.2 Violence

The WHO defines violence as any use of physical force or power that is used intentionally to injure, take someone’s life, do psychological harm, and/or deprive another person, a group or community, whether it comes as a threat or results in actual harm (World Report on Violence and Health, 2002).

4.1.3 Gender-based violence

Gender-based violence (GBV) is when violence is intentionally aimed at and causing harm to women and girls, or to groups with marginalised gender identities. The United Nations defines GBV as: “Any act of violence that results in, or is likely to result in, physical, sexual or mental harm or suffering to women, including threats of such acts, coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or in private life” (United Nations General Assembly, 1993, Article 1).

4.1.4 Historically disadvantaged young adults

Historically disadvantaged refers to participants self-identifying as being black in the broader sense of the term as understood by radical black discourses, and who have been socially, economically and educationally oppressed by the previous South African government (Mokoena, 2006). According to SSA (2016), youth can be divided into younger youth (15-24) and older youth (25-34 years). For the purpose of this study young adults will refer to women and men between the ages of eighteen and twenty-four.
4.1.5 Rurality

According to Sauvageot and Dias da Graca (2007), there is no universally accepted definition of what a rural environment is and that rurality can be defined in a number of ways. Hart, Larson, and Lishner (2005), recommend that researchers and policy analysts involved in health-related research and policy-making ought to specify which aspects of rurality are most relevant to the topic at hand when selecting a definition of rurality. For this reason, I have chosen Eager, Versteeg-Mojanaga, and Cooke’s (2014) summary of key socio-economic elements as an appropriate working definition of rurality for this study. Rural areas tend to:

- have low population densities with greater average distances to travel in order to access basic social services (Hart et al., 2005);
- have a disproportionate number of elderly people and children (Hart et al., 2005);
- be poor in comparison with urban counterparts (Eager et al., 2014; Sauvageot & Dias da Graca, 2007);
- depend more on agriculture and the use of natural resources for their livelihoods (Eager et al., 2014; Sauvageot & Dias da Graca, 2007);
- have unequal access to health care, education, electricity, water, adequate nutrition and other economic opportunities to overcome material deprivation (SAHRC & UNICEF, 2014); and
- be shaped by more ethnically and culturally homogeneous populations that tend to be more cohesive (Scott, Gilbert, & Gelan, 2007).
4.1.6 Townships

According to Pernegger and Godehart (2007), townships are “…underdeveloped, usually (but not only) urban, residential areas that during Apartheid were reserved for non-whites (Africans, Coloureds and Indians)” [sic] (p. 2). Townships are characterised by low levels of community facilities and economic development, unemployment, and poverty. Even though the post-apartheid government implemented strategies to close the physical gaps between former white cities and black townships, the spatial, social and economic inequities of apartheid endure. Townships are still characterised by low levels of education, high unemployment and HIV/AIDS; which in turn continue to be sites of struggle and resilience home to family breakdowns, inadequate policing, poverty and violence (Findley & Ogbu, 2011).

5. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

In the following section, I will contextualise my study, discuss my choice of research design used for the study, as well as outline the components involved in my choice of research design, namely: research paradigm, strategy of inquiry, ethical considerations, and my role as researcher (Creswell, 2013). Thereafter, I frame a discussion of each phase in the research process and how the various PVM were used as the strategy of inquiry. I conclude this chapter by describing the steps taken in analysing the data gathered in my study, and how I went about ensuring the trustworthiness of my findings.

5.1 Contextualising the Study

This study forms part of an international project called Networks for change and well-being: ‘Girl-led’ from the Ground Up Policy-making to Address Sexual Violence in Canada and South Africa (see http://girls4policychange.org/1075-2/). The aim of this project is to “study the co-
creation of knowledge about sexual violence in relational and institutional settings as informed by girls themselves. In so doing, it aims to shift the boundaries of knowledge production and policy change” (Mitchell & Moletsane, 2014, p. 2). This project makes use of social media, participatory digital/visual and other arts-based approaches in order to learn from historically disadvantaged girls and young women regarding how sexual violence against them can be addressed. In addition, it concerns what impact findings have on their SE in terms of advocating for policy changes that might ensure a safer environment for historically disadvantaged girls and young women.

Furthermore, this project looks at innovative approaches to disseminating information and communication, considering knowledge exchange between and amongst girls themselves, institutions, community practitioners and policy-makers. It builds on youth-led media making, community-based research, participatory action research, research as intervention and research as social change. As a master’s student researcher, working with one of the SA co-investigators in the study, this study will be conducted with historically disadvantaged young women and men (self-identified as coloured or black) who live in a rural FS community. I included young men, given concerns (e.g. Ramphele, 2012) that a focus on girls/women too often excludes vulnerable young men.

5.2 Research Design

I will make use of a qualitative research design in order to capture the historically disadvantaged young adults’ perceptions regarding how their community can better promote their safety regarding violence aimed at them. The call for resilience studies to make the voices of marginalised youth heard necessitates a qualitative design, because it facilitates youth
contributions (Burnette & Hefflinger, 2016; Kliewer et al., 2004; Mitchell, Theron, Stuart, Smith, & Campbell, 2011).

Qualitative research is defined by Malterud (2001) as an inductive method of enquiry that aims to capture in depth understanding of social phenomena by studying individual experiences and perspectives within a specific context. Furthermore, qualitative research requires the researcher to be subjective in using methods that elicit descriptions in words rather than numbers. The final written work in a qualitative design “includes the voices of the participants, the reflexivity of the researcher, a complex description and interpretation of the problem, and its contribution to the literature, or a call for change” (Creswell, 2014, p. 50).

One of the most important characteristics of my study as qualitative research was to investigate and describe the lived experience of historically disadvantaged young women and young men in their own familiar environment (Langdridge, 2007; Tracy, 2013; Creswell, 2014). Therefore, I focused my study on the personal perspectives of historically disadvantaged young adults and their explanation of what, according to them, would be appropriate protective factors against violence aimed at them within their specific social ecological context. I planned the meetings with the young adults in such a way that they occurred in their familiar environment, such as the social welfare centre in their neighbourhood.

As a qualitative researcher, I attempted to obtain multiple sources of data. Firstly, this meant that I interacted with eleven primary informants (that is, six young women, and five young men). Secondly, I made use of different data generation methods (Creswell, 2014; Tracy, 2013), all of which were PVM, namely, draw-and-talk, participatory video, and the Mmogo-method™. Mitchell et al. (2011) are of the opinion that PVM are appropriate for obtaining deeper and richer data, as it is able to access the memories, thoughts and feelings of people. In other words, PVM captures experiences not easily put into words. Therefore, my choice of PVM as research method
afforded me a greater opportunity to understand the messages historically disadvantaged young adults have for their SE in regards to protective factors that could better protect them against violence to which they are subjected.

In conducting a qualitative study, I was aware that the research process was an emergent design, which meant that change in any phase of the process might become necessary (Creswell, 2014; Malterud, 2001). During my research, it became evident that the young adults did not like the idea of making a collage as originally planned in our fourth phase of the study. I then adapted the research process by using the Mmogo-method™ with the young adults, in order to complete phase four.

5.3 Research Paradigm

This study is framed by the social constructivist paradigm. Research conducted within a social constructivist paradigm makes use of the participants’ understanding of the phenomenon being studied (Creswell, 2014). In other words, researchers seek to describe the understanding and meanings participants direct towards certain objects or phenomena (Langdridge, 2007). The responsibility of the researcher working within this paradigm is to rely as much as possible on the participants’ views of the phenomenon being studied - in this case, the view of historically disadvantaged young adults regarding how their SE can better protect youth against violence to which they are subjected.

Researchers working according to a social constructivist paradigm need to address the processes of interaction among participants, as well as the specific contexts in which the participants live and work (Tracy, 2013). My intent in this study is to make sense of historically disadvantaged young adults’ understanding of how their community could better protect young
adults against violence aimed at them. Table 2 is a summary of this study’s research paradigm and theoretical perspective.

Table 2

**Social constructivist paradigm**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philosophical assumptions</th>
<th>Understanding the meanings given by participants of a specific phenomenon (Creswell, 2013).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ontology</strong></td>
<td>Reality is interpreted according to the understanding and meanings given by participants, as well as their personal experiences regarding a specific phenomenon (Langridge, 2007).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In my mini-study, participants’ understanding of violence in their community, their personal experiences regarding how they are being protected against violence, as well as how their community can better protect them against violence aimed at them, is given primacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epistemology</strong></td>
<td>According to this research paradigm, the focus is to describe and interpret the participants’ understanding of a phenomenon. The researcher and the participants are united in a transactional relationship where both the researcher and the participants work together in the meaning-making process. Adding an interpretive dimension to phenomenological research, enabling it to be used as the basis for practical theory, allows it to inform, support or challenge policy and action (Lester, 1999).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The researcher and the participants will collaborate and participate in the data-gathering process. All data generated will be discussed together and interpreted collaboratively as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Axiology</strong></td>
<td>The researcher acknowledges that research is value-laden and that bias is potentially present (Tracy, 2013).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual values of both the researcher and participants are honoured, and are negotiated between researcher and participants. Specifically in this study, I hold that greater psychological well-being is</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
desirable and possible when participants’ voices are amplified by honouring and making public the message they have about the protective factors they need to increase resilience within their communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Participatory visual methods (PVM).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PVM is a qualitative research methodology that relies on the use of arts-based and visual media to make abstract concepts more tangible and realisable. It enables participants to challenge their own meaning-making as well as to delve deeper into what they are trying to say (Mitchell, Walsh, &amp; Moletsane, 2006).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 **Strategy of Inquiry**

This is a phenomenological study. Phenomenology describes research that aims to describe the common meaning individuals have regarding their personal experiences of a specific concept or phenomenon (Langdridge, 2007). Data is collected from the individuals who have experienced the phenomenon. The researcher then aims to develop an integrated description of the essence of the experience as expressed by all the individuals (Nieswiadomy, 1993; Creswell, 2013). According to Moustakas (1994), a phenomenological approach is used when a researcher examines a problem that is best understood from the shared experiences of several individuals. It is important to understand these shared experiences in order to gain a deeper understanding of the phenomenon as well as to develop effective practices and policies.

Using multiple data collection strategies, I focused on exploring and gaining a deeper understanding concerning how historically disadvantaged young adults, living in rural areas, could be better protected against violence aimed at them. Information gained from these young adults concerning the protective factors they require in order to be better protected against
violence was made public using visual artefacts they produced. This amplification of their voices, as it were, created a platform where these historically disadvantaged young adults were supported to negotiate with relevant community leaders for these needed protective factors. In doing so, my study hope to bring about the creation of effective practices and policies to better protect young adults against violence in their respective communities.

5.4.1 Participant selection

I invited 10-15 historically disadvantaged (self-identifying as coloured and black) young adults (18-24 years) from a rural FS community to participate in my study. Advertisements were given to a social worker active at this rural research site, who gave the advertisements to historically disadvantaged young adults in the community. In total, eleven young adults participated. They included six young women (average age 21 years) and five young men (average age 22). Their education levels varied from Grade 11 to first/second year university students. Their home language was Sesotho. They all lived in a township adjacent to a town in the rural Eastern Free State in which the research took place. Participants could not take part in the study if they were:

- younger than 18 years,
- involved in a legal case concerning violence that took place against any participant, as this may jeopardise their case; or
- involved in therapeutic interventions, as participation in this study could possibly trigger discomfort or painful memories.

The social worker at the research site communicated the inclusion and exclusion criteria to the young adults, along with the reason for the exclusion criteria prior to participating in this study.
5.4.2 Data collection strategies

In order to contribute to meaningful understandings of how a SE can support the resilience of young adults regarding how their communities can better protect them against violence, I employed different PVM, such as draw-and-talk/write, storyboards, participatory video and the Mmogo-method™. The research process was divided into four phases, as explained in the following sections. Permission was granted by the participants to audio-record all of the research sessions as well as to keep their original visual presentations.

5.4.2.1 Phase 1 - Draw-and-talk/write

I used two draw-and-talk/write activities in my first meeting with the young adults. A draw-and-talk/write activity comprises of creating a drawing based on a given prompt, thereafter allowing participants to talk/write about the meaning embedded in their drawings. Once participants explained their drawings, the researcher could probe for further information. The visual representation in a draw-and-talk/write activity is usually created by means of drawing on paper with the use of various media, such as, pencils, pens, crayons, and paint (Mitchell et al., 2011). I decided to use a white A4 sheet of paper, grey pencils, colour pencils, and crayons during the draw-and-talk/write sessions of my research. An advantage of the draw-and-talk/write method is that the power imbalance between the researcher and participant is decreased (Theron, Stuart, & Mitchell, 2011). Participants are actively involved in their visual representation of social issues, in this case, historically disadvantaged young adults’ insights regarding protective factors needed to prevent violence against them.

At the start of our first meeting, we (myself, two research interns and the translator) introduced ourselves to the participants and spent some time in a rapport building activity. According to Mitchell et al. (2011), it is imperative that researchers build rapport with
participants in order for them to feel comfortable to share their inner thoughts and feelings. Thereafter, we (myself and the translator) explained the purpose and aim of the study, as well as what the participants’ role in the study would entail. After our introduction activity, the young adults were invited to participate in the first draw-and-talk/write activity.

During the first drawing activity, young adults were asked to draw and describe violence prevention strategies based on the following prompt: “What is your community currently doing to keep young women/men safe against violence?” In the second drawing activity participants were asked to draw and describe protective factors that could be facilitated by their SE to better protect young adults against violence. The prompt was: “What can your community do to better protect historically disadvantaged young women/men against violence aimed at them?” After each drawing activity, participants discussed their drawings with me in groups (one female group consisting of six females and one male group consisting of five males) in order to ensure that I understood their messages clearly. Phase one took approximately two hours to complete.

5.4.2.2 Phase 2 – Storyboards and participatory video

During the second phase of the research, participants were asked to divide into two groups and to create a participatory video based on the prompt given in the second draw-and-talk/write activity, namely: “What can your community do to better protect historically disadvantaged young women/men against violence aimed at them?” Participatory video entails that participants actively engage in creating a video based on issues critical to them in order to inform the study (Mitchell et al., 2011). In their groups, participants wrote down as many protective factors they could think of that would be meaningful to them. These ideas were written on an A2 size paper for the participants in each group to see. During a refreshment break, each participant privately voted for the strategy that he/she felt was critical to their safety. After the voting was completed,
the strategy with the most votes was used as the main theme around which each group would formulate their video messages (Mitchell & De Lange, 2011).

Each group was asked to plan their video message by first drawing, or writing a storyboard (a visual outline made up of a series of drawings, sketches, or words) around the strategy for which they had voted (Moletsane, Mitchell, De Lange, Stuart, Buthelezi, & Taylor, 2009). After completing their storyboards, I provided each group with a Samsung tablet to video record their messages in English, or in their mother tongue (Sesotho). Both groups preferred filming their messages in Sesotho. A translator, who signed confidentiality agreements, translated these messages into English during discussions with the participants. Later, subtitles were inserted into the participants’ videos by one of the Sesotho-speaking research interns, in order to enable non-Sesotho speaking community stakeholders to understand these video messages clearly. The two groups made one video recording each (see Addendum J).

The No Editing Required (NER) approach of Mitchell and De Lange (2011) was followed. This meant that the participants’ videos were screened to them immediately after they had been filmed, without any editing of what they had filmed. This enabled me to engage the young adults in reflective discussions, and to probe for further information so as to ensure that I correctly understood the messages in each video. Participants were also asked to discuss how they, as young adults, could disseminate their video-based messages to the rest of their SE. From this discussion, young adults asked me to organise a meeting with SE stakeholders, including the local municipality officers, social workers, teachers, ward counsellors, and religious leaders. The participatory video session took approximately four hours to complete.
5.4.2.3 Phase 3 – Screening of participants’ videos

With the help of the social worker, a meeting was scheduled with the SE stakeholders chosen by the young adults six weeks after the completion of Phase 2. The aim of this meeting was to screen the video-messages to the SE stakeholders and to facilitate conversation between the young adults and SE stakeholders. The purpose of this conversation was to raise awareness regarding the protective factors historically disadvantaged young adults need to be better protected against violence to which they are subjected. The ideas of historically disadvantaged young adults challenge their SE stakeholders to carefully reconsider preconceived ideas on better protection against violence and to engage in strategies that could develop effective violence prevention programmes that better match their needs (Ginsburg et al., 2002; Mitchell et al., 2011). See Addendum I for photos of the meeting.

5.4.2.4 Phase 4 - Mmogo-method™

The fourth phase occurred one month after the screening of the participants’ videos to their SE stakeholders. The aim of this meeting was to determine whether their meeting with the SE stakeholders made a difference in regards to their video messages. Following Roos (2009) and her guidelines for the Mmogo-method™, participants were asked to make a visual representation, using potter’s clay, beads, dry grass stalks and a round piece of cloth, based on the following prompt: “What differences did communicating your messages make to better protect young adults against violence?” After participants had created their visual presentations, we discussed the meaning embedded in each presentation. This activity took approximately two hours to complete.
5.4.3 Data analysis and interpretation

Data analysis is an iterative process that involves organising the data, getting familiarised with the whole database, coding and organising themes, delineating, and interpreting the data (Bradley, Curry, & Devers, 2007; Tracy, 2013). In my study the data sets included drawings, videos and photos of the visual representations created by the participants, as well as the written/verbal explanations of these visual materials. The latter (i.e. the explanations) were transcribed by me and the research team. In instances where participants spoke in Sesotho this was translated by the translator and back-translated by the intern who was fluent in Sesotho and IsiZulu. In this way the English transcript was made reliable. The data analysis had two distinct phases, namely participatory analysis and inductive content analysis.

During my discussions with the participants, the visual material was explained by the participants themselves first (Theron, 2016). Such participatory analysis enabled me to prioritise the insights historically disadvantaged young adults had regarding protective factors they need to be better protected against violence aimed at them. In so doing, this study honours the recommendation made by Van Rensburg et al. (2015) to give voice to historically disadvantaged young adults’ own understanding of what they need in order to reduce the risk of falling prey to violence.

After I ensured that I understood the visual data as explained by the participants, I used inductive content analysis to make meaning of the visual data and transcripts. Inductive content analysis entails that each data set be analysed separately - an iterative process where resemblances and variances are used to contribute to existing theory (Nieuwenhuis, 2007). The first step was to immerse myself in the data by organising and reading through every data set (Bradley et al., 2007).
After reading through all the data sets to get a global sense of the data, I followed a process of open coding to label segments of participants’ words that answered each research question (e.g., “What can their communities do better to protect young adults against violence aimed at them?”). Open coding is a process of fracturing the data by making use of questions and constant comparisons in order to conceptualize and categorize the data that answers the research question (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). An open code can be a word or phrase assigned to a relevant section of the transcribed data (i.e., a section which offers an answer to the research question) in order to capture the essence of a specific portion of the data (Saldaña, 2009). During the open coding process I reviewed the data line by line, as a concept became evident I assigned a code to that section of the data. I then compared the labelled segments of data in order to determine if they reflect the same concept (Bradley et al., 2007). See Addendum E.

In order to refine the data, I grouped similar open codes into axial codes. I strategically developed the axial codes by reassembling the data that was fractured during the open coding process into higher order categories (Saldaña, 2009). To do so, I designed specific inclusion and exclusion criteria that specified the properties and dimensions of each category (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Prior to applying these axial codes to the data, I had a consensus discussion with my supervisor and a fellow master’s student. The aim of this consensus discussion was to review discrepancies and to resolve any differences regarding the inclusion/exclusion criteria and the axial codes I had developed (Bradley et al., 2007).

When consensus was reached, I listed the axial codes and the inclusion/exclusion criteria (see Addendum F) and followed a process of constantly comparing these axial codes (see Addendum G) across data sets to develop preliminary and later main themes, patterns and outliers in the data (Corbin & Strauss, 1990; Leedy & Ormrod, 2015). After the main themes became apparent, I compared the young women/men’s themes to answer the secondary question:
“How do the messages of these young women and men differ regarding the protective factors they need?

5.4.4 Trustworthiness

Following Creswell (2013), the following steps were taken to establish trustworthiness in this study:

- Participatory analysis ensured that regular member checks were done during data generation. All information generated from this study, and how I understood it, was discussed with participants, my supervisor and a fellow master’s student.

- Multiple data sources (e.g., drawings, storyboards, participatory video, and visual representations, conversations and group meetings) were generated and triangulated to justify developing themes.

- Consensus discussions with my supervisor and a fellow master’s student explored my understanding of participants’ explanations and ensured that my personal bias towards the data is eliminated as much as possible.

- External audits will be conducted by the greater project’s steering committee (on which historically disadvantage young people serve) as well as service providers and academics from both Canada and SA. The purpose of these external audits will be to review the trustworthiness of results and fair dissemination processes of my study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

5.4.5 Ethical considerations

The core ethical principles of authorisation, autonomy, informed consent, confidentiality and anonymity, non-maleficence, beneficence, and distributive justice, as described in the guidelines
by the Department of Health (Ethics in Health Research, 2015), guided my dealings with the participants, allowing for responsible research to be done with integrity. As indicated in section 5.1, this study was conducted as part of a larger research project. Ethical approval has been granted for the principal project (see Addendum A). The Research Ethics Board II (REB II) reviewed and approved this project by delegated review in accordance with the requirements of the McGill University Policy on the Ethical Conduct of Research Involving Human Participants and the Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans. Approval Period: May 15, 2015 – May 14, 2016; #267-0115). My study has received ethical approval from the Humanities and Health Research Ethics Committee (HHREC) on 27/07/2016 (Ethics number: NWU-HS-2016-0062). See Addendum B.

In order to comply with the ethical principle of autonomy, I had to allow each participant to make his/her own decisions regarding their level of participation in each phase of the research process (Theron et al., 2011). This meant that I had to ensure that all of the participants understood that their participation in the study would be voluntary and that they could withdraw from the study at any time during the research process, without any retribution. All participants read and signed a letter of informed consent prior to the commencement of the study. The informed consent letters were written in simple language (see Addendum C) and handed to the participants by the social worker active at the research site. It was verbally explained to each participant in their mother tongue (Sesotho), and the young adults had the opportunity to take the consent letters home in order to make an informed decision to participate in the study without any pressure from anyone. All participants signed their consent letters and handed it to the social worker. Prior to conducting phase one of the research process, I explained the information in the letter of consent in detail to the young adults once again. The translator checked the understanding too.
Participants were forewarned about the limited confidentiality and lack of anonymity in the consent letters. Even though group rules, such as not sharing any discussions outside of the group were decided together with the participants, no guarantees could be given that participants would uphold the agreement. Participants knew each other, which hampered confidentiality and anonymity even further. Furthermore, participants’ faces and/or voices could not be completely disguised in the making of their videos. Regardless of these factors, none of the participants had questions or expressed doubts about participating in the study.

All data was stored electronically. The confidentiality of the electronic data is protected on a secure network, which is both encrypted and password protected. The data is furthermore stored on a portable data storage device. The hard copies were securely stored in a locked filing cabinet in a locked storage room. The coded data and master list are securely stored, separate from the hardcopies.

In order to do the most good as researcher (Moletsane, Mitchell, Smith, & Chisholm, 2008), I had to ensure that participants were comfortable and felt reassured during the research process. I managed to do this by allowing tea and lunch breaks with snacks and light meals for the participants at every session. All activities were explained to participants in English and in Sesotho. Participants were reassured prior to each activity that the quality of their visual presentations was not important, but that attention would only be paid to the content of their visual presentations (Mitchell et al., 2011). Counselling services were secured by the Bethlehem Child and Family Welfare Centre in such case as the research process should trigger any sensitive emotions for participants. None of the participants made use of the counselling services.
5.4.6 Role of the researcher

As a qualitative researcher whose ontology is based in a phenomenological approach, I was involved in all stages of the study - from defining the concepts, to the design of the research process and activities, transcription, analysis, verification, as well as reporting the concepts and themes (Nieswiadomy, 1993; Creswell, 2013). Firstly, my role was to understand the messages of the young adults based on our discussions during the research process, and to convey these messages in academic words during the dissemination of their messages. Secondly, I categorised the emerging themes and recorded the essence of these messages in writing, which resulted in a comprehensive description of the phenomena (Sanjari, Bahrammnezhad, Fomani, Shoghi, & Cheraghi, 2014). Compare Chapter 2: Findings.

According to Creswell (2013), qualitative research is a subjective, interpretative process where the researcher is involved in close interaction with participants for a certain amount of time. The researcher’s subjectivity cannot be removed from the research process, thus the researcher can influence the process via assumptions and/or bias. It is therefore important for the researcher to reflect on his/her positioning and how this positioning can shape the research process.

As a white, privileged, Christian female researcher, I tried to be cognisant of my own subjectivity for the way in which it might colour my interactions and interpretations. I tried to minimise my subjectivity by bracketing my beliefs and ideas, in order to be able to see the experience from the eyes of the participants (Nieswiadomy, 1993; Creswell, 2013). In so doing, I gave primacy to the interpretations of the participants, rather than my own.
6. MINI-DISSERTATION FORMAT

This mini-dissertation follows the article model. For this reason, it is comprised of one article (Chapter 2), followed by a concluding chapter (Chapter 3).

Chapter 2: Article

In order to answer the main research question: “What message do historically disadvantaged young women/men have about how their communities can partner with young women/men in order to better protect them against violence?”, the following secondary research questions directed this article:

- What can the communities do better to protect young adults against violence aimed at them?
- How do the messages of these young women and men differ regarding the protective factors they need?
- What differences do communicating these messages make?

The article was prepared for *Youth & Society*. This journal publishes peer-reviewed articles in the field of Sociology. Articles should be written in APA 6 style, with a word limit of 7 000 words. The full guidelines for authors are included in Addendum D.

Chapter 3: Conclusions, limitations, and recommendations

The concluding chapter reflects upon the answers to my research questions, how well my findings contributed to the resilience literature, and the effectiveness of the methodology used in my study. I end Chapter 3 by commenting on the study’s limitations, and some recommendations for future study.
CHAPTER 2: ARTICLE

Historically disadvantaged youth negotiating for resilience resources to navigate towards violence prevention

Prepared for submission to: *Youth & Society* (see Appendix D for author guidelines). I am aware that this article is longer than the required length, however, I will appeal to the editor for clemency given that the article reports qualitative work.

The research questions guiding this article are as follows (compare Chapter 1: Figure 2):

- What message do historically disadvantaged young women/men have about how their communities can partner with young women/men in order to better protect them against violence?
- What can their communities do better to protect young adults against violence aimed at them?
- How do the messages of these young women and men differ regarding the protective factors they need?
- What differences do communicating these messages make?
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Abstract

Resilience, or adaptive behaviour in the face of adversity, foregrounds an individual’s ability to negotiate for, and navigate towards culturally appropriate resources that can facilitate positive adaptation. The aim of this article is to report a study that investigates how visual messages created and delivered by South African (SA) youth within a rural Free State (FS) community can lessen the violence to which they are subjected. This phenomenological study applied participatory visual methods (PVM) to explore the messages historically disadvantaged young adults have regarding how their community can better protect them against violence, and furthermore, how communicating these messages to their local community can bring about change. Eleven historically disadvantaged young women \((n = 6)\) and men \((n = 5)\) aged 18-24 participated in this study. Their messages foreground resilience resources. In particular, they indicate that protective strategies, facilitated by various stakeholders in their social ecology (SE) (i.e. parents, police services, community policing, public service departments), are needed to support and educate youth to avoid violence. The results have implications for mental health practitioners; more particularly those who serve historically disadvantaged young people from rural areas.

**Keywords**: resilience, resiliency, resilient, young adults, youth, adolescence, violence, rural
The purpose of this article is to explore the messages historically disadvantaged young adults have regarding how their rural FS community can better protect them against violence. Leoschut argues that “violence has become a characteristic feature of South African society” (2008, p. 81), and this is especially true of violence towards women and majority-world youth of SA (Theron, 2015). In SA, majority youth are historically disadvantaged youth who have been socially, economically and educationally deprived by the previous SA government (Mokoena, 2006). The World Health Organisation (WHO) defines violence as any use of physical force or power that is used intentionally to injure, take someone’s life, do psychological harm, and/or deprive another person, group or community, whether as a treat or actual harm (World Report on Violence and Health, 2002).

Exposure to violence appears to have serious repercussions on the behaviour of young people in the country (Clark, 2012), as it heightens the susceptibility of young people to not only become victims, but perpetrators as well (Lagasse et al., 2006). Thus, violence against youth negatively impacts individuals, the SA economy, and society at large (Ward & Lamb, 2015). Reducing violence and not simply treating the effects of violence ought to be a national priority (David-Ferdon & Simon, 2014). In an attempt to prioritise violence prevention strategies, Ungar’s (2011) Social Ecological Resilience Theory (SERT) was applied as a framework to understand the messages of historically disadvantaged young adults regarding what their communities could do to better protect them against violence. SERT prioritises the role of social ecologies (such as communities) in explanations of youth resilience. In her book entitled Ordinary Magic: Resilience in Development, Masten (2014b) defines resilience as “the capacity of a dynamic system to adapt successfully to disturbances that threaten system function, viability, or development” (p. 10). This capacity to adapt is informed by ecological systemic resources, such as personal resources as well as resources extrinsic to the
individual’s system (Masten & Powell, 2003). This understanding aligns with SERT, which defines resilience as the capacity of individuals, experiencing significant adversity, to navigate their way to the specific psychological, social, cultural, contextual and physical resources that sustain their well-being, as well as the ability of communities to co-negotiate for and/or provide these resources in contextually meaningful ways (Ungar, 2004; Ungar, Brown, Liebenberg, Cheung, & Levine, 2008; Ungar, 2012). Resilience is therefore a process shared by the individual and their SE, where the SE constitutes the most important component in the relationship that leads to recovery and sustainable well-being in the context of adversity (Ungar, 2012; Ungar, Ghazinour, & Richter, 2013).

A profusion of studies have focused on the risk factors associated with violence in many different contexts (Brownridge, 2008; Burnette, 2015; Hodges & Cabanilla, 2011; Kliwer et al., 2004; Leoschut, 2008; Molnar, Cerda, Roberts, & Buka, 2008; Ward & Lamb, 2015). Knowing what causes violence is important, but knowing what can protect against violence is even more necessary. Far too often, societies wait until violence occurs before they act, instead of working to prevent it before it starts. Responses to violence are critical, but they should not take the place of prevention initiatives (David-Ferdon & Simon, 2014). Therefore, the focus of resilience research has shifted towards studying protective factors.

Protective factors are initiatives, strategies and opportunities that have the potential to prevent or mitigate against the impact violence have on youth and others (Resnick, Ireland, & Borowsky, 2004). Even though resilience researchers have increased their attention towards protective factors buffering against the effects of exposure to violence, there is still a lack of extensive empirical research on protective factors for minority races and youth regarding violence in general (Burnette & Hefflinger, 2016; Kliwer et al., 2004).
Most international studies focus on young children and adolescents when conducting research on protective factors that enable resilience in the face of violence (Butcher, Galanek, Kretschmar, & Flannery, 2015; Ginsburg et al., 2002; Hammack, Richards, Luo, Edlynn, & Roy, 2004; Jain, Buka, Subramanian, & Molnar, 2012; Kassis, Artz, Scambor, Scambor, & Moldenhauer, 2013; Kliewer et al., 2004; Krenichyn, Saegert, & Evans, 2001; Lagasse et al., 2006; Laye & Maykota, 2014; Molnar et al., 2008; Ryan, Miller-Loessi, & Nieri, 2007; Sanders, Munford, Liebenberg, & Ungar, 2013; Stark, Thomson, & Potts, 2016; Schwartz & Proctor, 2000; Ungar, 2005; Ungar et al., 2008; Zahradnik et al., 2010). Very little attention is given to historically disadvantaged young adults (18-24 years). Only a handful of international studies were found to focus their attention on young adults and the protective factors they need to enable their resilience in the face of violence (Hamby, Grych, & Banyard, 2017; Jain, Buka, Subramanian, & Molnar, 2010; Shepherd, Reynolds, & Moran, 2010).

The same limitation is true of SA studies. Four SA studies focused on studying marginalised youth between the ages of 12 – 24 with the focus on restorative justice and the effects of violence exposure on youth, but not on protective factors (Clark, 2012; Lamb & Snodgrass, 2013; Leoschut, 2008; Phasha, 2010). Only four SA studies were found that focused their attention on protective factors enabling resilience in the face of violence, but these studies focused on adults (ages 25 and above) and/or families and adolescents (ages 13-19) (Ebersöhn, Nel, & Loots, 2017; Mampane, 2014; Vermeulen & Greeff, 2015; Ward, Martin, Theron, & Distiller, 2007).

Protective Factors in the Face of Violence

Despite this limited number, there is some agreement among researchers about certain protective factors that were found to mitigate the effects of exposure to violence. For example, several studies have found informal social support networks, such as positive connections to supportive
family members/adults and friends to be a main protective factor in alleviating the effects of violence against youth (Butcher et al., 2015; Ginsburg et al., 2002; Hammack et al., 2004; Kliewer et al., 2004; Krenichyn et al., 2001; Lagasse et al., 2006; Jain et al., 2012; Molnar et al., 2008; Stark et al., 2016; Ungar et al., 2008). Ryan et al. (2007) amplify the importance of these positive connections to others by saying that “adults, specifically parents and school personnel, are responsible for providing the first line of defense” (pp. 1053-1054) against violence aimed at youth.

In practice, however, informal social support networks do not always provide support for survivors of sexual violence. A study conducted by Stark et al. (2016) indicated that actions by relatives and friends at times impeded the recovery of survivors, as well as the ultimate success of the existing support networks. This was due to certain social norms and communal attitudes that blamed sexually abused girls for being the cause of the abuse, as well as labelling them as worthless to the rest of society. Attitudes such as these negatively influenced the level of support provided by caregivers, friends and the broader community.

At the level of the individual, some studies have indicated protective factors that mitigated the effects of violence such as, increased emotion regulation (Kassis et al., 2013; Kliewer et al., 2004; Laye & Maykota, 2014; Schwartz & Proctor, 2000), talking with parents or friends about violence, seeking help to avoid violence (Kassis et al., 2013), not endorsing aggression supportive beliefs (Kassis et al., 2013; Schwartz & Proctor, 2000), as well as developing a desirable personal identity (Ungar et al., 2008). Molnar et al. (2008) found two specific community protective factors to be highly effective in enabling resilience in youth exposed to violence, namely: organisations and services (education organisations, non-governmental organisations [NGOs], and social welfare departments). Their findings suggest that the interaction between the availability of organisations and services and the presence of
prosocial peers were especially protective against aggressive behaviour. Another important community protective factor in youth’s resilience is access to material resources, such as financial assistance, education, food, shelter and clothing, medical care, and employment (Ungar et al., 2008). In summary, Ginsburg et al. (2002) state that if societies want youth to be successful and resilient in the face of adversity, they need to be provided with opportunities that come with “…good education, good jobs and meaningful connections with adults” (p. 7).

Protective Factors Enabling Resilience in South African Youth Exposed to Violence

Protective factors mentioned in SA literature, specifically relating to violence aimed at youth between the ages of 13-19, were linked to engagement in spirituality, which fulfilled a basic need and proffered a sense of belonging (Ebersöhn et al., 2017). Safe and supportive school environments, pro-social peers, and involvement in conventional after-school activities was seen as important protective factors in buffering the effects of violence on youth (Vermeulen & Greeff, 2015; Ward et al., 2007). However, these protective factors were only employed in dealing with violence after it had occurred, and was not focused on protective factors as strategies to prevent violence from happening in the first place. It is clear that the voices of such youth are ignored, judging from the limited amount of extant research in SA regarding young adults and the protective factors they need to enable their resilience in the face of violence. This warrants the exploration of initiatives and found so that meaningful solutions to violence prevention can be achieved.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

The resilience research summarised above suggests that there is limited research focusing specifically on protective factors in the face of violence relating to historically disadvantaged, young SA adults between the ages of 18 and 24. It also suggests a limited understanding of the protective factors implemented prior to violence exposure in order to diminish or buffer against
the effects of violence on historically disadvantaged young adults. The aim of this article is to address these gaps, and to contribute to the field of SA resilience research by prioritising the voices of historically disadvantaged young adults in a rural FS community. In doing so, this article will also consider whether/how the messages of young men and young women differ and what difference the communication of their messages makes to limiting violence, if any.

**METHOD**

I conducted a phenomenological enquiry in order to explore and understand the protective factors historically disadvantaged young adults need to be better protected against violence aimed at them. A phenomenological enquiry was appropriate as I was not intending to focus on objective events, but rather seeking to understand the phenomenon of violence and the protective factors needed to better protect young adults from violence as understood from the participants’ shared experiences (Shepherd et al., 2010).

**Participants**

This study took place in a township adjacent to a town in the rural Eastern Free State. A social worker active at this rural research site was asked to identify 10-15 historically disadvantaged young adults, between the ages of eighteen to twenty-four. To comply with ethical constraints, these young adults were not clients of the social worker, but young adults who had participated in local youth outreach activities. The social worker explained the study’s aims and procedures, engagement time, freedom to withdraw, and the constraints on retaining anonymity given the visual methodology to the young adults.

All participants whom the social worker approached (i.e., six young women and five young men) agreed to participate in the study voluntarily. All the participants resided in a township community just outside of the research site. According to Pernegger and Godehart (2007), townships are underdeveloped residential areas that were reserved for those who fell
under imposed apartheid categories of African, Coloured and Indian. Even though the post-apartheid government implemented strategies to close the physical gaps between former white cities and African, Coloured and Indian townships, the spatial, social and economic inequities of apartheid endure. Townships are still characterised by low levels of education, high unemployment, HIV/AIDS contributing to family breakdowns, inadequate policing, poverty and violence and therefore continue to be sites of struggle and resilience (Findley & Ogbu, 2011).

**Data Generation and Research Process**

The participants engaged in four research phases detailed below. In each phase, a qualitative data generation activity, in which the participants were active contributors, was used. The activities were facilitated by a team of researchers comprising myself and two research psychology interns (one of whom spoke the participants’ mother tongue), and a translator (who also spoke the participants’ mother tongue). This team recorded and transcribed all phases. Interviews during phases 1, 3, 4 and 5 lasted approximately two hours. Phase 2 was the longest of the sessions and lasted approximately four hours.

I obtained approval from the university ethics review board prior to data collection. In accordance with this approval, all participants consented in writing following full information about the research and its phases (including that the phases relied on group activities which meant that anonymity could not be guaranteed). Counselling services from a local treatment centre were made available to participants if they were interested. However, no participants made use of these services.

**Phase 1: Draw-and-talk/write.** Young adults participated in two draw-and-talk/write activities. A draw-and-talk/write activity comprises participants creating a drawing based on a given prompt, and then explaining (talk/write) the meaning embedded in their drawings. Once
participants explained their drawings, the researchers could probe for further information (Mitchell, Theron, Stuart, Smith, & Campbell, 2011).

During the first drawing activity, young adults were asked to draw and describe violence prevention strategies based on the following prompt: “What is your community currently doing to keep young women/men safe against violence?” In the second drawing, activity participants were asked to identify resources/strategies that could be implemented in their communities in order to better protect young adults against violence aimed at them. After each drawing activity, participants discussed their drawings with the researchers in groups (the young women formed one group and the young men another).

**Phase 2: Participatory video.** In order to identify specific protective factors that are critical to young adults regarding violence prevention, participants were asked to revisit the prompt given in the second drawing activity, namely, “What can your community do to better protect historically disadvantaged young women/men against violence aimed at them?” In the two groups, young adults wrote down as many ideas as they could, based on this prompt. Participants then voted to find the strategy that most felt was critical to their safety. The voting took place during a refreshment break in order to ensure that each participant could vote in private. After the voting was completed, the strategy with the most votes was used as the main theme around which each group would formulate their video messages (Mitchell & De Lange, 2011).

Each group was asked to formulate and plan a video message by first drawing, or writing a storyboard (a visual outline made up of a series of drawings, sketches, or words) around the strategy for which they voted (Moletsane, Mitchell, De Lange, Stuart, Buthelezi, & Taylor, 2009). After completing their storyboards, participants used Samsung tablets (provided to them by me) to video record their messages in English, or in their mother tongue (Sesotho). The two
groups made one video recording each. The No Editing Required (NER) approach of Mitchell and De Lange (2011) was followed. This meant that the participants’ videos were screened to them immediately after they had been filmed (i.e. without any editing of what they had filmed), which enabled the research team to engage the young adults in reflective discussions and to probe for further information to ensure that the messages in each video was understood correctly. Participants were also asked to discuss how they, as young adults, could get these video-based messages across to the people that matter to them. From this discussion, young adults asked to have a meeting with SE stakeholders, including the local municipality officers, social workers, teachers, ward counsellors, and religious leaders.

**Phase 3: Video screening.** Six weeks after the completion of Phase 2, a community meeting was arranged by the social worker with the selected community representatives. The research team facilitated conversation between the young adults and community representatives (i.e. SE stakeholders). The aim of these conversations was to raise awareness regarding the protective factors historically disadvantaged young women/men need in order to be better protected against violence. According to Ginsburg et al. (2002), data generated from such conversations “offers policy makers, program designers and youth workers a deeper understanding from which to develop strategies” (p. 1).

**Phase 4: Mmogo-method™.** A one-month follow up session was conducted with the young adults to determine whether or not their meeting with the community representatives made a difference with regards to their video messages. Participants were asked to make a visual representation, using potter’s clay, beads, dry grass stalks and a round piece of cloth (Roos, 2009), based on the following prompt: “What differences did communicating your messages make?” Participants were invited to discuss the meanings of their visual representations in the
main group where the researchers were able to probe for further information as well as ensure that they understood the messages in each visual representation.

**Data Analysis**

The transcripts, drawings, storyboards, video footage, and photos of visual presentations constitute the data. I used participatory analysis and inductive content analysis to analyse the data. Participatory analysis entailed that data was first explained by the participants themselves (Theron, 2016). This process gives voice to historically disadvantaged young adults’ own understanding of the protective factors they need to prevent violence aimed at them (Van Rensburg, Theron, & Rothman, 2015). Inductive content analysis entailed that each data set be analysed separately - an iterative process where resemblances and variances are used to contribute to existing theory (Nieuwenhuis, 2007).

A process of open coding was followed to label segments that answered the research questions. Open coding is a process of fracturing the data by making use of questions and constant comparisons that protect researchers from their own subjectivity and bias (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). Coding categories were generated from the participants’ words that seemed to relate to how the community of historically disadvantaged young adults can better protect them against violence.

After the open coding was completed, a set of higher order categories of information and themes were identified by comparing and contrasting the codes, in a rebuilding of the data described as ‘axial coding’ by Corbin and Strauss (1990). I listed the axial codes from all the data sets in order to identify recurring and/or similar axial codes. I compared them in order to develop main themes, patterns and outliers in the data. After I had identified themes and patterns using all the data sets, I discussed my axial codes with an independent researcher to determine whether some of the codes could be refined even more. The findings were critically compared to
existing theory and literature on resilience relating to violence aimed at historically disadvantaged young adults.

**Trustworthiness**

In order to increase trustworthiness in this study, participants were asked to generate multiple data sources, as described above. These multiple data sources, together with the conversations, group meetings, and video-based messages, were used to triangulate sources and to justify developing themes (Leedy & Ormrod, 2015). My understanding of participants’ explanations in every phase of the research process was compared to participants’ explanations as well as discussed with my supervisor and student and research peers in order to eliminate any personal bias in my understanding of the data. In addition, the greater project has a steering committee on which historically disadvantaged young people, as well as service providers and academics from both Canada and South Africa serve. As part of its duties, this steering committee will review the trustworthiness of results and fair dissemination processes (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

**FINDINGS**

The findings are structured into three sections. Firstly, I report what the young adults believed their communities should do to better protect young people against violence. Secondly, I highlight what was unique to the messages of young men versus young women. Thirdly, I report the young adults’ understanding of what difference communicating their messages made.

**Socio-Ecological Strategies: A Safety Wall to Keep Violence Away**

In answer to the question: ‘what message do historically disadvantaged young women/men have about how their communities can partner with young adults in order to better protect them against violence?’, the following theme was reported by both young women and men: socio-ecological strategies could act as a safety wall around young people that keeps violence away from them (see Figure 1). Socio-ecological strategies are factors facilitated by various
stakeholders in the SE of these young people, including: parents/primary caregivers, South African Police Service (SAPS), Community Police Forum (CPF), educational organisations, Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs), and social welfare departments. Four main protective factors emerged, namely: accessible public spaces that facilitate protective factors; public service departments that educate young women/men about violence; creation of job opportunities, as well as provision of better security services.

Figure 1. Summary of socio-ecological strategies that act as a safety wall around young people.

**Accessible public spaces that facilitate protective factors.** Young women/men reported that accessible public spaces, such as community youth centres; sport facilities for sports such as soccer, basketball, volleyball, and netball (see Figure 2); libraries; soup kitchens and community gardens (small-scale collaborative food farming, mostly within rural communities) would act as protective factors, because these would keep them off the streets and subsequently away from violence. For example, Young-woman-participant 3 said,
…sports is the only thing that can keep them [young people] off the streets and busy.

Young-man-participant 3 said:

The government can open new library for men who are interested in reading to gain knowledge or open a hall for men to be entertained or this will keep them away from any activity of violence.

![Figure 2](image)

Figure 2. Young-woman-participant 1’s drawing of accessible public spaces, such as sport facilities, that act as protection against violence.

The young adults thought it was important that these spaces are accessible at all times, as is depicted in Figure 3. Regarding the meaning of her drawing, Young-woman-participant 2 said:

Community must build up centres where each an [and] every young person can get help wherever he/she needs it. Help, counselling, emotionally, socially, and how should they behave when they are faced with violence. Those centres are open 24/7 for any report like crime, starvation/hunger, anything that is harmful towards young people individually. During the day
those centres used as resources for the community by keeping young people busy on creative art/work alerting other young woman about crime and strategies they must take in order to keep them busy.

Figure 3. Young-woman-participant 2’s drawing of accessible public spaces, such as a youth centre being open.

**Public service departments that educate young women/men about violence.** The need to have active public service departments, which could educate young adults effectively regarding violence emerged strongly from the findings, but was more prevalent in the young women’s findings. According to the young women, understanding violence and the behaviours that precede violent acts will enable them to make better decisions, which could lead to them protecting themselves more effectively against violence. Regarding specific actions that could be facilitated by the department of social welfare, Young-woman-participant 1 said that:

...social workers can give out pamphlets with information about preventing/dealing with abuse.

Young-woman-participant 2 said that community youth centres can be
used as resources for the community by […] alerting other young
woman about crime and strategies they must take […] by feeding young
people with good information regarding violence.

Not only was education regarding violence mentioned throughout all the young women’s second
draw and talk activity discussions, the young women also built their whole participatory video
message around the importance of effective education provided by public service departments.
The young men, on the other hand, explained that education initiatives regarding violence, such
as the ‘Love Life’ programme ought to focus on rehabilitating men who committed violent acts,
as well as educate young men about how to stay away from violence. Figure 4 depicts Young-
man-participant 4’s view that

Violent people must undergo certain programmes that will help them not
be violent.

Regarding education initiatives that would limit young men’s exposure to
violence, Young-man-participant 3 said:

Male only support groups is important to teach young men about life and
how to stay away from violence.

The idea of male-only support groups, however, was not group-endorsed, but was mentioned by
Young-man-participant 3 only.
Creation of job opportunities. Creation of job opportunities as a protective factor, either created by the community or by means of entrepreneurial actions, was found to be a possible solution to violence aimed at young adults. Both female and male participants explained that not having jobs contributed to violent behaviour in their communities. Young-woman-participant 5 said:

*I think what our community can do better is to provide or create job’s for young women so that they can be busy and find something to do with their hands, since we have shortage of jobs in our societies, so for them be kept busy can make or assist them from most of violence in the community or the society they are living at.*

Similarly, Young-man-participant 3 said:

*There should be more jobs, because lack of job opportunities can lead people to mugged [mug] each other, which sometimes involves violence.*
Provision of security services. Even though both young women and young men mentioned that they need better security services such as increased police/CPF patrols, this protective factor was not endorsed by the majority of the young people. Young-women-participants 1 and 3 (see Figure 5) mentioned that they need better security services to protect them against violence. Young-woman-participant 1 said:

I think they [police/CPF] should go around and make sure that people are not walking around in the streets at night and even during the day they should always be around the community. Because people are afraid of the police, if they see the police more often, then there won’t be any more violence.

Figure 5. Young-woman-participant 3’s drawing of a police station indicating that police patrols can help keep violence away from young women.

Socio-Ecological Strategies Reported by the Young Men Only

Specific protective factors that facilitate strategies to avoid violence by different SE role-players emerged from the young men’s findings. These protective factors indicated by the young men
are the development of parental/primary caregiver skills, and SE that should educate young men to obey their parents/primary care-givers.

**Development of parental/primary care-giver skills.** During the second draw-and-talk/write activity, two of the young men stated that they need parents/primary caregivers to be educated regarding parental involvement in all the dimensions of young men’s lives, as well as have effective disciplinary skills.

**Parental involvement.** The young men expressed a need for parents/primary caregivers to nurture and support young men and to be involved in all the dimensions of their lives. According to these young men, their parents/primary caregivers do not know how to connect with them effectively. Young-man-participant 3 explained:

*Parent support is a very important thing, especially to us as children because sometimes we do not get enough support from our parents...* (see Figure 6).

The young men further explained that, if parents/primary care-givers could be educated about how to support and guide young men regarding important life issues, such as good behaviour and choosing good friends, young men would be better protected from violence, because they will be enabled to make better life decisions. For example, Young-man-participant 1 said:

*I think that if our parents could guide us and tell us this is how you should be, like this and like that and like that in order to not engage in these matters of fights or things like that...*
Figure 6. Young-man-participant 3’s drawing of parental involvement.

**Effective disciplinary skills.** The young men noted that parents/primary care-givers find it difficult to discipline youth, because they are afraid of retaliation. Young-man-participant 1 said:

> nowadays if you do something wrong, parents are afraid to reprimand you. Because you might respond in a negative way cause kids these days do.

> So they [the young men] are saying that things should change in that aspect.

Even though parents/primary caregivers are fearful of disciplining youth, Young-man-participant 3 mentioned that he thinks it is important that parents/primary care-givers should take up their responsibility and lead young people in the right direction with the correct disciplinary measures. He said:

> I think that if our parents took responsibility, even if it is […] anyone else’s child and if they make a mistake I [parent/primary care-giver] should discipline them and then they listen to me - they should listen to me. I believe
that will give us a way forward so that we stop doing crime and violence but if we are still living the way we do today, the violence will continue.

Social ecologies should educate young men to obey their parents/primary caregivers.

According to the young men, youth do not want to listen to their parents/primary caregivers. They felt that youth needed to be taught that obedience towards parents/primary caregivers will create an environment where young men would not be lured into violent acts, because they would have listened to the guidance of their parents/primary caregivers. Even though this protective factor was mentioned by only two of the male participants during the second draw-and-talk activity, all five of the young men decided to build their whole participatory video message (see figures 7a – 7d) around the importance of young men obeying the instruction of their parents/primary caregivers, in order to be better protected against violence.

In their video, named Tears of regret, a young man becomes involved with the wrong type of friend. After being warned by his father not to go out with this friend, he decided to move out of his father’s house, ultimately stabbing another young man to death. The young man is put in jail and regrets not listening to his father’s advice.

Figure 7a. Video clip of father advising his son not to spend time with a young man who seems to be a bad influence.
Figure 7b. Video clip of ‘bad’ friend encouraging his friend to stab another young man who looked at his girlfriend.

Figure 7c. Video clip of ‘police officer’ arresting the young man for murder.
Figure 7d. Video clip of young man regretting the fact that he did not listen to his father’s advice.

What Differences did Communicating these Messages Make?

The young adults communicated their messages regarding how their communities can better protect them against violence by screening their participatory videos to various SE stakeholders (local municipality officers, social workers, teachers, religious leaders, and various ward counsellors) in their communities. The main message in the young women’s video was that public service departments ought to educate young women about violence. The young men’s main message was that social ecologies ought to facilitate initiatives focused on educating young men to obey their parents/primary caregivers, in order to be protected against violence.

One month after the young women/men screened their videos to the various SE stakeholders, they were asked what differences communicating their messages made. The most commonly reported theme among the participants was that the SE stakeholders did not fully comprehend the importance of their messages.
Young-man-participant 3 said:

*I don’t think that they [SE stakeholders] got the message very well.*

According to the young women and men, their SE stakeholders seem to be out of touch with their needs, because most of the SE stakeholders do not stay inside their community. Young-man-participant 1 said:

...*mayors they don’t stay within the community. They stay in suburban areas.*

*So they don’t know the needs of the community.*

In support of Young-man-participant 1’s statement, Young-man-participant 2 said:

...*mayors come into the community, they come with a message. They don’t necessarily come to hear what the community has to say. They need to come and listen to the needs of the community to be able to work.*

Young-woman-participant 1 confirmed these statements by saying:

...*some of the, the community heads are not doing anything because it’s not close to them. They haven’t felt the pain, or they don’t know what’s happening in their communities. So it’s easy for them to just never matter to them.*

In summary, the young adults did not experience any changes relating to their main video-based messages. The young men however noticed some other differences (not relating to their main video-based message) in their communities, namely an increase in the visibility of security services (see Figure 8), and the reopening of the community’s public park (see Figure 9).

**Increased visibility of security services.** According to the young men, they had noticed that police and CPF members were regularly patrolling at night. Young-man-participant 2 said:

*We realise that we have the patrollers during the night. Those guys they are patrolling every few minutes...*
The young men explained that they believe this change was due to a meeting that was organised by the mayor’s secretary after the screening of their video-based message. Young-man-participant 1 said:

...the reason why there are more patrollers is because [...] the secretary of the mayor conveyed the message to the mayor. So, the mayor most probably, you know, went to the right people to try and help the community.

Reopening of the community’s public park. The young men mentioned that one of their community parks was closed because of previous criminal activities, for example: Young-man-participant 1 said:

Before, the reason why the park was closed is because these kind of things [rape, violence] happened [...] After the meeting they have noticed that the park was reopened with increased security and fencing around it to better protect the young people who would like to relax in the park.

Figure 8. Young men’s visual presentation of the changes they have noticed regarding security services in their community.
Young women’s perceptions regarding the differences communicating their message made. Only two out of the initial six young women were involved in the one-month follow up meeting. The other four young women were not available for a follow up session. According to these two young women, communicating their message to the community stakeholders made no difference in their community. They did not receive any information regarding violence prevention, there were no community awareness programs initiated by anyone in their community and the police/CPF patrols decreased (see Figure 10). Young-woman-participant 1 said:

> Since we’ve been here [stakeholder meeting] there’s been several incidents of women and raping in our community. So, the government hasn’t done anything. They are reluctant to help. And people are still going to the taverns and coming alone during the night and then they get raped and killed. I think it is because they take a lot of time to respond.
In explanation of her visual presentation, depicted in Figure 11, Young-woman-participant 4 said:

*In my picture there is CPF people, community members, police patrol cars and the local municipality. They are not doing anything.*

*Figure 10.* Young-woman-participant 1’s visual presentation of the differences communicating their message made.

Young-woman-participant 1 presented a women being raped after she went to the tavern. There were no security services to protect her.

*Figure 11.* Young-woman-participant 4’s visual presentation of the differences communicating their message made.

On the left side of the picture Young-woman-participant 4 presented community members. On the right side of the picture, she presented police cars and the police station. These figures are standing opposite each other to present her point that young women are not being protected by their security services.
Concerning the re-opening of the community park, the young women did not experience this as a change that could better protect them against violence. Young-woman-participant 1 explained that even though there is security and fencing, she would still not visit the park, because there are trees inside the park where women could still be raped by men hiding behind the trees. She said:

*I don’t think it’s safe because there are trees inside the park. Women can be raped easily.*

**DISCUSSION**

The aim of my study was to hear directly from young adults which protective factors they need to be better protected against violence to which they are subjected as well as presenting to them a platform where they could negotiate with SE stakeholders a variety of strategies to implement these protective factors in a contextually meaningful way. The meeting with the respective SE stakeholders allowed these young adults an opportunity to voice their ideas regarding the protective factors they view as contextually meaningful in preventing violence to which they are subjected. Their explanations added depth and context to the protective factors needed to better protect historically disadvantaged young adults against violence.

Concerning the protective factors voiced by the young adults, it is clear that they are asking for protective factors that are indeed limited in their environments. Studies conducted by Leoschut (2008) and SSA (2017) found that SA youth have very few safe spaces in which they are not at risk of being victimised. According to the Victims of Crime Survey (SSA, 2017), the proportion of households who knew the locations of places of safety for victims of crime declined from 16.9% in 2011 to 11.1% in 2016. This necessitates the creation of safe recreational spaces and other social support services for SA youth.

Youth end up relying mainly on parents/caregivers for emotional support following traumatic events. This is problematic, because SA families and communities are characterised by
high rates of violence (SSA, 2017). According to Choe, Zimmerman, and Devnarain (2012), family conflict and friends’ violence influenced violent attitudes in youth. Therefore, if youth cannot access support services outside the family in order to be protected against violence occurring inside their families and communities, they will have to bear the brunt of violence with only their families’ limited support, or no support at all. One of the main reasons for this lack of support services is the fact that youth are not being informed or educated regarding the support services available to them when they become victims of violent acts, and can therefore not access available support services (Leoschut & Burton, 2006). Young adults’ need for education as a protective factor against exposure to violence makes sense against this backdrop.

One of the surprising results in this study was that parent support was seen as a main protective factor in the lives of young men. Contrary to the notion that young adults want to exist independently of parents/primary caregivers’ influence, the young men in this study called for active involvement from adults that would discipline the youth and teach them how to avert violence. These findings echo the findings reported by Artz et al. (2016), Choe et al. (2012), and Leoschut (2008). According to their findings, young people between the ages of 12 and 22 years are developing their unique identities and therefore look to a range of sources for guidance in this process. When the youth are constantly faced with violent behaviours, they begin to believe that violence is the only meaningful way to solve problems. For this reason, prosocial adults are extremely important in the lives of youth in order to guide them in healthy ways to resolve conflict.

Differences in the needs of young women and men regarding violence prevention education. Even though the young adults included in this study mainly asked for education initiatives that could limit their exposure to violence, there was a significant difference regarding the type of education young adults needed. Young women specifically expressed the need for
quality education regarding what violence is, as well as practical actions they could employ to protect themselves against violence. Education about violence heightens youths’ awareness regarding the risks of violence, and therefore decreases their risk of getting caught in the cycle of violence (Laye & Mykota, 2014). The young men voiced a need for educational programmes focusing on the development of better parenting skills.

Although young men and women focused on different SE stakeholders (parents vs community representatives/educators), it was evident that a network of SE stakeholders are needed to facilitate strategies that can better protect young adults against violence. This aligns with Ungar’s (2011) Social Ecological Resilience Theory (SERT) described here. The young women in this study realise that in order for them to be better protected against violence, they need to have access to a network of SE stakeholders in their community in order to negotiate for effective protective factors. Having continuous support from their SE is a gender-typical resilience process within historically disadvantaged young women. This is supported by findings from a study conducted by Jefferis (2016) with Sesotho-speaking girls living in a rural FS community. Her findings suggest that constructive relationships are invaluable to girls when facing adversity. The SE of young women plays a crucial role in enabling their resilience when it includes accessible, caring role-players (mostly women kin and girlfriends) that transfer meaningful contextual education regarding violence.

**Changes brought about after presenting video-based messages to stakeholders.** The young adults reported that no changes were made regarding their main video-based messages. According to SERT, communities ought to regard the social and physical ecology as important to the resilience of its members, and not only the qualities of individuals alone (Ungar, 2011). From the data gathered, this FS community appears to lack the ability to facilitate navigation and negotiation processes between the young adults and the respective SE stakeholders, in order to
make available the protective factors voiced by the young adults. Even though this might be the case, it is most probable that long-term research projects, or purposeful interventions that includes programmes which assist communities to facilitate young adults’ resilience in the face of violence are needed, as social change requires time (Jefferis & Theron, 2015). Concerning the less significant changes noticed by the young men and the decrease in security services noted by the young women (see Findings), it is possible that they simply became more observant of their environment and that it was not necessarily change in the community that occurred. Change therefore probably happened within the young adults, which is a useful consequence of this research.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE
From this study, it became clear that researchers and mental health practitioners ought to facilitate connections with community and governmental organisations in order to enable this FS community (and others) to navigate towards protective factors negotiated between the young adults and their SE stakeholders. Furthermore, when young people were asked, they had many useful ideas about how their communities could protect them. This teaches practitioners, service providers and policy makers that they would be well-served to partner with the youth, and to create opportunities where youth insights can direct social policy and social change (Theron, 2017).

CONCLUSION
In conclusion, this study adds to a body of knowledge in resilience research focusing on protective factors needed to better protect historically disadvantaged young adults against violence. Historically disadvantaged young adults in a rural FS community believe that a variety of SE stakeholders are needed to implement effective violence prevention strategies towards their being better protected against violence in their community. Initiatives that implement the
protective factors mentioned by these young adults will most likely produce more positive outcomes than strategies that primarily focuses on risk factors. According to Ginsburg et al. (2002), we as researchers and practitioners ought to continue to listen to the voices of the youth, as doing so offers meaningful insight into the specific needs young adults have in order to be better protected against violence to which they may be subjected. My study adds that researchers and social ecologies need to go beyond listening. We should act on the insights of youth.
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3.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this final chapter of my mini-dissertation is to summarise my study by revisiting the research questions posed, in order to assess the study outcomes. After that, I discuss the conclusions drawn from my study and reflect on the methodology used to understand the messages of historically disadvantaged young adults living in a rural FS community. I end this chapter by briefly reviewing resilience within the field of Positive Psychology (PP), as well as outlining the strengths, limitations and possible contributions this study has made.

3.2 RESEARCH QUESTIONS RECONSIDERED

This mini-study was directed by one primary and three secondary research questions. The research questions and the steps that were taken during this study to answer the secondary research questions are visually summarised in Figure 4. All questions were framed by the Social Ecology of Resilience theory (Ungar, 2011), where, as a result, the questions were focused on understanding how social ecologies and historically disadvantaged young adults could collaborate and co-negotiate for specific, culturally meaningful protective factors so as to better protect young adults against violence to which they are subjected.
Figure 4. Schematic representation of methodology informing each secondary research question.
In Chapter 2 I reported my qualitative study, which involved PVM used to explore the SE of resilience in a FS community in order to hear from historically disadvantaged young adults regarding how they think they can be better protected against violence aimed at them. The findings reported in Chapter 2 indicate that I generated answers (with the support of my participants and supervisor) to the secondary research questions informing this study. In the section that follows, I discuss the conclusions drawn from the answers to the secondary questions in order to answer my main question.

3.3 PROTECTIVE FACTORS NEEDED TO SUPPORT THE RESILIENCE OF HISTORICALLY DISADVANTAGED YOUNG ADULTS IN THE FACE OF VIOLENCE

My study yielded the following conclusions:

Conclusion from My Literature Review

During my literature review, I determined that historically disadvantaged youth in SA are particularly vulnerable towards violence, with the most common forms of violence being physical and sexual violence in the home and community (Mathews et al., 2014; Swartz & Scott, 2014). Young women, specifically, are exposed to acts of GBV (e.g. sexist remarks, unwanted sexual touching, and rape), whereas young men are more at risk to experience physical violence (e.g. assault and/or homicide) (Le Roux, 2016). See also Chapter 1: 1.1 and Chapter 2: Introduction.

Numerous international and national studies focus on a variety of risk factors that expose communities, families, children, and adolescents to violence, as well as protective factors that could be employed to enable their resilience if/when they have been exposed to violence. However, the current published literature provided limited insight into the protective factors that
could be employed by historically disadvantaged young adults in order to protect them from experiencing violence in the first place (Burnette & Hefflinger, 2016; Kliewer et al., 2004). I found only eight SA studies that focused on resilience processes in the face of violence, of which only four studies focused specifically on protective factors that enable resilience in the face of violence in adults (ages 25 and above), families and adolescents (ages 13-19) (Ebersöhn et al., 2017; Mampane, 2014; Vermeulen & Greeff, 2015; Ward et al., 2007). None of these studies focused on protective factors historically disadvantaged young adults (18-24 years of age) need to enable their resilience in the face of violence. See also Chapter 2: Protective factors enabling resilience in youth exposed to violence. Furthermore, studies that do focus on protective factors that enable resilience in youth exposed to violence do so by applying deductively selected protective factors (that is, gained from existing theory) to the different contexts in which youth live, instead of being informed by young people themselves regarding the protective factors they need to be protected against violence within their specific contexts.

From the literature it seems that spirituality, positive connections to others, social support, quality education, and emotion regulation are main protective factors that might buffer against the effects of violence, which could be generalised across other contexts (Anderson, Renner, & Danis, 2012; Banyard & Williams, 2007; Banyard, Williams, Siegel, & West, 2002; Burnette & Hefflinger, 2016; Butcher, Galanek, Kretschmar, & Flannery, 2015; Ginsburg et al., 2002; Hamby & Banyard, 2017; Hodges & Cabanilla, 2011; Jain, Buka, Subramanian, & Molnar, 2012; Lagasse et al., 2006; Laye & Maykota, 2014; Molnar, Cerda, Roberts, & Buka, 2008; Stark, Landis, Thomson, & Potts, 2016; Ungar et al., 2013). The findings of my study echo that positive connections to others, quality education, and emotional regulation are indeed important protective factors for young adults to be protected against violence, but these results
are to be interpreted within a specific social ecological context of application. I will discuss this further in the following section. See also Chapter 2: Literature Review, Findings and Discussion.

**Conclusion from my empirical work**

From exploring the messages historically disadvantaged young adults had for their SE stakeholders regarding the protective factors they need to be better protected against violence, I determined the following resilience process (as summarised in Figure 5). Through employing PVM, the historically disadvantaged young adults communicated that they have a need to collaborate and co-negotiate with their specific SE stakeholders to be “kept away” from violence. They voiced specific actions that could be taken by their SE stakeholders to implement strategies that could better protect young adults against violence, as well as places that could be made safe and accessible to these young adults living in this rural FS community. In the end, both the young women’s and young men’s main messages were centered on education, with the crucial difference being the type of education they require in order to limit exposure to violence.

Young women specifically voiced a need for education regarding the nature of violence, whereas young men voiced their need for parental guidance and development (see Chapter 2: Findings). Education regarding violence for the young women meant that intervention strategies developed by a collaboration and co-negotiating process between them and respective SE stakeholders ought to focus on: (1) defining violence; (2) educating young women to recognise early warning signs of violence in their home and/or community; and (3) educating young women about how to design their own pro-active violence prevention strategies by using the available resources in their community. Parental development for the young men meant that parents ought to be educated about: (1) effective strategies to discipline their young men with love and authority, which would increase the likelihood for young men to obey their
parents/primary caregivers and stay out of trouble; and (2) positive involvement in the lives of young men in order to guide young men regarding difficult life situations (e.g. choice of friends, and how to avoid the cyclical nature of violence).

From the findings in my study, it is apparent that the specific type of education strategies requested by the young women/men in this FS community could lead to less exposure to violence, and in turn, might better protect them from violence to which they are subjected. If the SE stakeholders heed these messages from the young adults in their community and form partnerships with them, they could positively contribute to the resilience processes young adults require in order to be better protected against violence to which they are subjected. Through such a collaboration process, young adults in this FS community will be positioned to foster positive relationships with other young adults in their community, pro-social adults, and possibly their parents/primary caregivers. They will gain a greater understanding of the available resources they can navigate towards and in turn increase their current level of social support by partnering with different SE stakeholders (e.g. SAPS, social welfare departments, schools and religious organisations). The educational process suggested here can, as a whole, assist youth in developing more effective emotion regulation strategies within themselves. Findings from this study thus indicate that protective factors buffering against violence aimed at young adults ought not to be understood as a one-size-fits-all strategy, but rather, as a context specific strategy derived from the messages voiced by historically disadvantaged young adults facing violence within their specific community (Ungar et al., 2013; Ungar, 2004; Ungar, 2005).
Figure 5. Summary of the resilience process between historically disadvantaged young adults and their SE in co-negotiating for voiced protective factors.
Conclusion: Methodology

According to Jefferis and Theron (2015), PVM, such as draw-and-talk/write, participatory video and the Mmogo-method™ (see Chapter 2: Method), provide the opportunity to generate more meaningful accounts of resilience. This is mostly due to the fact that PVM is a research methodology that uses non-traditional methods to facilitate non-western understandings of resilience processes shaped by the socio-cultural context (Masten, 2014a). In my exploration of historically disadvantaged young adults’ messages regarding protection against violence, PVM fits within the framework of SERT.

The protective factors visually and verbally described by these young adults, as well as the resilience processes needed to employ these protective factors in their community are contextually-specific, collaborative, and a youth-society process (Masten, 2014a; Ungar, 2011). All of the visual methodology used in this study indicated that young adults require the support of their SE (e.g. parents/primary caregivers, social workers, SAPS/CPF, educators) to help develop programmes that can better protect young adults against violence. None of the drawings, videos and visual presentations depicted young adults relying on their own strengths to protect themselves against violence.

Even though the PVM process is an enjoyable method (Jefferis & Theron, 2015; Mitchell et al., 2011), the young adults in this study seemed reluctant to engage in the first draw-and-talk/write activity. Mitchell et al. (2011) state that participants ought to be reassured by the researchers that their drawings do not have to be aesthetically pleasing, or of good quality. In other words, participants need to be reassured that the drawing activity is not about how well participants draw, but rather about what they draw. If participants are not fully reassured in this regard, they can experience some discomfort, and show reluctance to engage in the activity (Jefferis & Theron, 2015). Even though we reassured the young adults in the consent letters
given to them (through written communication and verbal explanation by the social worker who administered these letters to them), as well as further reassurance on the day of the draw-and-talk/write activity, participants were still very reluctant to engage in the activity.

The participants eventually engaged in the drawing activity and produced valuable information in their drawings. However, we had to ask ourselves where their reluctance to draw came from. I believe Mitchell et al. (2011) answer this question in their explanation of the draw-and-talk/write process, which elaborates that, prior to conducting a draw-and-talk/write activity, researchers ought to spend sufficient time building rapport with participants. If this rapport is not sufficiently formed, participants can feel unsure about the drawing activity. I believe this is where we fell short. Even though we did start off with an introduction activity, it seems that it might not have been enough time for the participants to become familiar with us. As a result, they may indeed have felt a lingering discomfort to produce visual material that could illuminate their inner thoughts. We did not encounter this reluctance from participants to engage in any of the subsequent PVM, which points to the initial lack of rapport between researchers and participants as being the result of a lack of familiarity. If it were possible to revise my study, I would spend more time building rapport with the participants prior to conducting research-related activities. The following options can also be applied to further ease the discomfort participants felt in the initial drawing activity, namely: (i) we could have joined in the drawing activities and participants could have been invited to examine our drawings (Theron, 2012); or (ii) participants could have been introduced to the first drawing activity as a group drawing activity, instead of being asked to produce individual drawings (Ebersöhn, Ferreira, & Mbongwe, 2011).

According to literature, applying PVM in resilience research that privilege majority-world youth (Theron, 2015) can contribute to the empowerment of participants because they
identify social issues, and also imagine solutions to social issues (Mitchell et al., 2011). This is because, as Mitchell et al. have argued, PVM “broadcast pressing social issues in irrefutable ways. They give voice to the traditionally voiceless, encourage expression, and demand attention” (2011, p. 26). For this reason, PVM presents a pathway to bring forth much needed social change.

Despite the potential of PVM to realise social change, we did not experience this to be the case in this study. During the one month follow up session, it was clear that participants did not experience any follow up or active engagement from the community stakeholders that attended the screening of their video-messages. At the time of the video-screening, the community stakeholders seemed impressed with the young adults and their messages. For example, one of the teachers who attended the video-screening supported the young women’s call for education about violence. The pastor who attended the video-screening came forward with information regarding father-son workshops that he runs in the community. The municipality representative stated that she was not exactly sure what the young adults needed from the municipality as such, and asked that the young adults write to her or phone her in order to communicate the details of their messages to her. Participants and community stakeholders exchanged contact details at the end of the meeting, and the young adults wrote more specific needs on paper, that were handed to the municipality representative. In this way, a process towards better protecting young adults against violence in this FS community was observed to have been activated.

Thereafter, why did the young adults report no change regrading better protection against violence in their community? According to one of the young men, he contacted the municipality representative after the meeting, but he could not reach her. The municipality representative did not return his phone call. The pastor who mentioned the father-son workshops did not have any
workshops running at the time between the video-screening and the one month follow-up session. Participants could not find any information about when these workshops would be held. As a result, participants felt that they were not heard by their community stakeholders.

In most communities, youth are the least valued stakeholders, and their voices are stifled by groups and adults that are accepted as having a more prominent stake in society (Helgeson & Schneider, 2015). Studies conducted by High, Singh, Petheram, and Nemes (2011) on the practice of participatory video indicated that social change can also be hampered by participants who feel that they are generating content in such a way that fits the researchers’ or the funders’ agenda, rather than addressing their core concerns. Since this study forms part of an international project focusing on hearing from girls and young women how to prevent gender-based violence, it is possible that our research agenda was in the foreground. However, participants knew about the purpose and aims of the study, and participated voluntary in the research.

Jefferis and Theron (2015) suggest that social change probably requires long-term research projects or purposeful interventions that include programmes to assist communities in facilitating young adults’ resilience in the face of violence. This is a possible reason for not experiencing social change in the FS community where this study took place. One month is probably not a sufficient amount of time to make visible changes and the researchers did not connect with the young adults and SE stakeholders in order to assist them in their collaboration and co-negotiation processes. In other words, SE stakeholders and researchers need to form connections in order to support the SE of these young adults.

It is important to note that an intervention programme is currently being developed by me specifically around the types of education voiced by young adults. I am doing so in collaboration with a local NGO whose social worker acted as the gatekeeper in my study. This will hopefully
form the much needed connections between researchers and social workers to start a process of capacity building within this FS community that might lead towards greater social change.

3.4 APPLICATION OF POSITIVE PSYCHOLOGY AND RESILIENCE IN THE CONTEXT OF THIS STUDY

This study contributed to the field of PP (see Chapter 1: 2) by focusing my resilience research on protective factors that can better protect historically disadvantaged young adults from violence. In doing so, the findings here have the potential to make a positive difference in the lives of the historically disadvantaged young adults in this rural FS community (Masten, 2011; Wissing, 2013; Wong, 2011). In other words, finding contextually appropriate protective factors that protect historically disadvantaged young adults in a rural FS community against violence can indeed motivate these youth, and improve their lives in general. However, although my study potentiates valuable knowledge, young people’s reports of a lack of social change in response to communication of their messages means PP needs to also be concerned with how to enable and sustain positive social responses to resilience-enabling knowledge.

3.5 CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE STUDY

My study contributed to a body of knowledge in resilience research that focuses on finding contextually relevant protective factors (Ungar, 2011). The findings present valuable insight into the contextually meaningful protective factors historically disadvantaged young adults need in order to be better protected against violence in their community. These protective factors voiced by the young adults can assist in protecting them from initial exposure to violence, thus heeding David-Ferdon and Simon’s (2014) recommendation that attention be given to identifying protective factors that directly impacts the reduction of violence, and/or to buffers against risk factors of violence.
Van Rensburg et al., (2015) state that many resilience studies still focus on individuals (see also Chapter 1: 4). However, my study included the principle of decentrality in Ungar’s (2011) explanation of SERT. In other words, my research moved away from a focus on the individual, towards the interaction between individuals and their SE, so as to facilitate and support the development of protective factors that have the potential to better protect historically disadvantaged young adults against violence aimed at them. This study further contributed to the body of knowledge that privileges historically disadvantaged young adults’ voices in regards to what they need to be better protected against violence, thus adding to understandings of resilience amongst marginalised majority-world youth, specifically young adults (Theron, 2015).

My study also contributed a reminder that it is not easy to effect social change. This reminder urges PP researchers to work longer and harder in collaboration with communities, to facilitate the uptake of resilience-enabling findings.

3.6 LIMITATIONS OF STUDY

The findings of my study must be read against a number of limitations. I list these below, after which I make relevant recommendations.

3.6.1 Due to the context-specific nature of the findings in this study, the ability to generalise to other samples of historically disadvantaged young adults is limited.

3.6.2 According to Mitchell (2011), visual data might be biased toward the most recent experiences of the young adults in this study. In other words, I might not have gained the most comprehensive insight into the protective factors historically disadvantaged young adults need to be protected against violence.

3.6.3 High et al. (2011) mention that participatory video relies on the ability of participants to express themselves visually and verbally. Some of the participants were very shy when it
came to explaining their visual presentations, and relied on other participants to explain their video messages. Participants who are shy, or feel unsure in creating visual data can end up simply following what other participants think or feel. This was definitely the case with some of the young adults included in this study. This might mean that important protective factors may not have been mentioned.

3.6.4 Despite having a translator present, the language barrier may also have had an impact on the extent to which participants chose to discuss their visual presentations. As a researcher, I could not always probe for further information, because I could not always follow the discussions between the participants and the translator in real time, and could only grasp the full context during data analysis. This may have caused deeper insights to get lost ‘in translation’.

3.6.5 Contact with the participants was problematic, even with the added support of the gatekeeper, who knew the participants fairly well. A WhatsApp group was created to ensure that no-one missed out on important information and dates. This did not work very well, because participants did not always have data to read their messages. We (myself and the social worker) contacted each participant directly when meeting dates had to be scheduled. Even this was problematic, as participants changed their contact details often.

If this research were to be reworked, I would use participatory action research and not have used participatory visual methods. Participatory action research allows participants to be engaged throughout the whole research process (Tracy, 2013). This continuous level of involvement could enable participants to better understand their community’s social and educational practices regarding violence aimed at youth. By understanding their community’s practices around violence aimed at youth, researchers and participants can design even more effective strategies
and intervention plans that could be implemented by all role-players and so position participants to become agents of change within their own community (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2007).

### 3.7 RECOMMENDATION FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Some questions arose from Chapter 2. The following section provides recommendations for future resilience research that could propagate answers to each question:

**3.7.1 What exactly hampered SE stakeholders in this FS community to implement the messages young adults voiced regarding the protective factors they need to be better protected against violence?** Future research could replicate this study with SE stakeholders to hear from them what they need to provide their young adults with the protective factors voiced in this study.

**3.7.2 How can researchers capacitate the SE stakeholders in this FS community to implement violence prevention strategies that aim to better protect young adults against violence?** Future research could investigate how resilience researchers can partner with and inform young adults’ SE (e.g., social workers) on how to effectively implement the protective factors voiced by the participants in this study.

**3.7.3 According to PP, each community has a unique combination of strengths by means of which to build its future (Linley, Bhaduri, Sharma, & Govindji, 2011).** As such, future research might examine how the existing strengths of this FS community can be harnessed to better protect young adults against violence.

In addition, I recommend the following to address the limitations noted in the preceding section: a follow-up with groups in multiple urban and rural settings to understand how transferable the current study’s findings are. During this study, young adults will be invited to co-direct the research with particular emphasis on the choice of participatory methods and the language.
medium. It is possible that if participants have a say in the methods and process, they will participate more actively (Macpherson et al., 2017; Hart et al., 2016).

3.8 FINAL CONCLUSION

The purpose of this mini-study was to explore the messages of historically disadvantaged young adults regarding the protective factors they need in order to enable their resilience in the face of violence. As can be inferred from this concluding chapter, with the help of my participants, I achieved this purpose. However, simply relating their messages to community stakeholders is not doing “the most good” (Moletsane et al., 2008, p. 114). Thus, I conclude this study with a call to researchers, fellow students, and SE stakeholders to take hold of the insights that my study provides in order to support historically disadvantaged young adults in this FS community so as to enable their resilience processes in response to the violence they face. This call extends not only in this community, but to other historically disadvantaged communities where violence is prevalent. In so doing, resilience studies will broaden the scope of protective factors that could protect historically disadvantaged young adults from violence to which they are unfairly subjected, which it is a communal responsibility to address.
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ADDENDUM B

NWU Ethical Clearance

ETHICS APPROVAL CERTIFICATE OF PROJECT

Based on approval by the Humanities and Health Research Ethics Committee (HHREC) on 27/07/2018, the North-West University Institutional Research Ethics Regulatory Committee (NWU-IRERC) hereby approves your project as indicated below. This implies that the NWU-IRERC grants its permission that, provided the special conditions specified below are met and pending any other authorisation that may be necessary, the project may be initiated, using the ethics number below.

**Project title:** Networks for Change South Africa

**Project Leader/Supervisor:** Prof. LC Theron

**Ethics number:** NWU-2016-06-0323

**Application Type:** N/A

**Commencement date:** 2016-07-27

**Expiry date:** 2019-07-27

**Risk:** Medium

**Special conditions of the approval (if applicable):**
- Translation of the informed consent document into the languages applicable to the study participants should be submitted to the HHREC (if applicable).
- Any research at governmental or private institutions, permission must still be obtained from relevant authorities and provided to the HHREC. Ethics approval is required BEFORE approval can be obtained from these authorities.

**General conditions:**
While this ethics approval is subject to all declarations, undertakings and agreements incorporated and signed in the application form, please note the following:
- The project leader (principle investigator) must report in the prescribed format to the NWU-IRERC via HHREC:
  - annually (or as otherwise required) on the progress of the project, and upon completion of the project
  - without any delay in case of any adverse event (or any matter that interrupts sound ethical principles) during the course of the project.
  - Upon completion of the project, a final report should be submitted to the HHREC.
- The approval applies strictly to the protocol as stipulated in the application form. Should any changes to the protocol be deemed necessary during the course of the project, the project leader must apply for approval of these changes at the HHREC. Would there be deviations from the protocol protocol without the necessary approval of such changes, the ethics approval is immediately and automatically fulfilled.
- The date of approval indicates the first date that the project may be started. Would the project have to continue after the expiry date, a new application must be made to the NWU-IRERC via HHREC and new approval received before or on the expiry date.
- If in the interest of ethical responsibility the NWU-IRERC and HHREC retains the right to:
  - request access to any information or data at any time during the course or after completion of the project;
  - to ask further questions, seek additional information, require further modification or monitor the conduct of your research or the informed consent process;
  - withdrawal or postponement if any unethical principles or practices of the project are revealed or suspected;
  - to close the project if it becomes apparent that any relevant information was withheld from the HHREC or if information has been false or misrepresented, the required annual report and reporting of adverse events was not done timely and accurately;
  - any new institutional rules, national legislation or international conventions deem it necessary.
- The IRERCC can be contacted for further information via [Ethics.Clearance@nwu.ac.za](mailto:Ethics.Clearance@nwu.ac.za) or 018 210 3441

The IRERCC would like to remain at your service as scientist and researcher, and wishes you well with your project. Please do not hesitate to contact the IRERCC or HHREC for any further queries or requests for assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Prof. LA Du Plessis

Chair NWU Institutional Research Ethics Regulatory Committee (IRERC)

Digitally signed by

Prof. LA Du Plessis

Date: 2016.06.04 08:53:02 +02'00'

Prof. Linda du Plessis
ADDENDUM C

Voluntary Informed Consent Letter

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION LEAFLET AND CONSENT FORM FOR RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

TITLE OF THE RESEARCH PROJECT:
Networks for change and Well-being: Girl-led ‘from the ground up’ policy-making to address sexual violence in Canada and South Africa.

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS:

Canada: Claudia Mitchell, McGill University
South Africa: Relebohile Moletsane, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Naydene de Lange, NMMU, and Linda Theron: North-West University (Vaal Triangle Campus)

CO-INVESTIGATORS: Yolande Coetzer, Marco Ebersohn, Mosna Khaile, Deidre de Villiers

ADDRESS: North-West University. P.O Box 1174, Vanderbijlpark, South Africa, 1900.

CONTACT NUMBER: 012 4206211 (for Linda Theron); 084 333 3340 (Yolande Coetzer)
Who am I?

I am a master’s student, registered at the North-West University, and I would like to invite you to be part of my study that looks at what message indigenous young men have for their community leaders about how communities can partner with young men to keep them safe against violence aimed at them. Specifically, I want to understand what messages historically disadvantaged young women and men have for their community leaders about how communities can keep young adults safe from violence aimed at them. This study is part of a bigger study called Networks of Change and Well-being project; which is a partnership between South Africa and Canada. This letter will explain what you will be asked to do if you choose to participate.

What is this research study all about?

- The aims of this research are: To better understand what historically disadvantaged young adults (that means Coloured and Black young women and men) from rural (i.e., non-city) backgrounds know about violence aimed at young men in their community and how they believe this violence can be limited, with particular emphasis on:
  - What their community is currently doing to protect them against violence aimed at young adults in the community? and
  - What their community can and should be doing to better protect them against violence aimed at young adults in the community?
  - Finding out if using videos, made by the historically disadvantaged young adults, will help others understand how communities can better protect young adults against violence.
- Approximately 10-15 participants will be included in this study.
- The research will involve talking, drawing, making a collage (a picture made by sticking words, shapes, pictures [all cut from magazines] onto a piece of cardboard), and making a short video. I, the researcher, have been trained to use these activities and will help you to use them. I will also lend you everything you need to complete the activities.
Why have you been invited to participate?

- You have been invited to participate because you have responded to an advertisement asking for historically disadvantaged young adults, pasted at Bethlehem Child & Family Welfare Centre and chose to participate in a research study.
- And, you are:
  - an indigenous, young South African young women or young man (black or coloured),
  - originally from/currently living in a rural community (i.e. not from a city),
  - between the ages of 18-24,
  - comfortable doing the research in English,
  - willing to share your knowledge regarding violence aimed at young adults in their community and how this violence can be limited.
- I may not invite anyone who is involved in a legal case relating to violence against young adults, as this may jeopardise the case. If you are involved in a court case please let me know. Also, because this research could involve thinking about violence against young adults and so cause discomfort, I am not inviting anyone who is currently receiving any form of counselling for anxiety or trauma or related difficulties.

What will your responsibilities be?

During the study, I will ask you to:

- Complete and sign this consent form.
- Meet with me and other historically disadvantaged young adults (between 5 and 10 others) five times at the Bethlehem Child & Family Welfare Centre at times and dates that we agree on. The first two meetings will probably be over a weekend (Friday and Saturday).
- Our first meeting will take approximately 2 hours. At this meeting, I will explain the research project to you. I will then give you pencils and paper and ask you to make a
drawing about how you think your community is currently protecting young men against violence aimed at them in the community. After drawing your message, I will ask you to either write a short description of your drawing, or to give a verbal explanation of your drawing (whichever option you feel most comfortable with). We will then discuss your drawing in the group. If you are not comfortable with discussing your drawing openly in the group, you do not have to share it with the group. In that case, you can talk to me separately later. After we are finished discussing your first drawing, I will then ask you to make another drawing. This time, your drawing will be about what you think your community can, or should do differently, to better protect young adults against violence aimed at them. Once again we will discuss what your drawing means. I will ask your permission to keep your drawings, but if you are not comfortable with this I will ask to take a photo of your drawings.

- When we meet the second time, I will ask you to join in a video activity that will take about 6 hours. I will ask you to divide into two or three small groups (probably around 5 people in each) and to create a story-like message (of around 5 minutes) about what you think your community can and should be doing to better protect young adults against violence aimed at them in their community. I will lend you and your group a Samsung tablet, show you how to use it, and ask you to video-record your message. Your group may choose to make the video in your mother tongue and add English subtitles. If this needs to be done, reliable translators (who will sign confidentiality agreements) will be sourced by the researchers and the person who gave you this form. As a big group we will watch your video as well as the videos made by the other groups and talk about what your messages mean and how you, as historically disadvantaged young adults, can get these messages to the people that matter (like community leaders). Then, you will make posters, or hand-outs that will help the people who matter understand your video messages better. These posters, or hand-outs will be given to the people you choose to show your videos to. If you like, I will help you arrange a meeting with the people you think must see your video.

- We will also ask for your permission to upload the video onto Optentia’s website (this is the research group that I work in (see www.optentia.co.za). By uploading your video, it will possibly reach even more people who matter for keeping young adults safe from violence. If you agree, it is possible that your video will be uploaded via YouTube. We
will also provide you with a copy of the video for your own use. *Note: if the content of your video could put you or other group members at risk, then I will not upload it or make copies.*

- One month after showing your videos to the people who matter (e.g., community leaders), we will meet for a fourth time. I will ask you to work in groups of about 5 people and to make a collage (a picture made by sticking words, shapes, pictures [all cut from magazines] onto a piece of cardboard) that shows what changes have been made by your community to better protect young adults against violence aimed at them in their community. If no changes were made, you will be asked to make your collage about why you think the changes were not made. Together, we will discuss the meaning of your group’s collage, and the meaning of the other groups’ collages. This will take about 2 hours. I will provide the magazines, cardboard, glue, and scissors. I will ask permission to keep your group’s collage, but if your group prefers to keep it, then I will ask permission to take a photo of your collage.

- We will meet for the fifth and last time about 6 months after our fourth meeting. At this meeting I will ask you to make a drawing about the changes that were kept up, or what you think should be done to create the kinds of continued changes needed to better protect young adults against violence aimed at them in their community. After drawing your message, I will ask you to either write a short description of your drawing, or to give a verbal explanation of your drawing (whichever option you feel most comfortable with). We will then discuss your drawing in the group. If you are not comfortable with discussing your drawing openly in the group, you do not have to share it with the group. I will ask your permission to keep your drawing, but if you are not comfortable with this I will ask to take a photo of your drawing.

- In all five meetings, I will ask your permission to use a voice recorder to audio-record all of our conversations at every meeting.

- Your participation is **entirely voluntary**. If you say no, this will not affect you negatively in any way whatsoever. It also means that you can say no to any part of this study at any stage. You can also withdraw your information (data) at any stage of the study, except when we have published the findings (e.g., presented a conference paper or written an article).
This study has been approved by the Humanities and Health Research Ethics Committee (HHREC) of the Faculty of Humanities of the North-West University (NWU............) and will be conducted according to the ethical guidelines and principles of the international Declaration of Helsinki and the ethical guidelines of the National Health Research Ethics Council. It might be necessary for the research ethics committee members or relevant authorities to inspect the research records to make sure that we (the researchers) are conducting research in an ethical manner.

**Will you benefit from taking part in this research?**

- The direct benefits for you, as a participant, will probably be an increased awareness of violence aimed at young adults in your community and how communities can limit this. It is possible that making a video-message for a group of people, that could perhaps support you and other young adults against violence aimed at you in your community, will help you to feel that you are doing something worthwhile for young adults in your community.

- You will receive a toolkit, which is a set of guidelines on what young adults can do to avoid violence aimed at them.

- You will learn how to make video-based messages and to think about how to communicate messages to stakeholders that can possibly bring about positive changes (like better protection against violence aimed at young adults in your community). This is often used as part of advocacy campaigns (i.e., actions to bring about positive social change). It is possible that this is a skill that you will be able to re-use at other points in your life.

- The indirect benefit will probably be improved knowledge about how violence aimed at young adults can be limited. Your participation in this study should also lead to community leaders having a better understanding of the best ways to protect young adults against violence aimed at them in their community.
Are there risks involved in your taking part in this research and how will these be managed?

The risks in this study, and how these will be managed, are summarised in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probable/possible risks/discomforts</th>
<th>Strategies to minimize risk/discomfort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You will spend most of your Friday and Saturday participating.</td>
<td>Because I am aware that this is your weekend time, I will try to make it as pleasant as possible for you. We will do the first two drawing activities on the Friday, starting at a time that suits you best, and take a 20 minute break between the two drawing activities. I will provide refreshments (juice, fruit and muffins) during the break. I believe that we will have finished with these activities in about 2 hours’ time. We will start the Saturday with coffee/tea/juice and muffins at 09:00 before beginning the video- and poster-making activity (participants have found this to be lots of fun in the past, as is also written up in research literature). I know from experience that this activity takes around 6 hours. We will take a 15 minute tea-break in between the video-making process as well as an hour’s break for lunch. We will take another 15 minute tea-break in our session that will take place after lunch. I will provide refreshments (juice, fruit and muffins) during the breaks as well as a good lunch (curry and rice). We will plan to end the day at about 16:00. This means you will have the Saturday evening free.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After spending a weekend, you will have to spend time to participate in this study on two more occasions.</td>
<td>We will begin each meeting at a time that suits you, with coffee/tea/juice and muffins. We will have a 20 minute break with refreshments in between the first and second half of every meeting. I will provide refreshments (juice, fruit and muffins) during the break.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You might have to make use of public transport to come to Bethlehem Child &amp; Family Welfare Centre.</td>
<td>I will pay your public transport costs on the days that you will participate in our research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is possible that, in the course of discussing how to protect young adults against violence aimed at them in their university community, you may experience discomfort or become unhappy.</td>
<td>If you feel emotionally uncomfortable, please tell me. If you would prefer, I can help you to make an appointment with a social worker at Bethlehem Child and Family Welfare Centre for one counselling session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because you will be asked to participate in activities, like the video production that you may not be familiar with, you may be slightly nervous.</td>
<td>I will make sure that you understand what you need to do and I will show you how to use the Samsung tablet to make a video. I feel very confident in using this video method to collect information from you, because I have attended a three day workshop on it. Please feel free to ask me any questions about the video or any part of this project that you do not fully understand. It is very important that you are completely happy and that you clearly understand what this research is about and how you could be involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You will not know ahead of time who the other participants will be.</td>
<td>If, when you arrive at the first meeting, you recognize someone whom you would not be comfortable being in a group with, then please tell me. I will then arrange to work with you on your own or with participants you are comfortable with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because you will take part in group activities, others will know that you have participated and what you have said.</td>
<td>We will negotiate group rules around confidentiality (like, respecting each other, not talking about what is in the group to anyone outside the group).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the video, that you helped to make, is uploaded onto Optentia’s website, it is possible that you will be recognized. It is also possible that your group might want to show the video to others and that you could be recognized then too.</td>
<td>Please make sure that you are comfortable with other people seeing you in the video. If you do not feel comfortable with this, please do not agree to be video-taped (e.g., you could choose to be the person who does the filming). Another option is to hide some or all of your identity; that is, we can look at wearing masks or big glasses, wigs and scarves or hats to cover your face or boxes over your body. I will have all of these things with me and you can choose what will be best for you. Please, also know that if the research team is concerned that making the video public could put you at risk, we will not.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
do so. In this event, we would not make copies of the video available to group members either.

- However, we do believe that the benefits to you and to science (as noted in the previous section) outweigh the risks we have listed. If you disagree, then please feel free not to participate in this study. We will respect your decision.

Who will have access to the data?

- The information (or data) that I get from you in this research will include drawings/collages, written explanations, transcriptions of the audio-recordings (i.e., the recorded conversations will be typed up), and video-recorded messages. As soon as data have been transcribed, they will be deleted from the recorders. The drawings/collages and, written explanations will be stored for 5 years in a locked cabinet, within a locked office that is part of a university building that has restricted, locked access. They will also be scanned and stored electronically. The audio-recordings and their transcripts, and the video-recorded messages will also be in an electronic format. All electronic data will be encrypted and kept for 5 years on a password-protected computer operating on a secured network. As soon as the video-data have been stored on the computer, they will be deleted from the Samsung tablets.

- All of the data will be stored as anonymously as possible. This means that your name will not be linked to any of the data. Instead, we will ask you to choose a name (e.g., Eminem/Catwomen) by which your data will be labelled. Alternatively, the data can be labelled Participant 1, 2, etc. If you participate in the video, you will be seen, but your name will not appear on the video. The whole South African and Canadian research team will see this data, but will not know your identity.

- Your contact information (as provided in this form) will be kept separately from the data generated in these studies. Contact information will be encrypted (protected with a code) and kept on a password-protected computer operating on a secured network. Thus, your identity cannot be linked to the study data through our keeping of your contact information.
• The researchers who are collaborating in this project, and a transcriber will have access to your data, but not to your contact details. The researchers and transcriber will sign a confidentiality agreement which means that they cannot talk about the data or show/give it to others. If your video is uploaded onto YouTube/made available to each group member, then there will be unrestricted access to this part of the data.

• The policy makers and community leaders will only have access to the information shown to them from the video recording and hand-outs given to them during your meeting with them.

What will happen to the data?

• What I learn from this study will be written up and shared with other researchers and other people that are interested in this topic. I will write articles and reports in academic journals. I will also talk about what I learnt at conferences. The video that you make in the group could be shown to people at a conference and will be shared with the international research team via the project’s restricted website. It will also be shown to people that you choose (as I explained above). In all of this sharing of information, you will not be personally identified. This means that when I share what I learnt, I will not include your name or details that will help others to know that you participated (e.g., your name, address or age).

• It is possible that the Canadian and South African team will re-analyse this data as new theories are developed about what supports young adults to be safe from violence or resilient. The new analyses will stay focused on themes of resilience and limiting violence aimed at historically disadvantaged young adults.

Will you be paid/compensated to take part in this study and are there any costs involved?

• No, you will not be paid to take part in the study, but refreshments and lunch will be given as mentioned above.
• If participating in the research means that you have to travel especially for the purpose of participating, then your travel costs will be paid.

How will you know about the findings?

• All the information I get, and how I try and understand it, will be shown to you. Together, we will look at the information from our conversation, the group meetings, the video you make as well as what the people who you choose to look at the video have to say about it. I will put all information I get from this study together and take out the main ideas which I will write up into a summary. You will get a copy of this. We will provide you with a copy of the video for your own use. *Note: if the content of your video could put you or other group members at risk, then we will not upload it or make copies.*

• I will make copies for you of the drawings, writings and storyboard that you make.

Is there anything else that you should know or do?

• You can contact or WhatsApp me, Yolandé Coetzer, at 084 333 3340, or email me at yolande@pps.co.za, if you have any further queries or encounter any problems.

• You can contact the chair of the Humanities and Health Research Ethics, Prof Tumi Khumalo (016 910 3397 or Tumi.khumalo@nwu.ac.za). You can leave a message for Prof Tumi with Ms. Daleen Claasens (016 910 30441).

• You will receive a copy of this information and consent form for your own records.
By signing below, I ………………………………………………. agree to take part in a research study entitled: **Networks for change and Well-being: Boy-led ‘from the ground up’ policy-making to address sexual violence in Canada and South Africa**

I declare that:

- ✓ I have read and understood this information and consent form and it is written in a language with which I am fluent and comfortable.

- ✓ I have had a chance to ask questions to both the person obtaining consent, as well as the researcher (if this is a different person), and all my questions have been adequately answered.

- ✓ I understand that taking part in this study is **voluntary** and I have not been pressurised to take part.

- ✓ I understand that what I contribute (what I report/say/produce visually) could be reproduced publically and/or quoted, but without reference to my personal identity.

- ✓ I may choose to leave the study at any time up to publication and will not be penalised or prejudiced in any way.

- ✓ I may be asked to leave the study before it has finished, if the researcher feels it is in my best interests, or if I do not follow the study plan, as agreed to.

Signed at (place) ............................................ on (date) ......................... 20....

..................................................................................   ................................................................

Signature of participant                                          Signature of witness
- You may contact me again
  
- I would like a summary of the findings of this research

The best way to reach me is:

Name & Surname: ________________________________
Postal Address: __________________________________________
Email: ________________________________________________
Phone Number: ________________________________
Cell Phone Number: ________________________________

In case the above details change, please contact the following person who knows me well, who does not live with me and who will help you to contact me:

Name & Surname:

___________________________________________________________________________

Phone/ Cell Phone Number /Email:

___________________________________________________________________________
Declaration by person obtaining consent

I (name) ……………………………………………..……… declare that:

- ✓ I explained the information in this document to …………………………………..
- ✓ I encouraged him to ask questions and took adequate time to answer them.
- ✓ I am satisfied that he adequately understands all aspects of the research, as discussed above
- ✓ I did/did not use an interpreter

Signed at (place) ................................. on (date) ..................... 20....

.................................................... ....................................................
Signature of person obtaining consent Signature of witness
Declaration by researcher

I (name) ………………………………………………………… declare that:

- I explained the information in this document to ………………………………………... 
- I encouraged him to ask questions and took adequate time to answer them. 
- I am satisfied that he adequately understands all aspects of the research, as discussed above 
- I did/did not use an interpreter.

Signed at (place) ............................................ on (date) ......................... 20....

......................................................................   ...................................................................
Signature of researcher       Signature of witness
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ADDENDUM E

Excerpt Illustrating Open Coding Process for Written Explanations of Drawings

**Date of open coding:** 15/02/2017

**Activity:** Draw-&-talk/write 2 – Young women

**Question:** What can your community do **better** to protect historically disadvantaged young women against violence?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First step</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second step: Colour code used to compare/group codes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written explanations of drawings</th>
<th>Open code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Young-women-participant 1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The [public servants should create space for park and grounds where young women can group themselves and keep themselves busy during the day].</td>
<td>Community should create safe spaces where young women can come together and keep busy in order to stay safe against violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The [social development should be more accessible to young women],</td>
<td>More accessible social development centres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. they should [offer programs about violence in the community.]</td>
<td>Social development should provide programs that educate about violence in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The [SAPS should also be more accessible in times of danger and violence.]</td>
<td>More accessible security services – SAPS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Young-women-participant 2:

1. About my drawing. [*Community must build up centres where each and every young person can get help wherever he/she needs it.*]  
   Community should build centers that provide help when young women need it.

2. [Help, counselling, emotionally, socially, and how should they behave when they are faced with violence.]  
   At these centers counselling (emotional and social assistance) should be provided when young women are faced with violence.

3. [Those centres are open 24/7 for any report like crime, starvation/hunger, anything that is harmful towards young people individually.]  
   These centers should be accessible at all times to fulfil the needs of young people.

4. [During the day those centres used as resources for the community by keeping young people busy on creative art/work alerting other young woman about crime and strategies they must take in order to keep them busy.]  
   These centers is a resource that should be accessible during the day for young women to be kept busy with recreational activities.

5. [By feeding young people with good information regarding violence.]  
   Social development centres should educate young women regarding violence.

Rest of transcripts can be obtained from researcher.
## ADDENDUM F

### Coding key

**Colour code used to compare/group codes across all open-coded data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colour Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>All open codes relating to accessible safe spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>All open codes relating to education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>All open codes relating to security services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>All open codes relating to SE facilitating strategies to avoid violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>All open codes relating to creation of job opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>All open codes relating to agency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table Summarising all Axial Codes used for young women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Axial code</th>
<th>Inclusion / Exclusion criteria for axial code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessible community based public spaces facilitating protective processes</td>
<td>Including all public spaces in the community that facilitate protective processes such as recreation, education, or advocacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excluding residential and privately owned spaces, public spaces that provide services such as social welfare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service departments educate young women about violence</td>
<td>Including education by formal institutions, informal education initiatives by public service departments, such as social welfare and development, NGO’s, etc. that focus on sharing norms/values/skills to enable young women to be protected against violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excluding education initiatives/advice by peers and parents/primary caregivers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security services</td>
<td>Including both formal [government (e.g. SAPS) and private security providers] and informal [CPF, community volunteers].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excluding vigilante actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social ecologies facilitate strategies to avoid violence</td>
<td>Includes any shelters/counselling services, community initiatives and/or recreational activities that suggests and/or facilitate behaviours/values that supports the avoidance of violence. Excludes any punitive measures by social ecological actors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>Including any initiatives that lead to legal financial compensation [entrepreneurship, formal employment, etc.]. Excluding any volunteering initiatives as well as activities that provide illegal financial compensation that might encourage violence such as: drug dealing, prostitution, human trafficking, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal motivation (Agency)</td>
<td>Includes any initiative/action that is motivated and/or conducted by an individual that supports the avoidance of violence. Excluding any initiative/action/program facilitated by social ecological actors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Dataset 2: Explanations of drawings: Constant comparison: Young women

**Draw & Talk 2:** What can your community do better to keep historically disadvantaged young women safe against violence?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young-women-participant 1</th>
<th>Young-women-participant 2</th>
<th>Young-women-participant 3</th>
<th>Young-women-participant 4</th>
<th>Young-women-participant 5</th>
<th>Young-women-participant 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide accessible public spaces which facilitate protective processes</td>
<td>Provide accessible public spaces which facilitate protective processes</td>
<td>Provide accessible public spaces which facilitate protective processes</td>
<td>Provide accessible public spaces which facilitate protective processes</td>
<td>Create job opportunities</td>
<td>Public service departments should educate young women about violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide accessible public spaces which facilitate protective processes</td>
<td>Social ecologies facilitate strategies to avoid violence</td>
<td>Provide Security services</td>
<td>Public service departments should educate young women about violence</td>
<td>Social ecologies facilitate strategies to avoid violence</td>
<td>Public service departments should educate young women about violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service departments should educate young women about violence</td>
<td>Provide accessible public spaces which facilitate protective processes</td>
<td>Create job opportunities</td>
<td>Motivate agency of individuals</td>
<td>Public service departments should educate young women about violence</td>
<td>Public service departments should educate young women about violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Security services</td>
<td>Provide accessible public spaces which facilitate protective processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public service departments should educate young women about violence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public service departments should educate young women about violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide accessible public spaces which facilitate protective processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ADDENDUM H

**Table Illustrating Emerging Themes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerging themes: Young women’s written explanations of draw-&amp;-talk/write activity</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide accessible public spaces which facilitate protective processes</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service departments should educate young women about violence</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social ecologies facilitate strategies to avoid violence</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide security services</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create job opportunities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivate agency of community individuals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADDENDUM I

Photos of Video-screening and SE Stakeholder Meeting

Young adults preparing to screen their videos

Young adults and SE stakeholder discussing messages

Teacher relaying her message to young adults

Young adults and SE stakeholders exchanging contact details
ADDENDUM J

Participant Videos Screened to SE Stakeholders