



CSVR
Centre for the Study of
Violence and Reconciliation

SUMMATIVE REPORT

**Learnings from participants' reflections
on the strengthening urban violence prevention
through the Community Work Programme (CWP) project**

This work was carried out with the aid of a grant from the International Development Research Centre, Ottawa, Canada. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent those of the IDRC or its Board of Governors.



The Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation (CSVR) is an independent nongovernmental organisation established in South Africa in 1989. We are a multi-disciplinary institute that seeks to understand and prevent violence, heal its effects and build sustainable peace at community, national and regional levels. We do this through collaborating with, and learning from, the lived and diverse experiences of communities affected by violence and conflict. Through our research, interventions and advocacy we seek to enhance state accountability, promote gender equality and build social cohesion, integration and active citizenship. While primarily based in South Africa, we work across the African continent through collaborations with community, civil society, state and international partners.

Authored by Steven Rebello
Edited by Hugo van der Merwe
Design by Carol Cole

Published June 2019

The content of this publication is protected by copyright. Readers are, however, invited to freely use the information as published here, subject to acknowledging the Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation and the “Learnings from participants’ reflections on the strengthening urban violence prevention through the Community Work Programme (CWP) project” reflection report as the source.

Contents

Abstract	2
<hr/>	
1. Introduction	3
2. Objectives of this report	5
3. Methodology	6
4. Results	7
4.1. Lessons related to participant recruitment	7
4.2. Lessons around CWP participant training	8
4.3. Lessons around project conceptualisation and planning	9
4.4. Lessons based on CWP participants' experiences of implementing violence prevention initiatives	10
4.5. Lessons about project sustainability	15
5. Conclusion	17
6. Recommendations	18
7. References	22
<hr/>	

Abstract

CSVSR has been researching South Africa's Community Work Programme (CWP) since 2010. In 2016, the organisation commenced with an effort to strengthen urban violence prevention interventions, carried out by CWP participants, by offering furthering training and support in implementing violence prevention interventions. This report shares some of the key learnings from the CWP participants who were involved in this project. Based on their experiences, it highlights some of the potential strengths of this project as well as areas that may need to be revised for future iterations of such initiatives.

1. Introduction

Initiated by the South African Department of the Presidency in 2008, the Community Work Programme (CWP) was conceptualised as a public employment programme geared towards alleviating the effects of high levels of chronic or long-term unemployment in South Africa. The programme was also viewed as an economic ‘safety net’, in that it aimed to provide underemployed and unemployed individuals with two days of employment, per week, on an ongoing basis, while they continued to search for more permanent job opportunities. As of 2017, the CWP has grown to include just over 225 000 participants from 208 sites¹, with national government aiming to have the programme eventually reach one million people across the country².

CSVr highlighted how the CWP could be utilised as means of preventing different forms of violence within communities.

The CWP was conceptualised as being participatory in nature, where councillors, community members and other stakeholders are consulted in the conceptualisation of activities that are deemed to be useful to the community. Once all these consultation processes are complete, financially vulnerable community members are then invited to participate in the CWP and may then further contribute to the development of activities. While the participatory or collaborative nature of the programme contributes to variation in activities across sites, common activities have included food gardens, environmental and communal infrastructure maintenance.

While the CWP has provided an economic safety net, providing income to highly vulnerable individuals and contributing the development of their communities, research by CSVr also highlighted how the CWP could be utilised as means of preventing different forms of violence within communities. This was highlighted in the CWP pilot site of Bokfontein, which was largely constituted by individuals who had been evicted from two separate areas in the North West province and forced to live together. While sharing many of the factors that contributed to violent xenophobic attacks in communities across South Africa between 2008 and 2010, Langa suggested that the joint and diverse participation within CWP, stipends and activities geared at community development, may have represented factors that prevented violence within the community³.

Funded by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), CSVr built on this initial research by conducting research across seven CWP sites in three South African provinces⁴. This phase 1 research found that CWP has the potential to prevent violence in the various communities researched by CSVr. One of the key findings from this research was that although the CWP has the potential to prevent violence, many stakeholders, including participants, believed that violence prevention through the CWP could be strengthened if participants received further training and support in implementing violence prevention activities.

As a result, in the subsequent phase of the project, CSVr provided CWP participants with training and support in conceptualising and implementing violence prevention activities through their work. Through prior stakeholder engagements, these areas of training were identified as gender-based violence, working with men, substance abuse, parenting, working with ex-offenders and self-care.

After reviewing literature and consulting with various stakeholders (including the Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional affairs – holding CWP), CSVr developed the content that would be utilised to train and work with 40 CWP participants from 4 sites across Gauteng province (N= 160 participants). These sites included Tembisa, Ivory Park, Erasmus and Orange Farm.

CSVR provided CWP participants with training and support in conceptualising and implementing violence prevention activities through their work.

Participants in four sites were trained in all six areas, prior to them selecting areas for targeted violence prevention interventions. Subsequently, participants attended ten days of training between March and May 2017. The participants then motivated and voted for one or two areas of violence prevention on which they wished to focus between August 2017 and September 2018. The sites of Ivory Park and Tembisa elected to focus on the topics of gender-based violence and substance abuse, Erasmus focused on substance abuse, whereas Orange Farm elected to focus on parenting.

In collaboration with CWP participants and local stakeholders, this project *directly* reached 2,552 community members or beneficiaries between August 2017 and August 2018. A total of 37 events were hosted across the four communities. The greatest number of beneficiaries were reached through awareness-raising (33% of total beneficiaries), followed by 29% of beneficiaries being reached through school or class talks and 17% of the beneficiaries being reached through the initial situational analysis conducted at each site in July 2017. (The initial situational analysis aimed to assist CSVr and CWP participants in clarifying assumptions and developing a deeper understanding of beneficiaries' potential attitudes, behaviours and challenges related to the selected areas of intervention, for example, gender-based violence, substance abuse or parenting.)

Following twelve months of working with CWP participants, CSVr compiled a series of shorter summative reports which aimed to share learnings around the strengths and challenges of attempting to strengthen urban violence prevention through the CWP. These reports focus on the following:

- Potential shifts in CWP participants' knowledge, attitudes and behaviour following exposure to the six areas of violence prevention training (pre and post-training evaluation)
- CSVr project team members' experiences of the project and its attempts to strengthen violence prevention through the CWP
- CWP project participants' experiences of the project, including their experiences of recruitment, training, implementation and the future of their violence prevention work through the CWP
- Local stakeholder and project beneficiaries' experiences of the project and its activities
- CSVr project team members' learnings from its attempts to utilise a participatory approach during the manual development, training and implementation phases of the project
- CSVr team members' experiences of the strengths and challenges in state – civil society collaboration

2. Objectives of this report

This report aims to highlight participants' experiences of the project. These experiences include those related to recruitment, training, implementation and the future of their violence prevention work through the CWP. It is hoped that a greater understanding of these experiences could assist CSV, the Department of Cooperative Governance (CoGTA, who holds the CWP), CWP site management (implementing agents) and other stakeholders in strengthening violence prevention interventions through the CWP, other national (the Expanded Public Works Programme) as well as international public employment programmes.

3. Methodology

CSV decided to utilise focus group discussions (FGDs) as a means of gaining deeper insights into participants' experiences of the project. The FGDs were scheduled to take up to 3 hours, with regular breaks between questions. The FGD questions were chronological in nature in that they focused on participants' experiences of recruitment through to their expectations related to the sustainability of their violence prevention work through the CWP.

FGDs were held across the four sites between September and October 2018. Just over 60 CWP project participants engaged in the FGDs. This ranged from six participants in Tembisa to 22 participants in Orange Farm. The FGDs were co-facilitated by the two CSV teams who had been working with the CWP participants since March 2017. However, in an effort to reduce bias, the two teams switched sites or conducted discussions at the sites and with the participants with whom they had not worked.

While it is often difficult to maintain confidentiality when conducting FGDs, CSV endeavoured to read through informed consent forms with participants prior to initiating the discussions. Participants were encouraged to maintain confidentiality and discuss any concerns, which potentially emanated within the discussions, with CSV team members.

During the discussions, participants were able to speak their home languages, as CSV had the capacity to facilitate the discussion in multiple languages and then translate and transcribe the discussions into English. In terms of data analysis, each question was analysed for themes across the sites as well as themes that generated great debate within sites. These themes are presented in the following section.

4. Results

4.1 Lessons related to participant recruitment

In February 2017, CSV team met with the site managers and some site coordinators from the four CWP sites, in order to discuss the project as well as participant recruitment. Through this meeting, CSV recognised that the site managers and especially coordinators were well placed to know intricate details about potential participants. This included details pertaining to the participants' character and reputation within the community.

As a result of the meeting with site managers, CSV created a selection document that it hoped would guide site managers and coordinators in recruiting participants. While recognising the skewed nature of gender representation within the CWP, where close to 80% of participants are women, CSV encouraged site coordinators to push to have at least 10 (25%) males among the 40 selected participants. This request was aligned with stakeholder suggestions regarding the need to involve both men and women in community development efforts.

In analysing the results of the focus group discussions with CWP participants, it seemed that different methods were utilised in recruiting participants. At one of the sites, it appeared that participants were informed about the project through a broader meeting, while at another, participants were shortlisted and then provided with the opportunity to volunteer for the project.

"We had a choice, we were not forced" Erasmus

"They asked the coordinators at the sites, [site manager], to choose people who'd attend CSV training. That is how I got to know about it." Orange Farm

"They were asking us if we would like to be part of the project. I said yes I don't have a problem" Orange Farm

In another site, all participants agreed that one of the criteria for participation in the project was that they needed to be able to read and write. Although this criterion was considered by CSV, CWP site management and other stakeholders, they had agreed that it would not be a factor that limited potential participation in the project, as a balance of levels of literacy in the selected group of CWP participants would potentially compensate for lower levels of literacy.

"We were told from work by the coordinators that those who know how to write and read, there is training that they can attend. It was before January. We were told by December. That those who want to go – can read and write, they can go to – there is a project that they can attend in January"

4.2 Lessons around CWP participant training

CSVSR worked with multiple stakeholders in identifying the six areas of training as well as in the development of the training content and methodology. Although CSVSR initially proposed that CWP participants choose two or three areas of training on which they would like to focus, the selected site managers and coordinators agreed that it could be beneficial for the participants to be exposed to all six areas of training before designing interventions focused on one or two areas.

Subsequently, CSVSR implemented two training teams to conduct ten days of training at each CWP site between March and May 2017. In an attempt to prevent training fatigue, the teams aimed to train participants for either 4 or 5 days in a week, move to another site the following week and then return to the first site.

In reviewing the participants' responses to the training, the expression 'opened my eyes' appeared to adequately summarise the general sense that participants had developed new or deeper insights related to the different areas of training. While reflecting more broadly on the training, some participants commented on the way the training affected their attitudes towards people of different genders or sexual orientations as well as their relationships with their children or partners.

"The training opened my eyes because I didn't know that men have a tendency of bottling things up. Also with parenting, I learnt how to raise a child- and as a parent how to notice if a child starts doing odd things" Tembisa

"I've even changed personally, the way I used to see things before, the way I used to think before. I used to think just like any other guy in the township; that these people are iitabane [gay], and so on. But at least my attitude has changed" Orange Farm

A broader theme that was initially difficult to understand was that participants often spoke about their experiences during the implementation of their activities rather than their experiences of the training. While this was initially attributed to the implementation phase being more recent, it was recognised that some of the participants felt that the training may not have fully prepared them for the realities or challenges they faced within their contexts. These challenges included a lack of services in a community, a lack of finances for transport, corrupt local officials, as well as a lack of skills or expertise to fill identified gaps in service provision.

"I think the reason they can't get to [out-patient rehabilitation service provider] is due to a lack of fares. But if they were able to get counselling in Erasmus they would come. Money is a problem. Some people are willing to go to [service provider], but because they do not have money for transport they are unable to go. I wish we could get more training so we could counsel people so they don't have to go to [service provider].

The scope and extent of these contextual realities or challenges appeared to affect participants in different ways. These contrasting experiences were noted in two of the participants' experiences. The first participant reflected on how she felt trapped in an abusive relationship due to a lack of financial independence. In contrast, the second participant appeared to initially be apathetic when recognising

the size of the problem of substance abuse in her community and then appears to convey a sense of hope and social cohesion, suggesting that CWP participants and community members can work together to share information and support those affected by issues such as substance abuse.

"And then at home, maybe my husband is drinking. And if he says, you are not supposed to go outside to meet other ladies, I have to listen because it seems that is the way things are. If I don't do it, I don't have a house to go back to. And then if he says my kids are not supposed to socialise with this and so kids; somehow I have to adjust between those things. It seems my willpower or my ideas, my vision, my dreams, are still being under oppression." Erasmus

"So we realised that as our children are deeply involved in substance abuse, there was nothing they could do at the end. So I learnt that it was necessary that I amass the experience to be able to help them. We did help another one called [Price]. He went and got help. He was helped by myself [and two other group members]. So it is necessary that as people we take up an opportunity to help other people. Let us all help each other so people can live" Tembisa

The one weakness or grievance that spontaneously emerged through the focus group discussions included the fact that CSVV's training was not accredited or recognised by formal qualifications or the further education authority. Although CSVV made participants aware of this during the initial informed consent procedure, it appeared that some participants continued with the training and project, hoping that it would lead to a means of exiting the CWP and finding better employment opportunities.

"At least I can manage to find a job with accredited certificate, not that one, the attendance [certificate]. Maybe accredit one, I could put more on my CV, I can't put the attendance certificate on my CV. You see" Ivory Park

4.3 Lessons around project conceptualisation and planning

In June 2017, after completing the training, CSVV held a three-day workshop with participants where they were tasked with selecting one or two of the areas of training as their areas of intervention. They were also assisted in the process of thinking about their group's vision; the types of activities they believed needed to be implemented in order to achieve this vision; networking; budgeting; and a means of evaluating interventions.

Through these workshops, participants in Ivory Park and Tembisa chose to focus on the areas of gender-based violence and substance abuse, participants in Erasmus selected substance abuse, whereas participants in Orange Farm decided to focus on parenting.

When reflecting on the planning workshops, participants from three of the CWP sites recalled how they selected their areas of intervention based on the prevalence and thus need for interventions in the areas of gender-based violence (GBV) and substance abuse. This was in contrast to Orange Farm, where some participants stated that the topic of parenting was selected because interventions in this area could potentially prevent issues such as GBV, substance abuse or crime. Other participants

stated that they selected the topic based on its perceived relevance to their lives, where many of the participants were parents.

“We chose the drug and substance abuse because we saw the dramatic need for it in our society. As there are many [spots] around here that have those children who are doing drugs” Erasmus

“I can say that when we chose parenting, we were of the opinion that as parents we have challenges that we face. So in choosing to work with parenting. We’d be able to help ourselves so we can also help the community we live in” Orange Farm

In contrast, a participant in Tembisa and Erasmus appeared to doubt their group’s selected areas of intervention after feeling that they were facing what seemed to be an insurmountable problem. This sense of hopelessness was mainly due to socioeconomic issues but also the need to complete different work tasks.

“So when we start to work with it, others they started to feel lazy, they start to drag their feet at the back. So they think that this is useless, it is something that we cannot defeat at all. When it comes to GBV and substance abuse. As you can look here around the township there are many shebeens, many poverty and whatsoever” Tembisa

“People need help and we came to a realisation that we are failing them sometimes, because we are unable to reach them all. We still have CWP work obligations, which means we then have to stop CSVSR work and do CWP work” Erasmus

4.4 Lessons based on CWP participants’ experiences of implementing violence prevention initiatives

After the planning workshops, the CWP participants continued planning for and then started implementing activities between late August 2017 and September 2018. During this time, CSVSR continued to assist participants in planning events, considering content, reflecting on and revising content or events.

Overall, participants from all four sites had generally positive experiences of the project implementation period. Participants reflected on how they felt that they had learned a great deal through their participation in the project. This knowledge appeared to be empowering in that participants had a greater sense of what constituted violence as well as a more refined understanding of the resources or service providers that provided services related to their selected areas of focus (e.g. GBV, substance abuse or parenting).



A CWP participant in Orange Farm facilitating a discussion on single parenthood (July 2018)

“I think I gained more knowledge, especially on drugs and substance abuse. When doing door-to-door we find many people that don’t know where to go especially the SANCA [South African National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence]. Those // the client that we can take to SANCA, they don’t know where to get help about substance and drug abuse” Ivory Park

The project also appeared to provide participants with new challenges and opportunities for personal growth. In many ways, this project was different from other types of work that the participants had experienced as it required less manual or physical labour and more verbal and psychological engagement with team and community members. Many group members felt that, even though they were not easy, activities such as awareness raising, workshop facilitation and stakeholder engagements helped them to be less shy, more confident and outgoing.

“The experience I had from January to September is that I used to be a shy person, I did not like talking. But right now I am able to talk to people; whether we go to schools, or I meet people in the street, they know that I deal with such and such issues” Tembisa

“The reason I think many people left is because they were scared of having to present. Just like myself – I have problem having to do presentations. But I am getting used to it. I will end up getting good at presenting” Orange Farm

Aligned with the need for the CWP activities to be useful to the community, many CWP participants felt that they were receiving greater recognition, within their local communities, as resources or people that could be turned to for information and referrals. Even though the work had its challenges, this engagement provided some of the participants, many of whom were women, with a sense of pride or purpose. In one instance, it also led to a participant being elected as a local/neighbourhood leader.



A CWP participant sharing information about the CWP Erasmus group and its work on substance abuse (February 2018)

“The good thing about this is, people know that they are more informed than before. And there are even people who voluntarily come for information and to ask where to find help and things. It’s a good thing, and somehow it is fulfilling to see that at least my work was not in vain” Erasmus

“Thus far, the community I live in even chose me to be a chairperson of the community. It means they’ve realised that what I do pleases people” Tembisa

A sub-theme that was common across all four sites was the significance of stakeholder engagement. Across three of the four sites, stakeholder relationships developed through stakeholder meetings. These meetings provided opportunities for the CWP participants and stakeholders to share details of the work that they carried out as well as their experiences in working with gender-based violence or substance abuse. Participants appeared to value the opportunities to learn from stakeholders though greatly valued working relationships, where participants would refer community members to stakeholders for support or would collaborate with stakeholders in carrying out interventions (for example, awareness-raising campaigns or class talks in schools).

“The first thing we did when we started working was arrange a workshop for the stakeholders. We invited people from SAPS, SANCA and doctors, to tell us what they know about this thing. And then to give us clues of how to eradicate or to try to solve the problem. That is the first step that we take when we started this” Erasmus

“So, I have experience that when a person comes to me for help, I’d help where I can, but if I can’t, I would give him a number of who to contact” Tembisa

“Through the Restoration Programme, on parenting, we were invited by SANCA to do a presentation on parenting. They liked it because it went hand in hand with substance abuse” Orange Farm

Good working relationships were built between the CWP participants’ groups and stakeholders. There were some initial difficulties in this process due to the stigma associated with CWP work in some communities; i.e. as a programme where unemployed or unskilled community members forms of manual labour such as street sweeping. They are thus not viewed as people with useful knowledge or skills who are capable of providing assistance.

First of all, the person you are taking there, she or he wants to know that you are not playing with him. Are you really doing this because of your knowledge or you’re just helping? I don’t know. Even at SANCA, sometimes when you get there they just look at you very small. Like you don’t know what you are doing” Ivory Park

This project highlighted how such beliefs are misplaced and that, with adequate training and support, CWP participants can play a role in creating awareness, increasing knowledge and connecting community members with services. This potential role of CWP participants was found to be particularly relevant in the South African context, where a history of racial inequality has contributed to a lack of social and healthcare services in many predominantly African and Coloured communities.

Participants from all four sites experienced this lack of services as a frustration and limitation of their work. While participants were aware of local service providers, the distance required to travel to these service providers or a lack of capacity often meant that those who needed or wanted assistance were not able to receive such assistance. Where some participants felt that the government should increase services such as places of safety, rehabilitation, skills or recreation centres, other participants felt that opportunities for additional training and resources could make it easier for them be involved and provide services such as basic counselling, support groups or family mediation.

“I think the reason they can’t get to Mission Impossible [service provider] is due to a lack of [transport] fares. But if they were able to get counselling in Erasmus they would come. Money is a problem... I wish we could get more training so we could counsel people so they don’t have to go to Mission Possible. They should get counselling here in Erasmus. We would then refer them to a rehab where they won’t have to pay” Erasmus

“And mostly those children who are addicted to nyaope – some they discuss with me that they want to quit but they are trapped, they don’t know how to quit. So I find it difficult for those children to – where they can go actually” Tembisa

Based on participants’ reflections on the implementation phase of this project, it was apparent that communication between key project stakeholders; such as CSV, CWP participants, and CWP site management, is an area that requires consistent effort. CSV recognised how, following the training of CWP participants, the piloting and participatory nature of the project contributed to some changes in dates and timelines for planned activities. While efforts can be made to communicate these changes, the long-term and sometimes time-pressured nature of such projects occasionally contributes to

competing demands. This was noted in this CSVr project when participants were perhaps caught between site managements' need to carry out prior CWP commitments, ensure that participants have carried out eight days of work per month, and the need to carry out planned violence prevention activities.

“And even when they receive messages that we need to attend training, they’d say your training inconveniences us, we do not have enough staff. That is a challenge we are facing. It’s not that they do not get messages, they do get messages” Tembisa

The participants' references to difficulties in communication may have also pointed to some of the underlying or more implicit factors which may affect stakeholders' relationships - a point that has been made in previous reports by CSVr. This project, however, suggested that power dynamics may contribute to difficulties in communication. This was noted in one of the sites, where a site coordinator expressed concern about the need for participants to have multiple meetings in an effort to plan for an upcoming violence prevention activity (workshop). Such a concern could have been discussed with a CSVr staff member, but it was raised with participants who then informed CSVr staff member about the coordinator's concern.

“I remember there was one coordinator – they were always calling us; guys are you working? Why? Why? In fact, they were posing a threat, that you know what; it seems like you are always doing research, but we do not see you implementing it.”

While reflecting on this incident, it was necessary to consider what made it difficult for the coordinator or site manager to approach CSVr staff member. Factors such as race, gender, class, title (position), education, age, externality and others were considered to implicitly affect relationships, levels of power and the ability to communicate different concerns – both between CSVr and site management as well as site management and CWP participants.

The coordinator's conceptualisation of CWP work also brought into focus how 'useful' work may be conceptualised within the CWP. While 'useful' work includes any activities that contribute to local social, economic, environmental or infrastructural development, 'useful' work may at times be conflated with the amount of physical or manual labour carried out within a day. Attempts to discuss and plan workshop or event content, which can be a more dialogical and iterative process, may be viewed as quite different and perhaps more difficult to quantify or manage.

4.5 Lessons about project sustainability

In its ten years of working with communities, CSV has recognised the need for and challenges in developing sustainable projects. Learnings about project scalability and sustainability were important considerations for this project.

In working with participants, CSV attempted to make participants aware of the finite nature of the project when the project was first introduced to participants in March 2017. CSV hoped to develop learnings that would see CoGTA adopting policies to strengthen violence prevention through the CWP, but it also hoped that the participants would have a desire to envision their role in maintaining the projects.

Participants expressed mixed opinions regarding the future of their projects. Positive views expressed by participants related to their belief that they had gained the knowledge and experience required to continue the work that they had been carrying out. The agency, motivation, sense of purpose and togetherness that some participants had developed also appeared to be a factor that provided a sense of optimism, despite the challenges that they may have also faced.

“I would like to ask that we work together as a team. So we can continue with this good work that we do. Already there is a difference we do in schools, in the community. And then if we do not trust ourselves, then [CSV team] cannot make us trust ourselves. We should trust ourselves” Orange Farm

The first concern voiced by participants related to finances and how they would be able to purchase the basic resources (e.g. printing, stationery or basic catering) required to host activities.

“We have a big problem there. If CSV leaves who is going to fund us because we do not have funds, we do not have things to work with” Tembisa

While generally anxious about finances, participants in two of the sites still appeared to be motivated to find funding or support by registering their projects as non-profit organisations, finding sponsorships or creating joint microenterprises known as cooperatives. Participants in Orange Farm appeared to be most motivated to register as an NPO and with some support from CSVr, had already started the process of completing the required documentation.

“We’ve been thinking about an NPO, whereby we’ll continue with this project” Erasmus

“A future with Restoration is that we are planning to register this project as soon as possible. So we can work together with // so that we can get funds. After registering the project, we will start applying for funds so we can start programmes” Orange Farm

Another concern raised by participants in two of the sites related to the groups’ difficulty in working more independently. This difficulty appeared to relate to self-management as well as overall group leadership.

“Since we met, without CSVr it was difficult. So I have doubts that we are going to be successful without CSVr. Personally! Because of the way we are working; we are not punctual, number one. All of us. We are not sticking to rules. So far” Orange Farm

“Being demoralised, they used to be // most of them they used to work whilst they are being monitored. And it seems like independence will be not there when Selby and Palesa leave. But I just hope for the best” Ivory Park

A final concern expressed by participants (specifically in Erasmus) related to their experiences during implementation, namely, a perceived lack of support from site management. Strengthening working relationships between CWP participants and site management appeared to be an important factor related to project sustainability.

“For me the future of this group was blank. But when I turn it on the other side, especially working on this site, or with the CWP time, it might be quite difficult. Unless we work it as an individual group, as not being part of CWP” Erasmus

5. Conclusion

Reflecting on the participants' experiences, it seemed that the project had both strengths and weaknesses in its different phases. Related to the training, participants reported increased knowledge, changes in their attitudes and personal lives as well as feeling more equipped to deal with some of the social challenges they experienced in their communities. Simultaneously, although many participants felt empowered, it was noted how an increased sense of empowerment may have been subdued by the seemingly immovable contextual challenges encountered in their communities as well as their own homes. Some of these challenges require much broader collaboration between citizens, business and government departments at local, provincial and national levels. However, CSVr also noted a sense of togetherness, group identity or social cohesion amongst participants, where they felt that they could work together to affect positive change. This was also noted when reflecting on project implementation, where participants felt that they were increasingly being recognised as knowledgeable or resources within their communities - an outcome that was especially important in communities that continued to struggle with the lack of health services, primarily due to colonialism and apartheid and secondarily due to issues of service delivery post-1994.

A great challenge experienced during this project appeared to relate to difficulty in managing potential issues of rank and power and its effects on communication between CSVr, CWP site management and project participants. Although CSVr has been working with many of the CWP site managers since 2013, it seemed that initial implementation uncertainties strained the more intense and prolonged relationships required for this pilot project. Uncertainties such as: ensuring that participants had eight days of planned work per month; changing dynamics between site management and participants (potentially due to the 'special' or different types of work carried out in the project); issues of perceived class; education and race. As suggested in the recommendations, more can be done to address these challenges in future phases of this continuous process of learning and refinement.

In terms of participants' perceptions about the future of their violence prevention work through the CWP, it was promising to note that some participants had already taken some actions to find ways of funding or gaining support for their work. This included commencing with the process of registering their projects as not for profit organisations (NPOs) and thinking about how they could continue to work with local stakeholders. Despite this positive response, it was also noted that participants felt that needed additional support from their CWP site management if they hoped to continue their violence prevention interventions.

6. Recommendations

Aligned with the aims of this report, participants' experiences of this project contributed to several recommendations on how this and future projects could strengthen violence prevention through the CWP or other public employment programmes. These recommendations include:

1. More attention should be given to appropriate recruitment of participants. In this case, project timelines did not allow for it; however, it could be beneficial to develop a more experiential recruitment process. This could include CWP participants being informed about the types of work that may be included in the project, participants gaining first-hand experience of such activities (for example, awareness-raising, event planning and content development). They could then be asked whether they would like to continue working in the project.
2. More experiential, inductive training methods should be utilised. This could include asking participants to share their views on a selected topic (for example, gender-based violence) and then creating an exercise, such as a brief situational analysis, where participants are able to assess their views and learn from community members and other local stakeholders' experiences or views. The experience gained from such an exercise could then be supplemented with existing or developed material. Through its observations, CSVV would also recommend that experiential training, which also draws on personal experiences, should be regularly supplemented with individual and group debriefings for participants as well as facilitators.
3. Excellent collaboration between key stakeholders is needed in each community. Participants' experiences during this project reinforced the view that different forms of violence can only be prevented more effectively if citizens, local organisations, business and government departments are able to work together at local, provincial, national and even international levels. While CWP participants can help to challenge social norms, provide psychoeducation, support, life skills and referrals, contextual challenges such as unemployment, low wages, poor living conditions, and limited resources continue to fuel high levels of violence and crime. At a CWP site level, it is recommended that more can be done to strengthen local reference committees (LRC), which are made up of multiple local stakeholders who aim to support CWP sites, role in supporting violence prevention through the CWP. In addition, through the Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act of 2005, CoGTA is mandated to support intergovernmental collaboration and they have been focusing on this collaboration at the local level, primarily aimed at service delivery. However, more can be done to facilitate interdepartmental collaboration aimed at violence prevention at provincial and national levels.

4. CWP participants require psychosocial support to engage in violence prevention projects. Violence prevention work can be very meaningful, but it also exposes participants to high levels of suffering and secondary trauma. CWP participants who carry out violence prevention interventions or other types of socially useful work (e.g. home-based care) should be provided with support services such as regular debriefings. These debriefings could be facilitated with the assistance of local social workers, or CWP participants or coordinators could be capacitated through further training on trauma and debriefings.
5. Strong relationships need to be built between the primary project partners. Associated with the challenge of relationships between CSV, CWP site management participants and CoGTA, CSV has recognised that while it and others were learning from this pilot project, greater effort could have been exerted towards maintaining the strong relationships that are required for such projects. This includes a leading organisation trying to provide more advanced work plans, emphasising the importance of regular meetings between partners and sometimes, being courageous or vulnerable enough to create safe spaces for conversations around power (institutional, class, inequality and race).
6. The CWP needs to re-assess what counts as 'useful work'. While innovations in 'useful work' have occurred at CWP sites across South Africa, it is important that greater emphasis is placed on recognising the diversity in types of 'useful work'. Although the outcomes of more manual types of work might be more visible (for example, the amount of refuse removed from a site or the number of square metres of land tilled), the outcomes of planning for events are not always as easy to quantify. CSV recognises this, and also believes that CoGTA, implementing agents, site management and CWP participants can find agreeable ways of measuring progress and outcomes if they have a strong relationship and a recognition of the diversity of work.

-
1. 'CWP Aiming to Expand to More Municipalities', *Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs*, 2017, <http://www.cogta.gov.za/?p=1227>.
 2. K Philip, 'The Transformative Potential of Public Employment Programmes', Occasional Paper Series (Cape Town: The University of Cape Town, 2013), http://www.mandelaschool.uct.ac.za/sites/default/files/image_tool/images/78/Files/Pubs/KatePhilip_Transformative%20potential%20of%20PEPs.pdf.
 3. Malose Langa, 'Bokfontein: The Nations Are Amazed', in *Karl von Holdt, Malose Langa, Sepetla Molapo, Nomfundo Mogapi, Kindiza Ngubeni, Jacob Dlamini and Adele Kirsten *eds), The Smoke That Calls - Insurgent Citizenship, Collective Violence and the Struggle for a Place in the New South Africa* (Johannesburg: Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation & Society Work and Development Institute, 2011).
 4. Malose Langa; Malose Langa and Themba Masuku, 'The Role of Ex-Offenders in Implementing the Community Work Programme as a Crime and Violence Prevention Initiative', *African Safety Promotion Journal* 13, no. 2 (n.d.): 78–91; Malose Langa et al., 'Facilitating or Hindering Social Cohesion? The Impact of the Community Work Programme in Selected South African Townships', *South African Crime Quarterly* 0, no. 55 (5 April 2016), <https://doi.org/10.17159/2413-3108/2016/v0i55a159>; Fairuz Mullagee and David Bruce, *Building a Good Nation in Manenberg: A Case Study of the Manenberg Community Work Programme* (Johannesburg: Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation, 2015); Zukiswa Puwana, *The Community Work Programme in Grabouw* (Johannesburg: Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation, 2015).



CSV
Centre for the Study of
Violence and Reconciliation

CENTRE FOR THE STUDY OF VIOLENCE AND RECONCILIATION

Johannesburg Office

Physical address: 33 Hoofd Street, Braampark, Forum 5, 3rd Floor, Braamfontein 2001, South Africa

Postal address: PO Box 30778, Braamfontein 2017, South Africa

Phone: +27-11-403-5650 Fax: +27-11-339-6785 Email: info@csvr.org.za

Cape Town Office

Physical address: 451 Main Road, Premier Centre 5th Floor, Observatory 7925, South Africa

Phone: +27-21-447-2470 Email: ctadmin@csvr.org.za

www.csvr.org.za