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1. Introduction

Sub-Saharan Africa continues to be one of the worst affected areas when it comes to rural poverty and hunger (IFAD, 2010: 3). The question of how one faces the development challenges of poor rural communities is not a simple one. Non-Governmental Organisations (NGO’s) in Sub-Saharan Africa have traditionally used one of four approaches to rural development: a sustainable livelihoods approach; a rights-based approach; a participatory rural appraisal approach; and the most commonly, a needs-based approach (Russell, 2009: 1). These have met with limited success, primarily due to limited capacity and access to resources, leading to a mere handful of success stories (Nel et al, 2001:12). The South African Government has attempted via the Integrated Sustainable Rural Development Strategy (ISRDS 2000), to decentralise rural development to a local level, involving NGO’s and Community-Based Organisations (CBO’s). Yet, despite a pro-poor (particularly rural poor) rhetoric in National policy, these do not seem to translate into effective implementation (Nojekwa, 2009: 6).

In light of this, rural poor communities, and in our case, Leliefontein, continue to experience themselves as being disadvantaged and underdeveloped. A view that is, in itself, self-defeating and counterproductive to community-capacity building.

1.1 Context

Our focus area is the mountain-top rural town of Leliefontein, 1700m above sea level, in the Kamiesberg Municipal Area, Namaqualand, in the Northern Cape Province. It is situated on the N7 north, about 30km east of Kharkhams and 102km away from the nearest major town, Springbok. It was founded in 1817 by Rev. Barnabas Shaw as a Methodist Mission Station (Jackson, 2009: 18). According to a community profile done by The Sledge Foundation in 2010, it has a population of 673 people, is Afrikaans-speaking and consists of a Coloured community, originating from the indigenous Nama-Khoi people.

The extreme remoteness of the Leliefontein community means that they have had to look to outside initiatives, projects and funding to attempt to move out of the poverty trap. Personal conversations with older community members,
identify that development projects have been started in Leliefontein and surrounds, by various organisations and agencies. There have been, it would seem, no signs that these initiatives have been sustainable or that they have offered any real solutions. None of the projects still exist. After a few years of involvement as a Faith-Based Organisation working in Leliefontein, it became clear that the community remains desperately poor, and suffering from an extremely low view of themselves.

1.2. Research Problem.

Years of needs-based initiatives have left the people of Leliefontein all too aware of their poverty, and constantly looking and expecting outsiders to improve their situation (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993: 2). A basic needs approach to development has a history dating back to 1976, where at the International Labour Organisation Conference on World Employment, it was formerly adopted as the strategy that would be followed by all the major development agencies, as well as the major donor countries involved with developing nations (Hoadley, 1981: 152).

The problem with identifying and recognising underdeveloped and a disadvantaged state, is that communities, Leliefontein in this case, are usually defined in terms of needs, problems and deficiencies (Cameron & Gibson, 2005: 275). This results in a community, that Kretzmann and McKnight (1993) identify as, having a ‘deficit mindset’. In recent years, community development practitioners that have become disillusioned with this basic needs approach to development, have identified a viable alternative in the form of Asset Based Community Development (ABCD) (Mathie & Cunningham, 2003: 474).

Instead of mapping the weaknesses and deficiencies in a community, which a needs-based approach does, an ABCD approach offers an alternative that “leads toward the development of policies and activities based on the capacities, skills and assets of lower income people and their neighbourhoods” (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993: 5). In our case, rural communities and Leliefontein in particular, are able to identify community and individual assets as a primary resource for community development efforts. This process begins with recognising the deficiency of a needs-based map of the community, and then builds a new
community asset map that is built on the strengths and capacities already present in the community.

This research report, using an ABCD approach to development in Leliefontein would:

2. Enable the community to move from a deficit mindset, to one that recognises the tremendous assets within its grasp, and within its capacity to harness.
3. Support current development theory and trends that emphasise participatory approaches, such as people-centred development (Korten, 1984); social capital and the power of local associations (Putnam, 2000); as well as community-driven development (Nel, Binns & Motteux, 2001).
4. Potentially result in a self-reliant rural community (Burkey, 1996).

1.3 Research Question

Would an Asset–Based Community Development approach counteract a community deficit mindset in Leliefontein?

1.4 Aims and Objectives

This research report aims to explore the potential of an Asset-Based Community Development (ABCD) approach in Leliefontein. Through the ABCD process, an inventory of the individual capacities of a sample group will be undertaken, as well as an inventory of the significant local associations, organisations and institutions, as well as their capacities. The objective will be to use the asset-mapping process to challenge negative community self-perceptions, enabling them to build new, positive images that empower and release latent potential. The information gathered will also be made available to the individuals, organisations, associations and institutions within the community, along with some ideas on how mutually beneficial partnerships can be developed.

The key objective will be to assist the community of Leliefontein, to no longer regard themselves from a deficit mindset, but positively, as a community with tremendous resources, assets and relationships that can be harnessed for
community economic development. Asset-mapping can then be used by local organisations to build new relationships within the community, as well as relationships that harness resources outside of the immediate community.
Chapter 2. Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This research report aims to explore the potential of an Asset-Based Community Development (ABCD) approach in Leliefontein. The community suffers from a deficit mindset, which according to Kretzmann and McKnight (1993), has its roots in a community understood in terms of its basic needs, rather than in its capacity. The literature review will identify what a basic-needs approach is, followed by an overview of the major concepts and practices that an ABCD approach reflects and integrates. The core components of an ABCD approach will be identified, as well as some examples identified, of where an ABCD strategy has been implemented. Lastly, we will identify some challenges to an ABCD approach.

2.2 Basic Needs

Economic growth in developing countries has had, and always will have, a considerable emphasis on raising the quality and standard of living of the rural poor (Coombs, 1980:1). In the 1970’s however, a strategy specifically targeting the meeting of basic needs of the poor became a primary objective of mainstream development strategy and planning. Those were heady times with the World Bank declaring boldly that the basic needs of the world’s poorest could be met in one generation (Streeten, 1981: 33). A Basic-Needs Approach, as the name indicates, recognises that people have the fundamental human right to have access to primary services and resources that enable them to live full lives. Naturally, a universal framework of what constitutes basic needs is unlikely (Conyers, 1982: 128).

Willis (2005: 94) highlights the four categories adopted by the International Labour Organisation, these being:

1. “Basics of personal consumption – food, shelter, clothing;
2. Access to essential services – clean water, sanitation, education, transport, healthcare;
3. Access to paid employment;
4. Qualitative needs – healthy and safe environment, ability to participate in decision-making”.


Whilst there are some basic theoretical, practical, political and economic challenges to the basic-needs approach, of primary concern is the view that a basic-needs approach highlights the deficiencies and problems in a given community. Kretzmann & McKnight (1993), arguably the leading proponents of an ABCD approach, identify a number of negative consequences from drawing a needs map of a community (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993: 4):

- The residents develop a deficiency mindset which highlights their poverty, powerlessness and incapacity to take charge of their lives;
- A needs map becomes the guide by which a community understands and defines itself;
- Resources are channelled to service providers, rather than the community. Community becomes a consumer of services;
- Local leadership is forced to highlight deficiency rather than assets and capacity;
- Communities begin to believe that only outside experts can help them, which weakens community ties;
- A cycle of dependency inevitably develops. The vulnerable become more vulnerable.

With these very real issues in mind, we identify that an ABCD approach is able to harness the positive contribution of a number of development strategies, to move Leliefontein from a deficit mindset, to one where the community resources and relationships are mobilised to re-energise and re-build the community (Mathie & Cunningham, 2003). These strategies include: people-centred development, appreciative enquiry, social capital, and community development.

2.2.1 People-Centred Development

By the early 1970’s, the value and effectiveness of the growth and modernisation strategies were being questioned, as the plight of the developing countries became, in many cases, more severe. More and more people were sliding into poverty, instead of improving their livelihoods (ANSA Secretariat, 2007). A growing dissatisfaction with mainstream development was fertile ground for an alternative, people-centred approach to development (Pieterse, 2000).
People-centred development can be defined as, “an approach to development that looks to the creative initiative of people as the primary development resource and to their material and spiritual well-being as the end that the development process serves” (Korten & Carner, 1984: 201).

Mwangi & Sena (2003) identify a number of aspects of this people-centred approach:

1. It is a process;
2. It enhances individual and group assets;
3. It prioritises sustainability;
4. It highlights development as an issue of social justice;
5. People are responsible for their own development; and
6. Local people set the agenda.

In essence, people-centred development emphasises the need for poor communities to become self-reliant in addressing their own needs, to take charge of decision-making processes, and to be in control of local assets and resources, which can be harnessed for the common good.

ABCD is people-centred. It is built on the premise that people need to take responsibility and ownership for their own developmental needs, and that this is done through empowering local communities to harness local assets and resources (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993: 9). In terms of Leliefontein, the people-centred dimension of ABCD, is critical to the community committing to taking responsibility for their own well-being and welfare. Of significant importance, is that the community recognises that it is not with outsiders, but with themselves, that their hope lies.

### 2.2.2 Appreciative Enquiry

Appreciative enquiry was developed at Case Western University in the 1980’s as a tool for organisational change (Michael, 2005: 222). Founded on the heliotropic principle, which says that plants will always grow towards light, it was designed to help organisations or businesses to improve. The underlying philosophy is, that organisations, or in our case, communities, will grow towards whatever gives them life and energy (Mathie & Cunningham, 2003: 478).
At its simplest, appreciative enquiry is the search for what is best in a particular context. It sets out to discover where the life is in any given system, and then harnesses that awareness to move people or organisations forward (Moore, 2008: 216). Through enquiry, dialogue, and discovery, people are engaged with the purpose of identifying high points and successes from the past, which then “opens a pathway for new insights, new hope, and therefore new possibilities” (Finegold et al, 2002: 251). Where appreciative enquiry differs from other approaches, is that its assumed starting point, is not the deficiencies or apparent weaknesses, but the strengths, successes and existing capacity within a group (Bright et al, 2006: 289). A classic appreciative enquiry process involves what is called the 4-D cycle: discover, dream, design and destiny (Moore, 2008; Bright, et al, 2006; Michael, 2005). Through this process, groups are led to envision a future that is compelling and motivation for change.

Both appreciative enquiry and ABCD, work against approaches such as the basic needs approach that highlight problems, deficiencies and lack, with the accompanying deficit mindset (Mathie & Cunningham, 2003: 478). ABCD has much in common with appreciative enquiry, as it seeks to focus on strengths and capacities within a given community, and use these to empower communities to take responsibility for their lives and future development (Ketzmann & McKnight, 1993). In terms of Leliefontein, appreciative enquiry supports an ABCD approach that seeks to focus on community strengths, rather than community deficiencies. The asset mapping process, which leads to a capacity map of the community, will draw on the appreciative enquiry 4-D cycle to identify community strengths and opportunities.

2.2.3 Social Capital

The French sociologist, Pierre Bourdieu (in Bebington, 2007: 155), is credited by many as being the first to give social capital a theoretical framework, as he explored how social actors relate to each other in terms of power relations. James Coleman (in Portes & Landolt, 2000: 531), an American sociologist, paid particular attention to social capital as a source of social control. Putnam (2000) came along and gave social capital the dominant place it has held in development circles for the last two decades. He took social capital from the realm of the
individual and the small group, and extrapolated it to society as a whole. He studied the performance of local politics in Italy, concluding that “the social capital embodied in norms and networks of civic engagement seems to be preconditioned for economic development, as well as for effective government” (1994:9). He emphasises trust, norms and networks built by people belonging to voluntary organisations (1994: 10). Putnam was influenced by rational choice debates and made use of game theory, specifically the “Prisoners Dilemma”, to explain the relationship between the group and how it makes choices that lead to action (Spies-Butcher, 2002). For Putnam, a thriving civil society will lead to abundant stocks of social capital, which in turn will enhance democracy (Harriss, 2001: 29).

Two key concepts in social capital are, bonding capital, and bridging capital. Broadly speaking, bonding capital is concerned with building links within a community or group, whilst bridging capital is concerned with building links between communities and groups (Rydin & Holman, 2004: 118).

Other than bonding, bridging and linking social capital, Kramer (2009: 244) regards ‘personal social capital’, where individuals benefit from social networks, as a form of social capital; and Rydin & Holman (2004: 122) add ‘bracing capital’ as a form of social scaffolding that strengthens strategic ties between people or groups, but in a less formal manner.

In short, social capital harnesses the network of social relationships that exist within a community, to get people to work together, to collaborate, for the common good.

At the heart of ABCD, we find social relationships. Community relationships and associations are harnessed as assets to mobilise community capacity. Bonding capital is released and bridging capital links the community to outside agencies who can provide support and sustainable economic development. In terms of Leliefontein, social capital will be the oxygen for an ABCD strategy. It will be through the network of social relationships that the community will mobilise itself. The ABCD strategy will mobilise and re-enforce bonding capital. Once the community’s capacity and potential is identified, and a future development
strategy developed, the community will be able to utilise bridging capital to forge constructive relationships with outside resources.

2.2.4 Community Development

For many years it was assumed that those at the bottom of the economic ladder would eventually benefit from growth and modernisation, what was called the ‘trickle down theory’. It became clear that this was in fact not happening. The rich were getting richer and the poor remained poor (Hofferbert & Hofferbert, 1992: 331). Add to this, the fact that in most developing nations, the government of the day has limitations in terms of capacity, to seriously and significantly impact local communities (Nel, Binns & Motteux, 2001: 3). It is in this environment that local community-based economic development came to the fore. According to Mathie and Cunningham (2003: 481), community development aligns three paradigms:

1. The economic systems perspective, that simply regards community development as economic development and growth that takes place at a local, community level;
2. The value of developing the economic capacities of individuals, which as a by-product, will benefit the community;
3. Developing the economic capacities of groups in order to achieve a common end.

Community development efforts are based on the premise that the community needs to address its own problems, although, with significant outside support. It has strong ties with both social capital and needs-based paradigms, which have already been addressed.

ABCD is undoubtedly a community development strategy, in that it has as a core value, that local communities must drive the development process. ABCD identifies that it is the whole community that needs to be involved in the task of revitalisation (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993: 345). Where ABCD differs from the community development approach, is that it places significantly less emphasis on outside support to revitalise the community, especially in the early stages of the mapping process. The limitations of this study, is that only a portion of the Leliefontein community will participate in the ABCD process. This, purely due to
the scope and size of the research report. This does not detract however, from the ABCD approach’s commitment to a community-focused and -driven development strategy.

2.3 Asset Based Community Development

Our overview affirms that ABCD is not a stand-alone approach, and that it in fact integrates and reflects many of the current trends in development circles.

As an alternative to needs-based development, ABCD recognises that communities can lead the development process themselves by identifying the assets that already exist within the community, and harnessing these for economic development. Assets can be understood from a number of perspectives. From a vague definition, where assets mean all good things (Page-Adams & Sherraden, 1997: 423), to a understanding of assets in terms of personal wealth, which includes property and financial strength (Page-Adams & Sherraden, 1997: 423). Instead of mapping deficiencies, ABCD seeks to map the assets in people, relationships and organisations that, once determined, act as motivation for change.

The mapping process takes place on three levels, that of individual capacities, local associations, and formal institutions. A capacity inventory is the tool used to determine the life skills, community skills, interests, experience and personal information of individuals within a given community. It needs to be mentioned that particular attention is paid to identify the capacities of people with disabilities, welfare recipients and senior citizens (Kretzmann & McKnight, 2003: 51-83).

This is followed by an inventory of the local associations and organisations that exist, as well as their capacities. Finally, the more formal public, private and not-for-profit institutions are identified, and their capacities documented (Kretzmann & McKnight 1993: 16).

Once the mapping process is complete, a new community map is drawn, which skilled community workers can harness to mobilise the community. As the community takes ownership, it begins to develop a plan and a strategy that not only harnesses the existing capacity within the community, but also gives it the
position of strength to link with outside agencies that are then able to invest in economic development (Mathie & Cunningham, 2003).

2.4. Examples of ABCD projects

ABCD has proved useful in a number of environments. From inner city neighbourhoods in downtown Chicago (Kretzmann and McKnight, 1993), to building healthier communities for children and families (Pan et al, 2005). From building corporate social responsibility in Canada (Fisher, et al: 2009), to development amongst the indigenous communities of Taiwan that enhances traditional culture and heritage (Hipwell, 2009). From small town, economically depressed, disadvantaged communities in Australia (Cameron & Gibson, 2005), to bridging the digital divide in poor inner city communities in Massachusetts (Pinkett, 2000). In South Africa, we find groups like Community Connections pioneering ABCD projects in the Western Cape (www.connectionsafrica.org.za).

2.5 Challenges of an ABCD approach

Mathie & Cunningham (2003: 483) identify some challenges to an ABCD approach. These include:

1. Balancing the role of external agencies. How involved do they get, to what extent does the indigenous leadership manage the process?
2. How does one ensure that the marginalized in a community, (woman, youth, elderly, disabled) are included in the process?
3. What community leadership style is most effective and how is this leadership style identified?
4. What external environments (political, legal, regulatory) are suitable to an ABCD approach?
5. How does one manage the inevitable leadership, social, economic and organisational changes?

Other challenges include:

1. The issue of power relations within a community (Harriss, 2001);
2. The reality of conflict within communities (Burkey, 1996: 43);
3. Community connections and relationships can be destructive or ‘bad’ (Wilson, 1997: 747);
4. Limited ‘success’ stories within a South African context;
5. The fact that ABCD is still relatively young as a community-building strategy. Additional research is still required to determine the long-term real impacts of ABCD.

2.6 Conclusion

We conclude by summarising how an ABCD approach is able to harness a number of development strategies, to move Leliefontein from a deficit mindset, to one where the community resources and relationships are mobilised to revitalise the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset-Based Community Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>People-centred development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are the primary development resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self reliant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control own assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals in the community have assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community responsible for own well-being.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community harnesses resources, then draws in outside help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appreciative enquiry</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focuses on positives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-D cycle: discover, dream, design and destiny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle: harness people, map community, generate ideas, turn ideas into reality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social capital</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network of social relationships primary tool for development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonding capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridging capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People and their relationships are primary assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community networks harnessed for change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then draw in outside agencies to support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development takes place on local level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community responsible for development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires significant outside support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development is best approached locally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely community driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community answer to progress, some outside support required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is clear that an ABCD approach harnesses the strengths of each of these approaches in a single model. Ultimately, the strength of ABCD and the reason why it is gaining a dedicated, enthusiastic support base, is because, it is asset-based, internally focused and relationship-driven (Kretzmann & McKnight 2003). These values fit into the current people-centred trend in development circles.
Chapter 3. Methodology

This chapter deals with the methodology and data collection tools that will be used for this research project. These include the research design, scale, methods, and process that will be utilised, as well as justification for why they were chosen. The question of validity and reliability will be addressed; ethical issues covered, and finally, the potential limitations of the research identified.

The research design is, in essence, a predetermined plan or map that enables us to address and answer our research problem (Mouton, 1996: 25). This map is also influenced by the methodological paradigms that are adopted, the dominant paradigms being: quantitative; qualitative; and participatory action paradigms (Mouton, 1996: 37). Once again, the research problem, and what one wishes to achieve, will determine which of these will be adopted. Mouton (1996) points out that some debate exists as to whether one can mix paradigms due to their inherent epistemological and ontological assumptions; nevertheless, he believes a mixed approach is clearly possible (1996: 40). Some would argue, that a mixed method approach is not only acceptable, but desirable, as it allows a researcher to deal simultaneously with exploratory (qualitative) and confirmatory (quantitative) questions (Tedlie & Tashakkori, 2003: 15). The goal of social scientific research is to understand the complexity of human experience. This understanding is limited by the method used. Therefore, one can obtain a more complete understanding by using more than one method (Morse, 2003: 189).

The nature of our research problem calls for a mixed method approach that includes a quantitative, qualitative, and participatory action approach, and the various tools that are available under these paradigms (Mouton, 1996: 95). An important principle when using mixed methods, is that the dominant theoretical drive of the project must guide the methods and tools used. They must add to, and support, the research question. (Morse, 2003: 193). There are generally two forms of scientific reasoning, namely, inductive and deductive (Mouton, 1996: 74). “By inductive, we mean that the scientist develops generalisations based on a limited amount of data about a class of events. By deductive, we mean hypotheses are derived from a generalised explanation” (Baker, 1994: 52). Due to the fact that our theoretical drive is primarily inductive, the dominant method and
tools used will support, and be in keeping, with inductive reasoning and a qualitative paradigm (Morse, 2003: 193).

3.1 Scale
The community of Leliefontein, situated in Namaqualand, is identified as the target group, along with the associations, organisations and institutions within the town borders. Within the community, 30 adults will be identified to participate in the asset-mapping process.

3.2 Sub-Foci
The main questions that need to be answered in order to deal with our research question are:
- What are the core components of ABCD?
- How does the community view itself using a needs-based paradigm?
- What are the individual capacities of 30 people within the community?
- What are the main local associations, organisations and institutions?
- What would an asset map of Leliefontein look like?
- How does the asset mapping process move the community out of a deficit mindset?

In order to answer these questions, the following methods were used.

3.3 Methods
3.3.1 Literature Study
A literature review serves as a ‘map of the terrain’ (Mouton, 1996:119). Other researchers have already covered similar ground, and in conducting a literature review, the following outcomes can be identified:
- Familiarity with specific areas related to the research problem
- Identification of ideas and guidelines for the research design
- Growing theoretical constructs and a conceptual framework
- Ideas for methods
- Measuring this research to other research in related fields (Mouton, 1996: 119).
The previous chapter identifies the literature review on ABCD, which will enable us to do two things. Firstly, to conduct an asset mapping exercise, and secondly, to establish whether or not an ABCD approach will be effective in Leliefontein, as a means of moving the community out of a deficit mindset.

3.3.2 Sampling

According to a community profile done by The Sledge Foundation in 2010, Leliefontein has a resident population of 673 people, too many people to survey for the size of this report. For this reason, a sample of 30 people from the community will be identified. A key concept in sampling is representativeness (Mouton, 1996: 136), in other words, the sample needs to honestly reflect the population from which it will be drawn. A linked concept is that of probability. By probability, we mean that the sample drawn is most likely to represent the population. This is particularly important when the intention is to generalise the findings. This research forms part of long-term involvement in Leliefontein by a Faith-based organisation. Whilst the results of the data collection will be generalised through inductive generalisation (Mouton, 1996: 80) for the purpose of this research report, it will ultimately be a pilot study for an intended full community ABCD inventory, involving all residents, associations, organisations, and institutions, in this community in the future. A stratified sample will be drawn that includes age, sex, and what Kretzmann & McKnight call, ‘labelled people’ (1996: 7). By labelled we mean people with some form of disability. No accurate list of community members exists, but the community profile does include a statistic measurement of the age and sex variables.

In order to determine who would then form part of this stratified sample, a purposive sampling strategy was used (Chambliss, 2006: 99-100). This is a strategy that targets individuals based on their particular knowledge and involvement in the community (Chambliss, 2006:101). A couple who have worked in Leliefontein for some years as missionaries, and who have significant credibility and knowledge of the whole community, identified the sample group based on the following criteria:
• They needed to be resident in the community
• Able to attend all three sessions
• Able to participate in the discussions
• Have a good knowledge of the community life
• Reliable
• Be from all economic and religious backgrounds

The stratified sample was based on the following figures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>18 - 34</th>
<th>35 - 64</th>
<th>65+</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for labelled people, very few are resident in the community, and so one physically disabled person with slight mental impairment was identified to attend each focus group. This was done by utilising a purposive sampling technique.

3.3.3 Survey

The most common type of social research, is that of the survey (Baker, 1988: 172). Surveys focus on attitudes, opinions, information about life conditions, and categories that help identify one person or group as opposed to another (Baker, 1988: 10). Surveys are particularly helpful when attempting to describe, explore or understand a particular community or construct (Babbie, 2007: 304). A key step in a community asset mapping process, is to identify the skills, abilities and knowledge of individuals in the community. In our case 30 people. The survey method enabled us to identify the capacities of these individual members.

The survey method was also used in a follow-up visit to the community, one month after the initial research was done. The purpose being to determine whether the research results were an accurate expression of the groups experience, as well as to determine whether their emotional response to the community had improved through the research process.
3.3.4 Focus groups

Focus groups are a qualitative tool for research. They consist of a small group of people, generally 12 to 15 people (Babbie, 2007: 308), who are assembled to conduct in-depth interviews and group discussions, in order to generate both understanding and new ideas (Baker, 1994: 188). The group, consisting of a pre-selected people based on established criteria, meets in a specific site, with pre-prepared questions. Sessions are guided by a facilitator, and allow participants to express their views, and contribute to the research process in an open, informal, yet structured manner.

Due to the limited scope of the project, the most effective way to gain insight and information, was to utilise focus groups. Because 30 people were too many for a focus group, we had two groups of 15 people, drawn from a stratified sample of the community, as indicated above. These focus groups met over three sessions, where the following took place:

- The groups drew a needs-map of the community (session 1).
- The members of the group filled out the survey questions to establish a capacity inventory for each person (session 2).
- The groups drew a capacity-map of the community (session 3).

From the couple that assisted with the purposive sampling, the husband was present in all focus group sessions to assist with translation from English into Afrikaans, as well as to take notes and record insights.

3.3.5 Questionnaires

Survey research involves the collection of data through individual or group responses to questions. The primary modes of doing a survey are, therefore, questionnaires and interviews, with advantages and disadvantages to both (Rosnow & Rosenthal, 1996: 112). We used questionnaires, but seeing that they will be conducted in a (focus) group setting, they take on some of the characteristics of an interview. The advantage of this is that:

- The sessions have structure.
• One can establish rapport.
• One is able to assist participants in understanding the questions.
• It allows for some flexibility in rephrasing questions if need be (Rosnow & Rosenthal, 1996: 112).

There are four kinds of question-based surveys, namely: group, mail, face-to-face, and telephone surveys (Baker, 1994: 175). A group survey method was used. The group survey took place within the two focus groups.

Questionnaires were used during all three sessions, as well as the follow-up visit. For session one, structured questionnaires that consisted of open-ended questions were used. Open-ended questions leave room for the respondents to answer in a way that is appropriate for them and allows them to express their opinion or insight on the question at hand (Baker, 1994: 181). From an interviewing perspective, a semi-standardised interview technique was used, that involved predetermined questions, but with the opportunity to probe and explore answers to the prepared questions. Probing questions allow the interviewer to draw out more answers or insights to the question (Berg, 2007:100).

During session two, the survey method was used, which involved closed-ended questions. These questions force the respondent to answer according to specific alternatives (Baker, 1994: 180). In the case of the capacity survey, the person indicated whether they could do a particular activity, and whether they were able to teach others in that activity.

For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Gifts and Skills</strong></th>
<th>I can</th>
<th>I can teach others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repair engines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The individual capacity inventory only had closed-ended questions, the reason being that the desired outcome was to establish clear and concise variables. This allowed for quantitative analyses, where answers could be identified, collated and documented. The group setting did,
however, allow the questioner to clarify questions that individuals were struggling to understand.

During session three, open-ended questions were used, with the help of probing questions to clarify or encourage more thought and discussion. The purpose of this session was to enable the group to establish a capacity map of Leliefontein.

During the follow-up visit, a questionnaire using three closed ended questions with a three-level Likert rating scale (Baker, 1994: 416) was used.

3.3.6 Diagramming and mapping

One of the techniques utilised in participatory action research, is that of diagramming and mapping (Kindon, et al, 2007: 17). Kesby identifies ‘participatory diagramming techniques’ as an effective qualitative research technique (2000). This technique allows communities to generate information and share knowledge, using tools that are accessible to them. This is a key part of an ABCD process (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1996). Participants in the focus groups were guided through a diagramming and mapping process, that enabled them to draw a needs-map (session 1) and an asset/capacity-map (session 3) of the community.

In session one, the groups identified the needs of the community and what the obstacles were to these needs being met. They then prioritised these needs. In session three, a chosen representative from each focus group, was tasked with taking photographs of all the assets within Leliefontein. These were then printed out, and the focus groups were then tasked with ‘drawing’ a map of the community by placing the photographs spatially, where they should be. Once this was done, ‘post-its’ were used to identify all the organisations, associations and institutions within Leliefontein, as well the resource they had that were accessible to the community. The group was invited to add in, using post-its, any assets within the community that had not yet been identified. The result was a community asset map.
3.3.7 Photovoice

Photovoice is a technique that uses photographs to enable a community to identify, record and represent itself, which in turn stimulates discussion and self-discovery (Wang & Burris, 1997: 369). It is particularly useful when doing community participatory needs assessment (Wang & Burris, 1997: 371).

Each focus group identified someone from the group, who was given a camera and tasked with taking photographs of every aspect of community life that they regarded as being an asset. These were then printed out and made available to the group during session three, where they included them in their community asset map.

3.3.8 Individual Capacity Inventory

In session two, an individual capacity inventory was done to establish what skills were present amongst the 30 people in the two focus groups. There were 39 skills listed, which were loosely based on a Kansas City Community Builders questionnaire (in Kretzmann & McKnight, 1997: 83). See Appendix B for the list.

These 39 skills were clustered into 6 primary skill sets. The statistical analysis involved establishing the mean of each skill set, which gives us the central distribution (Baker, 1994: 377). The mean represents the arithmetic average, by which the number of positive responses in each skill set is divided by the number of skills in that set (Baker, 1994: 377).

3.4 Validity & Reliability

The two qualities that determine whether research is acceptable are validity and reliability. Validity answers the question: “Are these measurements reflecting what they are supposed to measure?” (Hunter & Brewer, 2003: 581). Reliability answers the question: “Can these measurements and findings be replicated?” (Hunter & Brewer, 2003: 581).

To ensure both validity and reliability, the following was put in place using a framework provided by Mouton (1996: 111).
A thorough literature review was undertaken | Theoretical validity

Questions were approved by Supervisor | Construct Validity

Stratified sample used | Representative Validity

Notes taken by researcher and second person
Two focus groups used, to compare
Meeting where participants could comment on research observations
Sessions recorded
Documentation kept
Photographic evidence | Reliability

Appropriate data analyses | Inferential Validity

### 3.5 Ethical Issues

Social research brings researchers into direct contact with people, and will therefore raise ethical issues (Babbie, 2007: 312). These issues are related to anonymity, confidentiality and informed consent (Baker, 1994: 78). To deal with these issues, a letter (see appendix A) was written to all participants explaining who the researcher is and what the intention is behind their involvement. The letter indicated that no questions of a personal nature would be asked, that they could withdraw from the process at any stage, that the sessions would be recorded for research purposes. They were also informed that all physical data would be returned once the research was complete. It was made clear that no outcomes from the research were promised. This was then repeated at the start of every session. All participants signed this letter, indicating that they complied with this relationship and process.

On the basis of this, no ethical problems were identified.

### 3.6 Action Research

The actual research process will bring about change in the participants. The focus group, involving the sample group of 30, will begin with a needs-map of their community, and through the research process, will draw a map that identifies
the assets, capacities and possibilities of the community. This process of moving from a deficit-map to a capacity-map, will undoubtedly influence both their perception of themselves as a community, as well as their future actions. This process of change during research, is the core feature of action research.

The origin of action research can be traced back to Kurt Lewin in the 1940’s, when he solved the problem of low productivity in a manufacturing plant, and then adapted the process of change, to be used in a development context (Hammersley, 2004; 166).

Action research can be defined as “a kind of collective self-reflective enquiry undertaken by participants in social relationships with one another in order to improve some condition or situation with which they are involved” (Berg, 2007: 223). It can be understood simply, as social theory that initiates some form of social action (Simonson & Bushaw, 1993: 28). Participants in the research process are highly involved and are intentional in their desire to bring about positive change. Some researchers add the term ‘participatory’ to action research, to highlight this commitment to the collaborative aspect of the process (Kindon, et al, 2007: 11).

A basic action research process involves clear stages:
- Identifying the research problem.
- Gathering information that deals with the problem.
- Analysing and interpreting the data.
- Sharing the results with the participants.

The purpose is clearly to go through the research process in order to bring about social change. The Leliefontein community is identified as having a deficit mindset. The research problem, and the aim of the research process, will be to change this perception, to one that both recognises and believes that the community is, in fact, one with immense resources, abilities, skills and capacity.

3.7 Limitations

The following can be identified as the potential limitations to the research methodology:
• Qualitative and participatory action paradigms have limitations in terms of the researcher’s bias, and thus potential influence on the research process and outcome (Rosnow & Rosenthal, 1996: 76).

• The research will be conducted in the researcher’s second language. It is likely that some of the subtle nuances will be lost in translation.

• Survey research is strong on validity but weak on reliability (Babbie, 2007: 307).

• The temptation in action research is to make the result tidy, when in fact, reality is normally messy and full of dissonance (Cahill, 2007: 181).

3.8 Conclusion

A broad theoretical approach and framework has been established. A mixed method approach was motivated, which includes quantitative, qualitative and participatory action paradigms, as well as the various tools associated with them. The research process was identified, and it was pointed out how issues related to validity and reliability are addressed. Some limitations are identified and ethical issues addressed.
Chapter 4. Data & Findings

This chapter deals with the analyses of the data collected from the sample group identified from within the resident, adult population of Leliefontein at the time of research. The data that was collected took place over three sessions, with two focus groups, and included the methods and tools identified in the previous chapter. The chapter will present the results, the analyses of these results, as well as the major findings. In fitting with the research question, the purpose will be to identify whether an ABCD approach can be utilised to counteract a community deficit mindset in Leliefontein?

4.1 Sample

Thirty residents were identified from the adult community in Leliefontein, and split into two focus groups. The people who were identified through the purposive sampling strategy, were given a letter, where amongst other things, they were given the option of withdrawing from future sessions, should they so choose. Some people did not attend all three sessions due to health issues, family responsibilities, or for other personal reasons. To ensure adequate numbers were maintained, a few people were recruited to attend the final session and so the final number of people who were involved over the 3 days, totalled 37 people.

4.2 Demography

The intention was to identify a sample of the community that was representative of the age and gender demographic. One person was identified for each focus group that came from the group that Kretzmann & McKnight call, ‘labelled people’ (1996: 7), which are those in the community who have some form of disability.

In terms of age, Focus Group 1 (FG1) had a 9/9 split of male/female and Focus Group 2 (FG2) had a 9/10 split of male/female, which together made an 18/19 male/female split.
This was in line with the gender split of 49% male and 51% female resident in the community as identified by The Sledge Foundation.

In terms of age, the demographic was slightly skewed due to the fact that most of the people in the age group 35 – 64 were unavailable due to being occupied by work responsibilities out of town. The older age group of 65+ is therefore slightly higher than it should be, due to the availability of this age group.

### Figure 4.2  Demographic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Actual groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 - 34</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 64</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3  Focus Groups

Three sessions lasting about 2 hours each, were held for each group over a three-day period. The following information was collected at each session:

#### 4.3.1  Session 1

The purpose of session one, was to do a needs analysis of the community. This was done by placing newspaper print on the wall and then asking the participants in each focus group to answer four sets of structured questions:
4.3.1.1 Question set 1

The first set of questions were:

1. “What problems do you experience from Leliefontein being situated where it is?”
2. “What are the most significant problems related to basic services in Leliefontein?”
3. “What are the most significant problems affecting families in your community?”
4. “What are the most significant problems affecting individuals in the community?”

The group responses were recorded on newspaper print. Other open-ended and probing questions were used to draw all the participants to responding as well as to enable a thorough needs analysis.

For FG1, the biggest issue seemed to be that the School Hostel had closed down. This impacted the number of students attending the school and therefore a decrease in the number of teachers, which in turn impacted the economy of the community. The group had no trouble identifying their needs, which are represented in Figures 4.3

For FG2, skills development was highlighted, as well as a lack of community leadership. The group focused often on the community being disorganised and battling to work together. The group needed some encouragement in identifying their needs, which are represented in Fig 4.4
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Needs Map
Focus Group 2

- **Individuals**
  - Skills Deficit

- **Families**
  - Cost of School Fees
  - No Training Opportunities For Adults
  - Sport Grounds wrong situation
  - Outside Toilets

- **Basic Services**
  - Library
  - Far From Medical & Other Facilities/Services
  - Transport Costs
  - Poor Roads
  - Wood Running Out
  - Poor Sewage
  - Cut off When Weather Bad
  - No Access To Media
  - Poor Clinic Facilities
  - Poor to non-existent Recreation Facilities

- **Location**
  - Lack of Knowledge of Resources or Opportunities
  - Unemployment
  - Unfair Church Financial Demands
  - Poor Postage Service
  - Water Erratic

- **Other**
  - Poor Sewage
  - Poor Mail Service
  - Poor to non-existent Recreation Facilities

- **Unemployment**

- **No Access To Media**

- **Far From Medical & Other Facilities/Services**

- **Transport Costs**

- **Poor Roads**

- **Wood Running Out**

- **Poor Sewage**

- **Cut off When Weather Bad**

- **No Access To Media**

- **Poor Clinic Facilities**

- **Poor to non-existent Recreation Facilities**

- **Poor Community Communication**
4.3.1.2 Question set 2

The second set of structured questions were:
1. “What avenues are available to address these issues?”
2. “What are the barriers to accessing these resources?”

**Figure 4.5** Avenues and Barriers for FG1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avenues</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipality approached to improve road</td>
<td>Promises but no money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality approached to co-ordinate a cell tower</td>
<td>Promises but no money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Education approached to re-open Hostel</td>
<td>Discussions at a dead end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Forum applied for funding for toilets</td>
<td>Need multiple funding sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Sport approached for improved sport facilities</td>
<td>Promises but still waiting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.6** Avenues and Barriers for FG2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avenues</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with a member of Local Council where the following issues were addressed:</td>
<td>Promises made but no action, although can now get electricity via a fax system and the roads are graded more often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- TV reception</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cell Tower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Access to facilities to buy electricity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Condition of roads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church applied for better Library resources</td>
<td>Still waiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community meetings held with various institutional leaders</td>
<td>Minutes taken, promises made and never any solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamiesberg Community Forum applied for better toilets</td>
<td>Still no responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The purpose behind these questions was to establish who the community was looking to, to solve their needs, what obstacles they were experiencing, and at who’s door they would lay the blame for any lack of progress. It was clear that the groups believed that it was the responsibility of outside agencies to solve problems as well as meet their economic and development needs. This is can be seen by the avenues chosen to deal with community needs, which were, the Municipality, various Government Departments, local politicians, the Community Trust and the local Church. They expressed frustration and anger that little to no progress had been made on most fronts.

4.3.1.3 Question set 3

The third set of questions involved an invitation to prioritise the areas of need, from highest need to lowest need. The purpose behind this exercise was to confirm the reliability of answers to the first two questions, and to give the group another opportunity to identify needs.

Figure 4.7 Needs Priority List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FG1</th>
<th>FG2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management Training</td>
<td>Electricity/wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostel Facilities</td>
<td>Skills Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>Recreation Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Sports Grounds</td>
<td>Better Clinic facilities and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>The Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easier access to basic services and support</td>
<td>Sports Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Fair payment for Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Monopolies/few shops</td>
<td>Better Sewage Removal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved health services</td>
<td>Inside Toilets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better recreation/youth facilities and programs</td>
<td>Establish a Community Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community lacks leadership</td>
<td>Children’s Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other than FG2 identifying ‘Fair payment for Services’ as a priority, the list for both groups mirrored the initial needs-map. By fair payment for services, the group felt that unemployed people shouldn’t need to pay the same for basic services as employed people, and this needed to be changed.

4.3.1.4 Question set 4

At the end of the Needs Analysis, the groups were asked how the information made them feel? This was a crucial question, because it sought to establish whether a deficit mindset was in fact present. Whilst some did not answer the question directly, here is a summary of relevant answers:

- Frustration at feeling that whilst they have skills, they can’t do anything about the needs
- Felt terrible (Sleg)
- Worried
- Overwhelmed
- Talking about it helps
- Bringing things into the open helps
- Younger generation are indifferent
- Many groups have come through to do a needs analysis, all talk, changes nothing.

Two key statement were, “You cant talk your problems away”; and, “Its still on paper, I feel bad, it doesn’t change reality”.

4.3.2 Session 2

The purpose for session 2 was to do an individual skills inventory of those involved in the focus groups. This information will be helpful to the community at a later stage, as they look to harness the resources within Leliefontein for the well being of the community. The goal of the session in terms of the research question, was to begin to create awareness in the groups of the tremendous skills and resources already available in the community in the people that are resident there. For this reason, the actual
data is of less importance than the changes in mindset that will be represented in the next session.

Forms were handed out to all the participants of the focus groups. A set of skills were listed, with the option of indicating which of the skills the person could do, and which of these they felt competent to teach to others.

The types of skills listed are divided into 6 skill sets, namely: artisan, care, community, practical, home and business. The average (mean) response per skill in the six skill sets were as follows:

As can be seen, the community has an alarmingly low artisan skill level (5.1 respondents). This is made worse by the fact that most of the skills represented in this graph, were from 5 men. The artisan skill set included skills such as plumbing, electrical work, woodwork and building.

The ‘home’ skill set is the highest (17.8 respondents), which included skills such as baking, cooking, yard work and house cleaning. This is to be expected, as all the members of each home are generally expected to share in the housekeeping duties.
The next highest skill set, is that of ‘care’ (average 13 respondents), which included; breastfeeding consulting, and care for the sick, elderly and children. This will be important as the people of Leliefontein build a stronger sense of community, which the focus groups indicated, is currently not present (see FG2’s comments in 4.3.1.1).

The practical skill set, with an average of 11.5 respondents, included farming, singing/playing music, art/crafts and driving a heavy vehicle.

The business skill set, with an average of 8.75 respondents, included Word processing, drawing, office work and business skills. With only two shops, a tavern and two funeral parlours in town, there is significant scope to start small, home based businesses that would generate employment opportunities.

4.3.3 Session 3

The purpose for session 3, was firstly, to draw an asset/capacity map of the community. Secondly, with this information, the research question was put to work in order to establish whether or not knowledge of assets and capacities within the community would change the perception of the focus groups. Would awareness of community assets change a deficit mindset to one that was motivated, energised and full of hope for the future?

An appointed member from within each focus group was tasked to take photos of everything in Leliefontein that contributed in some way to community life. These were then printed out and handed to the group. Post-its and pens were also made available.

The following set of structured questions were asked:

1. “Which photos reflect the physical/environmental assets in Leliefontein?”

2. “Which photos reflect the basic services that are available in Leliefontein?”
3. “Which photos reflect your sense of community?”

4. “Now, using post-its, add in all the organisations, associations and institutions that you know of in Leliefontein, along with the resources that are accessible to you”

5. “Looking at the map. Can you think of anything else that is positive or good in this community, and add it in using a post-it.”

The following photographic evidence of the two groups maps are presented:

Figure 4.9 Asset/Capacity map FG1
These can be tabulated as follows.

Figure 4.11 Asset/Capacity Map FG1 Tabulated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Space</th>
<th>Institutions/Associations/Organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water wells</td>
<td>Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit trees</td>
<td>Youth Brigade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veld food</td>
<td>Choir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flower Kingdom</td>
<td>Men’s League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#thoem#thaba Rock</td>
<td>Wesley Guild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertile Soil</td>
<td>Woman’s Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caves</td>
<td>Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Municipal Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health Clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crèche</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Community Assets</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2x Shops</td>
<td>See Figure 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage works</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Telephone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Grounds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2x Funeral Parlours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tavern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup Kitchen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Huts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The group was then asked:

“What do you think about this community map? And how does it make you feel?”

Here are the main sentiments expressed by the two groups:

- “This is an amazing (lekker) Leliefontein. It just depends now on how we manage it”
- “What will our children do with this Leliefontein?”
- “I didn’t know we had such a big place. I walk through it every day. It is for me a privilege to see what I’ve seen today” (Young person)
- Response to this from one of the senior members was “The scales have fallen off to see how big Leliefontein is”
- “This is a beautiful place to live”
- “I am proud of it”
• “It’s a lovely place, we must just maintain it”
• “We’ve all fought for what’s here and we need leaders to look after it”
• “Leliefontein is a heritage site. Leliefontein is a cultural site”
• “We don’t need to feel ashamed”
• “Proud”
• “It’s a town with history”
• “I will never leave this place or swap it for somewhere else”
• “On the whole we feel comfortable and safe in our little town”

4.4 Labelled People
Did the disabled person in each group add value to the process? Unfortunately the person in FG1 had an epileptic attack on the morning before the second day’s session and was rushed to hospital. The person did not return to the group. The person did however make an important contribution to the needs analysis, in that they identified the importance of sustainability. All the bushes were being burned for firewood and people needed to walk further and further to get wood. The person indicated the need to plant trees in order to ensure a future supply of wood. This was an important statement in the context of the first session, where people were only listing problems, and identifying outsiders as the answer to these problems. This person identified the community’s responsibility to look to the future. The disabled person in FG2, was reluctant to contribute and simply affirmed what others had said when prompted for comment. The aged members of both groups did however, contribute significantly to the discussion in all three sessions. They were in fact the most reliable in terms of attendance and were a source of tremendous information and insight when it came to the community’s history, culture, fauna and flora, and heritage. They were an important component of each of the focus groups.

4.5 Analyses.
The Needs Map session was important in terms of acknowledging the power that negative, dominant representations have on the community, before building more positive, empowering images (Cameron & Gibson, 2005: 277). This session confirmed Kretzmann & McKnight’s view that needs-driven development is a dead end (1993:2). Whilst some in the groups found it empowering to be able to name their problems, the overall sentiment was one of feeling disempowered
by the lack of progress made, despite significant promises made by sources of funding such as government and community funds. The group clearly looks to outside agencies for any hope of change, as indicated by the answers to the questions: “What avenues are available to address these issues?” and “What are the barriers to accessing these resources?” (Figure 4.5 & 4.6). Both groups identified outside agencies and people as avenues to address issues, and both groups blamed these agencies and individuals for lack of progress. At no point did anyone indicate in any way, that the solution lay with themselves. One particularly insightful comment was that the community is so tired of doing needs analysis. Group after group comes through and with much fanfare does a needs analysis, leaves, and absolutely nothing comes of it. Kretzmann and McKnight confirm this sense of dependence on outsiders, as being a consequence of a needs-based development strategy (1993: 4).

Another significant point that was emphasised by FG2, was the lack of leadership and the generally disorganised state of the community. This confirms Kretzmann & McKnight’s view that a needs-driven development focus disempowers leadership (1993:5). FG1 tended to be slightly more optimistic than FG2, where there was a sense of frustration and even anger during the discussion, as well as an obvious sense of disillusionment. It is interesting to note that the average age was younger in this group, and one wonders if this had an impact on the emotional tone of the group?

Noting the responses to the question, “How does this information make you feel?” (see 4.3.1.4), it would not be unreasonable to conclude that both focus groups expressed, what Kretzmann & McKnight would call, a deficit mindset (1993:4).

The second session, which sought to determine the skills and abilities of individuals, was designed to begin the asset mapping process. For the purpose of answering the research question, it is not essential to analyse the data itself. Identification of individual assets forms part of the process of moving the group from a deficit mindset, a task only seeing fruit once the community asset map is drawn. The groups were able to get insight into the vast array of gifts and abilities that lie within the people who define the community.
Once the community asset map was drawn, the group was then reminded of the responses to the questionnaires answered the day before, and it was pointed out that one could use a post-it for each skill of each person, and add them into the community map. Space and practicality prevented this, but they were invited to imagine what it might look like.

The last session, the drawing of a community asset map, is the most important for the research question. The reason being, that the responses of the participants to this process, and their reaction to the final question; “What do you think about this community map?” and, “How does it make you feel?” give the first indication of whether or not an ABCD approach can in fact be utilised to counteract a community deficit mindset. The responses are listed above, and show a marked difference to the responses from the first day's needs analysis.

Are these responses adequate to conclude that an ABCD approach to development would move Leliefontein out of a deficit mindset? Whilst the responses are encouraging, they are not conclusive enough to make a definitive statement. What can be considered more definitive, was the attitude and action of the community at a subsequent joint meeting of the two focus groups one month after the research. At that meeting, the following took place:

- A summary of the information of the research material was returned to the group and explained. This formed part of the research process in order to validate the data.
- The group was asked what they would like to do with that information, or, what the next step (if any) was for them?
- A short questionnaire was circulated and completed.

The group decided that they wanted to take the asset mapping exercise further by establishing a core committee from the focus groups, which would call the whole Leliefontein community together, to establish a formal Community Based Organisation (CBO). This group would then consider doing an asset mapping exercise of the whole community. It would be responsible for identifying ways in which the community can take responsibility for its own development needs, and represent the community to outside agencies as a united front. The group also decided that they would look to increase the skills base in the
community, by getting members with skills to offer training opportunities to the rest of the community.

In terms of the questionnaire, the following questions were asked:

1) Do you feel the information Grant shared with you today is an accurate reflection of the sessions you shared with him last month?
   Yes/No

2) Did the sessions with Grant lead you to have a (tick one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More negative</th>
<th>The same</th>
<th>More positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

   View of Leliefontein?

3) With the information gathered at each session, do you feel (tick one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empowered</th>
<th>The same</th>
<th>Discouraged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

   About Leliefontein’s future?

The results were conclusive.
All 32 respondents indicated that the information shared was an accurate reflection of the three focus group sessions. This is important for the validity of the research.

For question 2, all 32 indicated they felt more positive about Leliefontein.

And for question 3, 31 of 32 felt empowered by the information gathered. The one other respondent ticked ‘the same’.

These two questions, completed a month after the research event, show quantitative evidence that a change in mindset is present and that through the research process (action research), mindsets were changed for the positive.

4.6 Summary
The data, both quantitative and qualitative, shows that the focus groups experienced a significant change in mindset from the initial basic needs assessment to the final session with the community, where they were invited to
identify a possible way forward. The individual skills inventory and final community mapping sessions, enabled the groups to identify the tremendous resources within their own community, and they began to recognise that they were not as powerless as they imagined. They began to view the community in a different light. A deficit mindset was clearly present in the initial stages of the process, whereas the final meeting together identified a group empowered by the ABCD process and positive about a way forward.
Chapter 5. Conclusion

The small rural community of Leliefontein, experiences itself as disadvantaged and under-developed. This from years of development strategies, that have primarily resorted to a needs-based paradigm. The problem with identifying and focusing on needs, problems and deficiencies (Cameron & Gibson, 2005: 275), is that it results in a community, that Kretzmann and McKnight identify as having, a ‘deficit mindset’ (1993). Leliefontein has become just such a community, one that views itself from a deficit mindset, all too aware of its poverty, and constantly looking and expecting outsiders to improve their situation (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993: 2). In recent years an alternative approach to development has come to the fore, in the form of Asset Based Community Development (ABCD). An ABCD paradigm was reviewed in detail, and significantly, it was identified that an ABCD approach harnesses a number of development strategies under one umbrella. These including People-Centred Development, Appreciative Enquiry, Social Capital, and Community Development approaches.

This research report aimed to explore the potential of an ABCD approach to development, as a means of challenging and changing the deficit mindset in Leliefontein. This would then enable the community to build new, positive images that empower and release latent potential in the community in order to meet their development needs.

To this end, a mixed method approach was utilised to engage in a limited asset-mapping exercise of the community. Thirty (30) adults who are resident in the community, reflecting a stratified sample, were identified through a purposive sampling strategy. These were then split into two focus groups.

Over a three-day period, these groups met to participate in a basic asset mapping exercise, which involved the following three exercises. Day one, a needs analysis was drawn up. Day two, an individual skills capacity inventory was done by all the participants. Day three, a community map was drawn up where the assets of the community were identified, which included listing the organisations, associations and institutions in the community, as well as their known capacities.
The findings show a definite mindset shift amongst the participants. The move from a needs-focus to an asset-focus was an empowering exercise for the participants. This was evidenced in two ways: Firstly, the verbal responses of the participants are significantly different when comparing the first and last sessions. Whereas, people felt overwhelmed, frustrated and even angry at the sheer scale of the need, and the fact that little or no progress had been made on most of the issues, they felt encouraged, positive, excited and motivated by the asset-mapping exercise. Secondly, the follow-up meeting that took place with the community one month after the research. The group was asked in a questionnaire how the research process made them feel about Leliefontein and its future. The response was overwhelmingly supportive of the research objective. The group also decided on a number of important steps. These included choosing a representative committee that would identify skill vacuums in the community and then identify people in the community that could pass on these skills. This committee was also tasked with the responsibility of gathering the whole Leliefontein community, in order to establish a Leliefontein Community Forum. This forum would then act as a united front in harnessing community resources and dealing with outside agencies regarding its needs. The committee would also consider an asset-mapping exercise of the whole community in the future.

These shifts are significant and in line with the findings of other ABCD practitioners (Kretzmann & McKnight 1993; Pan et al, 2005; Fisher, et al: 2009; Hipwell, 2009; Cameron & Gibson, 2005; Pinkett, 2000). It is felt therefore, that an ABCD approach would move the whole Leliefontein community out of a deficit mindset, in the same way as it did amongst the focus groups.

The findings are also significant, because they affirm the role of other development strategies. The research process was people-centred, encouraging the community to take responsibility for their own development needs, as well as to access local assets and resources for the common good. It involved social capital, particularly bonding capital, which accesses the network of social relationships to assist the community to mobilise itself. There were elements of appreciative enquiry, in that it involved a search for what was best in that particular context, and it affirmed a community development approach, that identifies that a community needs to address its own problems. This process of
moving the community from a deficit-map to a capacity-map, clearly influenced their perception of themselves as a community, as well as their future actions, this process of change during research, being the core feature of action research.

There are clear limitations to this research. Only 30+ people participated out of a community of 673. Whilst the sample group was representative of the community, it was still a small sample. Over the three days, some participants came and went, and so the group was not static over the period of research. This no doubt impacted the group experience. The focus group experience and subjective nature of quantitative research, means that the group may have been shaped by dominant personalities within the groups. The one demographic that was poorly represented in the focus groups was employed people. This may have skewed the group dynamic in favour of the unemployed.

It is felt however, that the evidence is sufficient, reliable and valid enough to stand criticism and testing.

In terms of the way forward, it is suggested that the community of Leliefontein embarks on a full asset mapping exercise of the whole community, and explores together how an ABCD approach could move them forward in terms of their development needs. Once this has been done, the community will be able to utilise bridging capital to forge constructive relationships with outside resources.

Finally, the researcher is of the opinion that an ABCD approach to Leliefontein would not only harness several current developmental strategies for the upliftment of this community, but would also contribute to a growing body of knowledge that seeks to promote an ABCD strategy as a viable development alternative.
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Appendix A
Letter to Participants

My name is Grant Hopkins.
I am a Pastor from the Durbanville Methodist Church, who has been involved in your community for some time now.

As part of my academic studies, I will be in Leliefontein from the 1 – 6 August 2011, where I will be meeting with two small groups of 16 people to talk about Leliefontein. The purpose of these groups will be to find out more about your community, what its needs are, as well as to identify its strengths.

You have been identified as someone who will represent the community well, and so I would invite you to join me at the Manse on Tuesday from (times). Our sessions will never last more than 2 ½ hours. Light refreshments will be served mid morning/afternoon. While I would like you to join me on Wednesday and Thursday for those same times, please know that you have the opportunity to withdraw at any stage of the day, or week.

During our time together, we will chat about your community, and explore some of your own unique gifts and skills.

There are some things that you need to know:
- I won’t ask you any personal information, other than your name, address, and what gifts and skills you have.
- Your name or opinion will not be stated on any of the information I will use in my research, nor will it be passed on to anyone outside of the group.
- The sessions will be recorded, something I need to do to ensure I represent your views accurately.
- All information I gather will be returned to a representative committee, that you will participate in electing.
- I will return in a month’s time to share with you the insights I have gained, and the final representation of the community map that you would have helped draw.

If you are willing and happy to participate in the next few days, please sign below and the person who has brought this to you, will return it to me.

You are welcome to contact Ivan if you have any questions before I arrive. I will be available on Monday after lunch to meet with you if you have any questions or are uncertain about what is involved.

I look forward to meeting with you next week.

Yours sincerely,
Grant Hopkins

Your name: _______________________

Your signature indicating you are willing to participate:
_________________________
My naam is Grant Hopkins.
Ek is 'n Pastoor van die Metodiste Kerk, Durbanville, wat nou vir n' geruime tyd in jou gemeenskap betrokke is.

As deel van my akademiese studies, sal ek in Leliefontein vanaf 1 - 6 Augustus 2011 wees, waar ek met twee klein groepe van 16 mense elk wil ontmoet om oor Leliefontein te praat. Die doel van hierdie groepe is om meer uit te vind oor jul gemeenskap, wat jul behoeftes is, sowel as om jul sterk punte te identifiseer.

Jy is geïdentifiseer as iemand wat die gemeenskap goed sal kan verteenwoordig, en so nooi ek jou uit om my, by die pastorie op Dinsdag 2 Augustus, aantesluit. Ons sessies sal nooit meer as 2 ½ uur duur nie. Ligte verversings sal soggens en smiddae bedien word. Ek wil jou ook uitnooi om Woensdag en Donderdag (selfde tye) by my aantesluit. Wees asseblief verseker dat jy te enige tyd kan kop uittrek.

Tydens ons gesprekke, sal ons oor jou gemeenskap gesels, en ook iets leer oor jou eie unieke gawes en vaardighede.

Daar is 'n paar goed wat jy moet weet:
• Ek sal nooit enige persoonlike inligting vra, behalwe jou naam, adres, gawes en vaardighede nie.
• Jou naam of mening sal nie direk in my navorsing genoem word nie, dit sal ook nie oorgedra word aan enigiemand buite die groep nie.
• Die sessies sal aangeteken word, iets wat ek benodig om te verseker dat ek jou standpunte akkuraat verteenwoordig.
• Alle inligting wat ek versamel sal aan 'n verteenwoordigende komitee gestuur word, wat die groep self sal kies.
• Ek sal oor 'n maand terugkeer, om saam met jou die insigte wat ek opgedoen het te deel, en die finale verteenwoordiging van die gemeenskapskaart te wys.

As julle gewillig en gelukkig is om deel te neem, teken asseblief hieronder, en die persoon wat die vorm gebring het, sal dit aan my terugstuur.

Jy is welkom om Ivan te kontak indien jy enige vrae het voor ek aankom. Ek sal Maandagmiddag beskikbaar wees om jou te ontmoet indien jy enige vrae het, of onseker is, oor wat hierby betrokke is.

Ek sien uit na ons ontmoeting volgende week.

Vriendelike groete,

Grant Hopkins

Jou naam: _______________________

Jou handtekening dui aan dat jy bereid is om deel te neem: ______________________
# Appendix B

## Personal Capacity Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gifts and Skills</th>
<th>I can</th>
<th>I can teach others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repair engines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care for the elderly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking for large groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpentry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breast feeding consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring for the sick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring for Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word processing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of indigenous plants/medicines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing sports (which ones)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching sports (which ones)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House maintenance work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appliance repair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singing, playing music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and craft work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knitting, sowing and crochet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair cutting, braiding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour Guide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting my own business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation for adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation for children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving truck, bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on Kansas City Community builders, in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A GUIDE TO CAPACITY INVENTORIES: MOBILIZING THE COMMUNITY SKILLS OF LOCAL RESIDENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Community Building Workbook from The Asset-Based Community Development Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Policy Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040 Sheridan Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evanston, Illinois 60208-4100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John P. Kretzmann and John L. McKnight, Co-directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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