

Outcomes Evaluation:

SKILLZ Street Plus, a Grassroot Soccer initiative

Report compiled by:

Dr Adam Cooper

Dr Benita Moolman

Additional fieldworker: Mbali Matandela

This document was prepared by the Human and Social Development (HSD) research programme of



Table of Contents

List of acronyms	4
Glossary	5
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	7
Aims of the study	7
Research Methodology.....	7
Findings	8
Conclusions and recommendations.....	9
SECTION 1	10
EVALUATION OF THE SKILLZ STREET PLUS PROGRAMME, AN INTRODUCTION	10
Overview and purpose of the programme.....	10
A brief description of the evaluation.....	11
SECTION 2:	12
INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE AND GENDER EQUALITY AMONGST YOUNG SOUTH AFRICANS: A SNAPSHOT LITERATURE REVIEW.....	12
Gender Equality and Intimate Partner Violence as social problems	12
Rates of IPV	13
Effects of IPV.....	14
Interventions to address IPV.....	14
SECTION 3	16
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	16
Overview and logic of the evaluation	16
Why we decided on this design.....	16
Component 1: Process evaluation	17
Component 2: Outcomes evaluation	18
Data collection	19
Focus group discussions.....	19
In-depth individual interviews	19
Rapid Ethnographies and Observations.....	20
Sampling.....	20
Data analysis.....	20
SECTION 4	22
FINDINGS	22

Process evaluation	22
Initial comment.....	22
Attendance of learners	22
Recruiting schools and learners to the programme.....	23
Training of coaches	25
Curriculum	26
Monitoring and evaluation	27
Outcomes evaluation	29
Improving girls' gender-equitable partner choices and decreasing violence	29
Was the project able to strengthen the network of female coaches that are working to address gender-based violence and promote gender equality?	36
Did the programme improve gender equitable attitudes of young men?.....	39
Improved access to services for care	45
SECTION 5	48
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	48
References	51
Appendices	53
Appendix A: Focus group discussion guide	53
Appendix B: Individual interview guide	56
Appendix C: Observation schedule for rapid ethnographies:.....	58
Appendix D: INFORMATION SHEET: PARTICIPATION IN A LEARNER FOCUS GROUP.....	59
Appendix E: INFORMATION SHEET: PARTICIPATION IN A FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION	62
Appendix F: Research permissions, Gauteng Department of Education	64

List of acronyms

GBV	Gender-based violence
GE	Gender Equality
GRS	Grassroot Soccer
SSP	SKILLZ Street Plus
GS	Generation SKILLZ
IPV	Intimate partner violence
LGBTI	Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex
PM	Project Manager

Glossary

Coercion: To persuade an unwilling person to do something by using force or threats. Sometimes coercion can be very obvious, such as violence, but often it is more subtle. For instance, if a man threatens his girlfriend that if she does not have sex with him, he will break up with her or have sex with someone else, she may feel that she has no choice but to have sex with him. This is a form of coercion.

Gender-based violence: All acts perpetrated against women, girls, men and boys on the basis of their gender or sexual orientation which cause or could cause them physical, sexual, psychological, emotional or economic harm, and includes threats to do so. Commonly, the acts or threats include rape, sexual harassment, domestic violence, child sexual abuse, marital rape, homophobic and transphobic violence.

Gender Equity is the process of allocating resources, programs and decision-making fairly to all genders. This requires ensuring that people of all genders have access to a full range of opportunities to achieve the social, psychological and physical benefits that come from participating and leading in activities. It does not necessarily mean making the same programs and facilities available to all. Gender equity requires that people of all genders be provided with a full range of activity and program choices that meet their needs, interests and experiences.

Heteronormativity: The privileging and assumed dominance of heterosexual practices as the right way to be in a relationship or relate to others. A system of regulatory norms and practices that emerges within heterosexual communities and that serves a normative and disciplining function.

Heterosexism: A system of beliefs that privileges heterosexuality and discriminates against other sexual orientations. It assumes that heterosexuality is the only normal or natural option for human relationships, and posits that all other sexual relationships are either subordinate to or perversions of heterosexual relationships. In everyday life, this manifests as the assumption that everyone is heterosexual until proven otherwise.

Intimate partner violence: A pattern of abusive and threatening behaviours acted by one partner in an intimate relationship on another. This may include physical, emotional, economic and sexual abuse as well as intimidation, isolation and coercion.

LGBTI: An abbreviation referring to lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and intersex persons. “LGB” refers to sexual orientations, while “T” indicates a gender identity, and “I” a biological variant. They are clustered together in one abbreviation due to similarities in experiences of marginalisation, exclusion, discrimination, and victimisation in a heteronormative and heterosexist society. However, the possible differences between persons who claim these labels and those to whom these labels may be assigned ought not to be trivialised. The respective issues, experiences, and needs of these people may in fact differ significantly and in several respects.

Queer: Originally an offensive term used to degrade sexual and gender minorities, this term has intentionally been re-appropriated and now refers to a political, sexual and/or gender identity that is intentionally and visibly different from the norm. “Queer” is often used as a broad term for all people who are not strictly heterosexual or normatively gendered, including sexual minorities and gender nonconforming people.

Transgender and transdiverse: Terms for people who have a gender identity, and often a gender expression, that is different to the sex they were assigned at birth by default of their primary sexual characteristics. These broad terms encompass people who are androgynous, and those who defy what society tells them is appropriate for their gender. Transgender people can be heterosexual, bisexual, homosexual, or asexual.

Sexual violence: Committing or attempting to commit any sexual act or forcing someone else to commit a sexual act by using violence or coercion, unwanted sexual comments or advances, or acts against a person’s sexuality. Sexual violence can happen in any setting, irrespective of the relationship between victim and perpetrator. The term sexual violence includes acts of rape, sexual assault, sexual abuse, sexual harassment, and the denial of the right to use contraception. Sexual violence is a form of gender-based violence.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Aims of the study

This report, prepared by the Human and Social Development (HSD) research programme of the Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC), describes an evaluation of Grassroot Soccer's SKILLZ Street Plus project. The main aim of the evaluation was to use qualitative research to assess the relative success of the project goal, which aimed to **Improve the ability of 13-16 year-old girls to choose gender-equitable intimate partners and both to prevent and address violence in their lives**. The three stated 'intended outcomes' of the project were also assessed, including whether the programme was able to improve access to services for girls at risk of violence and HIV, strengthen the network of female coaches in the programme and, finally, improve gender equitable attitudes of young men. The efficiency and timeliness of the project implementation was also evaluated.

Research Methodology

The research intended to build on and flesh out findings from quantitative survey data which was conducted with 200 girl participants in the programme between 2014 and 2016. An initial process evaluation was carried out, assessing the attendance of participants, training of coaches, curriculum construction and delivery, as well as monitoring and evaluation procedures. An outcomes evaluation was then conducted, using focus groups discussions, in-depth semi-structured interviews with girl and boy participants and rapid ethnographies/ observations. Gender segregated focus group discussions were conducted with coaches and male and female participants that attended the weekly sessions. In-depth, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 8 young men and 11 young women participants. The interviews were guided by a semi-structured interview guide. Sessions were also held with GRS staff, eliciting information on programme delivery and effectiveness. Interviews lasted approximately one hour. A fieldworker spent three days conducting rapid ethnographic research at each of two high schools, observing SSP curriculum delivery and soccer playing sessions and getting a sense of the broader environment in which the workshops were conducted.

Findings

Overall, the programme was therefore well implemented, with capacitated coaches delivering school-based sessions in an efficient manner. The curriculum was extensively researched to include the most important aspects of gender-based violence, intimate partnerships and HIV/AIDS and it was adapted when feedback from the field indicated that the programme was too long. One weakness in the implementation of the programme identified by the evaluation team related to the process followed for recruiting schools and learners and the subsequent relationships that GRS developed with the schools. It appeared as if GRS had not developed deep, embedded relationships with the schools themselves, even if relations with learners were excellent. This issue is partly caused by the nature of the existing partnership GRS has established with the education department. The department chooses schools that it assesses *need* the programme, based on high levels of teenage pregnancy, rather than GRS selecting schools that demonstrate an interest in the programme. Without buy-in from schools, communication with learners is difficult, support for the use of space and other resources, like educators' time, is strained and it is difficult to link the programme to the core business of the school and its management team.

The findings suggested that some girls did leave physically and emotionally abusive relationships and some chose to be in relationships that contained greater levels of gender equality. The research did not clearly indicate what informed their choices to leave these unpleasant relationships. Possible explanations could involve beliefs with regard to gender equitable relationships, as well as improved self-efficacy, and/or self-protection. Based on interviews with girls who participated in SKILLZ Street Plus we could not point clearly to the intervention as the reason for them choosing to leave violent relationships. The findings also indicated that pursuing gender equitable relationships was not only informed by girls avoiding or minimising violence, it also related to the ways that men and women benefitted materially from being in relationships, as well as a broader understanding of a patriarchal society that positions women and men in particular ways. With regards to sexuality, women and girls are generally positioned as needing to fulfil men's sexual desires, whilst they repress their own and it was believed that women should reciprocate men's attention when it is bestowed on them. The findings indicated that there is still a large investment by girls in the hetero-patriarchal order that positions women as responsible for men's sexual arousal, constructs women as unfaithful and untrustworthy in relationships, and sometimes justifies men's use of violence.

Research with young men who participated in the *Generation SKILLZ* programme yielded three related and somewhat paradoxical findings. Boys appreciated the relationships they developed with coaches, which enabled them to speak about sensitive emotional issues. Many of the young men demonstrated impressive gender equitable attitudes and they stated that men should not act violently towards women. While these young men stated that violence towards women was wrong, many pinpointed women's infidelities as the root cause of gender-based violence, rather than shortcomings associated with men themselves.

In terms of findings related to coaches, this group clearly demonstrated that they were impressively able to empathise, self-reflect and think about social, economic and emotional issues facing young people in their community, including intimate partner dynamics. Their involvement in the programme appears to have fostered a reservoir of socio-emotional growth that is uncommon for people of their age and is a potent asset used for working with young people.

Coaches believed that the network of coaches could be improved through social media platforms that link them together and excursions or team building/appreciation sessions. The lack of a solid network may have contributed to coaches' perceptions that they are not adequately supported at the schools with the recruitment of learners. The coaches that participated in the research also felt that GRS could do more to support their professional development.

While the evaluation showed that young people who had participated in the programme demonstrated excellent knowledge of services for intimate partner violence and HIV/AIDS, young women reported that nurses and other personnel at clinics were rude and intimidating. Young people are unlikely to use these services if they believe that personnel are unpleasant and insensitive. Developing connections between the school-based programme and staff at public health facilities may begin to address some of these issues.

Conclusions and recommendations

The evaluation concluded by recommending that Grassroot Soccer attempt to strengthen its relationships with key institutions like schools, clinics, police stations and community leadership forums. Suggestions are made in the final section terms of how this could be achieved.

SECTION 1

EVALUATION OF THE SKILLZ STREET PLUS PROGRAMME, AN INTRODUCTION

Overview and purpose of the programme

The SSP project is a GRS initiative that combines girls' soccer with an educational curriculum that simultaneously tackles the issues of intimate partner choice, gender-based violence and HIV/AIDS prevention. The programme utilises a network of female soccer coaches to deliver the gender focused curriculum, mentor the girls and facilitate the soccer-based activities. In this way, Grassroot Soccer, its coaches and partner organizations, tackle two of the main challenges that young women face, namely HIV/AIDS and violence, including intimate partner violence. SSP contains a number of innovative practices, including using soccer as a drawcard to involve young women in the project and utilizing coaches as mentors for both the soccer and gender development components. Unlike most other large-scale, multi-sectoral initiatives, SSP combines behavioural, structural and biomedical intervention components, providing young women with positive role-models to challenge social norms, such as those that portray men as the sole decision-makers and dominant partners in relationships. The curriculum originally consisted of 10 sessions, but was then expanded to 19 sessions. Participants experienced the 19 session version of the programme as too long, resulting in a shorter 14 session curriculum being agreed upon. The project originally operated in in Soweto but has been expanded to include sites in Khayelitsha and Alexandra. It is also worth noting that an iteration of the SKILLZ Street Plus programme has been expanded by the GRS Partnerships team to a range of different countries across Africa.

Strategies and activities that form part of SKILLZ Street Plus include but are not limited to:

- **Building connections with female mentors**

A nurturing relationship between coach and participant is developed, building trust and stimulating deep and honest levels of discussion, creating supportive relationships for young women.

- **All-girls soccer league**

Non-elite soccer matches act to catalyze personal development amongst girls. Girls form teams of 10-players and play in 5-10 weekly fair play soccer matches as well as develop basic soccer skills.

- **All-girls curriculum-based sessions**

The SSP curriculum has been designed to combine soccer themed activities and life-skills discussions to aid girls as they reflect on and make difficult life choices. The curriculum incorporates lessons from gender theory and risk-factors associated with HIV and violence.

- **Access to services**

By fostering connections among and between participants, as well as with slightly older female role-models, safe spaces are developed where girls can engage in reflective dialogues on the topic of sexuality, in a non-judgmental and non-moralizing manner. Coaches may then link girls to services for abuse and violence, in order to assist them with these challenges. GRS and its coaches offer support to girls as they receive HIV test results and, if needed, help them enrol in requisite care or treatment programmes.

- **Mixed-sex activities**

The second stage of the intervention brings together girls who have completed previous activities with same-age boys. The mixed programme - *Generation SKILLZ* - consists of two sets of 7 interactive sessions that focus on reducing age-disparate sexual relationships, multiple partners and IPV. Generation SKILLZ is conducted in secondary schools with learners from Grade 9 and 10 in this project) and is led by a mixed sex coaching team, with a combination of mixed sex and breakaway single sex sessions. .

- **Women's tournaments**

All-women's soccer tournaments - with girls, their mothers, and grandmothers – are 1-day soccer and health events that accompany the curriculum-based activities. The tournaments bring together local health service providers, as well as fathers, boys and other men, all of whom function as visible supporters of this public event.

[A brief description of the evaluation](#)

The evaluation of the project included assessments of whether the project attained its goal, as well as its stipulated outcomes and intended outputs. The main aim of the evaluation was to use qualitative research to assess the relative success of the project goal, which aimed to:

Improve the ability of 13-16 year old girls to choose gender-equitable intimate partners and both to prevent and address violence in their lives.

The three stated 'intended outcomes' of the project were also assessed, including whether the project was able to

- 1) improve access to services for girls at risk of violence and HIV and support young female survivors of violence,
- 2) strengthen the network of female coaches that are working to address gender-based violence and promote gender equality and
- 3) improve gender equitable attitudes of young men.

The efficiency and timeliness of the project implementation was also evaluated.

More detail on the structure of the evaluation is outlined in the research methodology section.

SECTION 2:

INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE AND GENDER EQUALITY AMONGST YOUNG SOUTH AFRICANS: A SNAPSHOT LITERATURE REVIEW

Gender Equality and Intimate Partner Violence as social problems

Before it is possible to determine whether SKILLZ Street Plus improved girls' ability to choose gender equitable partnerships and prevent/address violence in their lives, it is important first to unpack what is meant by these key terms. Understanding the concepts GE and IPV involves more than generating definitions that include some notion of equality between men and women (GE), or physical/sexual coercion between people in a romantic relationship (IPV). How we make sense of these concepts depends, in part, on how we understand the causes of these problems to operate at the level of the individual, the interpersonal, the community and/or the society (McHugh & Frieze, 2006).

With this in mind, feminists and gender theorists have evolved early approaches to what was then called "women battery" in general public discourse, a term that portrayed women as helpless victims that were partly responsible for remaining in violent relationships. These portrayals overlooked the myriad socio-economic, cultural and political factors that shape IPV, implying that it was an individual person problem rather than a social one (McHugh and Frieze, 2006). IPV cannot be studied in isolation from the structural forces that produce and reproduce rules, roles, violence and enforced "discipline", as these play out in inter-personal relationships, institutions, norms, values and ideologies (McHugh & Frieze, 2006).

Applying this insight to the contextual factors that shape IPV in South Africa needs some acknowledgement of the multiple ways that marginalized men have attempted to regain power in the face of a racist, capitalist society from which they were/are largely excluded (Mager 1999; Glaser 2005). This requires an understanding of patriarchy, the society wide system that ensures that men oppress women, as intersectional, meaning that patriarchy always intersects with issues related to race, class, nationality, sexuality, amongst other aspects of identities. Put another way, gendered identities in South Africa are strongly shaped through sexuality, race and class. Masculinities cannot exist without sexuality as central to their constitution, hence the multiple forms of sexual risk-taking and/or sexual violence that constitute South African masculinities (Ratele, 2016). Similarly, the practice of hyper-femininities is prized and rewarded. Hyper-femininities are gendered and sexed identities that are shaped through normative understandings of 'being a girl and a woman', constructions of femininity that value practices of domesticity (being at home and making the home a good place for one's family), submission and sexual purity (remaining a virgin until marriage). Gqola (2012) identifies the themes of the cult of femininity and violent

masculinities as central in the scourge of rape and gender-based violence in South Africa. Jewkes et. al (2011) identify 27,6% self-reported rape perpetration, and concur with Gqola (2012) that masculine entitlement, and unequal gender relations reinforce practices of violence against women. In South Africa, masculinities associated with physical strength and forms of predatorial sexuality are often contrasted with femininities underlined by submissiveness and physical attraction (Jewkes & Abrahams, 2002). The purpose of this theoretical framing of IPV is to demonstrate that these gendered constructions (often referred to as gender roles or stereotypes), values and practices are embedded in South African society, as well as its history, meaning that solutions need to address the fact that gendered relations are complex and deeply inserted into the fabric of how men and women interact.

Similar to findings from research on adult relationships and IPV, key drivers of IPV amongst youth remain ideas and dynamics of gender inequality and male superiority (Russell, et.al 2014; Swartz & Seedat; Wood, Lambert, & Jewkes, 2008). The widespread acceptance and reproduction of gendered norms, values and roles has also meant that violence in intimate heterosexual relationships between young people has become increasingly normalized and even perceived as a necessary expression of 'love' (Wood, Lambert, & Jewkes, 2008). Forced sexual initiation with adolescent girls is framed through discourses of heterosexual ideologies of romance, love and relationships. Jewkes et al (2001) found that young women perceived forced sexual initiation as not as serious as "rape" (Jewkes et al., 2001). The findings suggest that forced sexual initiation is common among young women, yet it is not necessarily equated to rape. In some instances, the request for sex from a boyfriend/partner acts as a signifier of an unequal relationship for young girls, and they choose to leave the relationship, as indicated by data in this report.

Dominant societal values of heteronormativity also function to produce gender in everyday life, justifying violence towards gender non-conforming youth. Homophobic violence has been widely reported as an integral component of school life in South Africa, implicating both educators and learners and leading to queer youths being alienated, isolated and persecuted (Butler, Alpaslan, Strumpher, & Astbury, 2003; Msibi, 2012). With these normalized violent practices shaping gendered relations in asymmetrical ways, it is no surprise that high rates of IPV have been documented in survey research.

Rates of IPV

Recent South African literature has highlighted the extent of IPV in adolescent and teenage relationships. Shamu et al (2015) found that there was high prevalence of physical, emotional and sexual IPV experienced by girls and perpetrated by boys, with about a third of those who ever partnered having some form of experience of physical or sexual IPV. The South African national surveys of youth risk behavior found that intimate partner violence starts early in life—12.1 % of 8th grade girls reported having been hit, smacked (slapped), or

physically hurt by their boyfriends during the past 6 months, and 16.1 % of 8th grade boys reported having hit, smacked, or physically hurt their girlfriends (Reddy et al. 2010). 26.8 percent of 18-49 year-old women reported being physically abused by a partner in a large random sample of Eastern Cape women (Jewkes et al. 2001). 10.9% reported being abused in the year preceding the study and a third of those group reported being injured by these actions.

Effects of IPV

Research indicates that IPV has negative social, emotional, financial, physical and psychological effects for women. Social costs include isolation from support networks, emotional effects range from feeling, scared, embarrassed and ashamed to psychological costs such as feeling worthless and useless; financial costs sometimes mean losing a job or being financially controlled by the abuser. Physical effects can range from being hospitalized for physical injuries to marks on the face and body (where the abuser has smacked and hit her). Adolescent women do not necessarily experience all the different effects but probably experience the emotional, physical and psychological effects. For young women, they might be discouraged from attending school or tertiary education, and prevented from spending time with friends and family.

Interventions to address IPV

Historically, IPV has been dealt with through the criminal justice system. This initially took the form of the Prevention of Family Violence Act (1993) in South Africa and now, the Domestic Violence Act (1998) and the Sexual Offences Act (2007). In South Africa, IPV is still not recognized as a crime per se. Instead, assault, rape and sexual assault are defined as 'the crimes'. The legislation makes possible a protection order for victims of IPV. Government programmes have been responsive to the needs of victims of IPV through the provision of shelters for women and children and civil society organisations have provided psycho-social and legal support for victims, education and awareness-raising programmes for communities, and therapeutic interventions for abusive men.

Interventions for IPV outside of the realm of criminal justice have been substantially shaped by it generally becoming recognized as a public health issue. IPV was reconceptualised in the 1990s, evolving from associations with social welfare and the legal system, to being firmly located in the international public health domain. With the spread of HIV/AIDS, international agencies, such as the WHO, increasingly took on the responsibility for addressing IPV, meaning that it came to be understood as a medical rather than a social issue (Wood, Lambert & Jewkes, 2008). The medicalization of IPV affected how it was framed and the kinds of interventions that were designed to alleviate the problem. The dominant public health paradigm champions evidence-based programmes with tried and tested improvement measures of young people's health. The importance of primary preventative strategies is asserted in line with the accepted belief that "early intervention

and prevention are best". This is carried out whilst paying heed to the value of multi-sectoral and comprehensive approaches that incorporate different relevant stakeholders and lead to community development.

While situating IPV in a public health discourse offers benefits in terms of immediate primary prevention strategies, it raises a number of concerns, factors that need to be taken into account in an evaluation of this kind. For example, this approach perceives IPV through a bio-medical lens, which identifies the cause of IPV as treatable at the level of the individual, much like other 'diseases', even though we have argued that IPV is a social problem. Community involvement and participation is often situated on the periphery of bio-medical interventions considered to be appropriate. As such, the depth and complexity of power relations and gendered inequalities do not form part of the 'diagnosis'. This means that interventions for young women and young men often result in temporary attitudinal change but not sustained behavioural and social change.

Schools can be important settings for intervention programmes to address these different concerns, as they are key socialization sites for youth and they are connected to curricula, as well as parents, communities and government agencies. Successful school based violence reduction programmes are generally comprehensive in nature, involving multiple stakeholders and levels (Gevers & Flisher, 2012). Programmes that are most effective generally operate beyond the school walls, involving community structures and personnel in ways that promote sustainability and participation of different groups. (Gevers & Flisher, 2012; Moletsane, 2010). It is worth remembering that although schools can be important sites for shifting gendered norms, they are also places that reproduce problematic societal discourses of gender (Moletsane, 2010).

The challenge for programmes that aim to address GE and IPV is therefore to work within the funding models and ideologies of public health, taking insights such as the benefits of primary prevention programmes into consideration (see for eg Matzopoulos et al., 2010), whilst not losing sight of the fact that these programmes are ultimately embedded in broader social, economic and political contexts that impact substantially on their outcomes.

SECTION 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Overview and logic of the evaluation

The evaluation comprised of the following key components:

Component of the evaluation	Main evaluation activities
1. Process evaluation	Review project records, interview GRS staff; focus groups, in-depth interviews with participants and coaches
2. Outcomes evaluation	
Analyse quantitative survey	Assess key survey findings on intimate partner choice, violence prevention and plan how best to use this information for the qualitative research
Qualitative data collection and analysis	Focus groups, in-depth interviews with participants and coaches; observations of curriculum delivery and soccer playing

Why we decided on this design

- With a limited study in terms of budgetary constraints, we tried to provide the evaluation with as much depth as possible
- Provide insight into one site (Soweto) that has been part of the programme since inception, has a large number of participants and has the quantitative component
- The alternative would be only 2 focus groups in each of the sites: Alexandra, Khayelitsha and Soweto.

- We will not be able to generalise for the other sites, but with limited fieldwork the data for a multi-site evaluation would have been 'thin'.
- The main advantage of this design is that we will try to explain the survey data results through in-depth qualitative work

Component 1: Process evaluation

An evaluation of the implementation of the key project activities was conducted. This included an assessment of the curriculum revision, training of female coaches, curriculum delivery to participants, soccer training and competitions and information conveyed/awareness raised on support services for violence and HIV. The efficiency of delivering the gender-equity workshops with young men was also assessed.

The purpose of this component of the evaluation was to verify that these activities took place and to assess whether and why logistical difficulties arose in programme delivery. This was done by checking project records to confirm attendance levels and by posing questions related to programme delivery to participants during focus groups and individual interviews, including coaches and young male and female learners.

Five GRS staff were interviewed in order to assess the quality of programme delivery. GRS staff were also asked questions regarding their understanding of the programme's theory of change and how this theory translated into actual programmatic effects, in their opinion, during programme delivery. Programmatic adaptations that were explored and implemented prior to and during the programme were reviewed. Finally, a thorough assessment of the monitoring and evaluation systems, tools and personnel utilised for the SSP project was conducted as a component of the process evaluation.

Main questions for process evaluation:

- Are SSP activities delivered adequately?
Main activities: Training coaches
Curriculum development and review/redesign
SSP curriculum delivery

Other questions for process evaluation:

- How are schools and girls recruited for the programme?
- How do GRS staff work with the coaches in an ongoing manner?
- How does the programme coordinate with the other programmes and agencies with which it must interact e.g. clinics, schools, parents?

- How/why was the curriculum change done?
- How is Monitoring and Evaluation done? Who designed the longitudinal questionnaire and what was the process for this?

Component 2: Outcomes evaluation

The primary objective of the outcomes evaluation was to assess whether the programme's main intended goal to:

Improve the ability of 13-16 year old girls to choose gender-equitable intimate partners and both to prevent and address violence in their lives

was achieved. While a comprehensive analysis of the longitudinal survey data collected from girls involved in SSP did not form part of this evaluation, key findings from the quantitative study was used to inform research questions for the outcomes evaluation. Survey data may document self-perceived changes that occur, but it is unlikely to provide detailed understanding of 'how' and 'why' these developments took place and the ways that these changes operated in the context of young people's lives. Individual interviews and focus groups with girl participants were therefore used as data collection methods to aid in evaluating whether the programme goal was achieved, probing deeper into reasons for the survey results. The focus groups with coaches were also used to assess whether the girls' intimate partner choices and ability to prevent and address violence changed during the course of the programme.

In terms of the other three intended outcomes:

- 1) Improve access to services for girls at risk of violence and HIV and support for young female survivors of violence,

a similar process was followed, looking at survey questions pertaining to access to services for risk of violence and HIV and treatment for violent incidents. Answers to these survey questions were used to generate initial hypotheses and theories. Focus groups and individual interviews were used to ask participants whether the SSP programme aided them with referrals and linkages to services for the risk of violence and HIV. Focus groups with coaches probed whether these older women believed that the girls knew about and utilized these services.

- 2) Strengthen the network of female coaches that are working to address gender-based violence and promote gender equality

The process evaluation and focus groups with coaches was used to assess whether the network of coaches was adequately strengthened. During the process evaluation GRS

staff was interviewed and records of coaches' attendance and sustained involvement reviewed, providing information on how the network of coaches progressed through the programme. Focus group questions with coaches probed whether they were able to support one another and who they turned to for assistance with the programme. Finally, focus groups and individual interviews with girl participants tried to answer whether coaches were influential support mechanisms for girls in the programme.

3) Improve gender equitable attitudes of young men.

Interviews and focus groups with girls and boys were used to assess whether the attitudes of young men in the programme improved. For the young men this was done by engaging them in a general discussion about relationships and attitudes towards young women, before moving on to questions regarding the lessons learnt through the programme. Creative methods were used in the focus groups with young boys. Fieldworkers described a fictitious story of a relationship between two teenagers and asked the participants to comment on the actions of the characters and to say how they thought the story would unfold.

An overview of the data collection process and methods follows.

Data collection

Focus group discussions

Focus group discussions were conducted with coaches and male and female participants that attended the weekly sessions (a rough guide that was adapted is included as Appendix A). These sessions were facilitated by a trained fieldworker and guided by a semi-structured interview guide (Appendix B). The duration of the groups was approximately 1 hour. We conducted gender-segregated group discussions with participants:

- 2 x all-male group (approximately 6-8 participants)
- 3 x all-female group (approximately 6-8 participants)
- 1 x focus groups of coaches (6-8 participants)

In-depth individual interviews

In-depth, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 8 young men and 11 young women participants. The interviews were guided by a semi-structured interview guide. Sessions were also held with GRS staff, eliciting information on programme delivery and effectiveness. Interviews lasted approximately 1 hour.

Rapid Ethnographies and Observations

The fieldwork team observed a number of curriculum delivery/interventions in action at two Soweto schools. The researchers also observed coaches telling groups of learners yet to be involved in the project about the programme. Observation is an important data collection method that can be used to triangulate findings from the focus groups, individual interviews and quantitative data. Triangulation refers to the validation of research results using more than one method to study the same phenomenon, enhancing confidence with regard to the accuracy of research findings (Jick, 1979).

Observations of SSP curriculum delivery used an observation schedule (Appendix C) created in order to document the way that information was shared with the group, whether dialogue ensued, whether learners were able to ask questions and present issues with which they were struggling and whether a supportive atmosphere was produced in the groups.

Sampling

The research made use of a stratified random sampling strategy. Participants for the focus groups and in-depth interviews were randomly selected from the sample of 200 girls that formed part of the longitudinal study. Selecting participants from the same sample that participated in the quantitative research allowed the qualitative data to be directly compared and interpreted in relation to the survey information. This aided in the process of unpacking findings from the quantitative study, in more detail, during the qualitative research. For the purpose of convenience and cost-effectiveness, boys and coaches were recruited for focus groups and interviews from the same schools as the girls who participated in the quantitative research.

Data analysis

The original interview and focus group discussion recordings were translated and transcribed. Qualitative data analysis was supported by AtlasTi, a computer-aided software programme that assists with data coding. The analysis was guided by Braun and Clarke's (2012) approach to thematic analysis, which comprises six phases, namely: (i) familiarisation with the data set through repeated readings; (ii) initial code generation; (iii) construction of preliminary themes; (iv) refinement of themes through comparison with coded extracts and the entire dataset; (v) naming and defining themes; and (vi) generating the narrative report of the findings. We will approach the analysis from a deductive, critical, and constructionist approach standpoint (Braun & Clarke, 2012).

After generating themes and coding the data, we produced a descriptive account of the findings, before interpreting the data using gender specific theoretical and analytical concepts and frameworks.

SECTION 4

FINDINGS

Process evaluation

In this section we try to answer the following questions related to the implementation of the programme:

- *Was the programme well attended by learners?*
- *Was recruiting schools and learners a successful endeavour?*
- *Were coaches adequately trained?*
- *Did the programme utilize an appropriate curriculum and were effective changes made if curriculum related problems arose?*
- *Was monitoring and evaluation effective?*

Initial comment

As an initial overall comment, the GRS staff on the ground at the Nike centre in Soweto facilitated the research project efficiently and effectively and the team welcomed us warmly into their space. Communication was excellent and GRS personnel were well-organised. Cedric responded to emails timeously and was able to accommodate almost all of our requests and research needs at short notice. GRS staff insisted that we work out of their office while we were in the field. They fed us delicious lunches daily and made us feel very much at home. While this may seem like a trivial set of interactions- and desirable for staff hosting evaluators- our research team felt a warmth, care and high levels of professionalism that we have every reason to believe Cedric and his team extends to other visitors, partners and colleagues. An impressive institutional culture therefore existed at the GRS office in Soweto, forming a solid base from which to deliver a programme that dealt with sensitive issues.

Attendance of learners

Attendance and monitoring of attendance are taken seriously by GRS. On page three of the SKILLZ Street Plus manual it clearly states that “taking attendance at EVERY practice is one of the most important things that a SKILLZ Street Plus coach must do. Without taking attendance records there is no way to know how many kids have been reached across South Africa and whether or not the programme is working.”

It is commendable that the SKILLZ Street Plus manual states from the outset that it is important to monitor whether the programme actually reaches participants. A desktop review of GRS monitoring and evaluation tools showed that attendance of the programme has been very good overall. The longer 19 session version of the programme seems to have been less well attended, with participants present, on average, 13.54 out of 19 sessions. Other versions of the programme were very well attended, with participants present for at least 80% of the sessions. The decision to reduce the programme to 10 and then 14 sessions was therefore justified in the light of these attendance records, as it appears that the 19 session programme was too long and participants struggled to attend all of the sessions. This finding also illustrates that, as the Managing Director said, useful information is relayed from the ground regarding programme challenges: the belief that the programme was initially too long was communicated by programme staff, validated by diminishing attendance records, leading to a change in programme structure. An effective feedback cycle, coupled with strong monitoring and evaluation procedures therefore holds the programme in good stead.

Recruiting schools and learners to the programme

One weakness in the implementation of the programme identified by the evaluation team is the process followed for recruiting schools and learners and the subsequent relationships that GRS developed with the schools. This issue is partly caused by the existing partnership GRS has established with the education department. To illustrate the challenges involved in school recruitment, the Project Manager said that:

In terms of the success on the implementation side, I know we have had a lot of challenges working with the schools. We had a lot of problems working with the schools because of the... well, some schools do not understand our approach or how our programmes work, so they did not allow us or did not want us to be part of the... engaging the participants. We had problem with the district officers. We chose the schools based on the need because some district offices were able to identify schools for us that we need to target because there is high teenage pregnancy rate in the schools or too much drug or alcohol abuse so they identify specific schools that they wanted us to go to. So, we went to together with them in terms of identifying the schools, but also on our side, we need to identify the schools as well...

The opinion of the Project Manager that participating schools had not necessarily 'bought into' the programme and that relationships with schools were strained, was confirmed in our research (although it should be stated that our fieldwork only involved two schools and cannot be generalized across the programme). Of the two schools that we interacted with during fieldwork, one was uncooperative with the research process. When the team first arrived, resistance to participation in the research was expressed explicitly, even with the

lure of MP3 players as rewards for learners. We visited this school four times before we were able to conduct research at the site. Communication with the other school was difficult at times. While the benefits for participating in the research were not substantial, the evaluators believe that if stronger relationships had existed between the schools and GRS (and the schools believed in the sustained value of these relationships), the schools would have been more willing to give of their time for this process.

In one sense this difficulty in implementing programmes and conducting research at South African township schools is understandable, as they are over-burdened institutions trying to deal with a wide range of social and educational problems that present on a daily basis. Even so, it appeared as if GRS had not developed deep, embedded relationships with the schools themselves, even if relations with learners were excellent. Without buy-in from schools, communication with learners is difficult, support for the use of space and other resources, like educators' time, is strained and it is difficult to link the programme to the core business of the school, like potential connections between SKILLZ Street Plus and the Life Orientation curriculum. In short, good relationships with schools is necessary to ensure that the best results for the programme are obtained and that the project is sustainable.

Part of the reason for this difficulty, as the PM stated, is the fact that schools are recruited by the Education Department based on a need identified by the department rather than schools participating through their own volition, based on an interest and appreciation in/for the project. Time should be taken to demonstrate the value of the approach to school personnel. Schools need to believe in the value of the programme if it is to become a fixture in its operations. If schools remain unconvinced by the programme's potential after considerable effort to share the ethos and vision, it may be worth finding alternative schools that are more cooperative. It is extremely difficult to get traction in sites where schools are resistant to the process. Suggestions for achieving better programme-school relations are included in the recommendations section.

Recruitment challenges went beyond difficulties with schools. Coaches also described difficulties in their efforts to recruit learners for the programme. One of the coaches said that:

Interviewer: How do you get participants?

Respondent: That's the biggest question. The office recruits the school and says you with Protea Glen, you working with the grade 9s and that's it. As coaches when you go to school the kids don't even know what Grassroots soccer is and you have to introduce the programme and make the kids interested in coming to the programme.

Interviewer: And how do you do that?

Respondent: We scream our lungs (laughs) we run after the kids and ask them “are you not joining us”? then they say “what’s this?” We say “come and see for 5 mins and if you don’t like it you can go”. Cause I think the name of the foundation is not properly done, that’s the honest truth. Somebody needs to go to the school, after the teachers have agreed, somebody needs to go, so that the children know... so the children can have an interest and when they take the consent form to their parents they can say “mommy I saw this programme today I want to join, they did 1,2,3 and I’ll be sharing with you every day what we’ve learnt.”

Some way of consolidating and strengthening relationships with schools needs to be found in order to support implementation and assist coaches in their work. Coaches’ efforts to recruit learners is returned to on page 33.

Training of coaches

Interviews with project staff and a review of records indicated that training of coaches is carried out in a rigorous and well-organised manner. The Managing Director said that following recruitment, coaches initially receive three days of orientation to the organization, before undergoing an intensive five-day curriculum training, depending on the particular programme in which they will work. The orientation and training appeared to be well received and sufficient, according to both coaches and more senior staff. Research with the coaches clearly demonstrated that they were impressively able to empathise, self-reflect and think about social, economic and emotional issues facing young people in their community, including intimate partner dynamics. Their involvement in the programme appears to have fostered a reservoir of socio-emotional growth that is uncommon for people of their age and is a potent asset used for working with young people.

One issue that arose in an interview with a staff member is worth noting and the evaluators feel it extends to a number of different components of the programme. The staff member was describing who is present at training of new coaches:

“... if it’s the coordinator then they know that person is training and is not on the same level as us so we can be ourselves and coaches become very free. I noticed that the training of coaches... as soon as they got to school and started talking with them saying that it’s better if you coordinate with us because you have more experience and other coaches make us feel as though we’re not good enough. So I think when we do our training a very bad thing that we do is involving our coaches... I think training should be those specific coaches that are training and then management should be one doing the coaching so that they feel that it’s a safe area

to learn and make mistakes. So if it's someone who is going to be coach when you make a mistake they'll be laughing at you so it doesn't really work."

This comment indicated that new coaches are made to feel insecure by slightly more experienced coaches, in comparison to when they work with more established staff members. South African youth are extremely competitive, a result of growing up in difficult environments where they are forced to hustle and fight to assert their value. It is therefore understandable that coaches feel a need to demonstrate their strengths and superiority in relation to new coaches. However, making mistakes is an important part of learning and it would aid the training process to strive for an environment where nobody feels frightened to say the wrong thing or fearful that they may potentially be humiliated.

Curriculum

The SKILLZ Street Plus curriculum is well organized and researched, combining sports, creative exercises and essential knowledge to buttress young women as they make choices regarding intimate partnerships and their sexualities. However, we felt that gender could be integrated more consistently and explicitly into each session, helping girls to consider each of the topics in relation to gender. A number of suggestions in terms of how this could be achieved follow.

- The session on “decision-making” presents an opportunity to examine decision-making through a gendered lens. An activity could be used to explore when and how men and women make decisions. This would assist in later aspects of the programme when sexual decision-making and healthy relationships are foregrounded.
- The curriculum could problematize the concept of “sex”, as many contemporary gender theories do, challenging its position as fixed and natural. Sex, it is argued, is also socially constructed and performed through everyday practices of gender. Although this kind of advanced and highly conceptual gender theory may be beyond the scope of SKILLZ Street Plus, it should be communicated to young people that men often use arguments around nature and biology to exploit women, such as statements that men cannot control their sexual arousal because it is a biological phenomenon.
- The section on gender and HIV risk contains definitions of power that require more detail. In relation to gender, power is a social and collective phenomenon, as it shapes and is shaped by the categories of men (masculinities) and women (femininities). The importance of understanding the collective power of

masculinities, for example, demonstrates how male privilege and entitlement operate, such as in the form of male requests and demands for sex.

- The section that utilizes body mapping and body images should link gender and bodies in a more explicit way, unpacking patriarchal constructions of beauty and the notion of the ‘male gaze’.
- Some staff mentioned that the curriculum needed to include some discussion on same sex relationships. This was further identified in focus groups discussions, when participants identified as lesbian, indicating that there is very little in the curriculum that affirms young lesbian girls’ choices in relationships. The affirmation of lesbian girls often depended on who the coach was that they were allocated to work with.
- The section on relationships only includes heterosexual examples as case studies/scenarios.

As a final point on the curriculum, the evaluation team felt that there could be more opportunities for unstructured reflection and for girls to bring the issues they face in their lives, to the programme. One of the people that helped to develop the SSP curriculum concurred that:

Respondent: you know it’s always nice to give a little bit of breathing time in between when you talk about issues we don’t generally talk about so when you don’t have breathing time you just stick to the curriculum because you have certain weeks to complete everything so there’s no follow up on those issues.

The evaluation team agreed with this assessment and felt that additional “breathing space” could be inserted into the curriculum in a well-planned manner. One of the most innovative and effective components of the programme is the coach as a peer mentor. Providing more time for girls to seek assistance and advice from coaches and to allow coaches to guide them with socio-emotional challenges, would facilitate further benefits for participants.

Monitoring and evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation systems are well-developed and utilized by GRS, providing invaluable information for this evaluation and for the ongoing operations of the organization. Attendance records are well kept. Pre and post-test surveys, which are used to collect information on knowledge of HIV/AIDS, gender and services, as well as practices young people engage in and experiences of violence, are regularly administered. This data is

collected, collated and analysed as part of GRS' operations. These tasks are now supported by Programme Coordinators, who oversee the work coaches do in schools, aiding with the delivery of interventions and M & E work.

Overall, the programme was therefore well implemented, with capacitated coaches delivering school-based sessions in an efficient manner. The curriculum was extensively researched to include the most important aspects of gender-based violence, intimate partnerships and HIV/AIDS and it was adapted when feedback from the field indicated that the programme was too long. Areas for improvement included developing more robust relationships with schools and educators, providing coaches with better support in recruiting learners and inserting more space for open reflection and unstructured sharing of concerns in the curriculum.

Outcomes evaluation

Improving girls' gender-equitable partner choices and decreasing violence

Introduction

In this section we report whether the qualitative research used in the evaluation found that the SKILLZ Street Plus programme was able to:

Improve the ability of 13-16 year-old girls to choose gender-equitable intimate partnerships and both to prevent and address violence in their lives.

Findings are divided into two parts, initially exploring some of the girls' descriptions of leaving violent and inequitable relationships, before examining how participants assessed who was responsible for violence. Some of the girls did report leaving violent relationships; they also demonstrated impressive forms of agency and confidence. On the other hand, many participants described women as at least partially at fault when violence ensued. Reasons for these sentiments are explored below.

On choosing: Love, violence, sex and walking away

The findings suggested that forced sexual initiation was common in relationships between young men and women. Some girls clearly articulated that they left relationships because of their boyfriends' sexual desires:

Interviewer: The one that you had, why, what was the misunderstanding about if you don't mind me asking? You don't have to answer

Respondent: Ummm he wanted to have sex with me

Interviewer: Okay and you said no and then...

Respondent: [Interrupts] Yeah

Interviewer: ...the no led to the relationship ending?

Girl: Yeah

This young woman avoided a potentially abusive and violent relationship, making the choice to leave because she did not feel ready to begin a relationship that involved sexual intercourse. This illustrates agency and foresight on her part, as other research suggests

that sexual coercion is regularly associated with physical violence. Other girls were intolerant of infidelity and partners who made autocratic decisions:

Yes because most people I date are not faithful, they cheat and stuff. The person that I was in love with recently, we dated for one year and eight months, then he told me that he wants to sleep with me and stuff. So, I told him that I'm not ready. That's when he came up with the decision that why should we talk about sex when you don't have experience. But that person, I really loved him and I wanted to leave him. I did and found someone who really loves me.

In this story the young woman participant reported that her partner had decided that talking about sex was not desirable, due to her (the participant's) lack of experience with physical intimacy. She indicated that her boyfriend, like many other young men, was not faithful, but she understood that a more 'authentic' relationship needed to be based on honesty and joint decision-making. She perceived that her relationship did not contain gender equality and she was able to terminate it and find a more equitable partner. Some young women sought out help from relevant others to aid in their relationship challenges, also demonstrating a form of agency:

Interviewer: ...and what about a bad relationship?

Respondent: A bad one? [Sighs] oh okay, there was this guy Siyabonga...although Siyabonga and I dated I didn't quite understand him because I had to constantly make an effort in the relationship but he was alright...yooh ah mam, then there was this guy Thobile, he used to hit me whenever I didn't want to do anything and then I told my brother

Interviewer: What did your brother do to him?

Respondent: My brother hit him and told him to stay away from me, and he did. Today however I still see him and we greet each other whenever we see each other

Interviewer: So you're okay, you've left everything in the past?

Respondent: Yes, I remember he used to come to my house and hit me, where's that scratch, uhmmm its faded

This girl did not appear to be embarrassed about her boyfriend's violent behaviour and she was able to tell her brother about her partner's conduct. The brother helped her stop the violence, albeit by initiating violence himself. A key finding from the quantitative data was that participants in the SKILLZ Street Plus programme were more easily able to speak with

friends and family about violence in their lives after the programme had been completed. The vignette above reinforces that finding.

The respondent below tried to avoid her boyfriend's violent conduct by avoiding him:

Interviewer: Okay, so you've told me about your boyfriend that didn't want to wait for you. You've told me about that one, has there ever been one that shouted at you?

Respondent: Yes, he called me a bitch, a whore and that I'm worthless. He said that I did well that I didn't want to give him my virginity because that was all he was after.

Interviewer: And how did you deal with that afterwards?

Respondent: I didn't come to school for a week because I was so stressed, I didn't know what to do. When my mother asked me I didn't go to school, I faked my sickness because I had so much stress. I didn't know how to face that person because I was broken totally.

This girl dealt with the abuse that her boyfriend directed towards her by avoiding him and not attending school. Although this may not be a sustainable solution, the girl took action and tried to stop violence from occurring. A number of the participants in the study therefore explained that they were able to find ways of preventing or discontinuing violence that their boyfriends perpetrated. Some of the girls were able to leave abusive relationships or end them if it appeared that the boys were going to become sexually coercive. Other girls sought out the assistance of people like brothers and some participants were able to find ways of avoiding violence.

Who is to blame for the violence?

Although girls in the study were able to demonstrate healthy forms of agency and prevent violence in their lives, opinions were divided when it came to assessing who was at fault for young men's violent actions:

Respondent: [argues jokingly], they are both at the same school, should Ayanda do anything wrong, maybe the guy calls her and asks her where she is, should he stand there for too long maybe thirty minutes to an hour, when Ayanda pitches up she would get hit by Sihle. My friends have boyfriends that hit them and they enjoy it...they say it's nice because they have boyfriends that they are scared of even when left alone with another guy, they wouldn't be tempted

Interviewer: So whose fault is it then?

Respondent: Whose fault is it?

Interviewer: Yes

Respondent: It is the girls fault because as a girl, before you date a guy you need to know what kind of guy they are, you need to set some terms, tell them that as you date, they are not allowed to hit you, you listen to each other and they're not going to hit you as if they are your father, NO! You need to tell the guy before getting into the relationship.

This girl believed that some of her friends enjoyed being beaten by their boyfriends, that girls should not put themselves in situations that could lead to infidelities and that girls should be able to predict if their boyfriends were prone to violence. For all of these reasons this participant indicated that men's violent conduct was the fault of girls. Another respondent explained that:

Interviewer: Whose fault is it when men hit women?

Respondent: Sometimes, it happens to be the woman who causes the man to beat her because sometimes you might find that the person likes you and is trying to be faithful, but all you do is be busy with other people while he is trying to get your attention. But then, I don't think the man should lift a hand and hit a woman.

Interviewer: Yeah, so you think they should resolve it in a different way.

Respondent: Yes, in a different way with no violence.

Although this girl says that men shouldn't hit women, she indicated that girls should not be "busy with other people while he is trying to get your attention". This comment indicated that if men bestow their attention on young women, the girl is obliged to reciprocate this devotion. Like interviews with boys described in the next section, some female participants said that girls who "cheat" are at fault for provoking young men to become violent:

Interviewer i: Let's say a guy hits a girl, who is at fault?

Respondent: [laughs], a guy hits a girl? We don't know, because there are guys that hit girls because they don't like girls that cheat; maybe he'd caught the girl cheating and so as a means of punishment they would hit the girl

Interviewer: Who is then at fault?

Respondent: They are both at fault, why would you cheat when you know that you've got a boyfriend?

Interviewer: ...but then why hit the girl and not talk?

Respondent: [laughs] mam I don't know

As demonstrated above, in certain instances women were blamed for the choices they made, decisions that were interpreted as causing their male partners to become violent. Discussing problems is clearly perceived to be the ideal course of action to avoid violent interactions, however girls that are unfaithful are understood to be one of the main causes of IPV between young men and women. Some respondents blamed women for the clothes they wore, which they believed resulted in sexual assault by male partners:

Interviewer: So, whose fault is it when men try to kiss, touch and do things to women? Whose fault is it? And the woman doesn't want to, but the guy is continuing... whose fault is it?

Respondent: They guy, he must take it as a no.

Interviewer: And let's say the girl is wearing a short skirt? Whose fault is it?

Respondent: [LAUGHS] it's a tough one. Uhm.. I would say the girl.

Interviewer: Okay, why?

Respondent: They shouldn't wear short things, they should wear...

Interviewer: Below the knee?

Respondent: Yeah somewhere there.

Interviewer: So if it is too short, is she really inviting that?

Respondent: No, I wouldn't say that.

Interviewer: So are you saying then it's both of their faults? Or you still sticking with the girl?

Respondent: The girl.

Another respondent explained:

Interviewer: Okay what if a boy is touching a girl inappropriately, and the girl doesn't want to be touched, like trying to kiss her, whose is then at fault?

Girl: Err, it's the boys fault, he needs to listen to the girl when she says no; he needs to listen, when a girl says no it means no because ultimately she'll report him for sexual harassment, which is exactly what it is

Interviewer: Okay so let's say the girl is wearing a short skirt, who is then at fault?

Girl: Ah, it's the girls fault

Interviewer: Why?

Girl: Like why is she wearing a short skirt in the first place...

Some participants felt that men should not act violently towards women, but that women regularly provoked men to become sexually coercive through their behavior and the way they dressed. Women wearing short skirts and other 'revealing' outfits were deemed to be inciting sexual coercion. These girls had learnt that boys did not have the right to be violent or sexually abusive, but the notion that women should be free to express themselves regardless of male sexuality was not common amongst participants in the research.

One participant said:

Interviewer: Persevering and trying to work things out sometimes will get you into bad situation. Let's say the man is touching a woman and she doesn't want to be touched. Whose fault is that?

Respondent: Eish, it's the fault of the... So is it the man who is touching the woman and the woman doesn't want to be touched.

Interviewer: Yes.

Respondent: No, the woman must also understand maybe the man has gotten a chance to do it and there are no children around. Why doesn't the woman want that? Maybe, there is something else she is getting outside of the relationship

This participant said that women were responsible for allowing situations to emerge in which men could become sexually aggressive and that women should ensure that children are present at all times to interrupt and thus prevent male sexual advances. She questioned why women would allow themselves to be alone with their partners and whether they possibly held ulterior motives. Despite girls demonstrating a fair amount of agency to leave

violent partners, many young women therefore said that girls provoked violence through their actions and were at least partially culpable for the consequences.

Other respondents supported the belief that boys and young men were responsible for violent acts.

Interviewer: Okay, so let's say there are two people arguing and the guy hits the female, who is wrong?

Respondent: The guy

Interviewer: Why?

Respondent: He shouldn't hit her because men aren't supposed to hit women in the first place, he needs to talk to her properly like a civilized person, not treat her like an object

Interviewer: [laughs]

Respondent: No they shouldn't, he needs to talk to her properly

The word “civilized” is interesting above, steeped in colonial connotations. This term is used to show that boys that use violence are backward and barbaric, illustrating how some of these girls interpreted men’s violence as linked to outdated and poorly socialized masculinities. This girl also showed a mature understanding of gendered constructions, complaining that men should not objectify women through their abusive actions.

The findings therefore suggested that some girls did leave physically and emotionally abusive relationships and chose to be in relationships with greater levels of gender equity. The research did not clearly indicate what informed their choices to leave these unpleasant relationships. Possible explanations could involve beliefs in gender equitable relationships, self-efficacy, and/or self-protection. Based on interviews with girls who participated in SKILLZ Street Plus we cannot clearly point to the intervention as the reason for them choosing to leave violent relationships.

The girls’ responses to some issues related to gender-equity indicated that work still needs to be done to work with girls to explore how patriarchy impacts on their lives and shapes their assumptions. Many of the girls said that women were to blame for IPV, often citing the fact that girls are not faithful to their boyfriends, or that they dress in sexually provocative ways that lead to violence. Male infidelities were hardly mentioned or problematised in the research. The fact that many of these girls justified men’s violent behaviour requires further reflection in terms of the SKILLZ Street Plus programme.

The findings also indicated that pursuing gender equitable relationships is filled with contradictions and nuances. Choosing a gender equitable relationship is not only about avoiding or minimising violence, it also relates to the materiality of relationships as structured through masculinities and femininities which means that men are traditionally the breadwinner and women are receptive of money and gifts, for example, the contemporary phenomenon of “blessers”.

With regards to sexuality, women and girls are generally positioned as needing to fulfil men’s sexual desires, whilst they repress their own and it was stated that women should reciprocate attention when men dote on them. The findings indicate that there is still a large investment by girls in the hetero-patriarchal order that positions women as responsible for men’s sexual arousal, and sometimes, for men’s use of violence.

Was the project able to strengthen the network of female coaches that are working to address gender-based violence and promote gender equality?

The coaches that participated in the research did not believe that a strong network of coaches existed:

Interviewer: Has GRS made a network of coaches that have contact with each other?

Respondent: No. Not all of them. Like one or two or three like we still in contact. Some others, last time I saw them was 2012?

Interviewer: So there aren’t events or things where you...?

Respondent 2: I also think maybe they should create a facebook page, for coaches in 2010 to connect with coaches from 2014. Ok I’ve worked with her (points to another coach), nhe and our experiences are different like we get to connect with them and learn about what they did. It gets more exciting.

The coaches that participated in the research focus group began working at GRS at different times: one started in 2010, one in 2011 and four became employed at the organisation in 2014. The coaches felt that a stronger network may have existed previously, but that it was currently weak. Suggestions made to strengthen the network included using social media to create a more connected community and GRS organizing outings for coaches to attend and develop stronger relationships amongst themselves.

The disconnection that the coaches felt from one another extended to their experience of relations between themselves and GRS. Some coaches felt isolated in their work and

experienced a lack of support with regard to programme delivery. In the section on programme implementation it was apparent that coaches took strain in recruiting learners and that they desired more support from GRS staff and school personnel. One coach said further that:

“We get told Monday 7pm you need to arrive at this time, the point person is. They should take it to the 2010/2011 process when they took 2 coaches to the school for the whole day. They play with the kids, ask questions, get crazy, they know what is GRS, then when the coaches come they can approach the coaches. Right now if we approach the girls at assembly, at 8:45, class at 9, then you address the girls around the boys, when we went to Protea Glen secondary school, we had to walk class to class, recruit the girls, tell them what we was talking about and the boys laughed. It wasn’t really funny but the boys laughed. We were talking about rape. And when we started talking about periods yhhhoooo they laughed and they made the girls feel inferior. I think the strategy of which they recruit girls needs to change.”

In our observations at the schools we clearly saw that coaches exist in an intermediary position, perceived by learners to occupy a role somewhere between adolescence and adulthood. This uniquely positions the coaches as both an older mentor able to relate to adolescents’ sexual and social challenges, but also as an individual armed with resources to guide in that process. However, in the recruitment process this intermediary position can function as a disadvantage, as learners do not treat coaches with the level of respect and authority that they extend to adults. It is therefore recommended that GRS staff and educators aid in this endeavour. It should be kept in mind that coaches also felt that teachers treated them differently to GRS staff:

“When the staff goes and when the coaches go it’s a different story. For us we have a hard time with the teachers.”

Building relationships with schools can help to facilitate better bonds between coaches and teachers, enabling coaches to work more effectively on-site and alleviating some of the pressure that coaches felt to meet the targets set by GRS:

Interviewer: What targets?

Respondent: Oooh. Eish. (Groans) We are supposed to reach targets, the number of participants that are supposed to graduate at the end of the programme. It gives a lot of pressure. You just focus on the target now and the content slips away

The pressure to meet outcomes targets clearly impacted on the coaches’ overall mindset at the schools and their ability to deliver the programme. Accountability to funders and the

resources invested in the programme mean that these outcomes targets need to be an integral component of the work coaches perform. However, greater support from teachers and GRS staff, at the schools, may well alleviate some of the pressure that coaches feel in meeting these goals.

The coaches also expressed that they found it difficult to raise issues of concern, for fear of being labeled as “complainers” and they reported that in the past negative feedback was not well-received by GRS:

“Even if you try and follow up and find out why didn’t this change then it looks like you’re a bad person.”

The coaches’ perception that they were not adequately supported was exacerbated by the fact that the group felt that GRS was not sufficiently invested in their personal and professional development trajectories and aspirations:

“Having a plan...after serving your third year we take you...cause now after GRS we studying again...looking for a job again. From scratch.”

Some coaches struggled to find work or continue on the professional development path initiated by their time at GRS, when their two-year stint ended. Part of the reason for this is the tough economic climate both locally and internationally. Participants said that they did not feel prioritized when employment positions became available and that the posts are generally advertised without first consulting coaches already working with GRS. For example:

“And maybe to update us, for example one of the coaches are not working and we feel that...a page could update coaches, if there’s a post available coaches should be the first ones they think of rather than advertising it outside, so having a facebook page to make those kinds of connections. And inviting coaches to events they have.”

It is obviously not possible for GRS to employ all of the coaches on long term contracts. GRS management probably know better than others if a coach shows promise and would be able to excel in positions of employment. However, the fact that coaches expressed this view means that, to some degree, they feel a lack of care, guidance and loyalty from GRS, something which could be explored with the aim of improvement. These young women feel vulnerable in the difficult socio-economic context in which they live, as they negotiate their livelihoods and futures and they believed that GRS could be more supportive with their individual developmental trajectories.

To sum up, coaches believed that the network of coaches could be improved through social media platforms that link coaches together and excursions or team building/appreciation

sessions. The lack of a solid network may have contributed to coaches' perceptions that they are not adequately supported at the schools, with recruitment of learners. The coaches that participated in the research also felt that GRS did not sufficiently support their professional development.

Did the programme improve gender equitable attitudes of young men?

Introduction

Research with young men who participated in the *Generation SKILLZ* programme yielded three related and somewhat paradoxical findings. Boys appreciated the relationships they developed with coaches, which enabled them to speak about sensitive emotional issues. Many of the young men demonstrated impressive gender equitable attitudes and they stated that men should not act violently towards women. At the same time, boys said that gender based violence was the fault of women, as it was usually caused by female infidelities. These paradoxical attitudes are explored further in this section.

Mentors enabled boys to talk about sensitive issues

The majority of male participants spoke about the benefits associated with having access to a coach mentor, which allowed them to talk about sensitive issues:

Interviewer: Okay, is there anything that stood out for you in Grassroots, like your most significant moment. Something that you remember and that you'll never forget, just one.

Respondent: There was this other coach... It's as if that coach could see I was not feeling okay that day. After asking me to the side, this coach asked me to talk to them and them what was wrong. I told him there is a family feud between my uncle and my mother. They were people that kept fighting and that to my uncle committing suicide because they were always fighting. Now, that day, I was thinking about that and the Grassroot Soccer coach told me that I must try look past these things and then that build a bond between us. We would often just get together to talk...he was like a brother... he was the first people I told about such things about me.

Coaches provided the participants with a confidante with whom to unburden emotional troubles experienced in their lives. Family conflict and the loss of a relative were some of the issues that this young man said he discussed with his coach. He added that this was the first time that he had spoken about these issues that were clearly distressing him. The coach had inquired as to why he was unhappy, something which it is unlikely that many people, other than parents, do for boys in Soweto. Parents are often inappropriate as confidantes

because they are regularly implicated in young people's challenges. The coaches therefore occupied a unique position as older peers, intermediaries between youth and adulthood, people who could listen to these young men and give them advice.

Another young man described the coaches as similar to siblings:

Respondent: I think they were comfortable. I am one of them I didn't feel threatened or shy. The guys who were here were really humble and we felt they could communicate with us to an extent that they became my brothers and sisters and I can tell them anything. I asked them a lot of questions. Truly speaking I felt comfortable with them because they really knew how to communicate with teenagers. That's one of the best weapons I've seen in them because we can really communicate, they can talk to us and they were humble and nice

Key words that stand out from this description are "humble", "communication" and not feeling "threatened". It was clear that the coaches were able to delve into extremely sensitive topics in a way that did not make youth feel uncomfortable or insecure and that this was based on healthy forms of dialogue and discussion. The word "humble" is interesting and seems to allude to a difference between the coaches and other adults, the latter being seen as somewhat aloof and inaccessible to learners.

Besides providing the young men with a space to discuss important issues, coaches also provided boys with advice on how to deal with challenges that they faced:

Respondent: I really liked it because it was very beneficial in my life. Especially the word of advice given by the people who....uhm what are they called?

Interviewer: Coaches?

Another boy described the value of the coaches as follows:

Respondent: they understand how children are, we listen when we first see them and we respect them.

Coaches clearly formed authentic, meaningful relationships with participants, enabling them to generate insight into their own needs and pressing issues. This relationship allowed young men to develop socio-emotional identities and engage in deep self-reflection:

Respondent: it was nice because they encouraged me and I learnt many things I didn't know like how to love yourself

It is unusual to hear adolescent men speak about "loving themselves" in this manner and it is an admirable outcome of the project that such a response was elicited from this participant. A considerable achievement of the programme was that is provided young men with emotional support and a trusted older peer with whom to discuss issues that concerned these young men.

Gender equitable attitudes

Young men in the study demonstrated an impressive range of gender equitable attitudes in the focus groups and individual interviews. Consider the following from a focus group:

Interviewer: So how's a relationship supposed to be?

Respondent 1: It's supposed to be a mutual engagement, care and understand one another.

Respondent 2 : When a girl tells you that she is not ready you supposed to be patient with her if you really love her.

Respondent 3: You must be close to one another communicate about your desires and fears and help one another.

Respondent 4: A relationship is not just about sex, there are many ways one can do to have a healthy and happy relationship without sex.

Respondent 5: A relationship is when two hearts combine and beat as one heart, understanding ones partner.

This interchange, involving five focus group participants, reads like a Psychology textbook description for healthy relationships, with the participants endorsing reciprocal trust, care and partners being attentive to one another. These were described as integral components of these young men's ideal type relationship. According to these young men interactions between romantic partners should involve honest communication. Physical intimacy need not be a prerequisite to a good relationship, sex should be negotiated and should only occur if both partners are ready to participate in this activity. The final comment, filled with poetic romance, illustrated that for this young man a consolidated union, one based on mutual understanding and inter-dependence, was desirable. Taken together these utterances demonstrate remarkably advanced gender equitable attitudes, something which it is likely they acquired from the GRS programme.

Another young man said what he learnt from the programme was the following:

I learnt to treat everyone fairly, with respect ma'am and not to discourage each other and everyone has a right Ma'am.

This participant linked his attitudes supporting gender equality directly to *Generation SKILLZ*, stating that the programme taught him the benefits of being impartial in dealings with others, respect for human rights and that it is important to affirm people rather than to belittle them. One boy extended these egalitarian attitudes to financial transactions:

In my relationship I normally don't do that because she'll have a tendency of me providing for her and that if she don't get anything from that relationship then...I once asked her do you love me or what I have? So she told me that she loved and I said look if I don't buy you anything it doesn't mean I don't want you it's because I'm trying to balance things. Sometimes when we walk past tuck shops selling snacks and ice cream, even though I have money I don't buy them because she'll think every time she's with me she must get something. I can even spend a month without buying anything

This young man broke with Soweto cultural courting conventions, declaring that it is better, for a relationship, to avoid a transactional dynamic of a male partner purchasing gifts for his girlfriend, as this may become a precedent or basis for future interactions and their relationship more generally.

Some of the boys affirmed girls as soccer playing equals:

Yes it's good because it will represent their own strength that girls can play soccer like Banyana Banyana and they'll try harder to become professional soccer players. They must because it's good for their health not just focus on smoking drugs

The respondent stated that girls playing soccer and striving for a professional soccer career was a positive phenomenon. Banyana Banyana is named as a group of role models for young women and for himself, implying that professional women soccer players were examples of people that he respected. Another participant admitted to having a girlfriend who was more skilful on the soccer field than himself. Girls playing soccer is not normally encouraged in Soweto, so it is likely that the GRS programme changed some of these perceptions for young men in the project. Despite these impressive attitudes towards gender equality, boys still said that although violence between men and women was wrong, it was usually a result of women's behaviour.

Violence towards women

In the interviews and focus groups, most of the respondents explained violence in their neighbourhood as the result of women's infidelities, for example:

"they're blaming each other but most I think it's the women (at fault) because they cheat on men and men don't like that"

A paradox existed in the data: the overwhelming majority of young male participants stated that violence towards women was wrong, but explained the cause of violence between men and women as due to women's infidelities. Men were therefore deemed to be behaving badly, but were not culpable for this bad behaviour:

Interviewer: *Okay, whose fault is it then, especially when a boy hits a girl?*

Respondent : It's usually the fault of the girl. What the guy needs to understand that before he hits her, they are able to talk to each other about the things whatever situation he might not like. There is no need for him to hit her.

Interviewer: *So, is it still the fault of the girl? Why?*

Respondent: It's still the fault of the girl because you'll find that even though she's dating someone, she is cheating on him. I would say that...

Interviewer: *Is it always about cheating?*

Respondent: It's different, but you'll find that she is making a fool of the person she is dating and the other person she is seeing. She giving this new person the love she should be giving to her boyfriend. So, basically the boyfriend is being made a fool of via dating. The new guy may be giving her money, which is what would probably make her cheat on her boyfriend.

In this description, despite the interviewer's persistent questioning regarding the logic of who is to blame, the respondent maintained that while the woman is at fault, the 'guy' shouldn't hit her and that they should rather solve the problem through dialogue. In the story that he describes, the manipulative fictitious woman wants both the love of her boyfriend and the gifts of a "blesser", which ultimately causes the man's violent behaviour. The interviewee implies that the man should not hit the woman, but if he does, he is not to blame for his actions, because he is being humiliated and made to feel foolish. Others said that men were to blame, but their descriptions of typical vignettes indicated, similarly, that it was actually the behaviour of the woman which was ultimately causing the trouble:

Respondent: I think a guy has to be blamed. When you're a guy you're not supposed to hit a girl. Because a guy has pride and dignity. I don't know about this situation...maybe a guy is in a serious relationship with this girl and he wants to take their relationship to another level and this girl would be no, "I am only here for the money and nothing else". Those kinds of guys get upset because they're made fools out of...that lead to violence

Violent conduct towards women was explained as almost always caused by unfaithful incidents that threatened men's honour and inflicted shame. The example above begins, like the previous one, by stating that men should not behave violently. However, the characters described in the story include a male who is serious, faithful and committed to the relationship, while the woman is devious and self-interested. Again the participant says that it is wrong to hit a woman, but the story implies that it is understandable considering the "pride and dignity" that have been taken from the man and the "foolishness" he is made to suffer. Men's pride and respect from other men appeared to be the main justification for violence:

“Yes, so for example if my friend is dating this girl... I might to tell him that this girl is actually cheating on you and you have never cheated on her. What happens is that the guy will often hit the girl as if he was the one who saw her cheating on him. Personally, I can’t hit a woman.”

This story is somewhat confusing, but it seems as if the most important reason for the ensuing violence is that public information exists, whether true or not, that leads the “guy” to believe that he has been shamed. This is described as a typical story because “what happens is that the guy will **often** hit the girl”, in other words violence regularly occurs in this manner. The fact that others believe that the woman has been unfaithful results in male shame, meaning that violence is inevitable. The participant stated that violence is not a course of action that he would pursue, but it might be interpreted that he is justifying, or at the very least explaining the logic underpinning the actions of other men. In the following description the woman is said to be at fault for not walking away:

Respondent: It’s her fault Ma’am.

Interviewer: Which one. The one who is doing the hitting or the one being hit?

Respondent: The one being hit.

Interviewer: Why is it their fault?

Respondent: They should have avoided it and left.

Interviewer: So was there no other way of them resolving that?

Respondent: No, Ma’am there is. They could have spoken or communicated properly.

This participant believed that the woman should both have “avoided it and left” and “spoken or communicated properly”. However, she would surely have had to stay in order to speak and communicate properly. If she walked away they would not have been able to resolve the conflict through dialogue and yet, in the eyes of the respondent, she is at fault for remaining in the exchange that leads to violence.

How do we explain these paradoxical opinions that men shouldn’t hit women, but if they do so it is generally the women’s fault? One reason could be that through programmes like Generation SKILLZ they develop attitudes and gain knowledge that violence is wrong, but the deeper, embedded gendered values and masculine fragilities related to shame are left unresolved. Another explanation could be that while these boys demonstrated some

impressive gender equitable attitudes, in certain domains of gender relations, such as faithfulness and who is allowed to be unfaithful, gender and sex based prejudices endured. Further research is needed to probe the position of young men and the reasons for this apparent contradiction. These boys' experiences fit into the realm of South African studies on masculinities that position South African men in this ambiguous space (Moolman, 2013). On the one hand there have been great strides in gender equality through policy and legislation in the country, yet on the other hand the high incidences of violence against women persist.

To sum up, research with young men who had participated in the *Generation SKILLZ* programme illuminated that these boys greatly appreciated the space peer mentors provided them to speak about socio-emotional issues. Some of these boys demonstrated openness and impressive gender equitable attitudes. While these young men stated that violence towards women was wrong, many pinpointed women's infidelities as the root cause of gender-based violence, rather than shortcomings associated with men themselves.

Improved access to services for care

Awareness about the services available around VAW		
Services	Baseline	Endline
Are you aware of services available to you where you can go and report violence? <i>(yes)</i>	81.5	91.1
Are you aware of the Thuthuzela Care Centres (TCC)? <i>(yes)</i>	32.9	84.2
I know where to get support services for rape. <i>(true)</i>	84.2	96.6
I have the right to say no to sex, no matter who asks me. <i>(true)</i>	92.5	96.6
If rape or sexual abuse happens, then it is important to file a police report. <i>(agree)</i>	94.5	98.6
If rape or sexual abuse has happened in the past, then it can still be reported to the police. <i>(agree)</i>	89.7	91.1

The table above represents data from pre and post-test survey questionnaires administered to girls in the SKILLZ Street Plus programme. The item that demonstrates a substantial increase is participants' knowledge of the Thuthuzela Care Centres, which rose from 32.9% before the intervention to 84.2% at the time of the endline questionnaire. Thuthuzela Care Centres provide a range of services for victims of sexual violence and associated STIs. The fact that a sizeable increase occurred in the number of young women who became aware of these centres, is a great achievement of the programme.

In interviews and focus groups conducted as part of this evaluation, participants generally knew where the local clinics were located and what kinds of services they provided:

Interviewer: So you Noloyiso need to go for counselling but where in this community would you go?

Respondent: zone 6 or zone 3 at the clinic

Interviewer: so there's a clinic that will help boys and girls your age with condoms and pills?

Respondent: yes

Interviewer: is the counselling and HIV testing?

Respondent: yes

These focus group participants were aware of the location of local clinics in this part of Soweto and they said that they knew that medication, counselling and HIV testing were available at these sites. Participants also held strong opinions regarding the quality of service at these different venues:

Respondent: Yes, Diepkloof Clinic. It's near for everyone, but then sometimes people from Zone six go to Barra because it is the hotel near to them.

Interviewer: Okay, which is better do you think?

Respondent: I think Diepkloof Clinic is better because the nurses at Barra, they are so rude. They can't treat patients, so even if you are a patient and you go there for help you'll even doubt if they will give you the correct medicine or the correct treatment that you need so you are going to doubt that this person might give me the right things and I might end up...

Interviewer: Even as a young person, Diepkloof is better?

Respondent: Yes.

Interviewer: Okay, so hmmm... do you use these services if you have a problem or do you advise people to go to these places if they have a problem.

Respondent: Not people older than me, but people my age... we do talk and sometimes a person or one of my friends tell me this and this is happening and I don't know, I'm starting to be scared.

Participants knew about the different health services in their residential neighbourhoods and they had formed definite opinions on personnel at these institutions. It is unclear whether the girls' opinions were based on rumours in the community, or if they had actually had much personal experience at these places, but it seemed evident that public perceptions with regard to the different institutions certainly existed and were influential. The girls said that nurses at many of the local clinics and hospitals were rude and judgmental in their interactions with patients:

Respondent 3: same applies to nurses if you go to the clinic and you tell them you want to prevent they would ask why you are having sex at this age

Respondent 4: that's why there's teenage pregnancy because they're very rude. Yes they talk about abstinence but it's not always possible. I'm still a virgin but I am not going to say I've never thought twice because there was a time when I thought I met the right guy and then I went to the clinic and get some counselling because I wanted to be sure that I am ready and that lady asked me my age I told her I am 16 and she started shouting at me and saying why am I being so forward and that's when I said I've had it with nurses I told her that she should help e and not judge me so that I can make the right choices and not fall pregnant or get infected with HIV

Respondent 2: yes and when you go back to the clinic pregnant they'll say look at her she's pregnant

Respondent 4: I told her teenage pregnancy is your fault because right now I am here to try and prevent and get condoms if I come back here pregnant it's your fault then she got angry and sent me to another nurse and I was helped so I said no I don't think I want to go through that yet

Many of the participants complained about the quality of care administered by nurses and similar attitudes existed for the police when incidents of violence were reported at law enforcement stations. While the evaluation showed that young people who had participated in the programme demonstrated excellent knowledge of services for intimate partner violence and HIV/AIDS, young women are unlikely to use these services if they believe that personnel are unpleasant and insensitive. Developing connections between the school-based programme and staff at public health facilities may begin to address some of these issues.

SECTION 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SKILLZ Street Plus is a well-organized and efficient programme that appears to be enjoyed by its participants. Young people reap a number of benefits from being part of this initiative. Quantitative analysis showed that the girls' and boys' knowledge of risks for HIV/AIDS and IPV improved substantially through participating in the SKILLZ Street Plus and Generation SKILLZ programmes. The other noteworthy benefit was that girls reported that they talked to family members and friends more frequently about sensitive gender-related issues after graduating from SSP.

As stated at the beginning of this report and reiterated in the literature review, gendered relations are deeply embedded in South African society, intersecting with race, class and sexuality, amongst other aspects of identity. Making a larger, systemic impact on gendered practices therefore requires that organisations work more closely with other institutions that form the bedrock of South African society, including schools, clinics and community based organisations. Suggestions for improving the programme are made with this challenge in mind. Recommendations for improvement are described for each of the components of the evaluation, including programme implementation, outcomes of the SSP programme, benefits for boys participating in Generation SKILLZ, strengthening the network of female coaches and knowledge/access to services for HIV and IPV.

In terms of the programme implementation, better relationships with schools could be developed through identifying an educator to champion (not just a point person) the project at each school, an individual who believes in the approach and values of the programme. Such a person would aid in programme delivery and research tasks, but would also help to cement the programme in the school, such that it is not an "add-on" but an integral component of school operations. Having an educator champion on-site would facilitate the recruitment of learners from the school and help coaches to feel less isolated as they try to recruit learners to the programme. Part of this process could involve training with groups of teachers from the different schools, sharing the approach and gaining buy-in from staff. While it may take time to develop these kinds of relationships and educators are often loathe to give of their time in an already over-burdened system, this could be facilitated by district officials from the education department, as part of Life Orientation district training/support. Embedding the programme in schools also requires that GRS gain approval from- and work more closely with- school leadership, including the SMTs.

A number of girls described impressive decisions to terminate relationships when men pressurized them to have sex, or if they suspected that their partners were being unfaithful. Many boys who had participated in Generation SKILLZ exemplified gender equality in their

attitudes towards women. However, both boys and girls believed that violence was the fault of girls who cheated on their boyfriends. This finding indicates that some of the lessons learned by participants may be slightly superficial, as they understand that violence is wrong, but it is understood to be wrong unless there is some justification for the violence.

These attitudes are problematic on a number of levels. Empirical research would almost certainly show that boys are unfaithful at least as regularly as girls and yet that is never problematized. This inconsistency highlights continued gender inequality. Girls were portrayed as sexually manipulative, self-serving individuals who exploit their male counterparts. These attitudes amongst young Sowetans illustrate how deeply gender-based norms and values become entrenched in local communities. Even if girls are unfaithful (and it is highly unlikely that they cheat on their partners more frequently than boys and men), violence is not a helpful problem-solving technique. An initial solution could be to include a session on infidelities, “who cheats” and what are appropriate ways of dealing with partners being unfaithful. Perhaps some crossover information between different genders also needs to be included in the sessions. For example, in the girls only programme, more information and different insights on the socialization of boys (masculinities), could be used to challenge boys’ behaviours. Similarly, for the boys, knowledge could be disseminated that helps them to understand that girls are socialized to behave in particular ways, such as being submissive, but that it is not mandatory for girls to act in that way.

In observing SKILLZ Street Plus in action at the schools we noticed coaches regularly reciting scripted lessons and looking for pre-decided answers to aspects of intimate partner violence and HIV/AIDS prevention. The “kilo-culture” added to this pedagogical practice of following a pre-determined script. It appears as if this is both one of the strengths and weaknesses of the programme: it ensures that young people gain vital knowledge regarding immense social problems, invaluable information that clearly buttresses personal health. Simultaneously, it creates an atmosphere where learning is based on prescribed correct and incorrect answers rather than personal exploration of difficult socio-emotional challenges. While it is obviously desirable for young people, coaches and learners to gain this information, a balance should be strived for and an environment established in which it is okay to make mistakes and to learn from these. This is essential because, ultimately, the programme is as much about young men and women reflecting on their personal health, choices and developing self-esteem and a sense of self-worth, as it is about gaining information from others about relationships and reproductive health.

Slight changes to the curriculum could aid in this endeavour. Additional “breathing space” could be inserted into the curriculum, opening up more time for reflection and allowing participants to raise issues of concern. One of the most innovative and effective components of the programme is the coach as a peer mentor. Providing more time for girls to seek assistance and advice from coaches and to allow coaches to guide them with socio-emotional challenges, would facilitate further benefits for participants. We have also suggested deepening the focus on gender and sexuality, and ensuring that gender is integrated throughout the course of the curriculum, rather than as a standalone session

In the focus group discussion coaches made suggestions as to how the network of coaches could be strengthened. These included creating social media groups or platforms that link coaches to one another and outings that bring coaches together and demonstrate gratitude towards this group. Coaches said that they required support in the recruitment of learners, something which a supportive educator could facilitate in collaboration with GRS staff. The group also requested additional support from GRS for their continued professional development. GRS could think about a range of options in this regard, for example partnerships with government, tertiary institutions (especially FET colleges), SETAs and the private sector, to provide coaches with further assistance as they exit the programme.

While the evaluation showed that young people who had participated in the SSP demonstrated excellent knowledge of services for intimate partner violence and HIV/AIDS, many of the participants complained about the quality of care administered by nurses. Similar attitudes existed for the police, when incidents of violence were reported at law enforcement stations. Young women are unlikely to use services if they believe that personnel are rude and insensitive. Developing connections between the school-based programme and staff at public health and law enforcement facilities may begin to address some of these issues.

One of the main recommendations of this evaluation is therefore that GRS should strive to develop its relationships with other institutions and organisations, including schools, clinics, police and NGOs. This raises new challenges regarding how to conduct these kinds of activities while simultaneously demonstrating efficacy and impact to funders, in order to ensure the sustainability of the programme. However, because gender inequalities are embedded in and reproduced through societal structures, serious challenges to patriarchal systems also need to engage beyond the level of individual people, if systematic impact is to be achieved.

References

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. 2012. Thematic analysis. In H. Cooper, P. M. Camic, D. L. Long, A. T. Panter, D. Rindskopf and K. J. Sher (eds.), *APA handbook of research methods in psychology II: Research designs*, (pp. 57-71). American Psychological Association, Washington DC.
- Butler, A. H., Alpaslan, A. H., Strumpher, J., & Astbury, G. 2003. Gay and lesbian youth experiences of homophobia in South African secondary education. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Issues in Education*, 1(2), 3–28.
- Gevers, A. and Flisher, A.J. 2012. School-based youth violence prevention interventions. *Youth Violence: Sources and Solutions in South Africa*, pp.175-211.
- Glaser, Clive. 2005. "Managing the sexuality of urban youth: Johannesburg, 1920s-1960s." *The International journal of African historical studies* 38.2, 301-327.
- Gqola, P. 2012. Women's sexuality and pornography. *Agenda: Empowering Women for Gender Equity*, (93).
- Jewkes, R. and Abrahams, N., 2002. The epidemiology of rape and sexual coercion in South Africa: an overview. *Social science & medicine*, 55(7), pp.1231-1244.
- Jewkes, R., Vundule, C., Maforah, F. and Jordaan, E. 2001. Relationship dynamics and teenage pregnancy in South Africa. *Social science & medicine*, 52(5), pp.733-744.
- Jewkes, R., Sikweyiya, Y., Morrell, R. and Dunkle, K. 2011. The relationship between intimate partner violence, rape and HIV amongst South African men: a cross-sectional study. *PLoS One*, 6(9), p.e24256.
- Jick, T.D. 1979. Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: Triangulation in action. *Administrative science quarterly*, 24(4), pp.602-611.
- Mager AK. 1999. Gender and the making of a South African Bantustan: a social history of the Ciskei, 1945–1959. Cape Town: David Philip.
- Matzopoulos R., Bowman B., Mathews S., & Myers J. 2010. Applying upstream interventions for interpersonal violence prevention: An uphill struggle in low- to middle-income contexts. *Health Policy*, 97(1), 62-70.
- McHugh, M.C. and Frieze, I.H., 2006. Intimate partner violence. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1087(1), pp.121-141.

Moletsane, R. 2010. *Gender review in South African basic education*. Pretoria: Department of Basic Education and UNICEF.

Moolman, B. 2013. Rethinking 'masculinities in transition' in South Africa considering the 'intersectionality' of race, class, and sexuality with gender. *African Identities*, 11(1), pp.93-105.

Msibi, T., 2012. 'I'm used to it now': experiences of homophobia among queer youth in South African township schools. *Gender and Education*, 24(5), pp.515-533.

Ratele, K. 2016. *Liberating masculinities*. Cape Town, HSRC Press.

Reddy, S.P., James, S., Sewpaul, R., Koopman, F., Funani, N.I., Sifunda, S., Josie, J., Masuka, P., Kambaran, N.S. and Omardien, R.G. 2010. Umthente uhlaba usamila-the 2nd south African national youth risk behaviour survey 2008. *Cape Town: South African Medical Research Council*.

Russell, M., Cupp, P.K., Jewkes, R.K., Gevers, A., Mathews, C., LeFleur-Bellerose, C. and Small, J. 2014. Intimate partner violence among adolescents in Cape Town, South Africa. *Prevention Science*, 15(3), pp.283-295.

Shamu, S., Gevers, A., Mahlangu, B.P., Shai, P.N.J., Chirwa, E.D. and Jewkes, R.K. 2015. Prevalence and risk factors for intimate partner violence among Grade 8 learners in urban South Africa: baseline analysis from the Skhokho Supporting Success cluster randomised controlled trial. *International health*, p.ihv068.

Wood, K., Lambert, H. and Jewkes, R. 2008. "Injuries are beyond love": Physical violence in young South Africans' sexual relationships. *Medical anthropology*, 27(1), pp.43-69.

Appendices

Appendix A: Focus group discussion guide

BEFORE THE DISCUSSION BEGINS:

Thank participants for agreeing to be interviewed.

Check consent forms for interviewing and recording are understood and signed.

AGREE TO GROUP RULES: *These rules to be printed out and given to each participant*

Group/shared confidentiality: As participants, we will not speak about information that we have learnt about other participants outside of this session;

We acknowledge that we will be talking about sex, sexuality and violence and people may have different responses to this and views about this. We will respect peoples' differing views, which includes listening to and trying to understand those views, even if we don't agree with them; We will allow each person the space to speak.

Any other ground rules that participants would like to propose?

Restate why we have asked to interview them:

You are experts on the ways of doing things in your community and school. We want to hear about these from you.

We will not be asking you to share personal details, but rather asking you to talk about your understandings of these issues in general. You are free to express personal matters if you wish to and should you feel comfortable to in the group.

DISCUSSION GUIDE

We will start by reading some short stories and asking your input on them. In some cases we will ask you to carry on the story, telling us how you think it continues.

Vignette

Noloyiso is in high school and has been dating Xolani for 3 months. Xolani has left school and is working. Xolani says that he loves Noloyiso and helps her by giving her money for things she needs.

What happens next in this story? Why?

What is Noloyiso's and Xolani's relationship like?

Xolani has said to Noloyiso that it is time for them to "take their relationship to the next level". He says, "Having sex will make our love deeper". Noloyiso is curious about sex and she is in love with Xolani, but she is nervous. She has heard that sex is painful and she is scared she could get pregnant. She also worries that Xolani might be having sex with other people.

In your experience of relationships between young men and women, what would Noloyiso's response to Xolani be?

Is Noloyisa right to be worried about Xolani? Why?

One night Xolani and Noloyiso go to his house. Her parents do not know she is there. They have both been drinking alcohol and start kissing. Xolani tells Noloyiso that he wants to have sex. She says, "I'm not sure. I don't feel ready. Maybe we should wait a bit longer?" Xolani gets angry and asks, "Why did you come home with me if you didn't want to have sex with me? You are behaving like a child!"

What happens next? Why?

What does this exchange say about Noloyiso's and Xolani's relationship?

He slaps her face and she starts to cry. Noloyiso starts to pack up her things, but Xolani kicks her and shouts, "Tease! I will leave you if keep being a cheeky gold digger. You are playing with me!" Noloyiso is scared and does not want Xolani to leave her or believe that she is using him.

Is Xolani right to expect sex from Noloyiso? If so, why?

Is Noloyiso right to worry about Xolani thinking she is using him?

Noloyiso has sex with Xolani, but she is also scared to ask him to use a condom. Maybe he will think she is sleeping with other guys.

Is the reason Noloyiso does not ask Xolani to use a condom valid?

What would happen if Noloyiso did ask Xolani to use a condom?

Why is it that Xolani did not initiate using a condom himself?

After this incident Noloyiso is upset and tells her friend what happened. The friend says, "Noloyiso you are making a big deal out of this. You know that's what guys are like when they are drunk and turned on. You'd better keep him happy girl, or he'll get it somewhere else and dump you!" She advises Noloyiso to keep quiet about what happened, because she will get into trouble for being at Xolani's house without permission. Noloyiso thinks about telling the L.O. teacher, but she is a friend of her parents.

What do you think of the friend's advice? Do you agree with her?

What advice would you give Noloyiso if you were her friend? What would you say to Xolani?

General questions

1. We have made up a story together now. Are you aware of similar kinds of things happening in your community or school?
2. What rights should young women have in relationships? [probe regarding initiating or saying no to sex]
3. What rights should young men have in relationships?
4. What other kinds of violence do young women and men experience in your community and school? [probe: sexual violence, physical violence]
5. Where does this violence mostly take place?

6. Who are the main perpetrators and who are the main victims of violence? [probe: if not mentioned ask: what about incidents against people who do not conform to ideas of how a man or woman should be, or who likes to have sex with a same sex partner]
7. Who is to blame for sexual harassment between a man and woman? Why?
8. What actions are people who are the victims of violence able to take?
9. Are people who have experienced unwanted sex able to report it? What happens when they do?
10. Do friends generally help friends who are being hurt or controlled by their boyfriend or girlfriend? How?
11. Are young women in your community able to speak up for their rights?
12. Can lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender people in your community speak up for their rights?
13. Do your teachers and school help? How? [Probe to see if teachers are ever perpetrators?]
14. Has the SKILLZ Street Plus soccer programme helped you?
15. Is playing soccer good for young women?

Appendix B: Individual interview guide

1. Do most of the people in your grade have girlfriends/boyfriends?
2. What does it mean when somebody has a girlfriend/boyfriend?
3. What is the difference between a relationship and something casual?
4. How do relationships 'happen' for people of your age?
5. What do you want in a partner?
6. How do you/would you go about finding someone you would want to be in a relationship with?
7. Do any of you want to share stories about your boyfriend/girlfriend?
8. Tell me a story about a really great relationship
9. Tell me a story about a bad relationship
10. What things would you want to tell your boyfriend/girlfriend are important to you in a relationship?
11. Have you ever been able to tell a boyfriend/girlfriend about these things you think are important?
12. Does s/he honour these things
13. Can girls your age tell their boyfriends if you don't want to have sex? Why/not? Stories?
14. Does your boyfriend ever shout at you? When, where, for what reason?
15. Do boys your age hit girls they're in a relationship with? When, where, for what reason? Stories?
16. Are there times when you feel that you are treated differently/unfairly because you are a girl?
17. What do you do when these things happen
18. Whose fault is it when men hit women?
19. Whose fault is it when men try to kiss, touch or have sex with women who don't want to do these things?
20. Why do you say so?
21. Are there things that you have learnt in the SKILLZ Street Plus programme that you can tell other people about? Which things? Which people? Stories of sharing information and what happened?
22. What do people in this community do if they have been beaten or need to have an HIV test?
23. Do you guys use these services/ go to these places if you have a problem? Why/not?
24. What do you like about being part of a soccer team?
25. What do you like about your relationship with your coach?
26. How have your coach and soccer team helped you in your life?
27. Do you think playing soccer is good for you? Why?

28. What have you learnt from the soccer programme? Are there things you think differently about or ways that you act that are different since you started the soccer programme?
29. What are the biggest problems facing young women in your school/community?
30. How do they deal with these problems?

Appendix C: Observation schedule for rapid ethnographies:

1. Does the session start on time?
2. Are all of the learners present?
3. How would you describe the quality of the communication between coaches and learners?
4. Are instructions clear and do learners appear to understand what is said?
5. Are learners engaged?
6. Do learners ask questions?
7. Do learners get distracted?
8. Is communication dialogical or is it authoritarian?
9. Is there any conflict?

Overall description of the session:

Appendix D: INFORMATION SHEET: PARTICIPATION IN A LEARNER FOCUS GROUP

Outcomes evaluation of the Soweto based component of the SKILLZ Street Plus Soccer programme for girls

Who we are

Hello, I am and I am a fieldworker in a study being conducted by the Human Sciences Research Council.

What we are doing

We are doing research on the SKILLZ Street Plus soccer programme that aims to stop violence against girls and young women. The purpose of our research is to find out if these activities are helping girls and young women to protect themselves against violence. To do this, we need to ask learners about their intimate relationships, how safe or unsafe they feel and if they have ever experienced violence. We are talking to youth in schools in Soweto, and after combining everyone's answers, we hope to learn more about what works best to stop violence. This will help us make useful recommendations to people working with youth.

Your participation

We are asking you whether you would participate in a focus group discussion that will take 1 hour. In the discussion, I will be asking about your views on relationships and sexual- and gender-based violence. The discussion will be based on a fictional case study (that is, a case study that did not really happen) and will not be about experiences you have personally had. Rather, we are interested in your opinions more generally, as they relate to the case study we will share. The discussion will take 1 hour and will be hosted at your school. We are also asking you to give us permission to tape record the discussion. We tape record discussions so that we can accurately record what is said.

Please understand that **helping us with our research is voluntary**. This means that you are not being forced to take part in this study and the choice of whether to participate or not, is yours alone. If you choose not to take part, that is fine. If you do agree to participate, you may change your mind and stop participating in the research at any time and tell me that you don't want to continue. If you do this nothing bad will happen to you and your decision will be respected.

However, because you are under the age of 18, we need to have permission from your parent or guardian BEFORE you participate in this study. There is a separate form for them to complete, sign and return to the school.

Confidentiality

Only the researchers will be able to listen to the focus group. Any information that might include your name or other personal information will be kept by the researchers in a locked file cabinet. When we write our research report, we will not use any learners' real names. Instead, we will use pseudonyms (made-up names).

While every effort will be made by the study team to protect your confidentiality, we cannot guarantee that other participants in the focus group will respect confidentiality, even though every member will be encouraged to do so. For this reason you are advised not to disclose personally sensitive information in the focus group.

If you are being harmed or mistreated by anyone and you decide to discuss this with any of the researchers once you've completed the focus group, the researcher will make sure you get help so that what is happening to you can stop. The researcher is required by law to make sure that you get the help you need.

Risks/discomforts

Some questions in the interview will ask about things that are personal or sensitive. If a question makes you feel sad or upset, you do not have to answer it. If you need to speak with anyone after we have left, Lufuno Shandukani, a social worker from Grassroot Soccer in Soweto can be reached at the following telephone number 011 933 3166 or you can phone Childline on 08000 55 555, a free call from a landline.

Benefits

There are no immediate benefits to you from participating in this study. However, this study will be extremely helpful to us in making recommendations to the Gauteng Department of Education and to organisations that work in Soweto, that we hope will improve learner safety in schools.

Who to contact if you have been harmed or have any concerns

This research has been approved by the HSRC Research Ethics Committee (REC). If you feel unhappy about how this research was conducted or feel that you have been harmed in any way by participating in this study, please call the HSRC's toll-free ethics hotline 0800 212 123 (when phoned from a landline from within South Africa) or contact the Human Sciences Research Council REC Administrator, on Tel 012 302 2012 or e-mail research.ethics@hsrc.ac.za

If you have concerns or questions about the research you may also call the following people:

Dr. Adam Cooper (Principal Investigator) 021-466-8074

Dr. Benita Moolman (Co-principal Investigator) 021-466-7956

Raluca Banciu (Grassroot Soccer NGO) 078 7266471

ASSENT FORM:

PARTICIPATION IN A LEARNER FOCUS GROUP

Outcomes evaluation of the Soweto based component of the SKILLZ Street Plus Soccer programme for girls

Agreeing to take part in this research

I hereby agree to participate in research on sexual- and gender-based violence among youth. I understand that I am participating freely and without being forced in any way to do so. I also understand that I can stop participating at any point should I not want to continue and that this decision will not in any way affect me negatively.

I understand that this is a research project that is not meant to benefit me personally but rather to create safer schools in general.

I understand that this form (where I will sign my name) will not be linked to the focus group I participated in and that the information I share in the interview will therefore not be linked to my name: My name will be confidential.

I have received the telephone number of persons to contact if I want to speak about anything about this research.

I understand that if at all possible, feedback will be given to my school on the general findings of the completed research.

My parent/guardian has completed and signed a consent form giving me permission to participate.

Signature of participant:

Date:.....

Appendix E: INFORMATION SHEET: PARTICIPATION IN A FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION (FOR PARENT OR LEGAL GUARDIAN)

Outcomes evaluation of the Soweto based component of the SKILLZ Street Plus Soccer programme for girls

Who we are

Hello, I am and I am a fieldworker in a study being conducted by the Human Sciences Research Council.

What we are doing

We are doing research on the SKILLZ Street Plus soccer programme that aims to stop violence against girls and young women. The purpose of our research is to find out if these activities are helping girls and young women to protect themselves against violence and to choose intimate partners that treat them well. To do this, we need to ask learners about their intimate relationships and if they have ever experienced violence. We are talking to youth in schools in Soweto, and after combining everyone's answers, we hope to learn more about what works best to help young women choose healthy partners. This will help us make useful recommendations to people working with youth.

Your permission

We are asking your permission for your child to participate in a focus group discussion. In the discussion, I will be asking your child about his or her views on relationships and sexual- and gender-based violence. The discussion will be based on a fictional case study (that is, a case study that did not really happen) and will not be about experiences your child has personally had. Rather, we are interested in your child's opinions more generally, as they relate to the case study we will share. The discussion will take 1 hour and will be hosted at your child's school. We are also asking you to give us permission to tape record the discussion. We tape record discussions so that we can accurately record what is said.

Please understand that **your child's participation is voluntary** and they are not being forced to take part in this study. The choice of whether they can participate or not, is yours and your child's alone. If you choose not to give your permission, you or your child will not be affected in any way whatsoever. If you agree to their participation, you may stop them participating in the research at any time and tell me that you don't want him or her to participate any longer. If you do this there will also be no penalties to you or your child and you and your child will not be prejudiced in any way.

However, because your child is under the age of 18, we need to have your permission BEFORE he or she can participate in this study. There is a separate form for them to complete, sign and return.

Confidentiality

Only the researchers will have access to the research material. All identifying information will be kept in a locked file cabinet and will not be available to others. We will refer to your child by a code number or pseudonym (made-up name) in any publication.

While every effort will be made by the study team to protect the confidentiality of your child's information, we cannot guarantee that other participants in the focus group will respect confidentiality, even though every member will be encouraged to do so. For this reason your child will be advised not to disclose personally sensitive information in the focus group.

Risks/discomforts

Some questions in the interview or focus group may ask about things that are personal or sensitive. If a question makes your child feel sad or upset, they do not have to answer it. If they need to speak with anyone after we have left, Lufuno Shandukani, a social worker from Grassroot Soccer in Soweto can be reached at the following telephone number 011 933 3166 or you can phone Childline on 08000 55 555, a free call from a landline.

Benefits

There are no immediate benefits to you or your child for allowing them to participate in this study. However, this study will be extremely helpful to us in making recommendations to the Western Cape Department of Education and to organisations that work in Khayelitsha, that we hope will improve learner safety in schools.

Who to contact if you have been harmed or have any concerns

This research has been approved by the HSRC Research Ethics Committee (REC). If you feel unhappy about how this research was conducted or feel that you have been harmed in any way by participating in this study, please call the HSRC's toll-free ethics hotline 0800 212 123 (when phoned from a landline from within South Africa) or contact the Human Sciences Research Council REC Administrator, on Tel 012 302 2012 or e-mail research.ethics@hsrc.ac.za

If you have concerns or questions about the research you may also call the following people:

Dr. Adam Cooper (Principal Investigator) 021-466-8074

Dr. Benita Moolman (Co-principal Investigator) 021-466-7956

Raluca Banciu (Grassroot Soccer NGO) 078 7266471

CONSENT FORM:

PARTICIPATION IN A FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION (FOR PARENT OR LEGAL GUARDIAN)

Outcomes evaluation of the Soweto based component of the SKILLZ Street Plus Soccer programme for girls

CONSENT

I hereby give permission for my child to participate in research on intimate relationships and sexual- and gender-based violence among youth. I understand that I am allowing my child to participate freely and without forcing them in any way to do so. I also understand that my child can stop participating at any point should they not want to continue and that this decision will not in any way affect my child negatively.

I understand that this is a research project whose purpose is not necessarily to benefit me or my child personally in the immediate or short term.

I understand that this consent form will not be linked to any other research material, and that my child's participation will remain confidential.

I have received the telephone number of a person to contact should I or my child need to speak about any issues that may arise from my child's participation.

I understand that if at all possible, feedback will be given to my community on the results of the completed research.

Signature of participant

Date

Appendix F: Research permissions, Gauteng Department of Education



For administrative use only:
Reference no: D2017 / 209
enquiries: Diane Buntting 011 843 6503

GAUTENG PROVINCE

EDUCATION
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

GDE RESEARCH APPROVAL LETTER

Date:	1 September 2016
Validity of Research Approval:	1 September 2016 to 30 September 2016
Name of Researcher:	Dr A.L. Cooper
Address of Researcher:	71 Mountain Road; Woodstock; Cape Town; 7925
Telephone / Fax Number/s:	084 261 2750
Email address:	acooper@hsr.ac.za
Research Topic:	Outcomes evaluation of the Soweto based SkillzSt Plus programme to improve the ability of 13 - 16 year old girls to choose gender-equitable intimate partners and both to prevent and address violence in their lives.
Number and type of schools:	TWO Secondary Schools
District/s/HO	Johannesburg South

Re: Approval in Respect of Request to Conduct Research

This letter serves to indicate that approval is hereby granted to the above-mentioned researcher to proceed with research in respect of the study indicated above. **However the Focus Group Interviews with learners MUST be based on the proposed Case Study only.** The onus rests with the researcher to negotiate appropriate and relevant time schedules with the school/s and/or offices involved. A separate copy of this letter must be presented to the Principal, SGB and the relevant District/Head Office Senior Manager confirming that permission has been granted for the research to be conducted. However participation is VOLUNTARY.

The following conditions apply to GDE research. The researcher has agreed to and may proceed with the above study subject to the conditions listed below being met. Approval may be withdrawn should any of the conditions listed below be flouted:

CONDITIONS FOR CONDUCTING RESEARCH IN GDE

1. The District/Head Office Senior Manager/s concerned, the Principal/s and the chairperson/s of the School Governing Body (SGB.) must be presented with a copy of this letter.

2016/09/02

1

Making education a societal priority

Office of the Director: Education Research and Knowledge Management ER&KM)

2. The Researcher will make every effort to obtain the goodwill and co-operation of the GDE District officials, principals, SGBs, teachers, parents and learners involved. Participation is voluntary and additional remuneration will not be paid;
3. Research may only be conducted after school hours so that the normal school programme is not interrupted. The Principal and/or Director must be consulted about an appropriate time when the researcher/s may carry out their research at the sites that they manage.
4. Research may only commence from the second week of February and must be concluded by the end of the THIRD quarter of the academic year. If incomplete, an amended Research Approval letter may be requested to conduct research in the following year.
5. Items 6 and 7 will not apply to any research effort being undertaken on behalf of the GDE. Such research will have been commissioned and be paid for by the Gauteng Department of Education.
6. It is the researcher's responsibility to obtain written consent from the SGB/s; principal/s, educator/s, parents and learners, as applicable, before commencing with research.
7. The researcher is responsible for supplying and utilizing his/her own research resources, such as stationery, photocopies, transport, faxes and telephones and should not depend on the goodwill of the institution/s, staff and/or the office/s visited for supplying such resources.
8. The names of the GDE officials, schools, principals, parents, teachers and learners that participate in the study may not appear in the research title, report or summary.
9. On completion of the study the researcher must supply the Director: Education Research and Knowledge Management, with electronic copies of the Research Report, Thesis, Dissertation as well as a Research Summary (on the GDE Summary template). Failure to submit your Research Report, Thesis, Dissertation and Research Summary on completion of your studies / project – a month after graduation or project completion - may result in permission being withheld from you and your Supervisor in future.
10. The researcher may be expected to provide short presentations on the purpose, findings and recommendations of his/her research to both GDE officials and the schools concerned;
11. Should the researcher have been involved with research at a school and/or a district/head office level, the Director/s and school/s concerned must also be supplied with a brief summary of the purpose, findings and recommendations of the research study.

The Gauteng Department of Education wishes you well in this important undertaking and looks forward to examining the findings of your research study.

Kind regards



Dr David Makhado

Director: Education Research and Knowledge Management

DATE: 2016/09/02