Our Story Your Story: Participant Experiences of a Community-Based Participatory Research Project

Candice Linde (LNDCAN004)

Department of Psychology

University of Cape Town

PLAGIARISM DECLARATION

PLAGIARISM

This means that you present substantial portions or elements of another's work, ideas or data as your own, even if the original author is cited occasionally. A signed photocopy or other copy of the Declaration below must accompany every piece of work that you hand in.

DECLARATION

1. I know that Plagiarism is wrong. Plagiarism is to use another's work and pretend that it is one's own.

2. I have used the American Psychological Association formatting for citation and referencing. Each significant contribution to, and quotation in, this essay/report/project from the work or works, of other people has been attributed, cited and referenced.

3. This essay/report/project is my own work.

4. I have not allowed, and will not allow anyone to copy my work with the intention of passing it off as his or her own work.

NAME: Candice Linde

STUDENT NUMBER: LNDCAN004

ASSIGNMENT: Honours research project

DUE DATE: 6 November 2015

SIGNED: C. Linde

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge the following people for their roles in helping me complete this project:

To my supervisor, Dr Shose Kessi, for helping me conceptualize the research and for your support throughout the year. Thank you for keeping me calm yet focused.

To the Our Story Your Story team. Thank you for accommodating me at sessions, for making sure participants understood my role as researcher and, most importantly, for allowing me to be part of this eye-opening project.

To the Our Story Your Story participants, for welcoming me into sessions and allowing me to listen to your personal stories.

To my parents. Thank you for your financial and emotional support throughout the research process.

Abstract

Participation in community-based participatory research (CBPR) holds potential for empowerment and much-needed transformation in South Africa. However, participation can be hindered by power inequalities between researchers and participants. CBPR projects tend to focus on research-specific objectives such as data collection, failing to recognize the importance of participation itself. Storytelling methodology in CBPR, supporting participants' sharing their life stories, is discussed as a method that prioritises participation. Storytelling in CBPR can give communities a voice in political and social transformation and can support community cohesion and healing from oppression. Such participation is relevant in South Africa due to Apartheid legacies. However, this largely depends on the quality and outcomes of community participation. This study aimed to assess participant experiences of Our Story Your Story (OSYS), an intergenerational storytelling CBPR project run with youth and seniors in Cape Town by Clowns Without Borders South Africa. This research was conducted using a critical community psychology framework and qualitative ethnographic methods including observation of OSYS workshops, OSYS's focus group reflection with participants, interviews with facilitators and a review of the project's funding application and curriculum. Data analysis was informed by ethnographic content analysis, thematic analysis and triangulation. Themes were divided into benefits of participation, project processes supporting these benefits and barriers to engagement. Participation in OSYS contributed to transformation through empowerment, personal liberation and connections fostered. However, researcher-participant power differentials were evident in terms of coaching and performance and affected the quality and value of participation. As such, recommendations have been made for OSYS to explicitly define participation in a way which redistributes power. This research intends to promote recognition of participatory potential, and possible barriers thereto, in CBPR and specifically in storytelling CBPR.

Keywords: community-based participatory research; ethnography; intergenerational; Our Story Your Story; participation; South Africa; storytelling; transformation

Our Story Your Story: Participant Experiences of a Community-Based Participatory Research Project

The lived reality of many South Africans in post-Apartheid South Africa resembles life during Apartheid (Bray, Gooskens, Kahn, Moses, & Seekings, 2010). Wealth and material inequality is severe (Bray et al., 2010) and still manifests along racial lines (Duncan, Stevens, & Canham, 2014). Social psychologists have suggested community mobilization and empowerment for transformation through individual and collective action (Campbell & Cornish, 2010). Community-based participatory research (CBPR) seeks to actively involve community members in research processes for problem definition, data collection and analysis (Israel, Schulz, Parker, & Becker, 1998). Shifts in research power aim to improve community wellbeing through empowerment, capacity-building and social capital (Israel et al., 1998). Data collection generates knowledge (Israel et al., 1998) while community empowerment supports change (Prinsloo, 2008). Empowerment is appropriate in marginalized communities for reducing social inequalities (Israel et al., 1998).

Researchers' adherence to CBPR principles depends on project purposes and context (Israel et al., 1998). Although CBPR theorises inclusion, there are issues surrounding the nature of participation (Stoecker, 2009). These include potential power differentials between outside researchers and community members (De Schweinitz et al., 2009) as well as potential harm unintentionally caused by researchers' imposing their own agendas (Guta et al., 2010). Meaningful engagement occurs when community members regard themselves as active leaders of social change (Rasmus, 2014) and promotes empowerment for change (Flicker, 2008). Direct evaluation of participant engagement is becoming increasingly important (De Schweinitz et al., 2009) and community participation needs to be managed throughout the process (Prinsloo, 2008). That being said, CBPR often fails to account for non-research-specific outcomes such as those of participation (Malone, McGruder, Froelicher, & Yerger, 2013; Stoecker, 2009).

Benefits of Participation

Personal development, including empowerment and skills development, may result from participation in CBPR. Janzen, Pancer, Nelson, Loomis and Hasford (2010) assessed the perceived value of participation in the Better Beginning, Better Futures community-based youth prevention programme ten years later. Participants gained a sense of community, improved self-esteem, independence, responsibility, discipline and empathy. Participatory action research with youth surrounding socio-political development resulted in improved confidence as participants took on new challenges and became aware of their capabilities

(Zaal & Terry, 2013). Among community participants in the Protecting the 'Hood Against Tobacco CBPR programme in San Francisco, participation enabled participants to feel part of something useful in their communities (Malone et al., 2013). Participants' perceived usefulness de-pathologized the community, promoting self-efficacy. Participation in The Positive Youth Project, a CBPR programme for HIV-positive Canadian youth, contributed to empowerment; giving valued voices to those who previously felt silenced (Flicker, 2008).

Participation has also been linked to transformation through individual change and advocacy. Many participants in the Malone et al. (2013) anti-smoking project stopped smoking and encouraged others to do so. Zaal and Terry (2013) found that participants' new role as experts, gained through participation, contributed to advocacy. Role redefinition empowered youth to resist taking drugs and return to school (Flicker, 2008). Social change also occurs through community cohesion. Rasmus (2014) evaluated the Ellum Tungiinun CBPR project in Alaska from the perspective of Yup'ik community participants. Elders' participation re-established traditional leadership roles. Yup'ik indigenous values emphasize collaboration and communication in dealing with problems (Rasmus, 2014). Elders' re-established roles enforced community values and contributed to community cohesion.

Effective community participation enhances the quality of research as research questions become more relevant to the needs of communities (Flicker, 2008). Specifically, in Flicker's project, participants widened discussions from the researchers' initial focus to include issues surrounding access to health and social services. Research that engages community members also allows community-based organizations to take action based on reliable findings (Flicker, 2008).

Barriers to Participation

The value of community participation depends on its quality (Khodyakov et al., 2013). Having discussed the potential benefits of participation, it is important to identify limitations which may hinder them.

For example, disability can serve as a barrier to full participation or engagement in CBPR (Hassouneh, Alcala-Moss, & McNeff, 2011). CBPR involving disabled community members aims to ensure full inclusion (Hassouneh et al., 2011). Mobility and fatigue, for example, necessitate inclusionary strategies (Hassouneh et al., 2011). Researchers need to be responsive to the needs of disabled participants. Accommodations may include personal assistant services, assertive communication and matching of roles and responsibilities with individual abilities (Hassouneh et al., 2011).

Cultural beliefs and values also affect the quality of participation. De Schweinitz et al.

(2009) report on the Barekuma Community Development Programme in rural Ghana. Despite researchers' intentions for community participation, participants did not take ownership of research. Participants' belief that decision-making should be controlled by researchers, and perceptions of themselves as recipients of aid, prevented full engagement. Participants in a community development project in Thailand were not comfortable participating due to low self-respect and confidence instilled by Thailand's culture of hierarchical submission (Nuttavuthisit, Jindahra, & Prasarnphanich, 2014).

Hence, power dynamics affect community participation (Guareschi & Jovchelovitch, 2004). Utilitarian approaches to participation use community involvement to legitimize research while empowerment approaches seek community empowerment. Therefore, participatory approaches may still be affected by power relations which can prevent empowerment outcomes (Kessi, 2010). Utilitarian-empowerment conflict renders power relations important (Guareschi & Jovchelovitch, 2004).

In CBPR on social exclusion and healthcare provision among transgender Canadians, Travers et al. (2013) faced challenging power differentials between community members and academics. Although community members are considered to be experts in their own communities, institutional support for academic researchers afforded them power over the research. Institutional goals and practices were favoured over those of the community. The authors argue that a lack of direct acknowledgment of power differentials devalued community participation.

Power differentials threatened participation in CBPR on the indirect impact of AIDS on the livelihoods of youth in Malawi and Lesotho (Ansell, Robson, Hajdu, & van Blerk, 2012). Local interpreters, used as research assistants, became overly involved in knowledge production by censoring and ridiculing participants. Because interpreters were older, participants felt unable to protect and maintain their narratives. Participation was therefore hindered by perceived lack of power. Formal discussions of power dynamics can promote participant commitment (Travers et al., 2013). Furthermore, direct acknowledgment of power differentials can improve communication and collaboration (Malone et al., 2013).

Collaborative researcher-community relationships are essential for CBPR sustainability (Altman, 1995). Collaboration may be threatened by researcher orientations to data collection rather than service delivery (Altman, 1995). Researchers' desire for programme integrity and promotion of goals, which may differ from community priorities, also affects collaboration (Altman, 1995). Researchers tend to define programme integrity as maintaining control to meet project objectives (Altman, 1995). However, community

members often need to alter programmes to meet their needs and allowing this promotes true integrity as the programme becomes valuable to the community (Altman, 1995). Altman suggests that resolving power-related conflicts means allowing community partnerships to influence the research agenda.

Collaboration and sustainability are also affected by broad-based support for the programme as community stakeholders need to be involved and supportive (Altman, 1995). Altman argues that the project's success relies on this support. Lack thereof limits the potential benefits of community participation (Altman, 1995). Financial or time constraints, territoriality issues, lack of interest and limited skills may prevent community-based organizations from supporting projects (Altman, 1995). Altman argues that coalition development be prioritized during programme design. A written partnership plan ensures commitment and accountability of community-based organizations by outlining all parties' goals, rights and responsibilities (Bloom et al., 2009).

The importance of community-based organisations' support is illustrated by Rhodes et al. (2015) in a CBPR project involving men who have sex with men (MSM) within the Latino/Hispanic community. The project was dedicated to partnership and teamwork for health improvement. Partners included Latino/Hispanic communities as well as organizations such as AIDS service, the Chatham social health council, public health departments and two scientific university departments. Some partner organization staff realised their prejudices and discrimination against MSM and sensitivity training was established. Building trust between partner organizations also proved challenging due to geographic distance and some being unaccustomed to scheduled conference-calling.

Storytelling CBPR: A Participatory Focus

In light of the potential of participation and the barriers thereto, CBPR methods ought to marry research-specific objectives with participatory ones. Specifically, shared research power seems essential for community empowerment and change. Unitary appreciative inquiry (UAI), for example, is a research method representing CBPR values in which participants are seen as experts on their own experiences and research power is shared through co-operative participatory approaches (Hughes, 2012). Creative media such as storytelling, art or creative writing are used for data collection and data are presented as a unitary appreciative profile allowing holistic insight into the subject or experience (Hughes, 2012). Such data can be disseminated creatively to an audience and used to inform policy and practice (Hughes, 2012). UAI's additional therapeutic function presents participation as a direct benefit to participants (Hughes, 2012). Profile creation enhances capacity for change

by allowing participants to reflect upon their lives (Hughes, 2012). UAI presents as a CBPR method which prioritizes both research-specific objectives and participatory benefits by ensuring participants' ownership of the research. Thus, such methods hold potential for enhancing participatory benefits and preventing the barriers discussed.

CBPR using storytelling methodology could thus prevent power dynamics as collecting life stories contributes to research data and community empowerment. Lenart-Cheng and Walker (2011) present the potential of communal life-story sharing sites. In terms of research goals, policy makers' access to life-stories serves as data on the needs of communities which then inform decision-making. In terms of participatory goals, sharing life-stories gives communities a voice in social and political change. The Panos Network is an example of a story-sharing site where life-stories of disadvantaged and marginalized communities are collected with the primary aim of supporting participation in national and international decision-making (Lenart-Cheng & Walker, 2011).

The simplest form of social change resulting from story sharing is community connection (Lenart-Cheng & Walker, 2011). It is argued that sharing life-stories can build, or strengthen, communities through community cohesion. Loe (2013) investigated the effects of the Digital Life History Project in which students worked with elders to produce a digital story honouring elders' lives. Meaningful new friendships developed between the generations and participants confronted ageism and ageist stereotypes. Listening to each others' life stories supported appreciation for generational differences in life experience.

Storytelling in communities experiencing legacies of colonialism or ongoing discrimination holds transformational potential (Beltran & Begun, 2014). It allows communities to reclaim knowledge and enhance resilience (Beltran & Begun, 2014). Beltran and Begun (2014) conducted community-based digital storytelling (DST) workshops with the Maori community. Participants described the project's power for community transformation through broadcasting the stories. Such transformation emerged out of discovering and sharing one's story, others' stories resonating with one's experience and perceptions of a safe environment of interconnectedness. This study presents the potential of storytelling CBPR among South African communities facing Apartheid legacies.

Participatory value appears to be focused on CBPR outside South Africa. In terms of South African CBPR, although many projects exist to achieve research-specific objectives, there is a lack of literature concerning the quality and outcomes of participation (e.g., Masovel, Simon, van Stade, & Buchbinder, 2005; Van Niekerk, Lorenzo, & Mdlokolo, 2006). As participation itself stands to benefit communities, not to evaluate it is arguably to

neglect an integral aspect of CBPR. Effective participation in CBPR can promote social transformation in various ways. However, unequal power in CBPR can hinder participatory benefits. Storytelling is suggested as a CBPR method where participation is prioritized. Research is shared through full collaboration and participants benefit from the data collection process. The potential of storytelling CBPR in the South African context lies in policy-makers' access to marginalized communities' experiences, community connection and resilience development. Participation in storytelling CBPR could contribute to the much-needed transformation in Post-Apartheid South Africa. Therefore it is worthwhile evaluating the quality of participation, and outcomes thereof, in South African storytelling CBPR.

Aims and Objectives

This research aims to assess the potential of participation in a storytelling CBPR project in the South African context. To do so, this study will investigate participant experiences of the Our Story Your Story (OSYS) project.

Main Research Question:

How do participants in the OSYS project experience participation therein?

Sub-Questions:

How do participants engage with the OSYS workshops and processes?

What are the intended and actual benefits of participation in the OSYS project?

Which OSYS processes support these benefits?

What barriers, if any, exist to engagement?

How do youth and seniors' experiences of OSYS differ?

Analyses relating to these sub-questions will answer the main research question.

Theoretical Framework

This research is guided by critical community psychology. Critical psychology addresses the inherent biases of mainstream psychology (Holzman, 2013), claiming that mainstream psychology supports unethical practices involving vulnerable groups (Holzman, 2013). South Africa's history of Apartheid necessitates the decolonization of knowledge construction and acknowledgment of power differentials (Lazarus, Bulbulia, Taliep, & Naidoo, 2015). The critical paradigm asserts that researchers need to take on more of an activist role to challenge power inequalities through research dialogue (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999).

This study asserts that mainstream community-based research is not sufficient for enacting change in South Africa as legacies of inequality necessitate a shift in power for community empowerment, mobilization and change. Campbell (2004) emphasizes the

importance of bottom-up efforts, where marginalized communities participate in collective action for social change by strengthening communities (Campbell, 2004). The social psychology of participation implicates empowerment and social capital as outcomes of bottom-up action (Campbell, 2004). Participation in bottom-up strategies provides an empowering experience by allowing responsibility for change (Campbell, 2004). Social capital consists of supportive social networks, such as those with friends or activist organizations, and supports collective efficacy and perceptions of citizen power (Campbell, 2004). This power shift for community mobilization represents the critical approach to CBPR participation fundamental to this study.

      Community psychology commonly adopts principles of critical psychology (Teo, 2015) while focusing on community-based prevention, social justice and transformation (Wolff, 2014). It echoes the intentions of bottom-up action by acknowledging that change results from strengthening community capacity (Wolff, 2014). This study recognizes the potential of bottom-up participation for empowerment, social capital and social change through community development. Through its critical community psychology framework, the study investigates the potential of community participation in CBPR.

Methods

Our Story Your Story

   OSYS is the CBPR project through which participation was assessed. OSYS is an intergenerational storytelling project, run by Clowns Without Borders South Africa, based on the premise that storytelling can promote community learning and development. With reference to UAI, while OSYS collects stories as 'data', participant experiences of participation are prioritized. Participation is intended to promote empowerment, social cohesion and leadership. OSYS also aims to unite communities in celebrating South African heritage and diversity through storytelling.

   It is noted that Clowns Without Borders South Africa does not explicitly label OSYS as CBPR. However, the researcher deemed CBPR an appropriate framework for assessing participation in OSYS. Collection of story narratives, involvement of participants in data collection and intended benefits of such participation align with CBPR principles. Emphasis on participatory goals and processes, rather than research-specific objectives, makes OSYS appropriate for studying the potential of participation in CBPR.

   Fifteen youth and fifteen seniors, recruited through partner organizations, participated in OSYS. The project consisted of three weekly workshops for youth and seniors separately, at respective partner organisations' premises, followed by five weekly intergenerational workshops at the Philippi senior club. Participants gained skills to construct autobiographical narratives. At the end of the process, participants told their stories at one of two performance events; either in Rondebosch or in Philippi. The 2014 OSYS pilot project showed participants' improved self-esteem and sense of accomplishment. Intergenerational aspects fostered youth's empathy toward South African heritage and seniors' appreciation of younger generations.

Research Design

   This study used qualitative ethnographic methods. An ethnography is an approach for analysing social phenomena using multiple data collection methods (Fetterman, 1998). These include, as in this case; observation, interviews, reviews of relevant documentation (Fetterman, 1998; Russel et al., 2012; Shover, 2012) and focus groups (Bryant, 2007). This holistic approach allows insight into insider and outsider perspectives and context (Fetterman, 1998). Ethnographies usually span a long period of time and researchers often become participant observers (Fetterman, 1998). Given time constraints, this study used a short-term interaction and non-participant observation. Such techniques are also useful (Fetterman, 1998).

Observation. Participant observation is critical to ethnographic fieldwork (Fetterman, 1998). This involves researchers' involvement in participants' natural settings while maintaining professional distance (Fetterman, 1998). The aim is for researchers to be able to internalize participants' beliefs, fears and expectations (Fetterman, 1998). The non-participant observation used entailed observation of OSYS workshops. The researcher kept an observation journal to record activities, interactions and emotions (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999).

Focus groups. Colloquial discussion during focus groups supports the collection of natural data and the presence of fellow participants prevents perceived power differentials for a shared research environment (Bryant, 2007). Participants' discussions of their experiences allow insight into individuals' opinions and how they influence others' (Bryant, 2007). Focus groups are appropriate for exploratory research, such as this study, because new information is generated (Bryant, 2007).

The initial plan was to conduct one focus group with youth participants and one with seniors. However, there was a deviation from this in that focus group data was collected from the project-run 'reflection' focus group in the last OSYS session, led by OSYS's lead facilitator. This group included twenty OSYS participants; both youth and seniors who would have made up the initially intended two groups. This was due partly to OSYS facilitators' wanting to conduct a group reflection session which would have been very similar to the researcher's focus group. Because participants were familiar with facilitators, their leading the reflection ensured participants felt comfortable. It would have proved difficult to organize separate focus groups for the youth and seniors due to time and financial constraints, for example, transport funding.

Interviews. Interviews are arguably the most important data collection method in ethnographic studies because they allow for contextualization (Fetterman, 1998). Ethnographic theory values differing views of reality and interviews allow researchers to compare these (Fetterman, 1998). Therefore, interviews with two workshop facilitators were conducted. These allowed a different perspective on participant engagement.

Documentation. Examining memoranda and mission statements is helpful in ethnographic research for insight into the programme's history and planning (Fetterman, 1998). OSYS' funding application was analysed to investigate whether the project's participation-related goals were achieved. Curricula were analysed to ascertain which activities supported or hindered participatory goals.

Participants

   This study used purposive sampling to ensure that the sample consisted of individuals who meet predetermined criteria (Cozby & Bates, 2012) relating to their involvement in OSYS. All participants were recruited from pre-existing OSYS participants and staff. Those observed in OSYS workshops included around twenty workshop participants, with varying attendance, and four facilitators. Focus group participants included twenty youth and senior OSYS participants, selected based on their attendance of the final session. Two OSYS facilitators were selected to be interviewed based on their roles in running OSYS.

Materials

   In ethnographic research, the researcher becomes a data collection tool by being perceptive in situations observed (Fetterman, 1998). The subjective nature of researcher perception makes the use of other materials important (Fetterman, 1998). In addition to researcher sensitivity, this study used interview and focus group schedules (see appendices C and D). The focus group schedule, initially devised for use by the researcher, was eventually used to inform OSYS's reflection session. The interview schedule was used to conduct semi-structured interviews with open-ended questions for flexibility and appropriateness in exploratory ethnographic research (Schensul, Schensul, & Lecompte, 1999).

Data Analysis

   Ethnographic data analysis entails making sense of field notes, interviews and documentation (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999). Looking for patterns is most important (Fetterman, 1998).

   Ethnographic content analysis. Ethnographic content analysis (ECA) allows for analyses of documentation (Altheide, 1987) as well as observed data through classification of events and behaviours into similar groups (Cho & Lee, 2014). ECA takes into account the interaction between the researcher, data collection and data analysis (Altheide, 1987). Thus ECA was used to code observations and documentation.

   Thematic analysis. A pattern-level analysis, important in ethnographic analyses (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999), was conducted with interview and focus group data to identify themes. The specific interest in participation implicates theoretical thematic analysis as coding ensured that the research questions were answered (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Data was transcribed, after which themes were detected and revised (Vaismoradi, Turunen, & Bondas, 2013) according to Braun and Clarke's (2006) guidelines.

   Triangulation. Collecting several types of data allows researchers to test one source against another for perspective in reaching informed and credible conclusions (Fetterman,

1998). Triangulation allowed for comparison of interview, focus group, observed and documentation data. As such, ECA and thematic analysis were used simultaneously to locate themes which emerged across various data collection methods.

Ethical Considerations

Qualitative research has unique ethics requirements because ethical issues are often more subtle than in quantitative research (Orb, Eisenhauer, & Wynaden, 2001).

Confidentiality and anonymity. Researchers have an ethical obligation to think about the consequences of revealing participant identities (Orb et al., 2001). Pseudonyms ought to be used to maintain anonymity (Fetterman, 1998; Orb et al., 2001). This study has not used participants' real names. Focus group and interview data were transcribed by the researcher. Only the researcher had access to transcriptions and recordings were kept secure.

Informed consent. The principle of autonomy requires that researchers display respect for participants by recognizing their rights (Orb et al., 2001). Participants must be informed about research purposes and procedures and their right not to participate and to freely withdraw at any point (Orb et al., 2001). Autonomy is upheld by means of informed consent which includes the study's purpose, risks and benefits (Cozby & Bates, 2012).

Workshop participants and facilitators were verbally informed of the researcher's presence and the purpose thereof before workshops started. A memorandum of agreement was sent to OSYS staff to be distributed to participants (see appendix E). This gave notice regarding observation to workshop participants and facilitators. Focus group and interview participants signed separate informed consent forms (see appendices A and B). For Xhosa-speaking focus group participants, the form was explained by a translator.

Risks and benefits. This study did not pose any physical harm to participants as data collection happened in a safe environment. Emotional stress was not anticipated as the study investigated experiences intended to be enjoyable and empowering. As expected, participation did not spark negative emotional arousal. For participants, data collection acted as an OSYS debriefing. Participants received the opportunity to contribute to future OSYS projects, thus making them feel valued.

Power. Deception is inappropriate in ethnographic research as researchers are required to explain the study to any participant who inquires (Fetterman, 1998). It was important for participants to be aware of this study's purpose and procedure so as to minimize the impact of observation on behaviour and to enable collection of valid data. OSYS staff and I informed participants of the purpose of observation and answered questions. Ethnographic researchers should report on their role in order to document contamination caused by their

presence and ensure credibility of findings (Fetterman, 1998). I included in my journal any times I felt my presence influenced dynamics so that reflexivity was possible.

Limitations

The main limitation of this research is the project-run focus group reflection. Because it was not led by the researcher, follow-up questions could not be asked. The group was very big and data quality might have been improved by conducting two smaller groups. It would have been beneficial to discuss experiences with youth and seniors separately as, in the combined setting, each group may have felt pressured not to be critical of the other. The presence of OSYS facilitators might have prevented participants from voicing concerns. In addition, facilitators' presence in the focus group could have informed their answers in individual interviews. However, I do not think this was the case as they spoke mainly about their own feelings and experiences.

The language barrier between the researcher and Xhosa-speaking OSYS participants served as a limitation. During observation and the focus group it was difficult, even with simultaneous translation, to understand fully and to capture the nuances of expression. Data analysis may have been affected by linguistic intricacies lost during translation.

Reflexivity

Reflexivity is a quality-control technique for understanding the effects of researcher characteristics and experiences on qualitative research (Berger, 2015). These include effects of social location and emotional responses to participants (Mauthner & Doucet, 2003). Ethnographers realize that objectivity is unrealistic as it is impossible to separate personal understandings of social situations from the research (Pellatt, 2003). Deriving meaning from ethnographies requires researchers' awareness of their impact on processes and findings (Williams, 1993).

My social location as a white English-speaking university student differed significantly from that of black Xhosa-speaking and, in the case of many seniors, uneducated participants. I believe that identity disparities may have influenced my understanding of participants' experiences. Berger (2015) argues that researchers familiar with participants' experiences will be more likely to understand them. While taking part in a previous condensed version of OSYS may have given me some insight into participation, I believe differences in social location made my experience different to participants'. For example, due to histories of oppression, participants may have experienced an added dimension of healing. Recognizing the extent of my unfamiliarity with participants' experiences allowed for "fresh" research perspectives (Berger, 2015, p. 227).

Ethnographers ought to consider the impact of their presence (Fetterman, 1998). It is possible that OSYS participants were influenced by my presence, thus affecting the validity of data. Toward the beginning of the project, one youth participant stated "we don't know much about Candice." This is especially concerning in a storytelling project where the researcher hears personal stories without sharing anything. However, over time, participants became more at ease with observation.

The researcher's emotional responses to participants, specifically OSYS facilitators, may have affected data analysis. Relationships formed with facilitators inspired an affection for the project. During data analysis, I began to consider that this might have impacted on my ability to remain critical. This awareness allowed me to ensure that findings emerged from critical analyses.

Results and Discussion

Themes have been divided according to research sub-questions; benefits of participation, OSYS processes which supported these benefits and barriers to engagement. Sub-questions regarding participant engagement and differences in youth and seniors' experiences are answered within these categories. Triangulation allowed all data to contribute to each theme.

Benefits of Participation

Benefits identified are psychological liberation, empowerment through confidence-building and intergroup connections. These align with OSYS objectives outlining the intended benefits of participation.

You become free: Psychological liberation. Both youth and seniors experienced a sense of psychological liberation in telling their stories. This happened as early as the youth's third session as one youth participant commented that telling stories "released some burdens about my past" (field notes). A senior participant commented during reflection that talking about the past brings freedom.

>*Using that story took me back and made me think about lots of people (…) but I felt free—sometimes you feel held but once you share something—and then you become free.* (Lucy, senior participant)

Maggie explains how this liberation tends to occur through storytelling.

>*(…) there's a transformation that happens in—in the sharing and being heard in your story but also in the capacity to craft a story, like psychologically, that has an impact. There's (…) a coherent way of seeing one's life that shifts.* (Maggie, facilitator)

The transformative potential of DST projects has been described by participants as the capacity for personal healing, specifically from historical trauma (Beltran & Begun, 2014). Leseho and Block (2005) argue for the power of speaking and being heard in healing after living under military dictatorship. The theory behind this assertion is that "reclaiming one's voice" in speaking to an audience with the intent to listen and understand, allows revival of one's sense of self and one's purpose in life (p. 175). Telling one's story is essential for healing and can also inform one's agenda for social transformation (Leseho & Block, 2005).

Thus the psychological liberation felt by participants forms part of this healing process which is integral to the transformative potential of OSYS.

Empowerment through confidence-building. Confidence has been identified as a benefit of CBPR through participants' awareness of their new capabilities (Zaal & Terry, 2013). As early as their second session, youth identified their confidence, saying "(storytelling) builds confidence to trust yourself and trust others" (field notes). One had a job interview the following day and stated "I won't be shy anymore. I'm ready now" (field notes). Another felt she gained the confidence to be herself.

> *When we need to stand there and share, I was like shy. I like to exaggerate things so I was like "I don't want to exaggerate it." (…) but when I hear the feedback—it's like the thing that I wanted to do (exaggerate)—it's something that I had to do it.* (Felicia, youth participant)

Bryan, a youth participant, stands out for me in terms of confidence development (field notes). From the beginning, he was friendly and interested. He volunteered to speak but stumbled on his words. In our personal conversations, he lacked the confidence to express himself. His final performance was amazing. However, development of his interpersonal communication was most impressive. His new confidence extended beyond the stage. At the last session, I spoke with him. He spoke clearly and confidently. Maggie gives special mention to Brian.

> *Brian's final performance was unbelievable. From the beginning, he could hardly— kind of formulate stories properly. (…) the growth in him was just remarkable.* (Maggie, facilitator)

Some seniors discussed overcoming their initial shyness. For one, new confidence allowed her to share things she hadn't felt able to share before.

> *When I joined this (…) I'm shy and I can't share something that is inside me. (…) But I knew that the things from my life—they like big but I can't take them out. But today, I know that one of my stories I did share. (…) This programme helped me—that it's like I'm not shy. I was able to share about myself.* (Lindiwe, senior participant)

Confidence is arguably linked to participant empowerment in that confidence gained through storytelling would enhance perceived control over other aspects of their lives (Campbell, 2004). Empowerment, as a result of participation in bottom-up collective action such as OSYS, is a driver of social change by re-assigning power and strengthening communities (Campbell, 2004).

It is important to note which project processes promote confidence. Unlike DST projects' use of digital platforms, OSYS's performance-focus supports confidence-building. I believe this benefit emerges largely from performing one's story. For example, Brian's practicing and performing his storytelling was arguably important for his confidence-development.

Building bridges: A common humanity. Intergenerational connections were fostered between youth and seniors throughout the project. An interracial connection developed at the Rondebosch performance between black participants and the white audience.

Intergenerational bridges. One of the objectives of OSYS, according to the funding application, is to break down intergenerational divides between youth and seniors. This was arguably achieved. Intergenerational story-sharing can foster meaningful relationships between young and old when new connections with the other generation replace negative stereotypes and ageist conceptions and create unity (Loe, 2013). Facilitators argue that youth and seniors' perceptions of, and appreciation for, each other improved.

> *I think they (seniors) had that perspective of like—the youth doesn't have respect (…).*
> *Also the youth side, they like "old people they moody, they want always the youth to*
> *do chores, they don't want to do anything" (…). So when they meet together, they*
> *didn't find those things. (…) now they have a different perspective than they had*
> *before (…).* (Angela, facilitator)

> *There was a—there is a tension between generations... I mean they all shared that*
> *there is. So I think that does—it shifts.* (Maggie, facilitator)

The youth anticipated difficulty working with seniors. Seniors thought the youth would not treat them respectfully. However, when the generations met, these stereotypes were challenged. Participants explain this.

> *I was like "Oh my God, I will meet the old people. I wonder how it will be." And then*
> *like—I compared them with my grandmother because she always complains about*

simple little things so I thought I would also receive that. I didn't know that I will meet these grandmothers that are nice (…). (Debbie, youth participant)

When we were told we were gonna meet the youth, my fear is that we were not gonna get the good treatment (…). So when we met them, I saw these people—you know— they like people that have been trained (…) how to treat the old people. So I felt happy. (Francis, senior participant)

Bonding social capital emerging from bottom-up participation, supportive relationships with those of similar levels of economic, political and social standing, is important for development of a critical consciousness through which individuals become empowered to enact change (Campbell, 2004). Intergenerational connections between youth and seniors may act as bonding social capital for transformation by strengthening communities from within.

Interracial bridges. The storytelling performance in Rondebosch for a predominantly white audience promoted a sense of unity between participants and the audience. As part of the audience, I could feel the empathy and interest. Participants spoke about how they felt at this performance.

At first I was afraid. When I was there—when I meet the people from Rondebosch, I felt the unity. Even when we were searching for stories (a song sang to 'search for stories'), they were also searching for stories as well. It was like we all have unity, it's like they were here with us through all the process. (Lucy, senior participant)

It was very exciting when I see like white old people. Then I'm like, "we are not alone in this thing". There are also younger people so it's like—this thing—it becomes one. (…). Also what I like about this unity you made, it's like you made us receive something from the other people and they also receiving something from you. (Florence, senior participant)

By bringing white and black people together and creating unity and a space to learn, the performance celebrated cultural diversity. This represents the achievement of an OSYS objective outlined in the funding application: to 'celebrate South Africa's rich history and culture by bringing together diverse communities through storytelling performance.'

This racially integrated story-telling space allowed white listeners a glimpse into the reality of life for black South Africans. Broadcasting participants' stories in public spaces

may promote transformation within the broader community (Beltran & Begun, 2014). Public story-sharing can promote social change through community connection and cohesion (Lenart-Cheng & Walker, 2011). Sharing stories can strengthen existing communities or build new ones (Lenart-Cheng & Walker, 2011). The effects of OSYS extended into the broader community as the unity between black speakers and the white audience contributed to a new, connected community. Maggie explains that this performance provided a forum for diverse groups to hear each others' stories which they otherwise may not be exposed to.

> *(…) it (storytelling) has the capacity for bridging (…) divides across different things so like black-white (…). That's why I wanted it to be at (Rondebosch hall) so that it would be um, accessible to people that (…) have never heard these stories before. (…) there's this feeling in South Africa sometimes of like "I know what's going on there but I can't really—it's so disconnected from my reality that I can't go there" whereas this—it kind of brings the—brings the common humanity.* (Maggie, facilitator)

Maggie read me a text message she received from a friend who attended this performance. It illustrates one listener's appreciation of this exposure to participants' stories.

> *"I was so impressed but also a good wakeup to the deprivation that most people in South Africa experience and how incredibly privileged I am."* (Text message read by Maggie)

A second type of social capital is implicated in the sharing of stories interracially. Bridging social capital consists of relationships between diverse social groups with varying access to resources and power but some mutual interest (Campbell, 2004). Black participants' sharing their stories with a white audience of different social positioning, and the unity seen, suggests the development of bridging social capital. Campbell (2004) argues that bridging social capital results from effective participation in collective action and allows communities to influence social change beyond their own context. Responsibility for change is shared with powerful groups. However, the potential of social capital may be hindered by powerful groups' resistance to change (Campbell, 2004). It would be interesting to further investigate audience reactions to the performances.

They will learn: Seniors become teachers. The youth's presence influenced the stories seniors chose to tell. Some chose a story to teach the youth about life when they were

younger and to encourage youth to appreciate their opportunities. This aligns with one of the goals of OSYS outlined in the funding application: to 'allow seniors to take their place as elders in the community while providing young people with the opportunity for self-expression.' Seniors took on a traditional elder role as teachers. Angela explains that, when helping participants choose their story, it was important for them to think about a story they wished to share with the other generation. This was one means of achieving the above-mentioned goal.

> *(...) and they were aware that they (seniors) will meet with the youth (...) so when they choosing the story they need to keep in mind why they choosing this story.* (Angela, facilitator)

Some seniors commented on their choosing stories to teach the youth.

> *That is why I knew that I need to choose one story and choose the one where I grew up. The way we were being raised—grew up—it's not the way they grew up and being raised. Lots of things—they don't know. That's the reason why I was happy. They will learn. As a teacher, I knew I would teach them some of the things we did.* (Anele, senior participant)

> *And then I thought "ok let me take the one when I grew up", especially that I knew was the youth that is coming so I feel like they need to know my childhood.* (Florence, senior participant)

> *I wanted to share that it's like—I didn't know my husband. (…). They have opportunity to get married to the person that they know and they even staying with. I was helping so that I was happy (…).* (Polly, senior participant)

Elders' participation in CBPR can re-establish their traditional leadership roles in the community, affirming indigenous values and enhancing community cohesion (Rasmus, 2014). Seniors' teaching roles in OSYS repositioned them as leaders in the community and supported intergenerational connection. However, it is unclear whether the second part of the above-mentioned OSYS goal was achieved in terms of youth's self-expression. Specifically, supporting seniors' taking their place as elders might have reinforced a generational power dynamic which could have hindered youth's self-expression. For example, a youth participant explains that his story choice was influenced by the seniors' presence and his desire to maintain their respect. This could have prevented self-expression.

> *Because it's like, if I share my other stories, I will lose my respect from the older* *people. That is why I choose that one.* (Brian, youth participant)

Promoting seniors' traditional elder roles might have also prevented their learning from the youth. One senior commented that she wanted to learn from the youth.

> *When we were about to meet the youth, I was happy. (…). We will also hear about* *their story. Because they are the one who teach us.* (Susan, senior participant)

However, youth did not report having taught seniors and seniors did not discuss what they had learned from youth. Intergenerational DST demonstrates students' realization that seniors wanted to learn from, and about, them (Lalor, 2009). Elders in Loe (2013) reported an interest in learning about young people's experiences to compare their own perception to real stories. OSYS's goal to affirm seniors' community-elder role might have neglected the potential of seniors' learning from the youth.

Challenging traditional generational roles and power dynamics might support intergenerational relationships by allowing for further learning and expression. This could support youth's self-expression by removing perceived constraints emerging from seniors' traditional roles. One youth participant's appreciation for a perceived shift in generational roles alludes to a possible desire to challenge traditional roles.

> *(…) I thought they would send me like "go do that, go do that"...So when I arrived—* *when everyone was laughing and everyone was having the tea, the porridge—so it* *means that I'm gonna be offered instead of offering them.* (Siphi, youth participant)

Supporting Processes

It is important to determine which processes contributed to the stated benefits of the project so they may be further developed. Coaching and creation of a story space were identified. Varying satisfaction with coaching necessitates an assessment of underlying power dynamics.

Coaching. Coaching plays an important role in the OSYS curriculum. Facilitators assigned coaching groups in preparation for sessions to ensure that each participant was heard by a facilitator in a small group. Participants could also perform their stories for the entire group and receive group coaching. Coaching focused on stories' beginnings and endings as well as performance skills such as eye contact, body language, voice, volume and general communication skills.

In one of the last sessions, the benefits of coaching became apparent in that participants had learned, from listening and critiquing, important aspects of storytelling; confidence, background information and clarity (field notes). Despite this, the coaching process was met with varying responses from participants. Two senior participants explain their appreciation for coaching.

> *I loved the support. The support of like sharing your stories and also people like commenting on your stories because you gonna be clear, especially the actions.* (Betty, senior participant)

> *It helped me a lot—being coached.* (Florence, senior participant)

According to others, there seemed to be conflict between participants' freedom of expression and project goals. While the project aimed to develop stories to be performed for an audience, some participants wanted more freedom to share without constraints. They felt that coaching advice as to what to include and exclude in their stories limited their expression. This affects OSYS's goal for youth's self-expression dealt with earlier and relates to common issues of power in CBPR (Altman, 1995; Ansell et al., 2012). One youth participant felt restricted in his control over his own story, implying that his story was influenced by facilitators' input and his desire not to be 'rude' when receiving this assistance.

> *To be honest, I didn't like the feedback from the people. I felt like—for me when I'm sharing this story, it's important to share this. And then when the people—they like I need to take it out and I'm wasting the time—I would think like how can I do it. So—but I thought like I would listen. When I spoke to Maggie and Nicole (facilitators) (…). Then it's like instead of cutting out the things, let me do it short because I felt like I'm being rude because you were helping me to cook this.* (Brian, youth participant)

Brian's perceived need to be agreeable to coaching presents a barrier to his freedom of expression. Similarly, Ansell et al. (2012) found that perceived lack of research power left participants unable to protect their own narratives, thus limiting their engagement. Other participants felt disturbed by coaching direction.

> *(…) it kind of like being disturbed because it's like I wanted to finish but we understand the process that you need to be timed up.* (Lucy, senior participant)

Maggie explains that the project does not simply aim to allow therapeutic expression, but to equip participants with storytelling skills. She argues that coaching is beneficial for participants.

> *(…) because the project aims to build up the participants to a level where they are able to stand in front of an audience and share their story, there's a level of (…) learning, crafting, coaching that needs to happen. (…) I often had the debate around it would be much easier to do it the other way because they benefit from just sharing their stories but I can see that the coaching of the stories, although it can be challenging because "it's my story, don't tell me how to tell my story," it also brings so much benefit to them (…) being able to stand in front of an audience and master something.* (Maggie, facilitator)

The conflict between project goals and participants' objectives represents dilemmas outlined in the CBPR literature. Desire for programme integrity, in this case ensuring participants can deliver their stories to an audience, exists in conflict with participants' desire for free expression (Altman, 1995). Travers et al. (2013) implicate power differentials in prioritization of researchers' objectives over those of community members. The data collection-service delivery debate (Altman, 1995) is also relevant. While coaching allowed for collection of narratives, it may have prevented delivery of desired services, such as freedom of expression.

Despite dissatisfaction, Maggie argues that coaching was intended for participants' benefit as well as project goal attainment and participants did understand its importance. From observation of storytelling 'mastery', I believe coaching did benefit participants. Specifically, mastery and performance, influenced by coaching, have been discussed in terms of confidence-development. Addressing power dynamics and redefining participation could support self-expression and satisfaction while serving project goals.

A story space: Facilitator-participant relationships. An important aspect of OSYS, outlined in the curriculum, is the creation of a safe storytelling space in which participants feel heard and free to share. An important element in achieving this was facilitators' relationships with participants. Throughout observation, it was clear that facilitators were bonding with participants (field notes). Participants were always happy to see facilitators and to engage with them.

Researcher-community relationships are argued to affect project sustainability (Altman, 1995). Networks created between participants and Clowns Without Borders South

Africa may constitute bridging social capital for social change (Campbell, 2004). Participants in Beltran and Begun (2014) argued that DST's effects on transformation were influenced by perceptions of a safe environment of interconnectedness. This points to the importance of a safe story space and researcher-participant connections. Maggie explains this.

> *The main like premise of OSYS is creating a story space (...) so there's like a story heart that's required which means an openness, a connection (...). I think part of that story space is who the facilitators are and what they bring. (...) so, the connection and the relationships that we build with the participants is very important.* (Maggie, facilitator)

Angela highlights the role of the facilitators' "friendliness" in making the project enjoyable for participants.

> *I think we built like a strong relationship because even our last day there, I was like saying our goodbyes and they were like "Angela, when you do things, please invite us."* (Angela, facilitator)

Seniors, especially, displayed affection toward facilitators and expressed sadness when the project came to an end. One senior participant had to leave the last session early due to a death in her family. She expressed her affection through her appreciation for the opportunity to say goodbye.

> *I'm just grateful that when I go, I know that I did see you.* (Francis, senior participant)

Barriers to Engagement

Engagement quality was influenced by seniors' disability, language barriers and partner organisations' disengagement. Seniors' disability represents a generational difference in participation quality. The latter two barriers necessitate inquiry into the distribution of power.

Seniors' disability. According to its funding application, OSYS aims to involve 'children and adults with disability directly in the project.' CBPR should ensure inclusion of disabled participants and failing to do so is tantamount to discrimination (Hassouneh et al., 2011). However, Hassouneh et al. (2011) explain that disability can prevent full engagement of participants. While some seniors had disabilities, I argue that some may have been restricted from fully participating due to these disabilities. Disabilities ranged from being confined to a wheelchair to deafness, blindness and lack of physical strength (field notes).

Various curricular activities challenged inclusion. This is suggested by Maggie and Angela (facilitators) in their interviews. A senior participant voices her feeling excluded from the focus group. This suggests a possible silencing of disabled seniors throughout the project.

> *(...) the age—hearing—kind of disabilities that might—um, hinder (engagement) (...)* (Maggie, facilitator)

> *And some of the seniors—the—doing some of the energisers—it was difficult because some of them—they struggle to stand up.* (Angela, facilitator)

> *I'm just raising my hand for being happy. I didn't even hear what she was sharing (...) 'cause I can't hear. So that girl (youth participant)—when she was speaking—she was like 'shmmshmmshmm.'* (Fiona, senior participant)

Energizers formed a significant part of the curriculum in order to maintain participants' focus but challenged disabled seniors' engagement. For example, 'boom chicka boom' and 'funky chicken' were songs, led by facilitators, requiring participants to stand up, dance and sing. Some seniors had difficulty participating because of confinement to wheelchairs or lacking strength (field notes). It is possible that these seniors felt they could not fully engage. None of the seniors voiced this in the focus group. However, it might be the case that those who were 'excluded' due to disability felt silenced in the focus group itself.

There were efforts from facilitators to involve those who could not fully engage so that they did not feel excluded, for example, by helping them get up (field notes). There were songs taught which did not require physical activity, such as 'Baba Lagumba.' The seniors enjoyed learning this song and more could participate fully. It is important to constantly re-evaluate disability strategies (Hassouneh et al., 2011), for example, to note silencing or exclusion. Matching activities to participants' abilities (Hassouneh et al., 2011) could prevent disability from restricting engagement and promote inclusivity goals. Specifically, activities, such as energizers, should cater to seniors' abilities.

My story were not that clear to them: Language barriers. At the Rondebosch performance, the audience was predominantly white. Seniors shared their stories in Xhosa which meant a lot of the audience could not understand. There was debate among facilitators as to whether to have translation during the story or to let the audience 'experience' it. It was decided that a brief summary of the story would be given in English prior to its telling.

However, during intermission, facilitators changed the format to include translation during the story. Each method had its advantaged and disadvantages. Of the two participants who had their stories summarised in English before-hand, one appreciated the summary while the other felt her story was not fully understood.

> *For me—first it's like—before we share—you (translator) first share our story—what is it about. So when we entered, we know that these people—they know what it will be like hearing. So we're not afraid, we know that they know like what we are talking about.* (Susan, senior participant)

> *For me, I had something inside me—even if it was shared, she didn't share everything the way I'm sharing it. (…) My story were not that clear to them.* (Florence, senior participant)

The two seniors who had full translation for their stories also differed in how they felt. One felt it was manageable while the other found it distracting to the point where she mistakenly switched to English mid-story.

> *For me, I didn't get disturbed because I was sharing and then giving Chris (facilitator/translator) the chance to translate.* (Joanne, senior participant)

> *What made me hurt it's like the part where you say like you need to stop and then someone to translate. ... And like I need to wait and then the thing that I was gonna share is like (snaps fingers to signal loss of idea) (…) and that is why I ended up speaking English.* (Betty, senior participant)

Both facilitators argued that this needed to be addressed for future OSYS projects to ensure participants feel understood without disturbances. Maggie discussed the importance of making sure storytellers feel understood.

> *I'm not sure how we can improve it but I think it needs like to be thought of—how we can translate the stories or translate whatever the participant is saying in their own language.* (Angela, facilitator)

> *It was sad—like she (Florence) didn't feel like she'd fully gotten a chance to share her story (...). I'm looking at maybe doing a digital story translation (...) because it's important that the storyteller feels that the people are understanding what they saying (...).* (Maggie, facilitator)

While digital translation is one solution, I believe issues surrounding translation relate to dimensions of power. Specifically, facilitators need to think about the implications of taking participants out of their communities to perform for a white audience and their having to accommodate the audience's linguistic needs. There is a certain power dynamic created when participants, as guests, have to cater to the audience's needs in a foreign environment. Participants will surely feel less powerful. While it has been established that this performance celebrated heritage and diversity and created interracial connection, this could be achieved by hosting a performance in Philippi, participants' own community, for a white audience. There is a power dynamic implicated in the assumption that white communities need to have heritage 'delivered' rather than accepting the responsibility of pursuing it. Language barriers may be less problematic at a performance held in participants' community where they feel empowered as hosts and satisfied with translation processes.

Partner organisations' disengagement. Broad-based support for CBPR projects is essential for high-quality participation (Altman, 1995). According to its funding application, OSYS aims to partner with existing organisations in the community for optimal success. OSYS partnered with a youth employment organization and a senior organization which runs clubs supporting vulnerable seniors. Lack of partner support restricts potential benefits of participation (Altman, 1995). Establishing trust and common understanding between partners in CBPR can be time-consuming (Rhodes et al., 2015). Maggie explains that the partnerships were not as successful as intended and argues that future projects need to make partners more accountable.

> *So, as much as we tried to facilitate good partnership, it felt like they weren't interested. (…) I would've liked much more support from their organizations for the participants. They didn't really show any engagement or support. And I think it would have benefitted the participants quite a lot if their own organisations would support the process (…). (…) it's not that they were anti (OSYS) at all. (…) I think it's a symptom of being super-busy (…) and knowing that this other organisation is coming and offering this thing to your participants. (…). So we might say "you need to meet us" (financially) but (…) it kinda felt like they wouldn't have—then we wouldn't have been able to partner because they don't have the resources to give.* (Maggie, facilitator)

I noticed that, at (youth organisation's) offices, management would check in as facilitators arrived but would not stay to observe sessions. I never saw management discussing participants' experiences with them. I did not see anyone from (senior

organization) management at sessions. As Maggie argues that partners were not "anti" OSYS, the reason for lack of support is likely time or financial constraints rather than disinterest (Altman, 1995). It is necessary to investigate partner organizations' perceptions of their role to determine the underlying reasons behind lack of engagement. This was, however, beyond the scope of this project.

While participants were likely unaware of their respective organisations' disengagement, Maggie argues that this support would have benefited participants. Powerful stakeholders' involvement in bottom-up efforts contributes to bridging social capital by forming alliances between them and community members which support social change (Campbell, 2004). Alliances between participants, partner organisations and OSYS may contribute to project outcomes. Therefore, stakeholders' intention for engagement must be addressed (Campbell, 2004). Plans for creating incentive and accountability can motivate engaged collaboration (Campbell, 2004). It is important not to rely on financial investment to create this incentive as it seemed partners did not have the resources. Instead, partners' involvement in project planning could sustain incentive and accountability.

Recommendations

Generational roles, coaching, language and partners' disengagement may be managed by addressing power dimensions. It is recommended that OSYS redefine participation so that power be redistributed to enhance participatory benefits and maintain programme integrity.

Involving participants in goal-setting could allow insight into the generational roles participants wish to shift. If consulted during planning, youth may have voiced a desire to challenge traditional roles and seniors a desire to learn from youth. OSYS could become more relevant to participants and project goals could be supported, for example, by promoting youth's self-expression.

Participants' involvement in OSYS's design could manage coaching-related dissatisfaction by resolving data collection-service-delivery dilemmas. Participatory goal-setting could promote service-delivery, for self-expression, while maintaining organizational goals for data collection and storytelling mastery. Communication of power differentials is advised. Explaining the benefits of coaching for both participant and project objectives could manage resistance. Discussing participants' desire for self-expression and project goals for storytelling mastery could make power dynamics visible, thus negating potential negative effects thereof.

Dissatisfaction with translation during the performance is argued to relate to bringing participants into a more powerful community and having them 'accommodate' the audience. Bringing white audiences into participants' communities could de-problematise translation as participants may more willingly accommodate the audience when they do not feel powerless in an unfamiliar environment. I recommend that participants be involved in performance planning. Participants' organization of a showcase in their own communities could be empowering and develop new skills. Inviting white audiences into participants' communities could support interracial learning and connection, without perpetuating oppressor-oppressed relationships. Thus, this would support OSYS objectives.

Coalition development with partners, beginning during programme design, is suggested to establish trust, understanding and communication. Thus, I recommend involvement of partner organizations in project planning. Opportunities for time investment in, and meaningful contributions to, the project could serve as an incentive for engagement. This would contribute to bridging social capital. Familiarity with participants means partners' involvement might enhance project relevance by acknowledging participants' needs.

Conclusion

Participation in OSYS benefited participants through psychological liberation, empowerment, intergenerational and interracial connections and seniors becoming teachers. Coaching and the creation of a story space supported these benefits. Seniors' disability, language barriers and partners' disengagement limited participation and potential benefits thereof. Differences in youth and seniors' experiences are evident within themes of intergenerational connection, seniors becoming teachers and seniors' disability. Identified benefits and barriers overlap with those outlined in the CBPR literature. Psychological liberation and connections fostered are specific to storytelling CBPR. OSYS's focus on performance arguably contributed to confidence development not evident in DST projects. OSYS has achieved many of its objectives, for example: celebrating heritage and diversity, allowing seniors to take on community elder roles and promoting intergenerational connections and social cohesion.

It is argued, however, that power differentials may have affected aspects of participation including generational roles, dissatisfaction with coaching and translation and partner organisations' disengagement. Recommendations have been made for redefining participation in a way which redistributes power. Assigning participants and partner organisations a role in project planning could enhance OSYS's relevance and support goal attainment. Power redistribution could manage barriers to participation, thus enhancing the benefits thereof while promoting participant empowerment.

This research contributes to the literature on CBPR participation argued to promote empowerment and transformation from within communities. OSYS's participatory benefits raise awareness as to the importance of participation in CBPR. Particularly, insight is offered into storytelling CBPR participation in South Africa because of its potential contribution to empowerment and community capacity. Despite prioritising participation, storytelling CBPR is susceptible to researcher-participant power differentials. Awareness is therefore raised as to possible barriers to participatory benefits, specifically power dynamics. CBPR projects, including those with storytelling methodology, should ensure power is shared between researchers and participants. This stands to support participatory benefits and programme integrity by balancing research-specific objectives with participatory ones.

References

Altheide, D. L. (1987). Reflections: Ethnographic content analysis. *Qualitative Sociology*, *10*(1), 65-77. doi: 10.1007/bf00988269

Altman, D. G. (1995). Sustaining interventions in community systems: On the relationship between researchers and communities. *Health Psychology*, *14*(6), 526-536. doi: 10.1037//0278-6133.14.6.526

Ansell, N., Robson, E., Hajdu, F., & van Blerk, L. (2012). Learning from young people about their lives: Using participatory methods to research the impacts of AIDS in southern Africa. *Children's Geographies*, *10*(2), 169-186. doi: 10.1080/14733285.2012.667918

Beltran, R., & Begun, S. (2014). 'It is medicine' narratives of healing from the Aotearoa Digital Storytelling as Indigenous Media Project (ADSIMP). *Psychology & Developing Societies*, *26*(2), 155-179. doi: 10.1177/0971333614549137

Berger, R. (2015). Now I see it, now I don't: Researcher's position and reflexivity in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research*, *15*(2), 219-234. doi: 10.1177/1468794112468475

Bloom, T., Wagman, J., Hernandez, R., Yragui, N., Hernandez-Valdovinos, N., Dahlstrom, M., & Glass, N. (2009). Partnering with community-based organizations to reduce intimate partner violence. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 31(2), 244-257. doi: 10.1177/0739986309333291

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77-101. doi: 10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Bray, R., Gooskens, I., Moses, S., Kahn, L., & Seekings, J. (2010). *Childhood and adolescence in post-apartheid Cape Town.* Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC Press.

Bryant, C. (2007). Planning and moderating focus group research. In M. V. Angrosino (Eds.), *Doing cultural anthropology: Practices in ethnographic data collection* (pp. 115-129). Long Grove, Illinois: Waveland Press.

Campbell, C. (2004). The role of collective action in the prevention of HIV/AIDS in South Africa. In D. Hook (Ed.), *Critical psychology* (pp. 335-359). Cape Town, South Africa: University of Cape Town Press.

Campbell, C., & Cornish, F. (2010). Towards a "fourth generation" of approaches to HIV/AIDS management: Creating contexts for effective community mobilisation. *Aids Care*, *22*(2), 1569-1579. doi: 10.1080/09540121.2010.525812

Cho, J. Y., & Lee, E. H. (2014). Reducing confusion about grounded theory and qualitative content analysis: Similarities and differences. *The Qualitative Report*, *19*(32), 1-20.

Cozby, P. C., & Bates, S. C. (2012). *Methods in behavioral research*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

De Schweinitz, P., Ansong, D., Manortey, S., Amuasi, J., Boakye, I., Crookston, B. T., & Alder, S. (2009). Evaluating international collaboration: Differential perceptions of partnership in a CBPR project in Ghana. *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics*, *4*(4), 53-67. doi: 10.1525/jer.2009.4.4.53

Duncan, N., Stevens, G., & Canham, H. (2014). Living through the legacy: The Apartheid Archive Project and the possibilities for psychosocial transformation. *South African Journal of Psychology*, *44*(3), 282-291. doi: 10.1177/0081246314533636

Fetterman, D. M. (1998). *Ethnography: Step-by-step* (Vol. 17). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Flicker, S. (2008). Who benefits from community-based participatory research? A case study of the Positive Youth Project. *Health Education & Behavior*, *35*(1), 70-86. doi: 10.1177/1090198105285927

Guareschi, P. A., & Jovchelovitch, S. (2004). Participation, health and the development of community resources in Southern Brazil. *Journal of Health Psychology*, *9*(2), 311-322. doi: 10.1177/1359105304040896

Guta, A., Wilson, M. G., Flicker, S., Travers, R., Mason, C., Wenyeve, G., & O'Campo, P. (2010). Are we asking the right questions? A review of Canadian REB practices in relation to community-based participatory research. *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics: An International Journal*, *5*(2), 35-46. doi: 10.1525/jer.2010.5.2.35

Hassouneh, D., Alcala-Moss, A., & McNeff, E. (2011). Practical strategies for promoting full inclusion of individuals with disabilities in community-based participatory intervention research. *Research in Nursing & Health*, *34*(3), 253-265. doi: 10.1002/nur.20434

Holzman, L. (2013). Critical psychology, philosophy, and social therapy. *Human Studies*, *36*(4), 471-489. doi: 10.1007/s10746-013-9293-x

Hughes, M. (2012). Unitary Appreciative Inquiry (UAI): A new approach for researching social work education and practice. *British Journal of Social Work*,*42*(7), 1388-1405. doi:10.1093/bjsw/bcr139

Israel, B. A., Schulz, A. J., Parker, E. A., & Becker, A. B. (1998). Review of community-based research: Assessing partnership approaches to improve public health. *Annual Review of Public Health*, *19*(1), 173-202. doi: 10.1146/annurev.publhealth.19.1.173

Janzen, R., Mark Pancer, S., Nelson, G., Loomis, C., & Hasford, J. (2010). Evaluating community participation as prevention: Life narratives of youth. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *38*(8), 992-1006. doi: 10.1002/jcop.20410

Kessi, S. (2010). *Shooting Horizons: A study of youth empowerment and social change in Tanzania and South Africa* (Doctoral dissertation, The London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE)).

Khodyakov, D., Stockdale, S., Jones, A., Mango, J., Jones, F., & Lizaola, E. (2013). On measuring community participation in research. *Health Education & Behavior*, *40*(3), 346-354. doi: 10.1177/1090198112459050

Lalor, D. (2009) *Ipswich stories: Using digital storytelling to research intergenerational sharing of heritage, history, place, identity and community connection: A pilot study*. (Unpublished)

Lazarus, S., Bulbulia, S., Taliep, N., & Naidoo, A. V. (2015). Community-based participatory research as a critical enactment of community psychology. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *43*(1), 87-98. doi: 10.1002/jcop.21689

LeCompte, M. D., & Schensul, J. J. (1999). *Designing and conducting ethnographic research* (Vol. 1). Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Lenart-Cheng, H., & Walker, D. (2011). Recent trends in using life stories for social and political activism. *Biography*, 141-179. doi: 10.1353/bio.2011.0005

Leseho, J., & Block, L. (2005). "Listen and I tell you something": Storytelling and social action in the healing of the oppressed. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, *33*(2), 175-184. doi: 10.1080/03069880500132706

Loe, M. (2013). The digital life history project: Intergenerational collaborative research. *Gerontology & Geriatrics Education*, *34*(1), 26-42. doi: 10.1080/02701960.2012.718013

Malone, R. E., McGruder, C., Froelicher, E. S., & Yerger, V. B. (2013). Being part of something transformative outcomes of a community-based participatory study. *Health Promotion Practice*, *14*(2), 205-212. doi: 10.1177/1524839912443242

Mauthner, N. S., & Doucet, A. (2003). Reflexive accounts and accounts of reflexivity in qualitative data analysis. *Sociology*, *37*(3), 413-431. doi: 10.1177/00380385030373002

Mosavel, M., Simon, C., Van Stade, D., & Buchbinder, M. (2005). Community-based participatory research (CBPR) in South Africa: Engaging multiple constituents to shape the research question. *Social Science & Medicine*, *61*(12), 2577-2587. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2005.04.041

Nuttavuthisit, K., Jindahra, P., & Prasarnphanich, P. (2014). Participatory community development: Evidence from Thailand. *Community Development Journal*, *50*(1), 55-70. doi:10.1093/cdj/bsu002

Orb, A., Eisenhauer, L., & Wynaden, D. (2001). Ethics in qualitative research. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, *33*(1), 93-96. doi: 10.1111/j.1547-5069.2001.00093.x

Pellatt, G. (2003). Ethnography and reflexivity: Emotions and feelings in fieldwork. *Nurse Researcher*, *10*(3), 28-37. doi: 10.7748/nr2003.04.10.3.28.c5894

Prinsloo, M. (2008). Community-based participatory research: A case study from South Africa. *International Journal of Market Research*, *50*(3), 339-354.

Rasmus, S. M. (2014). Indigenizing CBPR: Evaluation of a community-based and participatory research process implementation of the Elluam Tungiinun (towards wellness) programme in Alaska. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *54*(1-2), 170-179. doi: 10.1007/s10464-014-9653-3

Rhodes, S. D., Alonzo, J., Mann, L., Freeman, A., Sun, C. J., Garcia, M., & Painter, T. M. (2015). Enhancement of a locally developed HIV prevention intervention for Hispanic/Latino MSM: A partnership of community-based organizations, a University, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *AIDS Education and Prevention*, *27*(4), 312-332. doi: 10.1521/aeap.2015.27.4.312

Russell, G., Advocat, J., Geneau, R., Farrell, B., Thille, P., Ward, N., & Evans, S. (2012). Examining organizational change in primary care practices: Experiences from using ethnographic methods. *Family Practice*, *29*(4), 455-461. doi: 10.1093/fampra/cmr117

Schensul, S. L., Schensul, J. J., & Lecompte, M. D. (1999). *Essential ethnographic methods: Observations, interviews, and questionnaires* (Vol. 2). Walnut Ceek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Shover, N. (2012). Ethnographic methods in criminological research: Rationale, reprise, and warning. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *37*(2), 139-145. doi: 10.1007/s12103-012-9160-8

Stoecker, R. (2009). Are we talking the walk of community-based research?. *Action Research, 7*(4), 385-404. doi: 10.1177/1476750309340944

Teo, T. (2015). Critical psychology: A geography of intellectual engagement and resistance. *American Psychologist, 70*(3), 243-254. doi: 10.1037/a0038727

Travers, R., Pyne, J., Bauer, G., Munro, L., Giambrone, B., Hammond, R., & Scanlon, K. (2013). 'Community control' in CBPR: Challenges experienced and questions raised from the Trans PULSE project. *Action Research*, 11(4), 403–422. doi: 10.1177/1476750313507093

Vaismoradi, M., Turunen, H., & Bondas, T. (2013). Content analysis and thematic analysis: Implications for conducting a qualitative descriptive study. *Nursing & Health Sciences*, *15*(3), 398-405. doi: 10.1111/nhs.12048

Van Niekerk, L., Lorenzo, T., & Mdlokolo, P. (2006). Understanding partnerships in developing disabled entrepreneurs through participatory action research. *Disability & Rehabilitation*, *28*(5), 323-331. doi: 10.1080/09638280500166425

Williams, A. (1993). Diversity and agreement in feminist ethnography. *Sociology*, *27*(4), 575-589. doi: 10.1177/0038038593027004002

Wolff, T. (2014). Community psychology practice: Expanding the impact of psychology's work. *American Psychologist*, *69*(8), 803-813. doi: 10.1037/a0037426

Zaal, M., & Terry, J. (2013). Knowing what I can do and who I can be: Youth identity transformational benefits of participatory action research. *Journal of Ethnographic and Qualitative Research, 8*(1), 42-55.

Appendix A

Informed Consent Form for Interview Participants

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

Participant Experiences of the Our Story Your Story project

1. **Invitation and Purpose**

   You are invited to take part in this study which evaluates participant experiences of the Our Story Your Story project. I am an honours student in the Psychology department at the University of Cape Town.

2. **Procedures**

   - If you decide to take part in this study, you will participate in an interview. Questions will be asked about your experience of running OSYS processes with participants, their engagement and reactions to the project. You will also be free to discuss any other aspects of the project. Data collected will be used to inform future Our Story Your Story projects.

   - The interview will last between 45 minutes and 1 hour but can be extended if needed.

3. **Risks and Inconveniences**

   - Participation in this study poses no physical or psychological risk to you.

   - You might be inconvenienced by having to give up an hour of your time.

4. **Benefits**

   - This study provides a forum for debriefing after the Our Story Your Story process. You will be able to discuss your thoughts and feelings in an confidential space and to voice any concerns or comments you may have about the running of the project.

   - Participation will also ensure that your contributions are taken into account for future Our Story Your Story projects.

5. **Privacy and Confidentiality**

   - Anything you say in your interview will remain strictly confidential. In order to ensure anonymity, your name will not be used anywhere.

   - Quotations may be used in data analysis sections however, you have the right to request that anything you share be removed from the record.

- A tape recorder will be used to record the interview.

- Only myself and my supervisor will have access to the tape recordings.

- Results of the study will be presented in the form of an honours research project to the Psychology department at the University of Cape Town.

- Participation in this study is voluntary. You will be free to withdraw from the interview at any time with no consequences.

6. **Economic Considerations**

- There are no costs associated with your participation.

- There is no payment for participation.

7. **Contact Details**

Should you have any questions, concerns or complaints about this study, please contact Candice Linde on 0824970644 or Dr Shose Kessi at the Department of Psychology, University of Cape Town on 021 650-4606.

8. **Signatures**

{Subject's name}_____ has been informed of the nature and purpose of the procedures described above including any risks involved in its performance. He or she has been given time to ask any questions and these questions have been answered to the best of the investigator's ability. A signed copy of this consent form will be made available to the subject.

_____
Investigator's Signature   Date

I have been informed about this research study and understand its purpose, possible benefits, risks, and discomforts. I agree to take part in this research as a subject. I know that I am free to withdraw this consent and quit this project at any time, and that doing so will not cause me any penalty or loss of benefits that I would otherwise be entitled to enjoy

_____
Subject's Signature   Date

Appendix B

Informed Consent Form for Focus Group Participants

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

Participant Experiences of the Our Story Your Story project

1. **Invitation and Purpose**

    You are invited to take part in this study which evaluates participant experiences of the Our Story Your Story project. I am an honours student in the Psychology department at the University of Cape Town.

2. **Procedures**

- If you decide to take part in this study, you will participate in a focus group. Questions will be asked about how you experienced the Our Story Your Story project. Specifically, I am interested in your perceptions of benefits of, and barriers to, participation. You will also be free to discuss any other aspects of the project. Data collected will be used to inform future Our Story Your Story projects.

- The focus group will last between 45 minutes and 1 hour but can be extended if needed.

3. **Risks and Inconveniences**

- Participation in this study poses no physical or psychological risk to you.

- You might be inconvenienced by having to give up an hour of your time.

4. **Benefits**

- This study provides a forum for debriefing after the Our Story Your Story process. You will be able to discuss your thoughts and feelings in an confidential space as well as to hear and discuss other participants' similar or different thoughts and feelings.

- Participation will also ensure that your positive and negative contributions can be taken into account for future Our Story Your Story projects.

5. **Privacy and Confidentiality**

- Anything you say in focus groups will remain strictly confidential. In order to ensure anonymity, your name will not be used anywhere.

- Quotations may be used in data analysis sections however, you have the right to request that anything you share be removed from the record.

- A tape recorder will be used to record the focus group.

- Only myself and my supervisor will have access to the tape recordings.

- Results of the study will be presented in the form of an honours research project to the Psychology department at the University of Cape Town.

- Participation in this study is voluntary. You will be free to withdraw from the focus group at any time with no consequences.

6. **Economic Considerations**

- There are no costs associated with your participation.

- There is no payment for participation.

7. **Contact Details**

   Should you have any questions, concerns or complaints about this study, please contact Candice Linde on 0824970644 or Dr Shose Kessi at the Department of Psychology, University of Cape Town on 021 650-4606.

8. **Signatures**

   {Subject's name}_____ has been informed of the nature and purpose of the procedures described above including any risks involved in its performance. He or she has been given time to ask any questions and these questions have been answered to the best of the investigator's ability. A signed copy of this consent form will be made available to the subject.

   _____
   Investigator's Signature   Date

   I have been informed about this research study and understand its purpose, possible benefits, risks, and discomforts. I agree to take part in this research as a subject. I know that I am free to withdraw this consent and quit this project at any time, and that doing so will not cause me any penalty or loss of benefits that I would otherwise be entitled to enjoy

   _____
   Subject's Signature   Date

Appendix C

Interview Schedule

1. How do you feel the workshops were received by participants? Was there a change over time?

   a. what aspects do you feel participants most enjoyed?

   b. what aspects do you feel participants found difficult?

2. Do you think there were barriers to participants' engagement which may have prevented them from fully experiencing the process?

3. What do you think can be improved for future OSYS projects?

4. Did you see any change or personal growth in participants throughout the process? What skills and attitudes were developed?

5. How did participants appear to feel about sharing their personal stories and listening to others'?

6. Were there any differences in engagement between seniors and learners?

7. What effect do you think the intergenerational interaction had on each group of participants?

8. How do you think participants feel about their participation after the project?

Appendix D

Focus Group Schedule (which informed OSYS's reflection session)

1. How did the OSYS workshops make you feel? Ie. Sharing and listening to stories.
2. How did telling your stories for an audience make you feel?
3. What did you learn? What skills/attitudes did you develop?
4. Was there any aspect of the process you found difficult? Or did not enjoy? Why?
5. How did sharing your stories with, and hearing stories of, learners/seniors make you feel?
6. Have your feelings toward your community, seniors/learners and yourselves changed throughout the project? How so?
7. When you look back, how do you feel about your experiences participating in OSYS?

Appendix E

Notice of Workshop Observation

Our Story Your Story

Memorandum of Agreement

Dear OSYS workshop participant,

This notice is to inform you that the OSYS workshops will be observed by an outside researcher in order to evaluate the program. The observation will not be intrusive and you should feel comfortable to act as you normally would. You may also ask the researcher any questions you have about the purpose and process of the research.

The researcher is a psychology honours student from the University of Cape Town. The research serves to evaluate the OSYS process so that it may be improved for future projects.

If you have any questions of concerns about this, please contact Candice Linde on 0824970644 or Shose Kessi on 021 650 4606.

Candice Linde (researcher)

OSYS team