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ABSTRACT

This study explored ways in which private companies and community collaboration can be capitalised and directed towards building resilience in communities. Limited research, indicating how private companies can collaborate with communities with the aim of building community resilience and contributing to disaster reduction exists. Therefore, the goal of this study was to make recommendations for private companies and community collaboration towards building resilience in the community.

The study applied both a review of literature and empirical research in order to achieve its objectives. The study was based on a qualitative research approach and the design that was employed in the study was a case study. The data collection methods used in the collection of data was focus group interviews with the community of Diepsloot and semi-structured individual interviews with the private companies operating in close proximity of the community. Through the study of literature and the contributions from the respondents in the study, the study highlighted the need for private company engagement in disaster risk reduction and resilience building in communities. The study further recognised, through theory and empirical research, the motivation for private companies collaborating with the community in order to build community resilience.

The study made recommendations on how private companies, through collaborating with communities, can direct their community engagement projects towards building resilience in the community. The recommendations made in the study highlight the need for private companies to have knowledge and awareness of disaster risk reduction related concepts with the aim of integrating disaster risk reduction related activities in their corporate social responsibility projects. Further to this, the recommendations propose that private companies can drive disaster risk reduction education in the community and moreover, the recommendations further highlight the need for private companies to consult with the community prior to collaborating and the inclusion of community protection forums in the collaboration process. The limitations of the study identified the limited scope of the study and presented the prospects for the study to recommend additional areas for future research.
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OPSOMMING

Hierdie studie het maniere waarop privaat maatskappye en gemeenskapsamewerking gekapitaliseer kan word, verken en is gerig op die bou van veerkragtigheid in gemeenskappe. Daar bestaan beperkte navorsing oor hoe privaat maatskappye met gemeenskappe kan saamwerk met die doel om gemeenskapsveerkragtigheid te bou en by te dra tot ramp vermindering. Daarom was die doel van hierdie studie om aanbevelings te maak vir privaat maatskappye en gemeenskapsamewerking om veerkragtigheid in die gemeenskap te bou.

Die studie het beide die hersiening van literatuur en empiriese navorsing toegepas om die doelwitte te bereik. Die studie was gebaseer op 'n kwalitatiewe navorsingsbenadering en die ontwerp wat in die studie gebruik is, was 'n gevallestudie. Die data-insamplingsmetodes wat gebruik is in die versameling van data was fokusgroeponderhoude met die gemeenskap van Diepsloot en semi-gestrukturierde individuele onderhoude met die privaat maatskappye wat naby die gemeenskap werkzaam was. Deur die studie van literatuur en die bydraes van die respondentie in die studie, is die behoefte aan privaat maatskappybetrokkenheid in ramprisikoverminderingsvermindering en veerkragtigheid in gemeenskappe beklemtoon. Die studie erken verder, deur middel van teorie en empiriese navorsing, die motivering vir private maatskappye wat saamwerk met die gemeenskap om gemeenskapsveerkragtigheid te bou.

Die studie het aanbevelings gemaak oor hoe privaat maatskappye, deur samewerking met gemeenskappe, hul gemeenskapsbetrokkenheidsprojekte kan rig om veerkragtigheid in die gemeenskap te bou. Die aanbevelings wat in die studie gemaak is, beklemtoon die noodsaaklikheid dat privaat maatskappye kennis en bewustheid van ramprisikoverminderingsverwante konsepte moet hé met die doel om ramprisikoverminderingsverwante aktiwiteite in hul korporatiewe sosiale verantwoordelikhedsprojekte te integreer. Daarbenewens stel die aanbevelings voor dat privaat maatskappye ramprisikoverminderingsonderwys in die gemeenskap kan bestuur. Die aanbevelings duí ook verder daarop dat privaat maatskappye met die gemeenskap moet konsulteer voordat hulle saamwerk en dat gemeenskapsbeveiligingsforums in die samewerkingsproses ingesluit moet word. Die tekortkominge van die studie het die beperkte omvang van die studie geïdentifiseer en die vooruitsigte daargestel om bykomende gebiede vir toekomstige navorsing aan te beveel.
Sleutelwoorde

Veerkrachtigheid; Gemeenskapsveerkrachtigheid; Samewerking; Privaat maatskappy; korporatiewe sosiale verantwoordelijkheid; Gemeenskap; Ramprisikovermindering; Stedelike ramp; volhoubare ontwikkeling.
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### ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community Based Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPF</td>
<td>Community Protection Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COJ</td>
<td>City of Johannesburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>Department for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRR-PSP</td>
<td>Disaster risk reduction-Private sector partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMA</td>
<td>Disaster Management Act of South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRR</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFDRR</td>
<td>Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFA</td>
<td>Hyogo Framework of Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPCC</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Panel on Climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRC</td>
<td>National Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>Private-Public Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>Price Waterhouse Coopers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNISDR</td>
<td>United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

1.1 INTRODUCTION AND ORIENTATION

Disasters can have devastating effects on humanity and ultimately threaten the progression towards achieving sustainable development. According to Dominey-Howes *et al.* (2014:904), disasters can have short- to long-term ramifications on the economic, social and environmental development of countries, particularly developing countries where there are limited resources to prepare for and respond to disasters. For instance, the United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR, 2014:7) indicates that approximately 68.5 million people were affected by a total of over 147 recorded disasters on the African continent between 2011 and 2012. Adding to the social and human ramifications of disasters, Africa experienced and continues to experience devastating economic consequences. In this regard Africa’s economic losses, because of disasters, averaged well over US$1 billion between 2001 and 2010 (UNISDR, 2014:7). The effects of disasters on the African economy has a bearing on the private sector in Africa and therefore requires significant involvement of the private sector in disaster risk reduction (Van Niekerk *et al.*, 2015:86). The UNISDR has for years advocated for countries to build resilience through the collaboration of private sector, public sector and the community (Johnson & Abe, 2015:19).

Resilience is conceptualised by Rutter (2012:34), as a comparative resistance to environmental risk occurrences, prevailing over stress and harsh conditions or a comparatively positive result despite risk occurrences. According to Murray and Zautra (2012:339), individuals achieve resilience within a larger social milieu that includes historical accomplishments in steering through adversity with the presence or absence of assistance from others. Therefore, the value is placed on their current social networks and the way in which communities respond to adverse occurrences.

The term resilience has its roots in the field of physical sciences and refers to the ability of a material to return to its original state, unchanged after exposure to stressful conditions (Ungar, 2012:13). It was further adopted in the field of psychology to refer to intrapersonal abilities of individuals to recover from experiences of acute and chronic stress and reflects the interaction between the individual and the environment, particularly the prospective possibility for personal growth and development (Ungar, 2012:13-14).

The use of the term resilience has gained popularity in the field of disaster risk reduction in the past decades (UNISDR, 2004). Building resilience to disasters in nations and communities was an approach adopted in the Yokohama Strategy in Kobe, Japan 2005 and is highlighted in the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015 and subsequently by the Sendai Framework for
Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 (UNISDR, 2012;7; UNISDR, 2015). The UNISDR (2004:16) defines resilience as the “...capacity of a system, community or society potentially exposed to hazards to adapt, by resisting or changing in order to reach and maintain an acceptable level of functioning and structure”. A community as a social system is defined as dynamic and ever-evolving social networks that encompass communities formed by shared geographical settings or by mutual interests (Murray & Zautra, 2012:340). The UNISDR (2004), however, emphasises that the capacity of a social system to protect itself and advance risk reduction measures, thereby creating a better future for itself, is largely dependent on its ability to reorganise itself and learn from past experiences of disasters.

Maguire and Hagan (2007:16) draw attention to the term social resilience, by defining it as the ability of a social system to recuperate or react constructively or unconstructively to the occurrence of disasters. According to Murray and Zautra (2012:337), resilience is an adaptive process that takes place through three processes, namely recovery, sustainability and growth. Recovery pertains to the attempts of a social system to return to its pre-disaster level of functioning, by successfully prevailing over adversity because of a disaster. Sustainability reflects the ways in which individuals manage to maintain their sense of purpose and their continued engagement in social relationships amid adversity. Finally, growth relates to the expansion of coping skills and advancement after adversity, through new learning and attaining a stronger sense of oneself (Murray & Zautra, 2012:337-338). Entrenched in the definition of resilience is that resilience is not only a process of recovery and maintaining a pre-disaster level of functioning, but it also reflects the strengths and assets embedded in communities that promote the quality of life and pre-sets conditions for growth and development to more advanced levels of functioning. Therefore, achieving resilience is furthermore a process that is dependent on the strengths the community possesses in order to overcome experiences of disasters.

The National Research Council (NRC), an American non-profit organisation, reflects the view that building resilience is dependent on the community’s ability to recover, sustain itself and grow after an experience of a disaster (NRC, 2011:4). Furthermore, the NRC elaborates that private sector-community collaboration is vital in establishing community networks and trust that are crucial in forming and sustaining healthy resilient communities (NRC, 2011:4). Similarly, UNISDR advocates for the strong collaboration between the private sector and communities in disaster risk reduction efforts and building resilience (UNISDR, 2015). Various authors refer to collaboration as involving active engagement of two or more parties forming a mutually beneficial relationship and working towards common goals, by sharing activities, responsibilities and resources (Backer, 2003:3-4; Thomson & Perry, 2006:23; Thomson, et al., 2008:98).
Throughout the decade, there have been calls by international non-governmental organisations to encourage national governments to take the necessary steps to mobilise support from the private sector (IDNDR, 1989, 1994; WHO, 1994; ISDR, 2001 in Twigg, 2001:17; UNISDR, 2007; INISDR, 2015). The Hyogo Framework for Action highlights the involvement of the private sector in disaster risk reduction and building resilience (UNISDR, 2007:11). This practice continues to be supported and is highlighted in the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 (UNISDR, 2015). Private sector involvement in disaster risk reduction can take place through philanthropy, corporate social responsibility and knowledge transfer (UNISDR, 2015; Van Niekerk et al., 2015:100). The Disaster risk reduction-Private sector partnership (DRR-PSP), formed by the UNISDR, currently includes 96 private sector members internationally - 2 members are based in Africa (Mali and Ghana) and none in South Africa (PreventionWeb, 2015). The involvement of the private sector in disaster management and risk reduction efforts in Africa is viewed as a critical factor in contributing to the global development agenda (Van Niekerk et al., 2015:87).

Particularly in South Africa (SA), private sector involvement in disaster risk reduction efforts is still minimal. This is despite the disaster risk management legislation in South Africa highlighting the need for involvement of private companies in disaster risk reduction and building resilience (DMA, 2002:14). According to van Niekerk et al. (2015:100), there is a need for the SA Government to actively engage the private sector in disaster risk efforts, such as policy development, risk mitigation, risk response and building resilience. The Disaster Management Framework of South Africa calls for the need of the South African Government to facilitate the involvement of private sector, non-governmental organisations, traditional leaders, technical experts, volunteers and the community. The aim is to form collaborative efforts in disaster management and disaster risk reduction, in particular strengthening resilience in communities (DMA, 2002:14).

The focus of this study was to explore private companies and community collaboration towards building resilience in the community of Diepsloot, Johannesburg, South Africa. Diepsloot is a township situated north of Johannesburg and lies in the periphery of most affluent suburban areas such as Dainfern, Fourways, Northgate and Sunninghill. Its development is as a result of the relocation of people to Diepsloot from Zevenfontein, and the banks of the Jukskei river in Alexander between 1991 and 2001, with the aim of providing less formal housing to the people (Ngie, 2012:6; Harber, 2011:10). However, this planned settlement was disrupted by the rapid influx of people into the area, in search of employment and to address the housing challenges (Himlin et al., 2014:5). These new immigrants did not qualify for government subsidised housing units, which forced them to erect their own houses using corrugated iron along what has been noted to be flood lines (Ngie, 2013:6; Harber, 2011:39).
The Diepsloot reception area is the more marginalised area of Diepsloot, also referred to as Diepsloot West Extension 8, comprising mostly of congested and densely placed informal houses (Himlin et al., 2014:4). According to Harber (2011:34), this area is where newcomers were placed before they were allocated a piece of land or a house in the adjacent extensions. The area offers an interesting urban development history, as is evident from its vast and rapid industrial and urban development. Rapid urbanisation is a challenging phenomenon, largely because it is accompanied by what Tostensen et al., (2001:7); refer to as urban crises, which governments often struggle to manage (Tostensen, et al., 2001:7). It is further indicated that urban crisis encompasses lack of proper housing, unemployment, poverty, severe environmental challenges, service delivery failures and inefficient local government structures (Tostensen et al., 2001:7). Diepsloot’s historical development has drawn attention from various researchers in different academic fields. These include, amongst others, social, economic, development, environmental and the built environment fields of study. These authors all encourage research areas focusing on disaster preparedness and mitigation, including urban planning and management (Bénit, 2002; Carruthers, 2008; Hadebe, 2008; Van Schalkwyk, 2011; Alexander et al., 2013).

Because of the rapid growth of informal settlements, Diepsloot is characteristic of an area that is vulnerable to several urban hazards, such as biological, chemical and physical hazards (Mail and Guardian, 2006; COJ, 2011; IOL, 2014; News24, 2014; Himlin et al., 2014:5). The UNISDR (2004:4) provides a simplistic definition of a hazard and it refers to a ‘prospective harmful physical occurrence that may result in the loss of life or injury, property damage, social and economic disturbances or environmental dilapidation’. Physical hazards include structural fires, flash flooding and catastrophes as result of deficient infrastructure, such as open drains, manholes and inadequate road infrastructure (Twigg, 2004:230). The physical hazards experienced in Diepsloot include potential structural fires, such as shack fires, exposure to flash flooding as a result of erecting buildings near river banks and catastrophes resulting from deficient infrastructure (Himlin et al., 2014:5). The settlement consists of dwellings constructed with corrugated iron and cardboard. The settlements are dense and congested (Harber, 2011; 35). As a result, fire from one shack may affect the adjacent shacks. Further to this, the lack of electricity forces families to use kerosene or paraffin for cooking and warming up their homes and as a result, approximately 17 shacks burnt down, leaving about 25 families homeless (News24, 2013).

In the past, storm water run-off and flooding of the Jukskei river in the area caused disruptions to the local road network, the infiltration of sewer networks as well as damage to infrastructure (Mail and Guardian, 2006; News24, 2014; IOL, 2014; Himlin et al., 2014:6). Other types of hazards identified in the area include biological and chemical hazards such as rodent...
infestation, water contamination and health risks associated with poor sanitation (EWN, 2014; Himlin et al., 2014:5). According to Twigg (2004:229), these types of hazards are known to cause diseases due to the associated health risks. Examples in Diepsloot include sewage problems (Himlin et al., 2014:5), water contamination (Mail and Guardian, 2012), and the use of communal toilets with an average of 20 families sharing a single toilet (COJ, 2011; Himlin et al., 2014:6). According to Dibben (2012:362), pathogens and infectious diseases are known to spread much more rapidly in areas that have poor sanitation practices and even more so in a high-risk flood area. Dibben (2012:362) further adds that water serves as one of the common transportation mechanisms of infectious diseases. This poses a risk factor for the population of Diepsloot. Chemical hazards occur because of pollution such as water and air pollution from lack of effective waste management, fires and carbon dioxide emissions from vehicles and industrial process (Twigg, 2004:229). Examples in Diepsloot include an inefficient waste management system in the area resulting from inland, air and water pollution (Himlin et al., 2014:6).

Diepsloot is largely vulnerable to these hazards because of various socio-economic and environmental deficiencies, such as poverty, population growth and inefficient environmental and urban management. Factors such as these that have been identified in Diepsloot, have a profound bearing on the way in which countries, communities and their local municipalities reduce risks and build resilience (Twigg, 2004:229; GFDRR, 2010:3). Accordingly, Christopolis (2003:95) is of the view that Government often lacks adequate capacity to effectively and efficiently address and manage vulnerabilities and risks associated with natural hazards. Thus, the need for private sector involvement in resilience-building within communities has been advocated in literature and the disaster management and risks reduction community (Mitchell, 2006:237; UNISDR, 2007:11; Chen et al., 2013:130; Izumi & Shaw, 2015:334; UNISDR, 2015; Van Niekerk, 2015:85).

The purpose of this chapter is to outline the orientation and research problem, research approach and design that were applied in the research project. Furthermore, the chapter discusses the research methods and methodology applied in the research project; the ethical issues that were considered for the research and finally indicated the limitations and the significance of the study.

1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

Disaster risk management has been conventionally perceived as the responsibility of the public sector; however, this perception has evolved to recognise the contribution of the private sector through private company intervention in community engagement (Sarmiento et al., 2014:3).
Disaster risk is not only a concern for the environment, individuals and communities, but also a concern for the private sector and their operations, both directly and indirectly. Fostering partnerships between the public sector and the private sector has been viewed as integral to the mitigation, reduction and management of disasters globally (UNISDR, 2007:11; National Research Council, 2011:1). The HFA advocates this practice by outlining it in their priorities for action. Priority number four in the HFA, highlights the “... promotion and establishment of public and private sector collaborations in order to engage the private sector to foster disaster risk reduction efforts; encourage the private sector to foster a culture of disaster prevention, particularly in the allocation of resources to pre-disaster activities such as risk assessments and early warning systems” (UNISDR, 2007:11). The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 highlights a similar view regarding the involvement of the private sector in reducing disasters and working towards resilience. Priority number three of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 encourages that a collaborative effort between the public and private sector be adopted towards building resilience by investing in disaster risk reduction activities (UNISDR, 2015:15).

This is due to the private sector directly being affected by disasters. According to UNISDR (n.d.:1), disasters may cause disruptions in operations and supply chain by causing physical damage to property and the loss of vital resources and infrastructure, like energy supply and transmission, public infrastructure and distribution networks. Amongst other reasons, this provides the rationale for the private sector to get involved in risk reduction measures. However, private companies’ engagement in disaster management has gained momentum in recent years, with several studies documenting the viability of private sector engagement in disaster risk reduction, particularly disaster resilience (Busch & Givens, 2013:2; UNISDR, 2005:11). These studies have particularly focused on what the public sector can do to enhance disaster reduction programmes by forming sustainable relationships with the private sector (Linnerooth-Bayer & Mechler, 2007:61; Jaine, 2014:3; Sarmiento et al., 2014:3). This is being achieved through what is known to be Private-Public Partnerships (PPPs).

Limited research, however, exists that indicates how private companies can collaborate with communities to enhance resilience and contribute to disaster reduction. According to the NRC (2011:1), collaborations formed between private companies and communities may contribute to a community’s ability to prepare for, respond to and recover from disasters thus enhancing community resilience towards disasters. Private sector engagement in community intervention operates largely under the umbrella of corporate social responsibility (Sarmiento et al., 2014:3). It is however noted that limited research that looks at private-community collaboration to build resilience exists.
Therefore, the focus of this study was to explore ways in which private company-community collaboration can be capitalised and directed towards building resilience in communities. The goal was to explore private company and community collaboration towards building resilience in the community.

1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research questions the study aimed to answer were:

- What are the theoretical perspectives of resilience?
- What are the theoretical perspectives of collaboration?
- What correlation exists between the private company-community collaboration and resilience?
- What type of community engagement programmes have companies undertaken in Diepsloot and to what extent is the community engaged in these programmes?
- What recommendations can be made regarding community-private company collaboration in building community resilience to physical hazards in Diepsloot?

1.4 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

Taking the above questions into consideration, the study aimed to achieve the following objectives:

- To determine the theoretical framework of community resilience.
- To determine the conceptual framework of collaboration.
- To explore the correlation between private company-community collaboration and resilience.
- To establish what community engagement programmes private companies have undertaken in Diepsloot and if the community is engaged in these programmes.
- To provide recommendations regarding community-private company collaboration in building community resilience to physical hazards in Diepsloot.

1.5 CENTRAL THEORETICAL STATEMENT

Murray and Zautra (2012:337) conceptualise the term resilience as an adaptive process encompassing three levels:
1. Recovery: which proposes that communities can overcome adversity and return to their pre-disaster level of functioning by making crucial social and physiological adjustments;

2. Sustainability: which proposes that communities continue to maintain and sustain valued social networks amid adversity; and

3. Growth: which suggests that the community’s experience of adversity, offers them the opportunity for growth and development. This suggests that communities that have frequently survived adversities may be strengthened by the experiences of adversities and challenging times. The social networks entrenched in communities serve as their strengths and assets, which contribute to the promotion of the quality of life (Murray & Zautra, 2012:339).

Therefore, achieving resilience is dependent on the strengths and assets accessible to communities.

Social networks not only refer to the immediate social environment, but also to the collaborative efforts between the community and economic structures existing in the community, that is, private companies that have a footprint within the community (Chen et al., 2013:131). Collaboration is a partnership between stakeholders working towards a specified goal (Backer, 2003:3). The focal point of the study was to understand the correlation between private companies and communities and building resilience. Although disaster reduction and management is largely the responsibility of local government, it should be emphasised that private companies provide the communities with added strengths and enhance their capacity to address and reduce disaster risks (UNISDR, 2007, UNISDR, n.d.). This can be achieved through collaborative efforts between private companies and communities towards building resilience (NRC, 2011:4). It can thus be said that effective collaboration should be evident in all three processes of recovery, sustainability and growth. Based on this information, it is therefore emphasised that:

- Collaborative efforts between communities and private companies are important for building community resilience to physical hazards (UNISDR, 2005:11; NRC, 2011:4; UNISDR, 2015);
- Private companies have a pivotal role to play in disaster risk reduction (Busch & Givens, 2013:2; Twigg, 2001:17; Van Niekerk et al., 2015:87); and
- It is important for communities to be engaged in community programmes that affects them (CARRI, 2013:12).
1.6 METHODOLOGY

The research methodology outlines the research process the researcher undertook and provides a description of data collection methods or tools that had been employed in the efficient, procedural and precise implementation of the research design and approach (Mouton, 2008:55). Kuthori (2011:8) refers to research methodology as the research methods to be utilised and outlines the logic behind the selection of these methods, based on the context of the research.

The following section provides a discussion of the methodology that was applied in the study to attain the data required in order to achieve the formulated objectives for the study. A comprehensive discussion of the research methodology used in the research project is addressed thoroughly in Chapter four, section 4.1 – 4.5 of this document.

1.6.1 Research approach and design

According to Bryman (2008:46), a research design pertains to the framework to be used to collect and analyse data. Mouton (2008:55) indicates that research designs are particularly formulated and tailor-made to suit the various kinds of research questions and the selection of the design styles should coincide with the types of questions of the study.

The research approach pertains to the philosophical assumptions and procedures of enquiry of the research study (Creswell, 2013:3). Creswell (2013:3), further outlines that selecting a research approach is based on the nature of the research problem, the issues to be addressed in the research, the researcher’s personal experience and the audience of the study (Creswell, 2013:3).

This study applied a qualitative research approach and the design employed in the study was a case study design. A case study outlines the types of enquiry within the research approach and the qualitative research approach is based on the exploration and understanding of how individuals or groups make sense of the human and social experiences (Creswell, 2013:4).

Firstly, the aim of the study was to explore how private companies are currently engaging with the community of Diepsloot. The study further aimed to establish the ways in which this engagement with the community of Diepsloot was directed towards reducing disasters and building resilience. In order to achieve this objective, an empirical exploration of private companies’ engagement with the community was done. The empirical enquiry further sought to establish the perceptions of the impact of these engagements on the community of Diepsloot as reported by the private companies. Secondly, the research further explored the community’s
knowledge and perceptions about the impact of private company engagement in the community. A phenomenological design is used in this research because the research sought to provide a comprehensive description of the lived experiences of both the community of Diepsloot and the private companies having a footprint in this community (Creswell, 2013:4). Furthermore, the study applied qualitative methods to collect and analyse data such as interviews and discussions. The empirical findings were provided representing both the private companies and community members’ perspectives.

1.6.2 Instrumentation

Interviewing is the most common form of data collection method used in qualitative research (Bryman, 2008:469). Qualitative research offers opportunities for one-to-one interactions with participants, either individually or in a group setting, and allows the researcher to collect and gain an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon to be studied (Creswell, 2013:4). This research study made use of the following tools: literature review; focus group interviews and semi-structured individual interviews.

1.6.2.1 Literature Review

A literature review pertains to the academic research studies already carried out in the field that the researcher wishes to study (Mouton, 2008:87). The researcher reviews already existing scholarly work to provide him/her with theoretical background of the field of study. Furthermore, it aims to provide the researcher with the latest, reliable and pertinent overview of the study field (Mouton, 2008:87).

The researcher employed a systematic review of literature. This is defined as “...a replicable, scientific and transparent process which aims to reduce partiality through comprehensive literature exploration of published and unpublished work and by providing an audit trail of the decisions, procedures and conclusions made during the review process” (Tranfield et al., 2003:209). The researcher made use of books, reports, journal articles and documents written about the topic and the field of study.

1.6.2.2 Focus group Interviews

Focus groups is a method of data collection, in which several participants are selected, based on shared experiences of a situation and are interviewed collectively in a group (Bryman, 2012:502). According to Ketzinger (1995:299), focus group interviews are valuable for discovering participants’ awareness and experiences of their own environment. The interview questions are based on a fairly defined topic and the interview focuses on participants and the
interviewer jointly construct meaning around their social world (Bryman, 2012:502; Ketzinger, 1995:300).

Focus groups provided the researcher with an opportunity to study the ways in which the community members collectively perceive private sector engagement in their community, make sense of this engagement and construct meanings around it. The researcher conducted focus groups interviews with community members from Diepsloot reception area. Five groups consisting of 10 members each were interviewed. These interviews were conducted using a semi-structured question sheet.

1.6.2.3 Semi-structured interviews

Semi-structured interviews include a list of questions in a question sheet with the specific themes to be explored during the interview (Bryman, 2008:471). This type of interview guide provides the researcher with a structure of the information to be collected, whilst providing the participants with flexibility to talk about issues they perceive as being important and worth exploring (Greef, 2005:292).

This method of data collection was utilised to collect data from the social responsibility managers or representatives from the sampled private companies. This method of data collection was appropriate because it offered both the researcher and the participant’s flexibility in exploring their engagement in the community under study, their perceptions regarding their engagement in the community and their perceptions of the impact of their projects in the community.

The researcher made use of an audio recording device in both interview methods as well as scribing of interviews. According to King and Horrocks (2010:44), using an audio recording device for interviews is essential and effective as this will ensure that the researcher focuses on conducting the interview and less on writing the entire interview. The authors however caution against using audio recording devices. They maintain that consent from participants is imperative before conducting the interviews and suggest that the researcher should scribe the interviews (King & Horrocks, 2010:45).

1.6.3 Population and Sampling

Population refers to the prospective participants who possess the characteristics, which the researcher is interested in, that is, all the individuals in the population who have specific qualities (Strydom, 2005a:193). The population in this study refers to the individuals living in the
community and companies in the area of Diepsloot. A sample was drawn to include the individuals from the community and the private companies that participated in the study.

Sampling refers to the detailed data resources chosen for the study. The size of the sample is dependent on the data analysis that the researcher uses to analyse the data, the requirements in terms of accurateness and the attributes of the population (Tracy, 2013:134-138).

Purposive sampling methods were used based on its relevance for this research study. In this method, a particular case was selected based on the salient features that are of interest to the researcher (Strydom & Delport, 2005:328). This technique required that the researcher carefully considers the parameters of the population and selects a sample according to those parameters (Strydom & Delport, 2011:392).

The participants in the study were selected based on their shared geographical setting. A sample of at least 50 participants was selected from the population and a total of 5 companies having a footprint and relevant involvement in Diepsloot were selected for the study.

1.6.4 Data Analysis

The method of thematic analysis was applied to analyse the data collected. According to Bryman (2008:579), thematic analysis is a categorising approach in which data is categorised into themes and sub-themes identified during the data collection process. Data analysis aims to provide structure and meaning to the bulk of data collected (Schurink et al., 2011: 397). In this type of analysis, the researcher re-examines the data collected and interprets the observations with the aim of uncovering and understanding the fundamental related meanings and patterns (Babbie, 2007:378). The researcher applied the following guideline as provided by De Vos et al. (2011:404-419) in the process of analysing data:

- Preparation for, and organisation of data

The researcher used an audio recorder to record the interviews. Careful considerations regarding the use of audio recorder was done to ensure the prevention of malfunctions, or insufficient power to record. The researcher scribing important notes during the interviews further complemented the audio recordings. After data collection was completed, a preliminary analysis of the data that was collected was conducted. In this case, the researcher in sorting out the data classifies and arranges the themes that emerge into related groups while also ensuring the proper handling of the information.
- Reducing the data

In this process, the researcher undertook a thorough analysis of the data that was collected. According to Schurink (2011:410), “this process demands a heightened awareness of the data, focused attention, openness to the subtle, tacit undercurrents of social life”. In this regard, the data that was collected was organised and arranged based on the themes that emerged from the analysis. The researcher considered and presented the data that was pertinent and relevant to answering the research questions and purpose of the research project.

This process was followed by the interpretation of the data collected, presenting the findings and linking those findings with literature. This process assisted the researcher to understand the phenomena that was being studied, while also assisting the audience in understanding what the research was communicating.

- Presentation of the data

In this process, the findings of the research were presented in the form of a research report.

1.6.5 Limitations and delimitations

According to Denzin and Lincoln (2005:98), all research projects have limitations and delimitations. What influenced the collection of the data included the safety of the researcher in the community. The community is notorious for violent crimes including murder, assault with grievous bodily harm, common assault and sexual crimes (ENCA, 2013). However, there are initiatives, such as visible policing that have been introduced to tackle the crimes (SABC, 2015). The security of the researcher was carefully considered during fieldwork. In all the focus group interviews, the researcher was accompanied by one of the community members to ensure the safety of the researcher.

The researcher was not able to guarantee the availability of the participants for focus group discussions particularly in relation to the time scope allocated for the completion of the research project. The implication was that the data collection process was extended to ensure that the proposed sample was covered. Similarly, challenges were experienced with regard to obtaining participants from private companies for the individual interviews. Because the researcher relied on the availability of the managers for the interviews, the data collection process was delayed.

Due to the limited time and scope of the research project, the focus was on a smaller segment of the community, which was Diepsloot reception area. The focus was also on one classification
of hazards, which were physical hazards. It would be ideal if focus was on the entire Diepsloot risk areas and all hazards were studied in accordance to their occurrence in the area.

Furthermore, the research focused on a small selection of private companies that had engaged with the community. As such, the impact of private sector engagement in the Diepsloot community was not representative of the larger population of private sectors that had engaged in the community of Diepsloot.

1.7 ETHICAL ISSUES

Ethics constitute a set of moral principles, which are recommended by individuals, are accordingly accepted and represent the regulations and behavioural expectations regarding conduct towards the participants (Strydom, 2005b:56). To ensure that the study was credible, valid and reliable, the following ethical considerations were considered.

1.7.1 Informed consent

Informed consent refers to rendering information relating to the goal of the study, procedures to be employed during the study, the possible advantages and disadvantages, including the potential dangers, to the participants and obtaining their consent to participate (Strydom, 2005b:59) Participation in the study was voluntary. As such, participants selected for the study were given the opportunity to provide their consent to partake in the research study. Verbal informed consent was provided by the research participants.

1.7.2 Voluntary Participation

It is considered unethical to coerce individuals to participate in a study because participation should always be voluntary (Neuman, 2003:124). Participants selected for the research study were informed, prior to the commencement of the study, that they were free to participate or withdraw from the research project at any point of the study should they feel the need to, and if they do, their refusal to participate in the study would not in any way compromise their well-being or livelihood in the community.

1.7.3 Avoidance of harm and deception

According to Strydom (2005b:58), the researcher is ethically obliged to protect the participants within practical boundaries; from any type of physical and emotional distress that may arise from the study. The researcher ensured that the participants were not exposed to factors that might have caused emotional of physical distress. The researcher further ensured that the methods of
enquiry that were used to obtain information from the respondents were not used with the aim to deceive the respondents.

1.7.4 Ensure privacy and confidentiality

Ensuring privacy and confidentiality is considered important in research ethics (Bryman, 2012:136). The researcher was committed to and informed the participants that their names and identity remained anonymous and the information that they shared during the interviews was confidential.

1.7.5 Presentation of data

The researcher was also bound by ethics concerning the presentation of data. This means that information was presented with honesty; the work of the researcher was reviewed by her supervisors and all the literature that was consulted and used in the research report was acknowledged (Bryman, 2012:144).

1.8 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Firstly, the aim of the study was to explore how private companies are currently engaging with the community of Diepsloot. The study further aimed to establish the ways in which this engagement with the community of Diepsloot was directed towards reducing disasters and building resilience. In order to achieve this objective, an empirical exploration of private companies' engagement with the community was done. The empirical enquiry further sought to establish the perceptions of the impact of these engagements on the community of Diepsloot as reported by the private companies. Secondly, the research further explored the community's knowledge and perceptions about the impact of private company engagement in the community. The overall goal of this research study was to establish the ways in which private sector-community collaboration can be capitalised and directed towards building resilience in communities. Resilience is considered to make a valuable contribution to the general security of a community (Dombrowsky, 2010:3). Furthermore, resilience increases risk reduction and disaster mitigation efforts. Emphasis is placed on maximising risk reduction preparedness, early warning systems, early action and response (Dombrowsky, 2010:3) to achieve resilience.

The HFA encourages that local governments actively participate in building community resilience standards that focus on implementation, city to city learning and cooperation, local action planning and monitoring of progress in cities, including the strengthening of local capacities. The HFA also encourages that private companies make similar contributions by actively taking part in disaster reduction activities in countries. The framework states that private
sector’s contribution to disaster risk reduction is imperative in supporting the development of industry standards and innovative urban risk reduction solutions (UNISDR, 2010:136).

The research project aspires to contribute to disaster resilience research by looking at ways in which private companies can collaborate with communities to increase disaster risk resilience globally.

### 1.9 PROVISIONAL CHAPTER LAYOUT

Chapter 1: Introduction and background of the study

This chapter provides a general introduction to the study, the phenomena that was studied, the critical theoretical statements, the rationale for the study and the methods used in collecting and analysing the data.

Chapter 2: Theoretical perspectives on resilience

This chapter included the different theoretical perspectives of resilience. The research explored what resilience was and how it can be achieved, particularly from a community level.

Chapter 3: Theoretical perspectives on collaboration

This chapter explored the concept of collaboration and how this concept can be applied to the community’s context. Furthermore, the chapter looked at how collaboration between the community and the private sector can best be used to build and achieve resilience.

Chapter 4: Research Methodology

The research methodology chapter discussed the research approach and design of the study, the instrumentation that was used, sampling methods and the analysis of data.

Chapter 5: Findings from the study – Private sector and community engagement programmes in Diepsloot

Chapter five of the research study focused on the presentation of the empirical data collected from the interviews.

Chapter 6: Conclusions and recommendations.

This chapter concludes the research project by providing the recommendations made from the findings, reported on the limitations of the study and lastly provided recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 2: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: COMMUNITY RESILIENCE

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Building community resilience towards disasters has become an important aspect in reducing the impacts of disaster risk globally. The call for building community resilience was first made in the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015 (UNISDR, 2007:7) and subsequently supported by the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR, 2015:15). The concept of resilience is viewed as stemming from the fields of study of Ecology (Manyena, 2006:433), and Health and Psychology (Berkes & Ross, 2013:6). Holling (1973) popularised the concept focusing on the resilience of ecological systems in his research. Studies on individual resilience advanced from the field of Psychiatry and Developmental Psychology (Waller, 2001:290; Jonson & Wielchelt, 2004:658), highlighting the resilience of individuals to stressors. The concept was further applied to the disaster management field by Timmerman (1981), applying resilience to the community context highlighting the resilience of communities to disaster occurrences (Cutter et al., 2008:600; Folke, 2010:2; Bené et al., 2014:601).

The first chapter of this study provided an overview of the study, outlining research objectives to be achieved and the research methods to be applied in order to reach the outlined objectives. The purpose of this second chapter is to address the first research objective namely, to give a theoretical overview of the concept of community resilience. Firstly, the chapter establishes the link between disasters, disaster risk reduction and resilience and then moves to conceptualising the term resilience as applied to disaster risk management. Furthermore, the chapter discusses community resilience and provides the capacities concerned in strengthening community resilience with the aim of outlining how resilience can be achieved through private company and community collaboration.

2.2 DISASTER RISK REDUCTION AND RESILIENCE

Disasters impair the development efforts undertaken by countries and they further threaten future livelihoods of individuals, communities and undermining the progress made towards achieving the previous development objectives of the Millennium Development Goals (UNISDR, 2012:4). The UN and various other international non-governmental organisations such as the Worldbank, MercyCorps and European Union have all recognised the need to reduce disaster risks and work towards sustainable development by strengthening the resilience of communities (UNISDR, 2005; Worldbank, 2013; MercyCorps, 2013; European Union, 2013). The importance of the concept of resilience has been further highlighted in goals 11 and 13 of the Sustainable Development Goals established in 2015 (UN, 2015). The UNISDR (2005) encourages nations
to adopt a risk-reduction approach and work towards building resilience with the aim of addressing the vulnerabilities and risks associated with natural or human-made hazards.

A hazard can be defined as a naturally occurring event or a human-made process that may potentially cause harm to people, their environment and their assets (Wisner et al., 2012:24). For example, a natural hazard may include floods, landslides, human epidemic or an earthquake. It is argued that hazards can be human-made because the likelihood and intensity of the occurrence of the hazard may be influenced by a combination of political and socio-economic conditions that make people vulnerable to the exposure and impact of hazards (Concern, 2005:7; Wisner et al., 2003: 4-5; Bogardi, 2006:3; Wisner et al., 2012:24). Vulnerability represents the extent to which a person or a group’s social status induces the differential effect caused by hazards and the political and socio-economic conditions that resulted in them being there and maintaining that status (Wisner et al., 2003:11). The occurrence of a hazard becomes a disaster when the hazards results in a disturbance of the operation of a community or a society, such as loss of human, material, economic or environmental assets, and the occurrence exceeds the coping capacity of that community or society (Twigg, 2004:13; UNISDR, 2004:17). Thus, a disaster risk can be defined as the prospective or anticipated loss or damage of human, material, economic or environmental assets, because of the interactions between natural or human-made hazards and vulnerable circumstances (Twigg, 2004:13; UNISDR, 2004:17).

As such the UNISDR (2004:17) conceptualises disaster risk reduction as:

“...the conceptual framework of elements considered with the possibilities to minimise vulnerabilities and disaster risks throughout a society; to prevent, mitigate and prepare for the adverse impacts of hazards within the broad context of sustainable development”.

According to Van Niekerk (2011:13), disaster risk reduction incorporates organised efforts in analysing and managing the causal factors of disasters. These activities include reducing exposure to hazards, decreasing the vulnerability of people and property, efficient management of land and the environment and improving disaster risk preparedness (Van Niekerk, 2011:13). The EU (2013:6) define disaster risk reduction as including approaches that focus on sustaining systems that allow for local communities and institutions to prepare for, mitigate and respond sufficiently to disasters that may be man-made or are natural hazards. The consensus between these definitions is that the activities within the practice of disaster risk reduction are aimed at reducing vulnerabilities, disaster risks and the impact of hazards; and are also concerned with the efficient preparation for and response to disaster occurrences all aimed at sustaining the existence and functionality of societies.
The Department for International Development (2004:12), further states that disaster risk reduction includes policies and practices that aim to reduce disaster losses, while working towards longer-term prevention. This includes interventions that cover three areas: hazard minimisation/mitigation; reducing exposure and vulnerability; and enhancing coping and adaptive capacity (DFID, 2004:12). Central to disaster risk reduction is the need to consider the following factors:

- The extent to which communities and their development may be compromised by disasters;
- The extent to which the communities' development choices impact or influence levels of disaster risks to which they are exposed to and
- The extent to which the capacity of the community can be maximised to address existing and future risks (UNDG, 2009:3).

Disaster risk reduction programmes include activities such as early warning systems and community health and disaster preparedness activities (DFID, 2004:16). These activities occupy significant roles in supplying the information and promoting the setting for social learning that can subsequently permit coping, adaptation and thus enhance resilience (DFID, 2004:16). The presence of resilient capacities within communities is not only crucial for preparation and rehabilitation activities; resilience is also imperative particularly in relation to the occurrences of disasters. According to Plough et al. (2013:1191), responding to disasters can be a delayed process, which requires communities to be self-sufficient for a lengthy period before proper formalised emergency interventions from the Government and other civil organisations. The authors further add that these resilient capacities can help the community to function with adverse events prior to urgent governmental interventions (Plough et al., 2013:1191).

Various international development agencies and several authors are of the view that the occurrence of hazards and extreme climate events will increase in frequency and severity in the near future (IPCC, 2007; UNISDR, 2012:10; Van Niekerk, 2013:1). This increase in severity and frequency will increase the vulnerability and risk of millions of individuals globally, particularly those living in poor urban environments in developing countries (Van Niekerk, 2013:1). This necessitates an adoption of a risk-reduction approach and work towards building resilience (UNISDR, 2005). Building resilience is conceptualised as 'the exercise aimed at developing the capacity of systems to absorb stress, hazards or negative forces while maintaining its basic functions and structures during disaster occurrences” (Resilience Alliance, 2013). Longstaff et al. (2010:5) refer to the concept of resilience as the practice of developing and improving communities’ access to resources and having the ability to efficiently and effectively apply these resources in such a way that it ensures its survival. This concept is further viewed as the
practice that facilitates the capacity for learning from past disasters, adaptation and self-organisation which incorporates bouncing back or bouncing back better from disaster occurrences (Longstaff et al., 2010:5; Resilience Alliance, 2013).

Berkes (2007:285) and Obrist et al. (2010:283) agree that building resilience and strengthening disaster risk programming share similar characteristics, namely:

- they provide a holistic context for evaluating systems and their interactions, beginning with the household; the communities through to regional and national level;
- emphasis is placed on capacities and ways to manage hazards or disturbances;
- they explore and provide options for preparing for uncertainty, shocks and changes; and
- their focus is more on pre-emptive and proactive actions.

According to UNISDR (2004), a positive correlation between disaster risk reduction and strengthening the resilience and coping as well as adaptive capacities of communities exists and therefore continues to be advocated by the organisation (UNISDR, 2004; Djalante & Thomalla, 2010:165). The UNISDR included the resilience approach in their Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015 by including resilience as one of their priorities for action (UNISDR, 2012:7). Priority three, four and five of the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015 includes strategies all aimed at strengthening resilience and reduce disaster risks (UNISDR, 2005:1). Building on the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015, the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 aims to “prevent new and reduce existing disaster risks through the implementation of integrated and inclusive economic, structural, legal, social, health, cultural, educational, environmental, technological, political and institutional measures that prevent and reduce hazard exposure and vulnerability to disaster, increase preparedness for response and recovery, and thus strengthen resilience” (UNISDR, 2015:12).

The resilience approach enables individuals, communities and nations to strengthen their coping mechanisms before, during and after disaster occurrences (Plough et al., 2013:1191). According to DFID (2004:16), resilience in the context of disaster risk reduction combines coping and adaptive capacities (community competence, economic development, social capital and information, and communication) with the social, institutional and informational resources that facilitate their efficient application in disaster risk reduction programming. The combination of coping and adaptive capacities in disaster risk reduction programming can serve as a pathway to achieving resilience of poor and vulnerable communities (Berkes & Ross, 2013:13-14; MercyCorps, 2013:2). With this in mind, disaster risk reduction is seen as being inclusive of practical and strategic activities relating to early warning systems and community emergency preparations which ultimately aim to increase individual, community and national resilience.
specifically focusing on natural hazards (Twigg, 2009:9; O'Sullivan et al., 2012:2280; MercyCorps, 2013:2).

The concept of resilience has become an important approach not only to the field of disaster risk reduction but also to development studies and practice. The following section takes a closer look at the concept of resilience in order to create a better understanding of the concept.

2.3 CONCEPTUALISING RESILIENCE

The preceding section introduced the concept of resilience in relation to disaster risk reduction. However, the term resilience has been applied to a wide variety of fields including metallurgy, safety, engineering, supply chain management, strategic management, risk management, health and psychology as well as ecology (Bhamra et al., 2011:5376). Because of the application of the concept in different fields, there is little unanimity on the origin and definition of the term (Manyena, 2006:433; Alexander, 2013:2713; Shimizu, 2013:41; Béné et al., 2014:599). Wyche et al. (2011:18), however argues that the concept resilience is multi-contextual and multi-disciplinary and therefore can be applied to a diverse number of fields including disaster risk management without having a major influence on its definition.

In general terms, resilience refers to the capacity to recover (Shimizu, 2013:41). From the health and psychology field, a common understanding of resilience places attention on the individual's capacity to recuperate from an unpleasant experience (Buikstra et al., 2010:975-991). Several authors further elaborate that resilience is the possession of a trait at the intra-personal level, that enables individuals to tackle challenges while adjusting to the change and recuperating from the adverse experience (Arbon, 2014:12; Masten, 2014:56; Ungar, 2013:13-14). Unlike the ecological perspective, the health and psychology perspective views resilience as leaning more towards the "within-person" factors and less on adaptation in the ecosystem context (Waller, 2001:290). The term was further recognised and applied to various study fields, particularly disaster risk management (Manyena, 2006:434; UNISDR, 2007:7; Bhamra et al., 2011:5375).

In conceptualising and understanding resilience within the disaster management field, various authors applied the ecological perspective which later evolved to be the social-ecological systems theory (Holling, 1973:1-23; Waller, 2001:290; Pelling, 2011:55). The ecological perspective on resilience included the view that ecosystems have "...a zone of stability that allows for the reorganisation of a system to continually exist and function even in the face of adversity and change" (Holling, 1973:9). The recognition of the social, political and environmental influence on systems inspired the social-ecological systems theory (Cretney, 2014:628). The recognition of the social, political and environmental factors on systems places emphasis on the intimate link between ecological and social systems (Timmerman, 1981:21;
Walker et al., 2006). The social-ecological system (SES) theory posits that the continuous well-being of systems is reliant on transformation, episodes of growth, breakdown and then re-organisation (Walker et al., 2006).

To understand resilience, it is useful to consider the approach presented in Figure 2.3.1 below.

Figure 2.3.1: Conceptualising resilience (DFID, 2012:9)

This approach provided by DFID (2012:9), views communities and countries as predisposed to shocks and stressors and evaluates their capacity to cope with these disturbances by focusing the three factors. These include;

- Exposure to risk occurrences: refers to the extent and rate of shocks as well as the intensity of the shock;
- Sensitivity (or vulnerability): refers to the extent to which the system will be affected by the shock; and
- Adaptive capacity: refers to the assets, resources and the capacities of the system to adjust to the change (DFID, 2012:9).

The UNISDR (2004:16) and Rutter (2012:34) share a similar approach to resilience and define the concept as the capability of a system, community or society that is experiencing or potentially exposed to hazards to adapt, by means of resistance or transition, in order to reach or maintain an adequate level of functioning and structure. Furthermore, various authors add that resilience is more than a systems resistance to change and the persistence to maintain present structures but a combination of numerous dimensions such as:

- The extent to which a system can absorb shocks and still preserve its functionality;
• The extent to which the system can self-organise and
• The capacity to build and enhance the ability to learn, adapt and where necessary transform (Folke, 2006:7; Berkes et al., 2003:13).

The concept of resilience thus focuses on both the individual and the community and places emphasis on their ability and capacity to respond to and cope with disasters. The following section discusses resilience as applied to the community in order to understand the concept of community resilience.

2.4 UNDERSTANDING COMMUNITY RESILIENCE

The previous section provided an understanding of resilience and how it can be defined and understood. The section noted the multi-contextual nature of resilience, which indicates that the term can be applied to individuals as well as the broader context of systems without causing much change to the properties of the concept. In this section, the concept of resilience is extended further to apply to the context of the community. Community resilience denotes the collective nature of the concept by highlighting the collectiveness of coping mechanisms within communities. Nuwayhid et al. (2011:505) however, cautions from approaching community resilience as a collection of individual resiliencies. Rather, community resilience is broadly concerned with the social, economic, technological and environmental factors relevant in communities that facilitate the coping capacities of communities from disasters (Ahmed, 2004:23).

In order to lay the foundation of this section, the definition of a community is provided to facilitate the understanding of community resilience. A community can be classified in terms of its geographical divide or in terms of shared expertise, values norms, interests and experiences (Wyche et al., 2011:18). For the purpose of this research, a community is defined as a group of individuals sharing a common geographical location, familiar social or work relations and sharing environmental and ecological resources (Wyche et al., 2011:18; McAslan, 2010:6; Adger, 2000:347). Lamb and Mixon (2013:24) recognise that communities can be affected by external disruptions in such a way that its functioning may be temporarily or permanently impaired. They further go on to say that communities struck by major environmental hazards, may not recover the loss in population, its economic activity or the quality of life, or it may either adapt to the adverse experience in such a way that its functioning is ultimately improved (Lamb & Mixon, 2013:24).

According to USAID (2013:3), the concept of community resilience stems from the concept of social resilience where social resilience is defined as the ability of “a social group sharing similar interests and expertise, to cope with external stressors and disturbances as a result of social,
political and environmental change” (Adger, 2000:347; Folke, 2006:260; Maguire & Hagan, 2007:16). Like the concept of social resilience, community resilience refers to the collective capacities within communities that enables it to prepare for, respond to, cope with and recover from disasters (Magis, 2010:401; Berkes & Ross, 2015:7). CARRI (2013:14) adopted Walker et al. (2010) definition of community resilience and defines the concept as the ability of the community to foresee risk, minimise impact, and rebound swiftly by surviving, adapting, evolving, and growing from experiences of tumultuous change. The concept is further defined by Cutter et al. (2008:600) as the intrinsic capacities that enable the community to absorb the impact of hazards and to cope with disaster occurrences, including those capacities that facilitate post-event recovery through reorganisation, alteration, and learning from the disastrous experience.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) (2013:23) and Plough et al. (2013:1191), in defining community resilience, concur with an emphasis on the persistent ability of the community to take in experiences of adversity while preserving similar levels of functioning. This definition reflects the capacity of a community to reorganise itself according to the change in order to continue its existence (IPCC, 2013:23). This view coincides with that of Murray and Zautra (2013:337) who state that community resilience is an adaptive process with the aim of reducing a community’s vulnerability to potential hazards occurring through three processes, namely: 1) recovery from the adverse experience; 2) sustainability by maintaining its basic levels of functioning; and 3) growth by learning from past disasters.

From the perspectives presented above, community resilience is mainly on the community-level factors that protect the community from adverse experiences as opposed to the factors within an individual that determines his/her resilience (Wyche, 2011:18). In the discussion presented above, the concept of community resilience refers to a set of capacities that are readily available to a community, which allows it to deal with adverse events (such as disasters) and in so doing, maintain its functional existence. These capacities include economic resources, information and communication, social capital and community competence. These capacities are discussed in the following section.

2.5 CAPACITY BUILDING FOR COMMUNITY RESILIENCE

Building the capacity of communities to respond to disaster occurrences provides one with a foundation to reduce disasters; mitigate against the effects of hazards and consequently achieve community resilience. The capacity of communities is seen as being made up of four key capacities, namely, economic resources; information and communication; social capital and community competence (Kapucu et al., 2013:219; Veil & Bishop, 2014:727-730). These factors
are helpful in developing the community’s capacity for building disaster resilience (Norris et al., 2008:128). Lebel et al. (2006) further states that strengthening the capacity of the system to manage resilience is imperative to enhance sustainable disaster risk reduction efforts. The following section includes a detailed discussion of the factors important in enhancing capacity building for community resilience, namely, economic resources; information and communication; social capital and community competence.

2.5.1 Economic Resources

Economic resources as a capacity reflect the extent to which the community can utilise economic resources to respond to and rehabilitate from disaster experiences (Veil & Bishop, 2014:727-730). Further to this, the community should have remaining resources to mitigate against and respond to future disasters (Veil & Bishop, 2014:727-730).

Hill et al. (2008:2) refer to the concept of regional economic resilience and they define it as the capacity of a region, such as a metropolitan area, to recuperate from shocks that may have directly or indirectly impacted on its economic growth. Kapucu et al. (2007:383) refer to economic resilience as referring to the extent to which the community’s economic resources and risks are equally distributed to respond to the occurrence of disasters or to build the coping capacities of the community to cope with disasters. Rose (2007:383) distinguishes two types of economic resilience, namely, static economic resilience and dynamic economic resilience. Static economic resilience refers to the way a community manages to efficiently utilise existing and available resources when a disaster strikes, whereas dynamic economic resilience pertains to the use of the available economic resources to reconstruct and repair the capital stock for future purposes, such as responding to future disasters. Rose (2007:74) argues that economic resilience is imperative to minimise the losses experienced during disasters, and therefore important in increasing the capacity of the community to cope with disasters.

For example, economic resources reflect the socio-political structures implemented by Government, at a national, provincial and local level to address poverty by promoting employment opportunities and encouraging economic growth, thereby enabling the community to organise economic resources to reduce disaster risks. In addition, this includes the implementation of the City of Johannesburg’s Disaster Management Plan that is in line with the National Disaster Management Framework of South Africa that aims to attend to disaster management by putting into practice an integrated institutional capacity for disaster risk management; disaster risk assessment; disaster risk reduction as well as response and recovery (COJ, 2014:292).
In the context of private companies, this capacity refers to the extent of private company presence in Diepsloot through their corporate social responsibility initiatives as well offering employment opportunities for the residents of Diepsloot.

### 2.5.2 Information and communication

Information and communication has been considered as an important factor to manage disaster risks and increase resilience (Watanabe *et al.*, 2014:9; Vos & Sullivan, 2014:61; Albano *et al.*, 2015:1645). Information and communication capacity not only refers to the level of technological innovation and infrastructure, but also focuses on increasing knowledge, awareness and the understanding of disaster risk, disaster reduction and resilience building in communities (Twigg, 2004:165; Albano *et al.*, 2015:1645). According to Renn (2008:207), risk education enhances the community’s understanding of risks; motivates changes with regard to their attitudes or behaviour; may stimulate confidence in the authorities accountable for the safety of the community and enhance the conditions for operational stakeholder participation in issues relating to risk.

For example, this capacity may include firstly, the knowledge and awareness of issues relating to disaster risks within the community and the extent to which they perceive themselves as being vulnerable to these risks. Secondly, this capacity relates to the extent to which the community exchanges information about the risks and measures to prevent or respond to the occurrences of disasters. Furthermore, this capacity denotes the mechanisms through which the community can mobilise during disaster events with the aim of responding to the event.

Norris *et al.* (2008:140) identifies two factors relating to this capacity and that is, systems and infrastructure for informing the public, as well as communication and narratives. According to Norris *et al.* (2008:140), information and communication is imperative in emergencies because people need to be rapidly informed about dangers and mobilised to implement the required actions in emergency situations. According to Longstaff (2005:55), accurate and accurately conveyed information increases opportunities for survival. Communication infrastructures and communication systems can be used during emergencies to engage volunteers and can later serve as a means for the community to be informed and have access to services.

In addition to the conventional communication infrastructures and systems, social media has been identified as an emerging platform within the disaster management field, playing a vital role in building community resilience (White, 2012:187; Dufty, 2012:40). According to Dufty (2012:42), social media’s role in disaster management includes: providing information about disaster risks; assistance in the planning and preparing for disasters and communicating warnings; promoting social capital and increasing disaster risk education and awareness.
Norris et al. (2008:104) refer to communication and community narratives, and are of the view that these elements promote coping capacities of communities. When community members have a collective appreciation of their reality, it contributes to their sense of belonging and unity and thus increases their resilience towards disasters (Norris et al., 2008:140; Hiwasaki et al., 2014:1).

2.5.3 Social Capital

The third capacity relates to the concept of social capital, that is, the level of social capital within communities that can be harnessed and utilised to enhance community’s coping mechanisms. According to Adger (2003:396), social capital occupies a significant role in coping with environmental disturbances, particularly in communities where Government’s response is delayed when disasters occur. Adger (2003:388) further argues that adaptation processes entail the interdependence of agencies based on their shared relationships, the institutions under which they live and the available resources they depend on, all which describes the notion of social capital.

Social capital is conceptualised as including factors such as trust, norms, and social networks that enables a community to efficiently function; is able to collectively solve its problems proficiently; work towards community progress and realise its goals (David & Li, 2008:2; Kapucu et al., 2013:219). Naughton (2014:3) highlights the benefits of social capital on the individual and community level. Therefore, when an individual has access to resources through their social contacts, their economic, physical or emotional well-being is positively affected (Naughton, 2014:3). And at the community level, collective action involves inputs and results in outcomes that are beneficial to the group and far outweigh any individual efforts or gains (Naughton, 2014:3).

From the community context, this capacity denotes the collectiveness of the community particularly during disaster occurrences and the recovery process. For example, during the occurrence of a shack fire, the community can mobilise and collectively work towards putting out the fire. The community may go further to provide shelter to the affected family. From a private company perspective, the corporate social responsibility programmes implemented in the community signify a level of social capital.

Plough et al. (2013:1191) is of the view that community resilience can be achieved when there is a supportive social context. This notion is supported by Mathbor (2007:360) in that social capital is crucial in building the community’s institutional capacities, particularly in disaster management efforts.
2.5.4 Community Competence

The last factor that is mentioned is the notion of community competence, that is, the extent to which the community can collectively work together before, during and after disaster occurrences to achieve collective action in responding to disaster occurrences (Lebel et al., 2006; Norris et al., 2008:128; Veil & Bishop, 2014:727-730).

Norris et al. (2008:141), identifies two components relating to community competence and that is, collective action and decision-making, as well as collective efficacy and empowerment. These two elements are related in that collective action and decision-making emanate from collective efficacy and empowerment (Cottrell, 1976:197). With regard to collective action and decision making, Cottrell (1976:197) argued that a competent community is one in which the community can collaborate collectively to recognise the problems within the community and call for community action; can accomplish operational agreement on goals and priorities and ways to generate and apply the approved goals and can cooperate with each other successfully to achieve these goals.

Based on Cottrell’s proposition, these varying components are features related to social capital and information and communication, and consequently a prerequisite for community competence (Norris et al., 2008:141). According to Brown & Kulig (1997:30), community resilience is grounded in the notion of human agency and can be understood with the view of capacity for significant, deliberate action. Thus, it can be said that, firstly, individuals and communities are considered resilient when their actions are directed towards recovering from what they perceive as a negative social or physical experience. Secondly, individuals and communities are considered to be resilient when their actions are directed towards transforming their social and physical environment to reduce future disaster risks (Norris et al., 2008:141).

Collective efficacy relates to shared trust and the mutual motivation for collective effort towards a common objective for the benefit of the community (Norris et al., 2008:142). Furthermore, the author is of the view that collective efficacy creates links between social capital and community competence and this increases the prospect of the community adopting mitigation approaches towards disaster risks.

The promotion of collective and meaningful participation of community members in decisions that affect the community members’ lives can be empowering (Rich et al., 1995:671). For a community to be empowered and considered to be effective in responding to hazards, it should not only have increased capacity for resilience building, but also access to a combination of resources which the community can efficiently use before and after disaster events (Rich et al., 1995:671). Longstaff et al. (2010:5) state that the community must have access to resources
that enable the activation of the capacities discussed in this section as well as the ability to apply and reorganise them in such a way that the community ensures its functionality before and after a disturbance. Furthermore, a resilient community must have a culture that allows for the community to challenge authority, institutions that enable coordinated responses and a political atmosphere that promotes citizen participation in decision-making processes (Rich et al., 1995:671; Norris et al., 2008:142). These issues addressed by Rich et al. (1995) and Norris et al. (2008) point us to the concept of collaboration when building effective and sustainable community resilience projects. This concept of collaboration and specifically collaboration between communities and the private sector is discussed in detail in the next chapter.

The theory on resilience has pointed out several discrepancies relating to the definition and application of the “resilient approach” to the broad context community and social development, particularly in disaster risk management (Sen, 1999:62; Leach, 2002:11; Clark, 2007:25; Cannon & Muller-Mahn, 2010:623; Coutlhard, 2012:601; Béné et al., 2014:606). These discrepancies are discussed in detail in the following section.

2.6 CRITIQUE OF RESILIENCE

The concept of resilience and its application to the community context in literature denotes the collective nature of the term. Thus, the first point of critique is towards the individuality of human actions (Davoudi et al., 2012:305). Coutlhard (2012:601), argues that much of the focus is placed on the “system’s ability to recover from shocks, and places less focus on the choices made by the individuals within the system, who may or may not have control over the process by which resilience is shaped”. In addition, the concept of resilience encompasses concepts such as social capital, self-organisation and self-reliance of systems. According to Davoudi et al. (2012:305), the consideration of such concepts, often leads to the misguided idea that building resilience in communities should encourage governments to retreat from taking responsibility for risks and ensuring the resilience of the community. Davoudi et al. (2012:305) further argue that the concepts and practice associated with resilience should not be used as a replacement for responsive and accountable governance. The aspects mentioned above such as individual human actions within communities and the collective nature of the concept of resilience; replacement of an accountable government with capacities representing resilient communities should therefore be considered whenever resilience is addressed.

Secondly, the practice of resilience within communities, particularly those characterised by the lack of resources, may adapt according to what they have available for survival (Sen, 1999:62; Clark, 2007:25). The term “adaptive preference” refers to, the tendency of poor households to deliberately or as a reflexive response, adjust their aspirations, expectations and desires,
order to cope with their unfavourable circumstances (Sen, 1999:62; Clark, 2007:25). Leach (2002:11) points to the distributional and externality issues relating to resilience, stating that resilience projects at the community level may make the whole system resilient but not all households in the community will necessarily benefit from these resilience-oriented projects. It is thus imperative that, implementing projects aimed at strengthening resilience in communities, practitioners should consider on what level will resilience be implemented and to break it down to all these different levels.

Thirdly, Davoudi et al. (2012:205) add that the outcomes or purpose of resilience is often linked to different “normative judgements”. That is, the outcomes of resilience thinking are often perceived as natural or desirable outcomes implying that any alternative outcomes indicate a lack of resilience (Davoudi et al., 2012:305). These authors discourage the application of ideal outcomes of community resilience but rather to consider the diversity of communities and that various communities may display diverse outcomes in relation to showing or having resilience.

The fourth critical issue that has been identified is the inability of the term resilience to address issues of power, human agency and inequity (Pelling & Manuel-Navarrete, 2011:10). This inability or difficulty in addressing such issues has resulted in questioning the use of the term in providing the correct framework for social transformation (Pelling & Manuel-Navarrete, 2011:10). It is argued that transformation and adaptation may be delayed by power structures especially if the transformation threatens to challenge the status quo, particularly in cases where those in power are at risk of losing the benefits from the current system and structure (Pelling & Manuel-Navarrete, 2011:10). Therefore, strategies to build resilience in communities should consider and address these issues in order to ensure the successful implementation of resilience-based community projects.

These aspects identified above are critical when implementing the resilience approach to community projects aimed at reducing disaster risks. According to Manyena (2006:436), applying the concept of resilience assists us to clearly comprehend risk and vulnerability concepts including bridging the gaps between the two. Furthermore, it is said that improving factors, such as economic resources; information and communication; social capital and community competence embedded in achieving disaster resilience, enhances the community’s coping capacities and livelihoods by enabling them to make correct and applicable choices within the context of their environment (Cox, 2012:1932; Manyena, 2006:436). Thus, applying resilience thinking to disaster risk reduction activities encourages development and resilience practitioners to integrate emergency, relief and development activities in order to reduce disaster risks (Pain & Levine, 2012:3). And it is therefore important in contributing towards building a more equitable and sustainable society (UNDP, 2012).
2.7 CONCLUSION

The aim of this chapter was to provide a theoretical overview of the concept of community resilience. This chapter revealed the complexity of the concept and the challenge to come up with a universally agreed upon definition and the origin of the concept. The concept of resilience is multi-contextual and a multi-disciplinary and it can be applied to various fields without much change to the meaning of the concept. What has been noted by various authors consulted in this chapter is that resilience links to the capacities of individuals, communities and systems to cope and overcome adversity. The linkage of disaster risk reduction and resilience has revealed that resilience based disaster risk reduction programmes have the potential to strengthen the preparation and coping mechanisms of communities before, during and after disaster occurrences.

The chapter also revealed that even though working towards resilience is imperative for reducing disaster risk and enhancing DRR thereby accelerating sustainable development, it is also important to take caution in defining and applying the concept of resilience in relation to communities. Several authors make note of certain inconsistencies associated with the concept of resilience by highlighting and challenging various factors that need to be addressed in order to increase the efficacy of the concept and practice of resilience. Despite these challenges, this concept has been advocated and supported by several authors and international development agencies. These authors and agencies are in support of this approach and encourages the application of resilience thinking to enhance disaster risk reduction activities because the presence of resilience in communities enhances their ability to prepare for disasters; increases community’s self-sufficiency to respond to the occurrence of disasters and assists the community system to rehabilitate from the disaster. Literature consulted in the chapter, further highlighted the various capacities that are necessary to build and strengthen resilience.

These capacities include economic development, information and communication, social capital and community competence. What was noted in the chapter was that community resilience requires a collaborative effort between stakeholders in order to build the capacities of communities to successfully achieve resilience. Firstly, these capacities relate to the efficient use of physical, economical and human resources in order to prepare for, respond to and rehabilitate from disaster occurrences. Secondly, capacities address the use of information and communication to inform the public in emergencies for them to assume the necessary actions. The role of social media was also identified as being imperative to not only communicate about emergencies but it has also been noted to increase social capital during emergencies. Lastly, social capital and community competence emphasise the collaborative aspects within
communities that are crucial for the efficient reduction of disaster risks and management of disaster occurrences.

The following chapter discusses in detail the concept of collaboration in the context of community resilience by firstly discussing the theoretical perspectives of collaboration. The chapter moves on to exploring the correlation between private company-community collaboration and community resilience.
CHAPTER 3: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: COLLABORATION

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter 1 of this study identified and reflected on the need for the private sector to engage in disaster risk reduction efforts and contribute towards building resilience in communities (UNISDR, 2015; Van Niekerk et al., 2015:87-100). The preceding chapter explored the theoretical aspects of the concept of resilience, its connection to DRR and community resilience. The chapter alluded to the factors involved in building community resilience and highlighted that the improvement of the four capacities within communities (economic resources, information and communication, social capital and community competence) can assist in the achievement of community resilience (Veil & Bishop, 2014:727-730).

This chapter provides a conceptual framework of collaboration with the main focus on the dimensions of collaboration. The chapter further provides the determining factors that enable successful collaborations as well as provide a summary of the strategies for collaboration that have been identified in literature. Lastly, the chapter explores the correlation between private sector and community collaboration in building community resilience, particularly on the role that the private sector can play in building resilience in the community.

3.2 CONCEPTUALISING COLLABORATION

The term collaboration is a multi-disciplinary and multi-dimensional concept that has been applied to various fields within the social and business sciences (Donahue & Zeckhauser, 2006:497; Thomas & Perry, 2006:23; NRC, 2010:24-25). Whereas, collaboration across both social and business fields is based on the same principle, the ultimate objectives of collaboration in a social context differ from collaboration in the business context. Firstly, in the social sciences field, collaboration is viewed as directed towards solving complex societal problems (Meinzen-Dick et al., 2004:1; Selsky & Parker, 2005:850; London, 2012:77). In contrast, collaboration within the business sector is largely concerned with the achievement of business related objectives (Kozuch, 2009:17; Murphy et al., 2014:145). The practice of collaboration is viewed as an effective mechanism in addressing various social impediments and causes as well as supplementing scarce resources to build the community by strengthening organisational ties (Selsky & Parker, 2005:850; Thomson et al., 2007:24). Similarly, Murphy et al. (2014:147-148) suggest that the value created by collaborating, particularly for a business, may include having access to new knowledge, networks, or expertise; enhanced legitimacy, reputation and recognition; increased financial and technological resources; improvement in stakeholder relations; reduction in environmental impact; and increased customer benefaction.
and ultimately, competitive advantage. Simply defined, collaboration means “to work with another person or group in order to achieve or do something” (Merriam-webster.com, 2016).

A large array of collaboration literature exists and all offers somewhat differing but related perspectives to the concept. Gray (1989:5) conducted extensive research on collaboration and defines the concept as “...a process through which parties who see different aspects of a problem can constructively explore their differences and search for a solution that goes beyond their own limited vision of what is possible”.

According to Hill and Lynne (2002:5), collaboration is “...the voluntary participation in inter-organisational (horizontal) relationships that involve agreements or understandings concerning the allocation of responsibilities and rewards among the collaborators”. Kozuch (2009:17) provides a similar view of the term by referring to collaboration as the “...establishment of relationships between multiple organisations or institutions for the purposes of achieving mutually agreed upon goals”. Bryson et al. (2006:44) extend the concept by referring to cross-sector collaboration and they define it as “...the linking or sharing of information, resources, activities, and capabilities by organisations in two or more sectors to achieve jointly an outcome that could not be achieved by organisations in one sector separately”.

A more comprehensive definition of collaboration is taken from Thomas and Perry (2006:23). They refer to collaboration as “...a process in which autonomous actors (individuals or groups) interact through formal or informal negotiations, jointly creating rules and structures governing their relationships and ways to act or decide on the issues that brought them together (mutually agreed upon goals); it is a process involving shared norms and mutually beneficial interactions (shared resources)” (Thomas & Perry, 2006:23).

The common themes embedded in these definitions are that the concept of collaboration is based on the formation of informal or formal ties between multiple agencies, institutions or individuals taking joint action with shared knowledge or sharing knowledge and resources to achieve mutually beneficial and agreed upon goals (Huxham, 1996; Thomas & Perry, 2006:20; Kozuch, 2009:18).

Furthermore, collaboration is identified as having multiple components that include concepts relating to governance, administration, mutuality, norms and organisational autonomy (Gray & Wood, 1991; Thomson & Perry, 2006:24). Based on the extensive research and literature reviews conducted by Gray and Wood (1991) and subsequently by Thomson and colleagues, the concept of collaboration encompasses multiple components (Thomson & Perry, 2006:24). Two of these components are structural in nature namely, governance and administration. The third component is based on agency, individual, group, or organisational autonomy (Thomson
The final two components are based on social capital, that is, the connections between individuals that is based on norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness (Putnam, 2000:19). These components include mutuality and norms. The section below provides a more comprehensive discussion of these components.

### 3.2.1. Governance

Governance relates to the joint establishment of rules and standards that govern behaviour and relationships in accordance to the collaborative activities and goals (Thomson & Perry, 2006:24). This component incorporates the means necessary to create shared power, accountability and shared decision-making between members (Mattessich & Monsey, 1992:15). Ostrom (1990) is of the view that the shared accountability in the decision-making process includes choices based around cooperative working rules that define how decisions will be made, which actions will be acceptable or restricted, the information that needs to be provided, and the ways in which responsibilities, the costs and gains will be allocated. These agreements made by the collaborating partners, form part of the foundation of collaboration and are an essential element of the negotiations that take place and consequently, results in commitments made by members to the collaborative relationship (Mattessich & Monsey, 1992:15; Thomson & Perry, 2006:24).

Literature on collaboration indicates that the governance component has the following implications for the collaborative relationship:

- An absence of a hierarchical division of labour or authoritative arrangements in the collaborative (Huxham, 1996);
- All members to be aware that they are not only accountable for realising agreements within the collaborative, but are also accountable to similarly execute these agreements on themselves (Gray, 1989);
- All partners should be willing to accept that all members in the collaborative have legitimate interests in the collaborative (McCaffrey et al., 1995:612). Further to this, the collaborative should indicate group harmony, instead of power or coalitional politics (McCaffrey et al., 1995:612); and
- All partners to be aware that governance in collaborative working puts emphasis on openness when sharing information, respecting other members’ inputs, and potentially prolonged dialogues in order to reach agreements (Thomson & Perry, 2006:24).

This component is viewed as serving an important role in collaborations. According to Bryson et al. (2006:49), governance incorporates a set of monitoring and coordinating actions that are
imperative to the survival of collaborative relationships. These monitoring and coordinating actions include a set of group level norms, values, and trust developed through the frequent exchange of information and constant contact between members in the collaborative (Jones et al., 1997; Bryson et al., 2006:49). Thomson and Perry (2006:24) argue that members in the collaborative action are required to comply with the jointly agreed upon rules and the jointly established values and norms. The authors further argue that their non-compliance to these rules, values and norms will result in the lack of consensus amongst members in the decision-making process, lack of commitment towards the collaborative and consequently a failure in the collaborative process.

According to Thomson and Perry (2006:25), collaborations do not self-administer themselves and therefore incorporate activities that enable the jointly agreed upon actions to be carried out by members. The following component discusses the administrative component.

### 3.2.2. Administration

The administrative component is the interpretation and implementation of the collaborative activities. According to Thomson and Perry (2006:25), organisations collaborate for specific intentions and these intentions must be clear as this will enable the move from governance towards action and the management of the collaborative relationships.

Mattessich and Monsey (1992:15) state that the functions inherent in this component include the clarification of roles and responsibilities, coordination, monitoring and evaluation of activities that were jointly agreed upon in the governance component. Mattessich and Monsey (1992:15) further state that these functions set the foundation for characterising the relationships within collaboration. This suggests that the collaborating partners occupy differing roles within the collaboration that enables the planned activities to be implemented and the relationship to be managed effectively (Himmelman, 1996; Radin, 1996:159; Sagawa & Segal, 2000; Williams, 2002:117). These roles may include but not limited to, those of a leader, convener, facilitator, funder, assistant, and advocate, depending on the objectives of the collaborative relationships (Himmelman: 1996).

Various authors highlight the complexity of implementing collaborative activities (Huxham, 1996; Gray, 2000; Huxham & Vangen, 2005). For example, Huxham (1996) points to the voluntary and autonomous participation of the partners in the collaboration suggesting that the partners may choose to withdraw the participation at any point. Furthermore, collaboration is viewed as following non-traditional mechanisms for implementation (Huxham, 1996; Gray, 2000; Huxham & Vangen, 2005). For instance, collaboration is non-hierarchal, it is not standardised nor does it follow a certain routine and the communication within the collaboration is dependent on the
interdependence of the relationships within the collaboration (Huxham & Vangen, 2005). As such, partners may see the need to withdraw their membership if the collaborative endeavour is incapable of attaining its short-term goals and objectives (Huxham, 1996; Thomson, 1999).

Thomson and Perry (2006:25) point out the importance of having a balance between administrative and social capacity in order to ensure that the planned activities are implemented efficiently. The administrative capacity refers to the implementation of activities through efficient and functional structures, in order to achieve the objectives of the collaborative effort (Thomas et al., 2015:98). And the social capacity refers to the functional structures embedded in the collaborative effort that supports the transparency of roles and effective communication means that harness the collaborative relationships (Thomas et al., 2015:98). Thus, the need to have a central role within the collaboration is imperative (Freitag & Winkler, 2001:68). These authors are of the view that a central role, such as that of a leader, within collaboration is required. The leader will see to the coordination of communication, organisation and dissemination information, and notifying the partners about the mutually established systems governing the collaborative relationship. The leader will further be responsible for handling the innate tension amongst members resulting from the need to fulfil own self-interest and that of the collective (Thomson & Perry, 2006:26).

It was earlier identified that the involvement of partners in collaboration is voluntary and based on autonomous engagement. The next component takes a closer look at how the autonomous involvement of partners shapes the collaborative endeavour.

### 3.2.3. Organisational autonomy

This component relates to a degree to which both members in the collaborative are willing and able to reconcile both individual and collective interests (Gray, 1991; Thomson & Perry, 2006:26; Thomson et al., 2007:26). This component recognises the reality that members in the collaborative endeavours share a dual identity which may create inherent pressure between serving the interests of the self and serving the interest of the collective while also trying to satisfy their obligation to the collaborative partners and their stakeholders (Wood & Gray, 1991; Huxham. 1996:6; Thomson et al., 2007:26).

The conflict between the collaborating partners is inevitable because of, (1) the distinctive identity each partner has; (2) the dual identity they share and (3) the identity of the collaborative (Wood & Gray, 1991; Huxham. 1996:6; Thomson et al., 2007:26). When partners are unable to reconcile their autonomous and collective interests, it is likely that the collaboration may not thrive (Huxham, 1996:6). The lack of a formal hierarchal structure in collaborative endeavours exacerbates the potential for this tension to exist and it is therefore suggested that the
collaborating members should ensure working relationships that are based on goodwill (Huxham, 1996:6). However, Innes (1999:644) posits that the tension inherent in collaborations is advantageous and useful for inspiring creativity amongst members. She argues “…equilibrium powerfully hinders change, while highly chaotic environments, on the other hand, produce only random responses, and systems cannot settle into patterns” (Innes, 1999:644).

Literature suggests that managing these conflicting interests inherent in collaborations is possible. Innes (1999:644) proposes that collaborating members may possibly use the prospective vigour inherent in this conflict between individual and collective interests by taking full advantage of the ‘latent synergies’ resulting from these individual differences Huxham (1996:7) adds that all members in the collaborative have to justify their involvement in the collaborative relationship and the contribution the collaboration makes towards individual goals. This justification of their involvement in the collaborative relationship will reduce or prevent conflicting goals between the members and contribute to the support for collaborative missions (Mattessich & Monsey, 1992:15; Huxham, 1996:7; Thomson & Perry, 2006:24).

The analysis on the autonomous engagement of individuals in collaborative endeavours reveals that there is a potential for collaborations to work despite the existing or potential for tension amongst members. This ability for members to reconcile their differing interests uncovers the reciprocal nature of working together. This reciprocity is captured in the next component, mutuality.

3.2.4. Mutuality

The preceding discussion on organisational autonomy highlighted the need for collaborating members to reconcile differences while trying to serve both their individual, collective and collaborative goals. This suggests that the collaboration should benefit all the members in the collaborative. This component discusses the concept of mutuality in collaboration. Several authors agree that the foundation of collaborations and the purpose of organisations collaborating are largely dependent on the conditions of reciprocity and sharing in the benefits of the union and shared interests (Mattessich & Monsey, 1992:15; Thomson & Perry, 2006:24). According to Thomson and Perry (2006:27), members that agree to engage in a collaborative, must be exposed to mutually gratifying interdependencies created through their varying or common interests. These shared interests are mainly founded on the concept of homogeneity or an appreciation and a passion for matters that surpass individual organisation’s mission, for instance, finding solutions to environmental degradation, contributing to poverty alleviation or climate change (Thomson & Perry, 2006:27; London, 2012:77). Powell (1990:303) introduces the notion of differing interests being complementary to each other. He states that members
agree to enter into a collaborative and one of the members is provided the opportunity to pursue their own goals and these goals serves and accommodates the goals of the other member (Powell, 1990:303). This may take place where a large company possesses unique resources that a smaller company needs or a disadvantaged community could benefit from. Wood and Gray (1991:161), emphasises the importance of both partners having the ability to satisfy each other’s distinct interests without harming themselves.

While the reconciliation of differences is based on mutuality and resulting in successful collaboration, some authors reflect on collaboration as based upon mutual interests, finding commonalities in their mission or their commitment to similar target problems or specialised orientation and ethos (Lax & Sebenius, 1986; Cropper, 1996; Thomas & Perry, 2006:27; Thomson et al., 2007:28). These authors further suggest that the commonalities shared between members that result in effective collaborations relies on the presence of norms of reciprocity and trust (Lax & Sebenius, 1986; Cropper, 1996; Thomas & Perry, 2006:27; Thomson et al., 2007:28). These norms characterise the working culture of the collaborative (Bock et al., 2006:7). This last component of collaboration is discussed in the following section.

3.2.5. Norms

Norms are the informal guidelines in a particular group or social unit, that guides individuals about what is considered normal social behaviour; they outline the foundation of collective expectations, and are central in creating social control and social order by putting pressure on the members to conform (Bock et al., 2006:7; SociologyGuide, 2006).

In collaborative working, norms of reciprocity and trust characterise the working relationship (Thomson et al., 2007:28; Bock et al., 2006:7). Reciprocity in collaborative working refers to the mutual eagerness individual member’s display towards the collaborative (Thomson & Perry, 2006:27). This eagerness which is founded upon the perceived levels of reciprocal obligations, allows the members to be willing to bear initial disproportionate costs with the expectation that other members will equalise their contribution and distribution of costs and benefits over time out of a sense of obligation (Thomson & Perry, 2006:27; Thomson et al., 2007:28). Collaboration literature identifies the notion of reciprocity as an important factor in collaborative working (Thomson & Perry, 2006:27). According to Axelrod (1984), retaliatory actions, supplemented by recurrent interaction make collaboration possible. These repeated interactions emphasise the perspective of obligation established through the social and cultural principles that originate from social interaction and give reciprocal relations significance (Powell, 1990). These reciprocal nature characterising collaborations further reflect the perceived level of trust shared between collaborating members.
According to Cummings and Bromiley (1996:303), trust reflects “…the common belief among a group of individuals that another group will, make good-faith efforts to behave in accordance with any commitments both explicit and implicit; will be honest in whatever negotiations preceded such commitments; and will not take excessive advantage of another even when the opportunity is available”. Several authors posit that trust plays an important role in collaborative working because trust yields reciprocated appreciation for the collaborative process and subsequently generates legitimacy and commitment towards the collaboration (Hardy et al., 2003:28; Selsky & Parker, 2005:854; Gray & Stites, 2013:40; Emerson et al., 2011:15). In addition to reciprocity and trust, Ostrom (1998) adds the concept of reputation in collaboration. Collaboration over time, consequently leads to longer-term commitments created amongst the members constructed through institutionalised “psychological contracts”, as members work together and build reputations for dependable conduct (Ring & Van de Ven, 1994; Ostrom, 1998).

According to Thomas et al. (2015:98), each component incorporates activities related to the collaborative process. These components highlight aspects related to the factors required to make the collaborative effort effective and successful. The following section classes the activities into six principles for successful collaboration as provided by Hardy et al. (2003). These include: “the recognition and acceptance of the need for partnership; developing clarity and realism of purpose; ensuring commitment and ownership; developing and maintaining trust; creating clear and robust partnership arrangements; and monitoring, measuring and learning” (Hardy et al., 2003:15-35).

3.3 DETERMINING SUCCESS FACTORS FOR SUCCESSFUL COLLABORATION

Literature on collaboration points to the viewpoint that collaboration can be a complex process but an effective mechanism for solving multiple societal challenges while also creating multiple benefits for the collaborating partners (Thomson & Perry, 2006:20; Thomas et al., 2007:24; Hamann et al., 2011:4; Keast & Mandell, 2012:2). The conceptual framework of collaboration provided in section 3.2 highlights several aspects that bring attention to the necessary conditions under which collaboration takes place and has the potential for success. Some of the common aspects predominant in the definitions of collaboration relates to the collaboration process as a purpose-driven endeavour; based on consensual involvement; it is mutually beneficial and is founded on trust, mutuality, autonomous involvement and sustainability (Huxham, 1996; Thomas & Perry, 2006:20; Kozuch, 2009:18). This section discusses the various determining success principles for collaboration identified in the literature.
According to Hardy et al. (2003:15), these principles include “the recognition and acceptance of the need for partnership; developing clarity and realism of purpose; ensuring commitment and ownership; developing and maintaining trust; creating clear and robust partnership arrangements; and monitoring, measuring and learning” (Hardy et al., 2003:15-35). According to Hamann et al. (2011:5), these principles are similar to or supplement other success factors developed in literature. The success factors identified in literature are integrated in the discussion of the six principles as illustrated by Hardy and colleagues.

### 3.3.1 Recognise and accept the need for partnership

The first principle places attention on two aspects; firstly, the history of collaboration in the community or organisation and secondly, the level of recognition for the need to work together (Hardy et al., 2003:16).

According to Hardy et al. (2003:16), the degree to which prospective partners have a prior account of effective collaborative working is critical in defining the scale and pace of their engagement in the collaboration and future successes of the collaborative. Mattessich and Monsey (1992:15) add that a history of working together within communities or organisations provides partners with clear understanding of the role expectations in the collaborative and instils a level of trust in the collaborative process. Both authors however, indicate that the lack of collaborative history should not deter future collaborative working (Mattessich & Monsey, 1992:16; Hardy et al., 2003:16). Instead, both partners should ensure that environmental issues, such as, the legislative issues, availability of funding for the collaborative, cultural issues or political environment are adequately addressed before the collaboration is affected (Mattessich & Monsey, 1992:16; Hardy et al., 2003:16). Hardy et al. (2003:16) maintains that taking stock of the history of collaboration involves a thorough assessment of the factors that contributed to the success of the collaboration and the factors that added to the challenges of the collaborative. This will enable the prospective collaborative partners to either minimise the challenging barriers or enhance the success factors in consecutive collaborations (Hardy et al., 2003:16).

Assessing the history of collaborative working further involves a level of recognition for the need to work together. In this instance, Hardy et al. (2003:15), encourages prospective partners to recognise and comprehend three basic elements: firstly, partners need to recognise whether the collaboration is voluntary, or coerced or mandatory based on local or national policy contexts or pressures; secondly, partners need to recognise and appreciate their interdependence and thirdly, partners need to recognise and acknowledge areas which they are not dependant on the other partners to achieve objectives.
This principle suggests that a weak history of collaboration may lead to inadequate appreciation of developing collaborative relationships and thus negatively impact the chances of collaborative working (Mattessich & Monsey, 1992:16; Hardy et al., 2003:15). Identifying the need to work collaboratively to achieve goals is also critical in initiating and implementing collaborative working (Hardy et al., 2003:16). Without this need to work together, collaboration will not make sense (Hardy et al., 2003:16). Further to recognising the need to collaborate, is the establishment of the objectives of the collaboration and assessing whether these objectives are realistic or not. This is further discussed in the second principle.

### 3.3.2 Develop clarity and realism of purpose

Any form of joint working requires that all partners reach a consensual agreement regarding the purpose, process and activities of the collaboration (Bryson, 2006:48; Kozuch, 2009:17; Compassion Capital Fund National Resource Centre, 2010:7). According to Hardy et al. (2003:20), this principle is largely concerned with establishing the scope of the collaboration; ensuring that there is mutual ground for joint action both with regard to the broader understanding of the collaboration as well as the more specific goals and objectives of the collaboration. A common aspect emerging from this principle refers to partners establishing concrete attainable goals and objectives; sharing similar visions for working together, which may exist at the onset of the collaboration or may develop as the collaboration progresses (Mattessich & Monsey, 1992:17; Czajkowski, 2007:5; Hamann et al., 2011:14; Gray & Stites, 2013:42; Garon et al., 2014:80).

Hardy et al. (2003:20), notes that any differences with regard to the goals and objectives of the collaborative endeavour should be made explicit and must be resolved at the onset of the collaboration. The lack of clarity in this regard, will negatively affect member enthusiasm and their commitment towards the collaboration (Hardy et al., 2003:20; Compassion Capital Fund National Resource Centre, 2010:7). Furthermore, goals and objectives that are realistically established within the capacity of the collaboration, will sustain the commitment of the members while also ensuring commitment towards achieving the set goals and objectives of the collaboration (Hardy et al., 2003:20; Compassion Capital Fund National Resource Centre, 2010:7). Hardy et al. (2003:20) further notes, the implementation of this principle in the collaborative provides partners with some indication of the extent to which the collaborative endeavour will be a short- or long-term relationship and whether this relationship will be sustainable or not. This in turn, may positively affect the commitment of members towards the relationship as well as attaining collaborative goals and objectives (Hardy et al., 2003:20). The acceptance for the need to collaborate as well as the agreements reached with regard to the purpose, goals and objectives of the collaboration are supported and reinforced through the
principles to follow, that is, ensuring commitment and ownership of the collaboration; developing and maintaining trust for the collaborative endeavour; creating clear and robust partnership arrangements; and lastly, monitoring, measuring and learning from the collaborative (Hardy et al., 2003:24). These are discussed in the following section.

3.3.3 Ensure commitment and ownership

The first two principles discussed above ensure that the collaborating members are committed towards the collaboration and own the processes concerning the collaborative endeavour. According to Keast and Mandell (2012:18), collaboration places high demands and deliberate attention on the scope of the problem and the various possible solutions obtainable and expanded resources as well as the commitments made by the partners. Garon et al. (2014:81) found that shared commitment between the partners towards the collaborative process plays an important role in sustaining the collaborative relationship. Cropper (1996:97) shares a similar view and emphasises that continued existence of the partnership is guaranteed because of the value realised when the partners commit to the collaboration and can work together to achieve the set objectives of the collaboration.

According to Hardy et al. (2003:24), this principle progresses from the previous two principles by leveraging support from the partners and reinforcing this support through committing to the collaborative process. Commitment towards the collaborative relationship should be supported by the partners at all levels, that is, community, organisational and leadership level (Mattessich & Monsey, 1992:17; Hamann et al., 2011:28). Hardy et al. (2003:24) further notes that commitment from both the organisation and community level is more likely to sustain the collaborative relationship where individual commitment towards the endeavour is supported by the leaders from the respective organisation and community. Furthermore, the organisational and leadership culture of collaborating members should reflect a supportive atmosphere for interest based negotiation where the members are able to overtly embrace the tensions between themselves or between the collaborative perspectives in order to create solutions that will be beneficial for both members (Hamann et al., 2011:28). Hancock (2007 in Ireland & Thomalla, 2011:5) further argues that “… the level of commitment of facilitators and leaders provides a long-term and committed engagement with communities that ultimately precipitates the formation of future collaborative relationships”.

Individual member ownership for the collaborative process is encouraged by emphasising the need for all members of the collaborative, sharing the responsibilities as well as the benefits of the collaboration (Hardy et al., 2003:24; Compassion Capital Fund National Resource Centre, 2010:7). Czajkowski (2007:5) indicates that joint decision-making processes and sharing the
governance of the collaborative ensures ownership of the process, while committing adequate
time, human and financial resources warrants the success for the collaboration. Hardy et al. (2003:25) further adds that collaborating members should be consistent in their commitment
towards and ownership for the collaborative processes. This in turn results in trust being created
amongst members for the collaborative relationship.

3.3.4 Develop and maintain trust

This principle places attention on the role of social capital and the interdependence of
individuals and institutions on each other through their relationships with each other (Adger,
2003:388). Promotion of the concept of interdependence plays a critical role in a collaborative
partnership including aspects, such as time and resources- both human and financial resources
(Czajkowski, 2007:6). Two main themes emerge from this principle, that is, the role of social
capital and the role of social networks on the collaborative process.

Firstly, social capital is the element inherent in the structure of society that seeks to describe the
relations of trust, reciprocity and exchange, the evolution of norms and the role of networks
Secondly, networks refer to the ties shared between individuals, clusters of people,
organisations or countries and indicate the exchange of resources, such as social and
emotional support, time, money, information, business transactions and expertise (Wellman &

Both these themes are interrelated and both have a bearing on the development of trust
amongst partners (Ireland & Thomalla, 2011:2). Relationships formed on the basis of social
capital are likely to be productive because they are formed based on shared expectations,
common set of values and a level of trust amongst the partners (Lockwood, 1996; Gibbon &
Pokhrel, 2001:1). Thus, strong social capital enhances trust and enables the development of
networks and subsequently collaboration, whereas weak social capital weakens trust and
consequently impacts negatively on the success of the collaboration (Coleman, 1988; Gibbon &
Pokhrel, 2001:1). Further to this, Adger (2003:389) states that collaborative working relies on
networks and interchange of information between the partners to facilitate the decision-making
process. This indicates the importance of communication between the collaborating partners
that enables the success of the collaborative endeavour (Mattessich & Monsey: 1992:16).

Literature supports the establishment of informal and formal communication links that are open
and frequent in order to foster the flow of information as well as promote cohesive group
According to Emerson et al. (2011:15), the development of trust occurs throughout the collaboration process, as the partners get to know each other. During this process, the partners need to prove to each other that they are rational, predictable, and reliable (Keast & Mandell, 2012:11-12). Emerson et al. (2011:15) further add that trust produces reciprocated understanding of the collaborative process, including the creation of clear and robust partnership arrangements, which consequently creates legitimacy and commitment to the collaboration. As such, trust plays a critical role in the success of collaborative endeavours (Hardy et al., 2003:28; Selsky & Parker, 2005:854; Gray & Stites, 2013:40). Hardy et al. (2003:28) maintains that the more trust there is between the collaborating partners, the better the chances are for a healthy partnership, regardless of the level - organisational, community or individual.

3.3.5 Create clear and robust partnership arrangements

The fifth principle is centered on guaranteeing that the collaborative endeavour and process is not hampered by burdensome, intricate and time-consuming working arrangements (Hardy et al., 2003:32). These authors maintain that this may result in frustration amongst the partners, negatively impact their enthusiasm for, and negatively influence their commitment to the collaboration (Hardy et al., 2003:32).

The administrative features, such as clarifying member roles and responsibilities, clarifying the goal and sharing consensus for the goals, ensuring well-coordinated tasks and conducting effective meetings are fundamental for effective and successful collaboration (Thomson & Perry, 2006:25; Thomson et al., 2007:42).

Furthermore, Thomson and Perry (2006:28-29) add that the costliest resources for collaboration is time and energy, that is, actual time and lapsed time. Actual time refers to attaining mutual understanding for the collaboration, establishing reliable commitments, and negotiating sources for action and coordination whereas lapsed time refers to managing accountability matters as well as additional priorities external to the collaboration (Huxham, 1996; Himmelman, 2002:1; Margerum & Robinson, 2015:55). These authors agree that actual and lapsed time places high demand on the collaborating partners which may de-motivate the partners if they do not efficiently manage the balance between actual and lapsed time (Huxham, 1996; Himmelman, 2002:1; Margerum & Robinson, 2015:55). Thomson and Perry (2006:29) maintain that the time allocated to the collaboration is critical to the success of the collaboration. Therefore, collaborative working should be practical, adaptable and flexible, time-limited and with task and goal-oriented collaborative structures; the primary focus should be on the collaborative processes and outcomes rather than arrangements and inputs; as well as clearly distinguishing
member roles, responsibilities and accountability (Mattessich & Monsey, 1992:16; Hardy et al., 2003:32; Czajkowski, 2007:6; Garon et al., 2014:85; Margerum & Robinson, 2015:54). Furthermore, the performance of the collaborative endeavour should be monitored and measured against set criteria to ensure success of the relationship (Hardy et al., 2003:36). This will further encourage learning from the collaborative while also creating value for future collaborative relationships (Hardy et al., 2003:36).

3.3.6 Monitor, measure and learn

One of the defining characteristics of collaborative working is that the value of collaboration is seen through the outcomes created when people partner together to achieve goals that they could not have achieved if they had done so individually (Gray & Stites, 2013:49). Thus, the sixth principle represents the reflective aspect of collaboration. For partners to realise the success of collaborative endeavours, it is imperative that they monitor the process, measure the progress and learn from the process (Hardy et al., 2003:36; Czajkowski, 2007:6). These authors further maintain that monitoring and measuring of the collaborative endeavour is important where the collaboration was characterised by doubts regarding the levels of commitment or resources used to accomplish the goals as well as the benefits to the individual partners (Hardy et al., 2003:36; Czajkowski, 2007:6).

With regard to the learning aspect in collaborative working, various authors support the notion that learning has a significant effect on successful collaboration and serves as a significant input or precursor to future collaborations (Doz, 1996: 55; Ruggie, 2002; 27; Hamann et al., 2011:7). Hardy et al. (2003:36) further adds that monitoring, measuring and learning is not only crucial for assessing performance but, is also essential for reinforcing the elements of commitment and trust in collaborative working.

The principles discussed above highlight the aspects that contribute to the success of joint action, namely, justifying the need for collaboration; realising the purpose of the collaboration; clarifying goals, roles and responsibilities of each party in the collaborative endeavour; committing towards and owning the collaborative; establishing trust and harnessing the trust to ensure success and finally, monitoring, measuring and learning from the endeavour (Hardy et al., 2003:15-35). To effectuate these principles, the literature identifies several strategies of collaborating, and these include networking, cooperation, coordination and collaboration (Mattessich & Monsey 1992:39). These strategies are presented and discussed in detail in the next section.
3.4 STRATEGIES FOR COLLABORATION

In conceptualising collaboration, section 3.2 presented the different definitions of collaboration found in literature. These differing views of collaboration provides an understanding that collaboration is a purpose-driven endeavour characterised by two or more parties working together to achieve objectives that would not have been achieved by one party working alone (Bryson et al., 2006:44; Thomas & Perry, 2006:23). Various authors refer to the existence of collaborative relationships between business and not-for-profit organisations, such as Community-Based Organisations (CBO) indicating that these relationships often center their interventions on environmental concerns and economic development initiatives including issues relating to health, equity, and education (Gray & Wood, 1991; Selsky & Parker, 2005:854; Donahue & Zeckhauser, 2006:497; Thomas & Perry, 2006:23; NRC, 2010:24-25).

Collaboration literature points to the understanding that collaboration forms part of four prevalent strategies for joint working, namely, networking, cooperating, coordinating, or collaborating (Mattessich & Monsey 1992:39; Himmelman, 2002:1; Czajkowski, 2007:2; McNamara, 2012:391). This suggests that collaborative relationships between business and not-for-profit organisations may take place in the form of these strategies. McNamara (2012:391) explains that these strategies appear along a continuum of increased engagement with networking being the initial and most primary form of joint working followed by cooperating, then coordinating and finally collaborating. For instance, each relationship begins as a network; then moves to cooperation, then moves to coordination until it reaches collaboration depending on the degree of involvement each member acting jointly agrees to take (Himmelman, 2002:1; Czajkowski, 2007:2; O’Flynn, 2008:185).

Based on observations by these authors, each strategy demonstrates a distinctive inter-organisational relationship, shaped by varying degrees of commitments relating to time, trust and turf, that is each strategy for joint working requires different levels of commitment of time in order to build trust and resolve conflict that may arise over turf amongst the partners (Dotterweich, 2006:55). The choice for each strategy is influenced by the extent to which each partner is willing to commit to the partnership in relation to three factors, namely, time, trust and commitment towards resolving turf issues (Himmelman, 2002:1; Dotterweich, 2006:55; O’Flynn & Wanna, 2008:185). This section distinguishes the different types of strategies for collaboration found in literature and discusses how the commitment of time, trust and turf characterises each type of strategy.
3.4.1. Networking

Networks are defined as the social (informal) and organisational (formal) relationship between various types of organisations, where the relationship is largely based on mutual benefits, trust and reciprocity (Lowndes & Skelcher, 1998; Junki, 2006:22; Longstaff et al., 2010:8). A resource-dependency model is often used to characterise the development of networks (Kim, 2006:23). The assumption made by this strategy is that, relationships within networks are motivated by the “need to obtain important resources, such as information and tools, from other individuals or organisations” (Aldrich, 1976; Scharpf, 1978; Kim, 2006:23).

Networking as a collaborative strategy, is characterised by informal inter-organisational engagement and regularly signifies preliminary levels of trust, limited time commitment and an unwillingness to share turf (Himmelman, 2002:2). According to Scott and Thomas (2014:3), networks set off collaborative relationships and collaborative relationships improve networks.

3.4.2. Cooperating

McNamara (2012:391) defines cooperation as engagement between parties that have the capability to achieve their own organisational goals but choose to work together, within current structures and policies, in order to assist in achieving individual interests. By cooperating, each party remains entirely autonomous, takes no risks and maintains complete authority (Mattessich et al., 2001; McNamara, 2012:391; Margerum & Robinson, 2014:54). Thus, by cooperating, organisations act jointly in order to accomplish own autonomous objectives (Czajkowski, 2007:2).

Cooperating is characterised by informal inter-organisational engagement and involves moderate commitment of time towards the collaborative relationship, lower levels of trust but minimal access to each other’s turf (Himmelman, 2002:2; McNamara, 2012: 396).

3.4.3. Coordinating

Coordination is defined as an interaction between two or more parties that share separate but similar objectives and require the assistance of one another to achieve organisational goals (Mattessich et al., 2001: McNamara, 2012:393). In coordination, each party remains semi-autonomous and maintains individual authority while sharing the risks and decision-making processes (Margerum & Robinson, 2014:54). The communication channels are more formalised than in cooperative arrangements (Czajkowski, 2007:2; McNamara, 2012:394-396).
Coordination is characterised by more formalised engagement between the coordinating partners and it involves substantial commitment of time towards the partnership; building trust in order to foster relationships and a substantial commitment towards resolving turf issues is important (Czajkowski, 2007:2; McNamara, 2012:394-396; Margerum & Robinson, 2014:54).

3.4.4. Collaborating

Strategies based on collaborative arrangements may occur as informal or formal agreements between collaborating partners (Thomas & Perry, 2006; Czajkowski, 2007:3). According to Bryson et al. (2006:47), informal agreements in collaborative arrangements are used to enable the collaborating parties to be more flexible in order to manage the partnership as it evolves or changes with regard to the partners or problem domain shifts. Wood and Gray (1991:146) define the collaborative strategy as a process that takes place when two or more organisations that have identified similar problems interact with each other to solve issues related to the identified problem through shared rules, norms and structures.

In collaboration, each party is not autonomous as they share mutual authority, the risks and the decision-making processes (Czajkowski, 2007:3). According to Mattessich et al. (2001), collaborative arrangements require extensive planning and communication on numerous levels and therefore imperative that all partners completely commit to the joint action.

Collaboration is characterised by both informal and formalised engagement between the coordinating partners and it involves extensive commitment of time towards the partnership; building trust in order to foster relationships and an extensive commitment towards resolving turf issues (Czajkowski, 2007:3; McNamara, 2012:394-396).

The strategies for joint working or collaborating may be implemented in various ways as identified in the discussion above. The type of collaborative relationship undertaken is mainly dependant on the level and extent to which the partners are willing to go in the partnership and the formalisation of the relationship. Networking and cooperation are more informal and requires minimal effort to manage the relationship whereas coordination takes on a more formalised structure of engagement and requires more effort from all partners to manage the relationship and the activities associated with the goals of the partnership. Collaboration is more flexible and may take on informal or formal structures for joint working.

Collaboration has been viewed as a purpose-driven endeavour (Gray, 1989:5; Thomson et al., 2007:24; Kozuch, 2009:17; Murphy et al., 2014:145). In other words, partners agree to collaborate in order to achieve a specific purpose. The following section provides an outline of
the purpose of collaboration in DRR efforts and community resilience and discusses the motivational and the beneficial factors associated with building community resilience.

### 3.5 PRIVATE COMPANY-COMMUNITY COLLABORATION FOR COMMUNITY RESILIENCE

The previous section provided a conceptual overview of collaboration. This section takes a closer look at the role of collaboration in building disaster resilient communities; particularly the role that the private sector can play.

A large array of literature exists that supports multi-stakeholder collaboration in DRR and building resilience (Gray & Stites, 2013:72; Murphy et al., 2014:145; Tshabalala & Mwau, 2014:29; WorldBank, 2015:3). The emerging need for collaborative working between the private sector and the community in order to enhance community disaster resilience has also been noted through evidence-based practice in DRR (NRC, 2011:4; Busch & Givens, 2013:2; Chen et al., 2013:130; UNISDR, 2013:3; Van Niekerk, 2015:85).

The formation of collaborative partnerships between Government, private sector and the community has been viewed as an important mechanism to reduce disaster risks through resilience-building (Izumi & Shaw, 2015:334; Van Niekerk, 2015:85). According to Mitchell (2006:237), there is an imperative need for collaborative action between formal and informal structures, including the community in preparing for and responding to hazards. Chen et al. (2013:130) support this view and indicate that there is a growing need for collaboration between multiple stakeholders, particularly the private sector, in building community resilience. Christopolis (2003:95) basis this need for private sector involvement in resilience-building on the lack of adequate capacity within the Government to effectively and efficiently manage the occurrence and re-occurrence of natural hazards, regardless of the geographical distribution of these hazards.

#### 3.5.1 Motivation for private sector involvement in collaboration

Different authors highlight the need for private sector involvement in DRR from the viewpoint of building community resilience (Li, 2015:42; Johnson & Abe, 2015:4). These authors maintain that improving the community’s capacity to prepare for disasters, is an imperative role of a business in community investment plans. Such initiatives may assist companies to shield the business, the value chain, its customers, and their employees from the impact of hazards; improve the company’s reputation by demonstrating good citizenship; help improve relationships with the government sector; influence stakeholder perception about the company; enhance employee motivation, morale and retention; and provide opportunities for new
business and markets that generate shared value through the development of new partnerships and networks (Chatterjee & Shaw, 2015: 47; Johnson & Abe, 2015:5).

PwC (in Johnson & Abe: 2015:6) further highlight the opportunities for companies to establish fresh and innovative products and services that enhance resilience, consequently resulting in economic growth and a reduction of vulnerabilities and risks within their markets. Murphy et al. (2014:147) further adds that companies engage in collaborative actions to build resilience as part of their corporate social responsibility programme in order to increase their recognition in society; to attract a pool of quality employees; to advance their legitimacy, to learn and share ideas as well as to distinguish themselves from their rivals.

3.5.2 Benefits of private sector involvement in collaboration

The private sectors involvement in DRR is motivated by the benefits associated with engaging in disaster risk reduction efforts as well the returns for the business. A variety of authors concur that the key benefits for the private sector participating in DRR and resilience-building guarantees the continuity of the business during and after disaster occurrences, as well as preparing for a variety of interruptions before they occur (Ratner et al., 2014:11; Murphy et al., 2014:147; Hori, 2015:106; Van Niekerk, 2015:92). The NRC (2011:4-5) emphasises the role of shared expectations of the benefits in collaborative working between communities and the private sector. According to the NRC (2011:5), community resilience will not succeed or be sustained if there is a lack of shared expectations between the community and private companies. Murphy et al. (2014:148) concurs and hypothesise that elevated degrees of alignment in terms of shared expectations between stakeholders, results in amplified levels of value creation and consequently, the likelihood for collaborative partnerships.

Other benefits associated with collaborating includes, developing trusted networks; transferring of knowledge regarding local critical infrastructure and interdependencies; and enhancing coordinating activities with other community stakeholders pre, during, and post disaster occurrences (Murphy et al., 2014:147). Furthermore, companies may enjoy greater recognition from and legitimacy within the community (Chen et al., 2013:135; Gray & Stites, 2013:31; Murphy et al., 2014:148). Additional benefits associated with collaboration comprise of early recognition of probable hazards, allowing for more precise analysis of risks and benefits, and reducing the costs associated with the disturbances (Hori, 2015:107; Van Niekerk, 2015:101). Additionally, the whole community gains exposure to the benefits of a more sustainable economy when individual businesses strengthen their resilience (Van Niekerk et al., 2015:87; Gray & Stites, 2013:73).
Murphy et al. (2014:147) further adds that these benefits also include access to new skills and potential for new networks; increase in technological or financial capital; enhanced legitimacy, recognition and reputation; enhanced stakeholder associations (including employee morale and retention); reduction of environmental impact; and amplified consumer support and consequently, competitive advantages.

The role that the private sector can play in DRR efforts and building community resilience cannot be overemphasised. Building community resilience and reducing disaster risks has far reaching benefits for both the community as well as businesses. Private sector engagement in DRR and community resilience-building is an important mechanism through which collaboration can take place. Conversely, community resilience can be achieved through private sector engagement in DRR efforts.

3.6 CONCLUSION

The focus of this chapter was to address two objectives set out in Chapter 1. Firstly, providing the conceptual framework of collaboration and secondly, exploring the correlation between private company-community collaboration to build community resilience. In this chapter, collaboration is broadly defined as the coming together of two or more partners for the purposes of solving an identified social or business problem. The factors required for successful collaboration were also provided namely, the recognition and acceptance of the need for partnership; developing clarity and realism of purpose; ensuring commitment and ownership; developing and maintaining trust; creating clear and robust partnership arrangements; and monitoring, measuring and learning. Based on literature, these factors are imperative determinants for successful collaborations. The concept of collaboration was further discussed as a strategy that develops from networking, cooperation, coordination and ultimately collaboration, depending on the level and extent of engagement between the partners influenced by factors relating to time, trust and turf.

The chapter also explored the role of private company-community collaboration in building disaster resilient communities. The discussions focused largely on the role that the private sector can play in DRR. The private sector is viewed as having the financial resources, the expertise as well as the capacity to assist communities to tackle DRR issues and build their resilience. As such, the chapter noted the advantages for business to be involved in DRR efforts. The section highlighted the motivational and beneficial factors associated with private sector engagement in building community resilience. What comes out clearly from the discussions in the chapter is that collaboration is an effective mechanism that can be used to
address complex societal problems particularly in the context of DRR and building community resilience towards disasters.

The next chapter takes a closer look at the methods that were applied in the study. The chapter outlines the research approach and design of the study, the instrumentation that was used to collect data, the sampling...
CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter 1 of this study provided in brief, the research methodology applied in the study. Kothari (2004:7-8) highlights the need to differentiate between research methods and research methodology. Research methods or techniques denote to the methods or a technique used in the research process, while research methodology not only highlights the research methods used but further considers the rationality behind the chosen methods in the context of the research study (Kothari, 2004:7). Thus, the research methodology elucidates the reasons for applying a particular method or technique and the reasons for not using others (Kothari, 2004:7).

The purpose of this chapter is to present a comprehensive discussion of the research methods and methodology that were applied in the research process. The chapter is divided into three sections, namely research methodology; literature review and empirical study and these sections are discussed comprehensively. The empirical study section includes in-depth discussions of the research approach and design that was applied to the research project, that is, qualitative research approach. The motivation for using the qualitative research approach was also discussed. An in-depth discussion on the data collection methods used in the research project is provided. The data collection tools that were applied in the research project included focus group interviews as well as semi-structured individual interviews. The data that was collected was analysed using thematic data analysis with inclusion of verbatim accounts from the research participants. The chapter further includes a discussion of the issues relating to validity and reliability of the research results. Finally, the conclusions are provided at the end of this chapter.

4.2 DEFINING RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research is defined in literature within the scope of scientific enquiry or investigation with the aim to gain and contribute new knowledge (Kothari, 2004:1; Kumar, 2011). According to Grinnell (1993:4), “…research is a structured enquiry that utilises acceptable scientific methods to solve problems and creates new knowledge that is generally applicable”. Bulmer (1977:5) and subsequently Kerlinger (1986:10), delineate the concept of research as “…a systematic, controlled empirical and critical investigation of propositions about the presumed relationships about various phenomena” with the aim of contributing methodical, dependable and valid information about the social world. Kothari (2004:1), further defines research as a systematic process encompassing the articulation of “…the problem, formulation of a hypothesis, gathering of facts or data, analysing of facts and reaching certain deductions either in the form of
resolutions towards the articulated problem or in certain generalisations for some theoretical formulation”. Mackey and Gass (2016:3), indicate that the methods and methodology chosen in the research process need to be justified considering the research question, the theoretical conceptualisations as well as the practical considerations of the particular research study. Therefore, research methodology not only identifies the methods or techniques used in the research process; it further seeks to explain the reasons behind the application of a chosen method within the specific research context (Kothari, 2004:1; Mackey & Gass, 2016:3). In this way, “…the research results are thus capable of being evaluated either by the researcher himself or by others (Kothari, 2004:1).

The purpose of this chapter is to outline in detail, the research methods and methodology that were applied in order to attain the data required to better understand how private companies can collaborate with communities to build resilience, to address the full ambit of the study. The study is divided into two sections: the literature review section, as well as empirical study and these sections delineate the methodology applied in collecting data.

Literature review presents an impartial, systematic summary and significant examination of the applicable existing research and non-research literature on the research study area (Hart, 1998; Cronin et al., 2008:38). Through the review of relevant research topics, the researcher could gain a background on the conceptual frameworks underpinning resilience, community resilience and collaboration. The literature review further assisted the researcher to understand the relationship between the concepts of community resilience, collaboration and disaster risk reduction. Through this process, the researcher could provide a justification for the research by identifying research gaps in the area of study. In addition to this, the researcher also used the literature review to formulate the relevant research topics for data collection. The review of literature also provided the researcher with information pertaining to the applicable research methods and methodology applicable to the research project.

The empirical study section includes the research approach and design; population and sampling; data collection, and data analysis. The goal of the research was to explore ways in which private company and community collaboration can be maximised with the aim of building community resilience in Diepsloot. Therefore, research methods and methodology chosen for the research project are consistent with the research topic. The research project utilised methods within the qualitative research approaches based on the research goal and objectives which was to explore and understand the significance individuals or groups assign to their social or human experience (Creswell, 2007:4). The research project further applied the phenomenological and case study designs because of the focus on individual and group experiences, and perceptions based on the research topic and goal (Creswell, 2007:4).
The data collection methods applied in the research project was focus group interviews and semi-structured individual interviews. In both these data collection methods, the researcher made use of a semi-structured interview schedule. The semi-structured interview schedule included a list of open-ended questions relating to specific themes identified in literature that are related to the topic under study (Bryman, 2008:31). According to Gill et al. (2008:293), focus group interviews are used to gather data based on the collective views expressed by the group and the connotations that represent those views. Focus group interviews were used with community members in order to determine their perceived experiences of private sector engagement in their community in relation to disaster risk reduction. The semi-structured individual interviews were held with corporate social responsibility managers or representatives from the sampled private companies in order to establish their extent of engagement with the community of Diepsloot in relation to disaster risk reduction and community resilience.

In order to provide structure and meaning to the bulk of data collected, the researcher applied the thematic analysis to analyse the data (Schurink et al., 2011: 397). Data was also presented in verbatim in order to support the analysis based on real evidence from the interviews (Lacey & Luff, 2007:32).

The research process and the research methodology are further elaborated on in the sections to follow.

4.3 LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of the literature review is to provide a theoretical background of the field of study by making use of the latest, reliable and pertinent information of the study field (Mouton, 2008:87). According to Creswell (2013:29), qualitative research is exploratory in nature and thus, the use of the literature review is consistent with the expectations of learning from the participants as opposed to imposing the researcher’s ideas in the questions asked to participants. Through the review of the literature, the research is able to establish how the research fits into existing literature and how it will contribute to new knowledge (Hofstee, 2006:91).

In order to gain a comprehensive understanding of the research topic, a comprehensive study of related research topics was undertaken by making use of books, reports, journal articles and documents written about the topic and the field of study. The focus of the literature review was to provide conceptual frameworks underpinning resilience, community resilience and collaboration. The literature review further sought to explore the relationship between these two concepts and disaster risk reduction. The literature that was reviewed aimed to further provide the researcher with related themes through which the interview questions were formulated.
Furthermore, the researcher used literature review to obtain information regarding the applicable research methods and methodology applicable to the research project. This information included the research approach and design applicable to the research project; how to sample from the population to be included in the research project; various methods for data collection applicable to the research project; and the framework that was used to analyse the data that was collected. This information is further discussed in the empirical study section below.

4.4 EMPIRICAL STUDY

Empirical research is research that applies empirical research methods in studying, observing and measuring phenomena and aims to develop knowledge from observable and measurable experiences instead of simply deriving knowledge from theory or belief (Moody, 2002:1; Mississippi State University, 2016). Empirical research outlines associations, reveals cause and effect and encourages researchers to start thinking of further opportunities to be tested, observed and studied (Mississippi State University, 2016). The application of empirical methods enhances the observations made and assists researchers to understand the structure of the world and the relationships within it (Swarthmore, 2010). Empirical methods include a collection of “…exploratory techniques for visualisation, summarisation, exploration, and modelling; and confirmatory procedures for testing hypotheses and predictions” (Swarthmore, 2010).

According to Moody (2002:1), empirical research methods, that is research strategies, falls into two categories, namely, quantitative and qualitative research methods. Quantitative methods are based on numerical data and uses statistical methods to analyse the data (Moody, 2002:1; Bryman, 2008:35). Qualitative research methods collect qualitative data, that is, information in the form of manuscript, pictures, sounds, derived from observations, interviews and documented evidence, and uses qualitative data analysis methods to analyse it (Mood, 2002:1; Bryman, 2008:35).

The research project was a qualitative research study and therefore utilised qualitative research methods to achieve its objectives. In the empirical research section, the following is discussed: the research approach and design; population and sampling; data collection tools and the data analysis framework that was applied to the research project.

4.4.1 Research approach and design

The research approach represents the broad-spectrum through which the research will be conducted (Trochim, 2006). According to Trochim (2006), the research approach defines, both overtly and covertly, the intention of the research, the process and steps of research, the
responsibility of the researcher and the technique to be used for data analysis. On the other hand, the research design denotes largely the strategy that the researcher will use to incorporate the various elements of the research project in a coherent and well-defined manner, and in so doing, the researcher ensures that the research problem is addressed effectively (Trochim, 2006). Furthermore, the research design represents the framework through which data will be collected, measured and analysed (Trochim, 2006; Bryman, 2008:46).

The research approach that was adopted for this research was the phenomenological approach. This approach focuses on the ways in which individuals make sense of their social worlds (Bryman, 2008:30). According to Bogdon and Taylor (1975:13-14), the researcher “…views human behaviour as a product of how people interpret the world in order to grasp the meanings they attach to their behaviour”. Thus, the researcher tries to understand social phenomena as experienced by the individuals in the study and presents the data as conveyed by the individuals being studied (Trochim, 2006; Bryman, 2008:31).

The phenomenological approach is associated with the qualitative paradigm and thus the research design that was applied to the study was qualitative research design. There are various definitions found in literature that describes qualitative research design all offering similar interpretations of the concept. According to Shank (2002:5), qualitative research is “…a form of systematic empirical inquiry into the meanings people attach to their experiences”. Schwandt (2001:84), further adds that qualitative research designs focus on human lived experiences, that is, the “life-world as it is lived, felt, undergone, made sense of, and accomplished by human beings who serve as the objects of study”. Polkinghorne (2005:138) argues that the key intention of qualitative research is to illustrate and explain the experiences of individuals as they are lived and represented in their consciousness. According to Denzin and Lincoln (2008:29), human experience is considered a complicated area to investigate because of its complex and multi-layered nature. As such qualitative research methods distinctively exist to take into consideration the specific features of human experience and to further aid the exploration of these experiences (Polkinghorne, 2005:138). Qualitative research designs focus on collecting descriptive data, with emphasis on the use of inductive approaches and places attention on understanding and interpreting social phenomena as it is conveyed by the individuals in the study and thus, serve as the key approach in social science research (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000:3; Bogdan & Biklen, 2007:283; Bryman, 2008:380).

The phenomenological approach and the qualitative research paradigm will allow the researcher to collect data and present this data in such a way that it reflects the meanings as constructed by community in the study as well as the managers from the private companies to be interviewed. The community of Diepsloot and the private companies represent the cases
which the researcher seeks to understand. As such, the research design to be employed in the study was a case study.

A case study research design is defined as an enquiry and analysis of a single case or a collective case, with the objective to denote the complexity of the case to be studied (Stake, 1995; Hyett et al., 2014:2). According to Creswell (2013:97), this approach “explores a real-life, contemporary bounded system, referred to as the case, or multiple bounded systems (cases) over time, through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information and reports a case description and case themes”. In addition, the definition is expanded by describing a case study as an empirical investigation that studies contemporary phenomena extensively within its realistic milieu, particularly when there is no clear boundary between the phenomenon and the context being studied (Zainal, 2007:1; Yin, 2009:18). Baxter and Jack (2008:544) indicate that this type of design enables the researcher to study individuals or organisations as they interact within the context of their relationships with each other, the community or through programmes. The authors further add that a case study enables the researcher to deconstruct or reconstruct various phenomena as they are studied (Baxter & Jack, 2008:544).

According to Yin (2009:4), a case study as a research method can be used in various situations, to enlarge our knowledge about an individual, a group, an organisation, social, political, and interrelated phenomena (Yin, 2009:4). According Zainal (2007:1), the case study method allows the researcher to intimately study the data within a particular setting by selecting a small geographical area or a limited quantity of individuals as the respondents in the study. In arguing the existence and use of case studies as a research method, Yin (2009:4) proposes that the unique necessity for case studies occurs when the researcher aims to familiarise herself with complicated social phenomena. Thus, the case study method permits researchers to preserve the all-inclusive and significant features of realistic experiences of, for example, group behaviour, organisational and management procedures, individual life cycles, neighbourhood transformations, and the maturation of industries (Yin, 2009:4) as well as problems based in the community, such as unemployment, poverty, disaster occurrences, illiteracy and drug addiction (Zainal, 2007:1).

The focus of the study is to explore how private companies and the community of Diepsloot are collaborating towards building community resilience. In order to achieve this objective, an empirical exploration of private companies’ engagement with the community and their perceptions of the impact of these engagements on the community of Diepsloot was done. The research further seeks to explore the community’s knowledge and perceptions about the impact of private company engagement in the community. The phenomenological approach, the
qualitative paradigm and the case study research design are best suited to this research. This is because the research seeks to provide a comprehensive description of the lived experiences of both the community of Diepsloot and the private companies having a footprint in this community (Creswell, 2013:4). This study made use of methods to collect and analyse data, such as focus group interviews and semi-structured individual interviews and presents the data from both the private companies’ and community’s perspectives. These methods to be used are discussed further in the section to follow.

4.4.2 Population and Sampling

According to Polkinghorne (2005:139), the main objective of qualitative data investigation is on collecting, defining, and providing descriptive accounts of human experience. Thus, qualitative enquiries entail gathering a succession of intense, complete, and saturated explanations of the experience under investigation (Polkinghorne, 2005:139). To achieve this, the researcher is required to select from the population of interest, the participants to serve as the respondents for the research project through the process of sampling. Participants are sampled on the basis that not all members of target population can serve as the participants for the entire research project (Mack, 2005; Oppong, 2013:203). Thus, the researcher selects from a larger population, a small group of people with similar qualities and sufficiently applicable knowledge about the proposed study (Brynard & Hanekom, 2006:54). Because the research methods applied in this research project are qualitative, qualitative sampling was used in selecting the participants for the research from the targeted population.

Population refers to the prospective participants who possess the characteristics, which the researcher is interested in, that is, all the individuals in the population who have specific qualities (Strydom, 2005a:193). Sampling refers to the detailed data resources that will be chosen for the study from the population of interest that are in line with the relevance of the study (Oppong, 2013:203; Tracy, 2013:134-138; Gentles et al., 2015:1775). Qualitative sampling involves selecting only a sub-division of the population identified for a specified research study (Brynard & Hanekom, 2006:54; Family Health International, 2010:5; Oppong, 2013:203).

The sampling strategy that was used in the research study was judgement sampling, also referred to as purposive sampling. This sampling strategy was used to recruit respondents from the community as well as respondents from the private companies. Strydom and Delport (2005:328) mention that purposive sampling methods are used when a particular case is selected based on the salient features that are of interest to the researcher. This technique requires that the researcher carefully considers the parameters of the population and selects a
sample according to those parameters (Strydom & Delport, 2011:392; Yin, 2011:311). Applying this research strategy enabled the researcher to select subjects based on their knowledge or experience of the issues that were addressed in the research study (Marshall, 1996:523; Oppong, 2013:203).

In this study, two populations were identified. First, it was the individuals living in the community of Diepsloot and the second population referred to the private companies operating in and around Diepsloot. A sample was drawn from each population to include the individuals from the community who were part of the focus group interviews and the CSR managers or representatives of private companies who served as the respondents for the semi-structured individual interviews. In both populations, the sample was drawn purposefully based on a selection criterion. Furthermore, snowball sampling was applied where the participants from both samples recommended suitable prospective participants for the research study (Marshall, 1996:523; Oppong, 2013:203).

The selection criterion for the research participants from the community of Diepsloot was as follows:

- The participant had to be a resident in the community of Diepsloot Reception area;
- The participant should be at an age appropriate to provide own consent without adult supervision.

The selection criterion for the research participants from private companies was as follows:

- Participant must be from a private company;
- Participant must have been involved in CSR projects; and
- CSR projects must have been based in Diepsloot.

The sample size for qualitative studies is inclined to be small (Marshall, 1996:523; Gentles et al., 2015:1782). Both these authors argue that the purpose of small sample size in qualitative research is to gather adequate information that satisfactorily addresses the research question (Marshall, 1996:523; Gentles et al., 2015:1782). According to Tracy (2013:134-138), the size of the sample is dependent on the data analysis that the researcher will use to analyse the data, the requirements in terms of adequacy and the attributes of the population (Tracy, 2013:134-138). Various research methodology literatures support the view that the best way to determine sample size in qualitative research is based on data saturation or point of redundancy (Patton, 1990:186; Marshall, 1996:523; Kumar, 2011:194; Tuckett, 2004:3; Oppong, 2013:203; Gentles et al., 2015:1781). Data saturation or redundancy refers to the point where the researcher
terminates the data collection process when no new information is yielded from the new sampled units (Patton, 1990:186; Marshall, 1996:523; Kumar, 2011:194; Tuckett, 2004:3; Oppong, 2013:203; Gentles et al., 2015:1781). Thus, determining the sample size for qualitative research is determined when the information obtained from the interviews is sufficient and comprehensive enough to address the phenomenon under study (Marshall, 1996:523; Kumar, 2011:194; Gentles et al., 2015:1781). However, Patton (1990:186) suggests that qualitative research studies need to have a pre-determined estimation of the sample size “…based on expected reasonable coverage of the phenomenon given the purpose of the study as well as stakeholder interests”. This suggests that sampling in qualitative research should be a flexible, iterative and cyclical process where data collection and analysis happen concurrently in order to satisfy the planned research objectives (Marshall, 1996:523; Oppong, 2013:203; Gentles et al., 2015:1781).

In Diepsloot, the list of private companies identified through internet-based research, was exhaustive. These companies included Abland, Internet Solutions, Growthpoint, SAB, Steyn City, Pikitup, Tourvest, G4S Africa Region, DBSA, Telesure, Auto & General to name a few. Companies were purposefully approached from this list based on their corporate social responsibility projects in Diepsloot. Semi-structured individual interviews were used as the data collection method to collect data from the CSR managers. Data saturation was reached after 5 CSR managers from the respective private companies were interviewed. For the focus group interviews, snowball sampling was applied and a total of six groups were interviewed. The first group included eight members; three of the members served on the community protection forum. They were able to assist in recruiting other members from the community. Two groups contained nine members from the community; the fourth group that was interviewed contained ten members and the last groups included seven and eight community members respectively. The data collection methods and tools are discussed in the following section.

4.4.3 Data Collection

Qualitative research offers opportunities for one-to-one interactions with participants, either individually or in a group setting, and allows the researcher to collect and gain an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon to be studied (Creswell, 2013:4). The qualitative research paradigm incorporates various tools that can be applied to achieve the research objectives. This study made use of literature review, focus group interviews as well as semi-structured individual interviews as the methods to collect the data required to achieve the research goal. The literature review was provided in both chapters two and three. The focus of chapter two was on exploring the conceptual framework of resilience while chapter three focused on presenting the conceptual framework of collaboration and finding the link between these concepts and disaster
risk reduction. The focus group interviews were used with the community while the semi-structured interviews were used for individual interviews with the CSR managers from private companies that are responsible for driving community engagement projects within communities.

The research made use of semi-structured interview questions and these were applied in the focus group interviews as well as the individual interviews. The focus groups interviews consisted of five groups containing 10 respondents per group, thus a total of 50 community respondents were recruited and interviewed. The individual interviews consisted of 5 respondents from the private companies. Therefore, the respondents for the study were a total of 55 respondents.

4.4.3.1 Interviewing

Interviewing is the most common form of data collection method used in social research (Bryman, 2008:209). The main objective for the interviewer is to collect information from the participant, respondent or interviewee (Bryman, 2008:209). In qualitative research, interviews are considered as an effective method for generating, understanding and interpreting participants’ social worlds as they are experienced (Yeo et al., 2013:178). This study made use of the following data collection methods: focus group interviews and semi-structured individual interviews.

4.4.3.2 Focus group Interviews

Focus group interview is a method of data collection, in which several participants are selected, based on shared experiences of a situation and are interviewed collectively in a group (Bryman, 2012:502). The interview questions are based on a fairly defined topic and the interview focuses on participants and the interviewer jointly construct meaning around their social world (Bryman, 2012:502; Gill et al., 2008:293; Ketzinger, 1995:300). A focus group includes “…a small group of participants, between six and nine in number, who are brought together by a trained moderator (the researcher) to explore attitudes and perceptions, feelings and ideas about a topic” (Denscombe, 2007:115).

Focus group interviews are considered valuable in qualitative research because:

- Focus groups provides the researcher with detailed and in-depth information about the perceptions and impressions as well as the feelings of the participants as they exist and function in their own social context (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990:140);
focus group interviews are if the researcher plans on discovering participants’ awareness and experiences of their own environment and “…the reasons behind their particular pattern of thinking” (Ketzinger, 1995:299);

And this technique is appropriate when the participants are considered to be marginalised as the participants are provided with the opportunity to express the views about their needs and problems (Dilshad & Latif, 2013:193).

Employing the focus group data collection method provided the researcher with an opportunity to study the ways in which the community members in Diepsloot collectively perceived private sector engagement in their community, made sense of this engagement and constructed meanings around it. The researcher conducted focus groups with community members from Diepsloot reception area. The researcher had five groups consisting of 10 members in each group. The focus group interviews were conducted using a semi-structured question sheet. The semi-structured interview was also applied when interviewing social responsibility managers or representatives from the sampled private companies.

4.4.3.3 Semi-structured individual interviews

A semi-structured interview refers to “…a context in which the interviewer has a series of questions that are in the general form of an interview schedule but the interviewer is able to vary the sequence of the questions” (Bryman, 2008:212). The semi-structured interview schedule consists of a list of questions that flow with the specific themes to be explored during the interview (Bryman, 2008:471). This type of data collection method is flexible in that it enables the interviewer to obtain in-depth information by allowing the participants to elaborate on important issues noted in the interview (Greef, 2007:293). Thus, the interview guide provides the researcher with a structure of the information to be collected, whilst providing the participants with flexibility to talk about issues they perceive as being important and worth exploring (Greef, 2005:292).

This method of data collection was utilised to collect data from the social responsibility managers or representatives from the sampled private companies. This method of data collection is appropriate because it offers both the researcher and the participant’s flexibility in exploring their engagement in the community of study, their perceptions of pre-engagement in the community, the outcomes of their engagement and their perceptions of the impact of their programmes in the community.

In both the focus group and semi-structured individual interviews, a digital audio recording device was used as an aid to obtain data. The semi-structured interview is described as a flexible method in conducting interviews (Bryman, 2008:471; Greef, 2007:293). Together with
the focus group interview, it entails asking open-ended questions and having discussions that have the potential to diverge from the interview guide (Cohen & Crabtree, 2006). According to Cohen & Crabtree (2006), of a digital audio recording device is helpful as the researcher can review the answers at a later stage and focuses largely on conducting the interview. Several advantages have been noted in literature regarding the use of audio recording devices. According to King and Horrocks (2010:44), using an audio recording device for interviews is essential and effective as this will ensure that the researcher focuses on conducting the interview and less on writing the entire interview. The authors however caution against using audio recording devices. They maintain that consent from participants is imperative before conducting the interviews and suggest that the researcher should scribe the interviews (King & Horrocks, 2010:45). The researcher made use of a digital audio recording device in both interview methods as well as scribing of interviews. The data to be collected was transcribed and analysed.

4.4.4 Data analysis

The method used to analyse the data collected was thematic analysis. According to Bryman (2008:579), thematic analysis is a categorising approach in which data is categorised into themes and sub-themes identified during the data collection process. Data analysis aims to provide structure and meaning to the bulk of data collected (Schurink et al., 2011:397). In this type of analysis, the researcher re-examines the data collected and interprets the observations with the aim of uncovering and understanding the fundamental related meanings and patterns (Babbie, 2007:378). The researcher used the guideline provided by De Vos et al. (2011:404-419) in the data analysis process:

4.4.4.1. Preparation for, and organisation of data

Careful considerations were made in preparation for the collection of data. Firstly, the data collection tools consisted of an audio recording device and a note pad with sufficient writing tools for noting down key information. Secondly, the researcher prepared for the interview venue where the focus group interviews were held, which was a church in Diepsloot reception area. In this regard, the researcher ensured that the venue was accessibly convenient for the community respondents. For the private company individual interviews, interviews were conducted with respondents at their places of work in a private office. In both instances, the venues provided privacy and prevented disturbances or distractions from passer-by’s. The data collection process was followed by a preliminary analysis of the data collected. In this regard, the researcher sorted out the data and classified it into related groups while also ensuring that the data was efficiently managed.
4.4.4.2. Reducing the data

In this process, the researcher undertook a thorough analysis of the data. According to Schurink (2011:410), “this process demands a heightened awareness of the data, focused attention, openness to the subtle, tacit undercurrents of social life”. Firstly, the researcher made a careful consideration of the data collected in terms of its usefulness and relevance to the research questions and purpose of the research project. The researcher assembled the data collected, developed themes and sub-themes and coded the data.

This process was followed by the interpretation of the data collected, presenting the findings and linking those findings with literature. This supported the researcher to understand the phenomena being studied and to further assist the researcher to communicate these findings in such a way that the audience understands precisely what the research is communicating.

4.4.4.3. Presentation of the data

This process in the analytical process entails writing up the findings of the research and presenting the data in a clear, coherent and understandable manner, while interpreting the findings to the audience. The data is presented in a research report contained in chapter five. The findings are presented interpretatively, linked with empirical literature as well as presented in verbatim in order to support the analysis based on real evidence from the interviews (Lacey & Luff, 2007:32).

4.5 MEASURING VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

The concepts of validity and reliability are concerned with the quality and rigor of a research project (Bryman, 2012:46). The consideration of validity and reliability in a research project is an important evaluation criteria that every researcher needs to be concerned about (Patton, 2001; Morse et al., 2002:19; Bryman, 2012:46). The concept of validity is concerned with the truthfulness in the findings produced from the research project (Bryman, 2012:46). Reliability is related to the consistency in the results that are produced when using a particular measuring tool or instrument (Bryman, 2012:47). Both validity and reliability are two all-encompassing concepts that can be applied in any research paradigm (Morse et al., 2002:19). In qualitative research, validity and reliability are established through authenticity, trustworthiness, rigor, credibility and quality (Golafshani, 2003: 599; Cresswell, 2009:201).

Since the notion of validity concerns itself with credible, trustworthy and therefore defensible research, Morse and colleagues propose the importance of applying verification strategies in
the process of the research project to ensure rigor (Morse et al., 2002:17). These strategies comprise of investigator responsiveness, methodological coherence, theoretical sampling and sampling adequacy, an active analytic stance, and saturation (Morse et al., 2002:17). Data was analysed concurrently with data collection. In this way, the researcher could determine future participants for the research. The use of purposive sampling methods enabled the researcher to recruit the participants that were best suitable to answer the research questions, such as the members of the Diepsloot community as well as representatives from the companies that have engaged in community projects in Diepsloot. Thus, the sampling strategy enabled replication and confirmation of the data collection tools (Morse et al., 2002:17). The data collection tools that were used in both the focus group and individual interviews were suitable for qualitative research design. The questions were asked as open-ended questions and these enabled the participants to answer questions based on their own lived experiences; they could elaborate on their answers which enabled the researcher to further explore emerging themes in the data collection process.

According to Golafshani (2003:601), ensuring reliability is examining trustworthiness of the research throughout the entire research project, that is, through the review of relevant academic literature and sampling relevant and appropriate participants for the research. To ensure reliability of the research results, the researcher sampled relevant participants who represented the population under study and who had knowledge regarding the themes explored in the research questions. This applied to both the focus group interviews as well as the semi-structured individual interviews. According to Morse et al. (2002:17), sampling adequacy ensures effective and efficient quality data saturation as well as ensuring that sufficient data is obtained to address all the aspects of the research project. The research participants in the focus group interviews were sampled suitably based on their lived experiences of Diepsloot and therefore could appropriately provide their perspectives on private company engagement in their community. The research participants for the individual interviews were individual representatives from private companies and they were sampled based on their engagement with the community of Diepsloot. They could provide their experiences with regard to their involvement with the community of Diepsloot. Reliability of the research was confirmed through the consultation of relevant and related scientific and academic literature (Golafshani, 2003:601).

Various authors argue that research should ultimately be truthful and this truth is measured through reliability and validity (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Johnson 1997:282; Mishler, 2000; Patton, 2001). The researcher should be able to display trustworthiness in the research process, the findings should be defensible and the researcher must have confidence in these findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Johnson 1997:282; Mishler, 2000). Lincoln and Guba (1985:316) further
state that establishing validity in the research process is adequate to corroborate the reliability of the research process. Patton (2001) supports this view and states that reliability is an outcome of validity in a research project.

4.6 CONCLUSION

The purpose of this chapter was to provide the research methods that were applied in order to achieve the formulated objectives and to attain the data required to better understand how private companies can collaborate with communities to build community resilience. The chapter outlined the research approach and design of the study and provided the instrumentation that was used to collect data. The sampling methods were provided as well as the process that was used in the analysis of data. The research project is based on a phenomenological design and therefore the applicable research approach is qualitative and the research design that used was a case study. The data was collected through focus group interviews with the community and through semi-structured individual interviews with representatives from the sampled private companies. The method that was used in the analysis of data was thematic analysis and this was discussed in the chapter.

The subsequent chapter presents and analyses the data collected from the individual and focus group interviews.
CHAPTER 5: EMPIRICAL FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS: Private Companies and Community Collaboration - Towards Building Community Resilience in Diepsloot

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The focus of this study was to explore private companies and community collaboration, towards building resilience in the community of Diepsloot, Johannesburg, South Africa. In order to achieve this goal, a qualitative research approach was applied. Chapter four of this study provided a comprehensive discussion of the research methodology applied to the study.

This chapter addresses objective five of the study which is to establish the kind of community engagement programmes private companies have undertaken in Diepsloot. The empirical stage of the study also aimed to establish whether the community had knowledge of and was engaged in these programmes. Therefore, this chapter presents the empirical findings and the analysis of the findings of the study. The chapter starts by providing a discussion of the research context in which the research project was conducted. This section is followed by a discussion of the research participants and is succeeded by a presentation and discussion of the findings from the interviews. The conclusion is provided at the end of the chapter.

5.2 RESEARCH CONTEXT

The study was conducted in Diepsloot, a community in the City of Johannesburg, South Africa. Diepsloot is characterised as an area that is vulnerable to several hazards, including potential structural fires, flash flooding and electrical hazards due to illegal electrical connections. This is due to the disparate socio-economic and environmental deficiencies, such as poverty, densely populated shacks and overcrowding. Furthermore, these factors have a profound bearing on the way in which the community and its local municipality reduce risks and build resilience (see section 1.1).

Diepsloot lies on the periphery of affluent suburban areas, such as Dainfern, Fourways, Northgate and Sunninghill. Substantially evident in the area, is a robust and highly progressive private sector, residential and commercial development which include estate housing developments, corporate business parks and shopping centres. Also, evident within the Diepsloot community, is a vast range of informal economic activities. In order to obtain a better understanding of how to build community resilience in Diepsloot through private company and community collaboration, it was essential to conduct research consisting of focus group interviews with local community members and individual face-to-face interviews with key private
sector representatives in this area. The next section presents in thorough detail, the research participants in the research study.

5.3 RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

During the data collection process for this study, respondents from private companies operating within the proximity of Diepsloot and the community members in Diepsloot were consulted.

Firstly, individual interviews were conducted with five (05) representatives of private companies in the area. The private companies were purposefully selected based on their proximity to the Diepsloot community. These respondents were best suited to answer questions based on their engagement with the community and the types of projects implemented in the community. Table 5.1 below provides a demographic presentation of the respondent profile for the semi-structured individual interviews.

Table 5.1: Respondent Profile for Semi-structured individual interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Type of industry</th>
<th>Line of business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 1</td>
<td>Internet Services</td>
<td>Information and communications technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>Property Development</td>
<td>Commercial &amp; residential property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>Tour operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>Asset protection and insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 5</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Health care</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondly, respondents from the Diepsloot community were purposefully recruited for the focus group discussions using a snowball sampling method. A total of five focus groups discussions, each consisting of 10 members per group were conducted in the study. As a result, a total of 50 community members participated in the study. The questions asked focused on their individual and shared perceived knowledge and understanding of the involvement of private companies’ engagement in their community. Table 5.2 below provides a demographic presentation of the respondent profile for the focus group interviews.
Table 5.2: Respondent Profile for Focus Group Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus group number</th>
<th>Gender composition</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus group 1</td>
<td>100% females</td>
<td>30-45</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group 2</td>
<td>20% males</td>
<td>26-40</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80% females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group 3</td>
<td>30% males</td>
<td>22-35</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70% females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group 4</td>
<td>20% males</td>
<td>23-55</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80% females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group 5</td>
<td>10% males</td>
<td>24-36</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90% females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next section presents and discusses the findings from the study, which are thematically presented.

5.4 FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

This section presents the findings from data collected through semi-structured individual interviews with private company representatives as well as focus group discussions conducted with the community. All interview responses were transcribed verbatim and initially checked and categorised manually to identify core “presenting” themes and patterns. Themes that emerged from the data were pieced together to provide a comprehensive picture of the views and experiences of the respondents. Therefore, the findings are presented according to the identified themes listed in Table 5.3 below. The findings of this study strike a chord with the literature as there is convergence between the views of the participants and the scholarly literature and other research consulted.
Table 5 3: Themes from the data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME</th>
<th>SUB-THEME</th>
<th>THEME NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.4.1</td>
<td>Nature of private company engagement in Diepsloot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2</td>
<td>Building effective private companies and communities collaborative partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2.1</td>
<td>The need for partnership between private companies and the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2.2</td>
<td>Community consultation for effective collaborative partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2.3</td>
<td>The importance of organised community structures for collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.3</td>
<td>Building the capacity of communities to respond to adverse events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.3.1</td>
<td>Availability of resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.3.2</td>
<td>Community competence in addressing adverse events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.3.3</td>
<td>The importance of creating awareness on disaster risk and addressing communities’ vulnerabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.3.4</td>
<td>Enhancing collective action through social capital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.1 Nature of private company engagement in Diepsloot

All the respondents from the private companies that were interviewed indicated that they had indeed engaged with the community of Diepsloot through their corporate social responsibility programmes or projects. Data collected indicates that, in all cases, private companies engaged in the community through corporate social responsibility initiatives by either collaborating with a Community Based Organisation (CBO) directly or had a Non-Profit section within the company that dealt with charitable aspects and that engaged in partnerships with the local CBOs. This is in line with the assertion made in literature that private sector engagement in community interventions operate largely under the umbrella of corporate social responsibility (CSR) as outlined in section 3.5.1 of this study.
Through partnerships with the local CBOs, the nature of each company’s engagement differs and has either direct ties to their day to day function or in some cases has nothing to do with their function. Table 5.4 below provides an overview of the types of community engagement projects undertaken by private companies in Diepsloot as outlined by the respondents from the private companies.

Table 5.4: Community Engagement Projects in Diepsloot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Internet services</th>
<th>Property Development</th>
<th>Tourism</th>
<th>Insurance</th>
<th>Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free Wi-Fi</td>
<td>Construction of church / multi-purpose centre</td>
<td>Providing library resources</td>
<td>Job Placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Support</td>
<td>Early childhood development (ECD) support</td>
<td>Reconstruction of temporary shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee engagement</td>
<td>Cleaning up of the Jukskei River</td>
<td>Donation of blankets and stationery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A respondent from the information and communications technology services (ICT, Internet services) indicated that the company’s community project was implemented through the collaboration of the companies with CBOs, but also involved collaboration with local high schools in Diepsloot. Furthermore, these types of projects were largely focused on skills development within the ICT field by supporting and sponsoring internet connectivity and information technology hosting in schools and encouraging employees in the company to engage in the company’s activities. Through their school support project, the company provided extra classes through E-learning on Saturdays to the underprivileged schools. The subjects they focused on were Maths, Science and Accounting. The aim of their community engagement was directed towards creating employment opportunities for the youth in Diepsloot.
“Our aim is to increase youth employment through ICT education” – Respondent, internet services.

On the other hand, a respondent from the company having property development as their core focus area indicated that their corporate social responsibility activities were implemented with the assistance of their own founded CBO. Through this partnership, they were in a process of constructing an all-inclusive children’s village which would focus on providing residential care to children who had been orphaned by HIV/AIDS. In addition, the respondent indicated that they had also completed the construction of a multi-purpose centre which the community was utilising for church services at the time of the study. They also provided training and youth development workshops including counselling services and had further worked with the community in cleaning up a section of the Jukskei River that ran through Diepsloot.

Corporate social responsibility initiatives by the company focusing on tourism included for example, sponsoring the building of a library in Diepsloot together with providing the resources to be used in the library; the reconstruction of low-cost housing for residents in the community; donating blankets and stationery to the community as well as encouraging employee engagement in these initiatives.

The company working in the insurance industry had strong corporate social responsibility objectives that they strived to reach. The aim of their corporate social responsibility strategy was to improve the lives of people living in Diepsloot by means of providing skills development and recruitment solutions in order to address the impact of unemployment and poverty. So, they had joined forces with one of the youth agencies in the community and the responsibility of the organisation was to manage the training, recruitment and selection of the youth in Diepsloot, while they provided the capacity to train and provide opportunities for employment for the community members.

“Our CSR strategy is to improve the lives of people living in Diepsloot through the skills development and recruitment programmes we have implemented together with a youth development agency in Diepsloot” – Respondent, insurance.

A respondent from the health care industry indicated that their corporate social responsibility initiatives focused on early childhood development in Diepsloot. By engaging in these initiatives, the company had funded and furnished two shipping container classrooms.

Despite the responses from the interviews with the private companies’ representatives regarding their engagement in Diepsloot, which showed greater involvement in the community, responses from the focus group interviews revealed differing views on the nature of private
company engagement in the area. The majority of the focus group respondents indicated that, whereas they were aware of companies that operated in close proximity to the community of Diepsloot, they were not aware of any community projects by the private companies in the area. Only few respondents indicated that they were aware of private company engagement in the community. The statement below from one of the respondents from the focus group captures the views of some of the respondents, who were not aware of the private companies’ involvement in the community.

“I have only heard about private companies doing projects in extension 2 but here in Diepsloot reception, I have not seen any” – Respondent, Diepsloot community.

Such responses suggested that not all community based interventions by private companies reached the entire community. Therefore, this implied that private company initiatives did not influence some areas of the community which necessitated the need for improved collaborative measures to address the knowledge gap between business operations and community engagement.

5.4.2 Building effective private companies and communities’ collaborative partnerships

Literature on collaboration identifies multi-sector collaboration as a complex but effective mechanism under which a multitude of societal problems can be addressed while also creating valuable returns for the collaborating partners as discussed in section 3.3. From both sets of the interviews, the following sub-themes emerged from the data and are presented as follows: 5.4.2.1) The need for partnership between private companies and the community, 5.4.2.2) Community consultation for effective collaborative partnerships, 5.4.2.3) The importance of organised community structures for collaboration.

5.4.2.1 The need for partnership between private companies and the community

The majority of the respondents from the private companies agreed that recognising and accepting the need for collaboration formed an integral process within the collaborative endeavour. For example, one respondent from the private company interviews cited the challenging task Government had in responding to the socio-economic needs of the country and the role of the private companies in assisting Government to address the gaps.

“We recognise the socio-economic challenges in the community and the burdensome role Government has in responding to these challenges. As a business, we respond to the needs that echo our core business strategic areas” – Respondent, internet services.
“Being from the tourism sector recognising that the sector has the ability to reach that part of the population that is unaffected by traditional means of economic empowerment, we are well positioned to assist in addressing unemployment, inequality and poverty” - Respondent, tourism.

In response to the mutual contributions partners brought to the collaboration, the respondents from the private companies highlighted their lack of expertise in relation to social issues and community intervention. As such, private companies counted on CBOs and schools within the community because they had more knowledge about the community and ways to intervene as well as an understanding of various social challenges eminent in the community.

“We rely on the CBOs that we work with, in the identification of families that are in need of shelter. Our role is to then assist in reconstructing their shelters” – Respondent, tourism.

The focus group respondents concurred with this view and highlighted the important role private companies played in addressing some of the challenges in the community. The following views captured the respondents’ confidence in the capacity of private companies to contribute to socio-economic challenges in the community.

“[Company] assisted in the burial of the two children that were murdered in the toilet” - Respondent, Diepsloot community.

“I am not sure of the company’s name, but some company has helped us refurbish the toilets in the community” – Respondent, Diepsloot community.

These findings reveal the need for collaborative working and therefore this creates an opportunity for both the private companies and the community to work collaboratively to address the socio-economic challenges faced in the community. Furthermore, the respondents from both sets of interviews recognised the ability of both parties to contribute towards a collaborative relationship that would be beneficial for both partners, thus indicating the potential for collaboration to be formed between the community and the private companies. This strikes a chord with the literature which indicates that both the collaborating partners need to have a consensual agreement, the recognition and acceptance of the need for partnership while also developing clarity and realism of the purpose of the collaborative (Hardy et al., 2003:15). The sub-theme links with sub-theme 5.4.2.2 which highlights the importance of having a consultative exchange between the collaborating partners in order to effectively address commonly agreed upon goals and objectives of collaborating.
5.4.2.2 Community consultation for effective collaborative partnerships

In this study, both sets of interviews highlighted the importance of private companies having knowledge and an understanding of the needs of the community before engaging in any projects and programmes.

“From my experience in working with various impoverished communities, the basis of any community project is conducting a socio-economic survey. By doing this, you have a fair idea of the needs of the community and you are able to contribute relevant and impactful projects” – Respondent, property development.

Data from the private company interviews cited the importance of involving the community in all the community engagement activities. Likewise, the respondents from the focus group also cited the importance of being involved in community engagement activities implemented by private companies. This enables both collaborating partners to jointly contribute towards the collaborative and to share in the benefits of the collaboration.

“Any project you do in the community, you have to involve the community members. The community has a better understanding of what is happening in the community” – Respondent, property development.

The majority of the focus group respondents agreed that private companies needed to engage with the community in order to create awareness and access to the various community projects that private companies offered to the community.

“These private companies should talk to the community; the community must know about these services. When the community is stranded, they must know where to go” – Respondent, Diepsloot community.

In responding to the joint roles that collaborating partners brought to the collaboration, the respondents from the private companies indicated that their role was to provide the expertise and resources while the community brought in the community level experience.

“Through our skills development projects, we benefit significantly from having a skill pool from which we can draw well-rounded, well-educated and skilful youth” – Respondent, insurance services.

On a similar note, the respondent within the tourism services indicated that their role was to provide the expertise and resources while the community brought in the community level experience.
In contrast to this view, the respondents from the focus group interviews were of the view that private company engagement in the community was firstly based on the assumption of what the community needs were and secondly these projects were centered on certain sections in Diepsloot that were more developed.

“If company ‘S’ donates food and clothes to the ECD centre in extension 2, how does that affect me when I live in Diepsloot reception area? It does not. If my child goes to that crèche, yes, but if I do not have money to pay for her school, she will not go and the food and clothes will not mean anything to me. I would rather have company ‘S’ pay crèche fees for all the children in Diepsloot- that would affect me” - Respondent, Diepsloot community.

“When these private companies do their research, they must do it all over Diepsloot and not just the sections in Diepsloot that are well-developed” – Respondent, Diepsloot community.

This finding suggests that projects implemented by private companies do not necessarily address the needs of the community, thus implying the importance for community consultation in order to collaborate effectively in addressing the needs of the community.

Further to this, the respondents from the focus group interviews reflected differing views in relation to the organisations and institutions, that is, CBOs and schools, through which the CSR projects were implemented. Theme 1, section 3.4.1 identified that private companies worked with CBOs and schools within the community in order to implement their CSR projects. According to the responses from the focus groups interviews, the mechanisms through which the private companies engaged with the community contributes to a lack of awareness within the community about private sector engagement in Diepsloot. This lack of awareness of private sector engagement within the community challenges whether the implementation of projects through the CBOs and schools in the area is inclusive, impactful and affective.

One respondent from the focus group expressed:

“Most private companies work with the school but these services do not reach us” - Respondent, Diepsloot community.

This member felt that companies should approach the community directly. This was supported by another respondent from another group who expressed:

“It is important that companies build a relationship with the community members and not just the school or one section of the community” - Respondent, Diepsloot community.
These findings suggested that private company engagement in the community of Diepsloot did not reach all the members of the community. It further suggested that CBOs used by private companies in community engagement, including the schools in the community did not influence all the members of the community. For the private companies, this current collaboration between the CBOs and schools is effective. The importance of collaborating with organised community structures was reflected across all the responses from the private company interviews. Even though this view was reflected by the private companies, the respondents from the focus group interviews felt that it was not effective because the community did not necessarily share in the benefits of these projects. These findings are in contrast with the view that successful collaborations are based on mutually agreed upon purpose, scope, processes and activities of the collaboration, as noted in section 3.3.2. This explains why the community was of the view that the community based projects by private companies were not affective. The following sub-theme identifies in detail the reason why private companies feel the need to collaborate with organised community structures in the community.

5.4.2.3 The importance of organised community structures for collaboration

The majority of private company respondents indicated their preference to work with CBOs and schools in the community and their CSR programmes were implemented through these organisations and institutions. While some of the respondents had their own company foundation, other respondents indicated that they had implemented their community projects through CBOs that were external to the private company. The majority of the respondents had also implemented their projects through schools.

This collaborative relationship with CBOs and schools was largely based on mutually agreed upon goals and mutually beneficial returns which was in line with what was discussed in section 3.3.1 and 3.3.2.

In justifying their preference to work with organised community structures, private company respondents highlighted their prior history of working directly with the community members. One of the respondents referred to the company’s prior experience with working directly with community members outside of the CBO assistance.

“We were unable to measure the returns to the business, as well as measuring the impact of our engagement in the community” – Respondent, insurance services.

For this respondent, the effort in managing the relationship between the company and the community members in terms of time and resources did not yield any value for the business.
This was their basis for working with a Diepsloot based CBO that managed the relationship with the community.

Another respondent added that they had trouble managing expectations and ensuring accountability as well as showing value to the business. This suggests that companies are constantly seeking to create and show value when engaging with the community. Their preference to work with CBOs further suggested the trust they had in these community organisations.

While contributing to the well-being of the community is the objective of the private companies’ CSR mandates, it was gathered in the data that private companies chose carefully the types of CBOs they work with. Some of the private company respondents referred to the importance of reputation and social standing of the CBOs they considered as a partner to collaborate with. These respondents indicated that the status and reputation of the organisation within society were important suggesting that the organisation or the school they worked with should show a history of good, reputable functioning within the community.

“Some of our selection criteria for CBOs is that they need to have a track record of their interventions within the community; have an effective and efficient monitoring and evaluation system in place and mostly, have a well-managed financial management system in place” – Respondent, internet services.

The respondents from the focus groups reported differing views of private sector engagement in Diepsloot, particularly in relation to community projects implemented by CBOs and schools. The majority of these respondents felt that community interventions by CBOs and schools were inaccessible as discussed in sub-theme 5.4.2.2. While some respondents were in support of private company – CBO interventions, others expressed their support for private company – school intervention, indicating that through schools, the community was better accessed.

“The relationship with private companies should start at school and the school must drive these projects” - Respondent, Diepsloot community.

“I think that private companies should work more with the school because it is easier to bring the community together” – Respondent, Diepsloot community.

For the respondents that supported private company – CBO interventions, it was expressed that there was a need for private companies to support emerging organised youth groups.
“There is a youth group that I am part of and we have talked about starting a non-profit organisation focusing on youth development. I think that private companies could assist because they have the knowledge and the resources” – Respondent, Diepsloot community.

Even though data from both sets of interviews have differing views regarding private company engagement through CBOs and schools, the findings commonly recognises the need for having organised structures through which community engagement projects by private companies can be implemented. While some group respondents felt that private company projects assume of what the needs of the community are; some respondents challenged the mechanisms (CBOs and schools) through which the community projects were implemented, suggesting that private companies should work directly with the community members. Further to this, data from both sets of interviews indicate the lack of connection, accessibility and communication between the private companies and the community. This is reflected in the differing and inconsistent views about the nature of private company engagement in the community. This implies that for private company engagement projects to be more effective, their current methods of implementation, that is CBOs and schools, need to be further revised in order to intensify the awareness of their community projects. These findings are in line with literature discussed in section 3.3.6, which indicates that monitoring the process, measuring the progress and learning from the process of the collaboration, enables both partners to realise the value of collaboration. The history of the collaboration also serves as a significant input or precursor to future collaboration (Doz, 1996: 55; Ruggie, 2002: 27; Hamann et al., 2011:7).

The following section, presents data based on how private company engagement can build the capacity of the community to respond to adverse events.

5.4.3 Building the capacity of communities to respond to adverse events

Theme 5.4.1 and theme 5.4.2 discussed previously presented data from both private companies and the focus group respondents about their views on nature of community engagement in the community. Data further presented respondents’ views about building effective collaborative partnerships between the private companies and the community can be developed. Even though data revealed the lack of connection, accessibility and communication between the private companies and the community, the data shows that there is an opportunity for these gaps to be addressed and consequently, for effective collaboration to be developed between the private companies and the community.

In this section, data was collected in order to establish the capacity of the community to respond to adverse events.
In literature (Chapter 2, section 2.5), it was identified that enhancing the capacity of communities to respond to disaster occurrences formed the basis for reducing disaster impacts, minimising the effects of hazards and building community resilience. In addition, community resilience includes mainly community-level factors that protect the community from adverse experiences as opposed to the factors within an individual that determines his/her resilience (chapter 2, section 2.4). This implies that, for the community to build its resilience, it will be imperative for collaboration with the private companies to be directed towards enhancing the capacity of the community to respond to and cope with disaster events.

The section includes data collected for the sub-themes identified as 5.4.3.1) Availability of resources, 5.4.3.2) Community competence to address adverse events, 5.4.3.3) Importance of creating awareness on disaster risks and addressing community vulnerability, and 5.4.3.4) Enhancing collective action through social capital.

5.4.3.1 Availability of resources

Section 5.4.1 identified that all the private companies that were interviewed, had engaged with the community of Diepsloot through their corporate social responsibility programmes. Further to this, the respondents from the private companies shared similar views about the important role that private companies occupied in assisting communities and the Government to address the socio-economic challenges in the community.

The data from the private company respondents revealed that the extent of engagement with the community occurred on different levels where their engagements were largely aligned to the core competencies of their business objectives. In the views of the respondents, their community engagement projects were not aligned to disaster risk reduction in any way.

"We are an internet service provider and we use our core competencies as a base for all our activities" – Respondent, internet services.

“As a business, we are considered leaders within the property development market and we have broad knowledge and experience within the field which we apply to significantly and substantially contribute to the greater good of the society, particularly the community of Diepsloot” – Respondent, property development.

However, the findings reveal that private company engagement in Diepsloot has contributed towards the reduction of the vulnerabilities associated with the socio-economic challenges experienced by the community. These findings suggest that private companies may not be consciously aware of the contribution made by their CSR programmes towards addressing the
vulnerabilities and disaster risks eminent in the community. From a resilience building perspective, private companies occupy an important role in enhancing the economic resource capacity of the community, thus making it better for the community to cope with disaster events.

An important aspect that was mentioned in the interviews with the private companies was the importance of financial resources to fund community projects. The majority of the private company respondents indicated that they had limited financial resources to work with and as a result, they continually tried to find alternative and innovative ways in which their community engagement projects would be conducted in order to create value for both the community as well as the company. These respondents highlighted various ways in which community engagement took place that required minimal financial commitments while creating valuable and sustainable outcomes for both the business and the community.

“We prioritise on our corporate spending. We look at what the needs in the community are based on a needs analysis. From the analysis, we assess which needs we can address based on our budget” – Respondent, tourism.

The majority of the respondents from the private company interviews explained further that they do not give direct financial donations but rather try to commit their time to their community engagement activities. For instance, the company in property development donated their time to assist the community to clean the Jukskei River. On the other hand, the company in the health sector provided shipping containers in support of the ECD in Diepsloot. While the respondent in the tourism sector donated library resources after constructing the library in the community. This shows that private companies are always willing to assist address community challenges considering minimal financial availability.

Further to this, the respondent from the property development field highlighted that their foundation together with the CBO, do a lot of corporate fund raising because of the magnitude of their residential care facility they are currently constructing in Diepsloot.

“This project [residential care facility] requires huge amounts of money. As a company, we are unable to do it alone hence the foundation and the CBO have approached other companies to assist” – Respondent, property development.

From these responses, it is clear that financial resources play an important role in community engagement. This however does not mean that the companies will not engage with communities in the absence of financial resources. Therefore, private companies are always willing to assist and are eager to find alternative ways in which they can engage with communities. What was commonly expressed by these respondents was the importance of their
community projects having sustainable and valuable outcomes for both the business as well as the community.

The focus group respondents expressed common views that private companies were better equipped to drive disaster related projects in the community because they have the financial resources and as well the knowledge to do so.

“For me, I think private companies have knowledge about disasters and they have the money to help us” – Respondent, Diepsloot community.

“I have not seen any private company in the community or heard of a particular private company but I think they can assist...I mean they have the money” – Respondent, Diepsloot community.

In addition to this, the focus group respondents identified prior disaster events in the community and expressed their willingness to work with private companies in order to address the hazards that led to the disaster. The majority of respondents referred to shack fires that have occurred in the community.

“Well, for me, I think private companies can teach us about fires and how to prevent them and how to stop the fires when they happen” - Respondent, Diepsloot community.

Conversely, the private companies recognise that they are experts in certain areas which their business is focused on, and have admitted to having the resources to address socio-economic challenges. This acknowledgement from both the private companies and the community indicates that there exists a mutual beneficial relationship between private companies and the community and therefore the opportunity to build resilience through collaboration. Literature indicates that private companies are viewed as having the financial capacity to potentially assist communities in times of disasters (chapter 3, section 3.5.1). Thus, from a community resilience building perspective, these private companies signify the economic resources in the community through which community resilience can be built.

5.4.3.2 Community competence in addressing adverse events

The respondents from the focus groups indicated their awareness of disasters that have occurred most frequently during the past five to ten years and these included: shack fires resulting from illegal electrical connections, paraffin stoves and candles; flooding and drowning of school children in the Jukskei River, violent crime and health related hazards, such as rat infestations. Considering these occurrences, the majority of the focus group respondents expressed a high level perceived risk and vulnerability.
Data from the focus group discussions highlighted existence of government resources, with the majority of the respondents expressing their lack of confidence in the services by Government.

“The ambulance services are slow to respond; you call them at 12:00 today and they come at 10:00 tonight.” – Respondent, Diepsloot Community

“Sometimes, the paramedics say they don’t enter our section because we do not have proper roads; so in case of a person needing an ambulance, we have to carry that person to the main street” – Respondent, Diepsloot community.

“The police tell us that they don’t come to our section because we don’t have roads” – Respondent, Diepsloot community.

With the lack of faith in government resources and response, the majority of respondents from the focus groups believed the community members of Diepsloot must be self-reliant. This is indicated by the existence of the Community Protection Forums (CPF) as well as the vigilantes who intervene on issues of violent crime. The role of the CPFs was mainly to address issues relating to neighbour, landlord-tenant disputes and domestic issues. The CPF was also described as being responsible for arranging meetings to discuss community related issues as well as working with the local police station in solving the issues. Despite the inefficiency in Government’s capacity to assist the community in times of distress, the community indicated that it relies on itself to survive.

Data from the focus group interviews indicated a high level of community competence in relation to the community’s ability to act collectively in response to disaster occurrences. These respondents expressed their collective ability to mobilise the community in order to respond to a disaster occurrence, such as a shack fire, even when they felt under-resourced.

“We as the community are ready and willing to help our neighbours when there is a shack fire but at times, we don’t have the resources to do so” – Respondent, Diepsloot community.

It was further gathered from the data that CPFs do not prioritise on activities for disaster risk reduction. Despite this, the presence of a CPF may serve as an important capacity where DRR related activities can be discussed and addressed thus enhancing the competence of the community to plan for and respond to disasters. In addition to this, the focus group respondents expressed their confidence in the capacity of private companies to assist in addressing disaster risks and responding to disaster occurrences in the community.

Whereas they were not aware, the majority of respondents from the private company interviews articulated their ability to assist the community in addressing the vulnerabilities associated with
the socio-economic challenges eminent in the community. Relating back to the discussion in section 5.4.1, it was gathered that private companies engage with the community through their CSR projects thus potentially contributing to the community’s ability to respond to and cope with adverse events. For example, the respondent from the tourism services donated blankets to the community during the winter season. On the other hand, the respondent in the health services donated shipping containers in response to the overcrowding of children that occurred in one of the nursery schools in the community. Through this intervention, the loss of life due to fire risk and unhygienic conditions was prevented.

Central to the discussion of disaster risk reduction and resilience building, is the extent to which communities can analyse and manage the contributory factors of disasters, with the aim of incorporating activities that reduce the exposure to hazards, decreasing the vulnerability of people and property, while also improving disaster risk preparedness and response (UNISDR, 2004:17; Van Niekerk, 2011:13). Data from both sets of interviews revealed that both private companies and the community have the competence to respond to or assist in terms of disaster occurrences. It was gathered in the data presented in theme 1 and 2 that private companies recognise the socio-economic challenges that are present in Diepsloot and their ability to assist in addressing them. Similarly, the discussions from the focus groups revealed the extensive confidence in private companies to contribute towards addressing their socio-economic challenges thus revealing the potential to collaborate towards building the resilience of the community.

5.4.3.3 The importance of creating awareness on disaster risk and addressing communities’ vulnerabilities

The data from the focus group discussions revealed that the community is not well-informed about disaster risk reduction. The majority of the focus group respondents acknowledged the lack of education and knowledge they were exposed to in relation to disaster risks, reduction and management. The statement below captures the views of the focus group respondents on the issue of disaster risk education.

“I don’t think the community is educated about disasters, we are not” - Respondent, Diepsloot Community.

Inversely, data from the focus group discussions gathered that the community has an insight of the risks eminent in the community as discussed in section 5.4.3.2. In addition, data revealed the community’s willingness and tendency to manage disasters as they occur, despite this lack of knowledge and resources to respond to these disasters.
Data from the focus group discussions further revealed the community has the perception that some community members were well-educated about disaster risk reduction.

“… but I feel that there are members within the community that have the knowledge but are not sharing it, especially those that are well educated and have good jobs” - Respondent, Diepsloot Community.

In response to this statement, other focus group respondents felt that there is a need for a platform where this information could be shared.

“But they don’t know how to share the knowledge and they also don’t know with whom to share this knowledge” - Respondent, Diepsloot Community.

For the community, the CPF may serve an important role where the information about disaster risks and reduction can be shared with the community.

On a similar note, data from the private company interviews revealed the lack of understanding on issues relating to disaster risk reduction. The majority of private company respondents linked their community engagement projects to their overall business objectives. Data presented in section 5.4.3.1, revealed that private companies do not consciously prioritise on disaster risk reduction in their CSR projects in the community. However, data shows that the projects by private companies have contributed towards addressing the vulnerabilities associated with disaster risks in the community thus helping the community to better cope with disaster events. The inability of private companies to make the connection between their community engagement projects and the disaster risk reduction suggests that, private companies are not well-informed about disaster risk reduction and resilience building. Therefore, this indicates the need to create awareness on disaster risk reduction in order for private companies to enhance their community engagement activities towards helping the community minimise the risks and vulnerabilities associated with disaster occurrences in Diepsloot.

Through information and education about disaster risk reduction, people can be educated about disaster risks and are better informed about dangers and the required actions in emergency situations (Twigg, 2004:165; Albano et al., 2015:1645). Data from both sets of interviews suggests that there is a need to create awareness on disaster risk and ways of addressing and the vulnerabilities in the community that result in disaster risk events. If the private companies are well-informed about disaster risk reduction and advance their CSR efforts to address the gap in knowledge about disaster risks in the community, the community will be at a better position to build their resilience towards disaster risk events.
5.4.3.4 Enhancing collective action through social capital

There was a general awareness of the existence of social groups in the community across the majority of the focus group discussions. Most of the focus group respondents reported on the presence of social groups and acknowledged that the social groups were formed in order to supplement household resources. While some group respondents indicated that they were not part of any social group, some respondents said that they had membership in various social groups, such as church-based groups, men’s church-based social clubs, youth groups and stokvels for groceries and funerals.

“We do have social groups in the community. For example, I am part of a stokvel where we help with contributions at funerals” – Respondent, Diepsloot community.

Furthermore, the focus group respondents also referred to the existence of CPFs discussed in section 5.4.3.2. The common perspective across the focus groups respondents was that social groups were not formed for disaster related activities suggesting that assistance in times of challenging events was based on the social networks within the community.

“Social groups or societies do not help during disasters. This is based on an individual’s decision to assist in times of disasters” - Respondent, Diepsloot community.

“I remember this one guys shack was burning and the neighbours were helping him put out the fire” - Respondent, Diepsloot community.

Further to this, the focus group respondents indicated that the extent to which community members participated in the social groups was dependent on, the reason for their existence. For example, some focus group respondents indicated that the participation of community members in a particular social group was dependant on the extent to which the members were attracted to the returns obtained from the social group. This finding indicates that community members based the value of their participation in the social groups on the returns expected from these social groups.

“Community members are likely to join a stokvel than joining a church group because stokvels bring money” – Respondent, Diepsloot community.

The data from the focus group discussions shows that stokvels serve an economic need for the community and thus play an important role in community resilience building.

More importantly, data from the focus group discussions further showed that the assistance of community members during difficult experiences was not only dependant on the social groups
but also from the social networks they have. The discussion in section 5.4.3.2 further revealed that the community is often independent and self-reliant in managing difficult circumstances. The focus group respondents referred to their lack of confidence in government-based services highlighting that the community often turns to the community vigilantes or the CPFs and at times to their own social networks mobilising to help a neighbour during a shack fire. This willingness and ability to assist during difficult circumstances shows the ability to take collective action and thus highlights that the community has a level of social capital.

The data from the private company interviews showed that the private companies occupy a role in enhancing the social capital capacity in the community. Through their implementation of CSR projects in the community, it signifies the social capital existing between businesses and the community. Therefore, private companies further serve as an imperative platform through which the capacity of the community to respond to adverse events can be enhanced.

Literature discusses the notion of social capital as embedded in the interdependence of agencies based on their shared relationships, the institutions under which they live and the available resources they depend on, which facilitates adaptation processes and enhances the resilience of communities (David & Li, 2008:2; Kapucu et al., 2013:219). The findings from both sets of interviews reveal the importance of collectiveness and the shared relationships within the community and the private companies. Despite the focus group data indicating that they do not prioritise their efforts towards disaster risk reduction, data indicates that the community members are able to collectively respond to disaster occurrences with minimal government intervention. Data further revealed the important role the community places on their own social networks, the CPFs for security and social groups for economic supplement. It is further gathered that private companies also play an important role in helping the community cope with socio-economic challenges through their CSR projects. As such, community resilience building efforts in the community should be directed towards finding ways in which private companies, social groups and CPFs can help address disaster risks within the community.

The preceding themes in this section presented data based on the nature of community engagement in the community and revealed the importance of private companies in addressing the vulnerabilities in the community. Furthermore, data revealed that the private companies serve as an important mechanism through which the capacity of the community to respond to adverse events can be enhanced. More importantly, data showed that there is a need for private companies to enhance their current collaborative efforts with the community thus creating an opportunity for private companies to effectively collaborate with the community in order to build resilience in Diepsloot.
The following section provides the summative discussion of the finding in the study.

5.5 SUMMATIVE DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

In the preceding section, the findings from the empirical data collection phase were presented and discussed thematically. Having presented and analysed the data from the private company interviews and the focus group discussions, it is important to discuss the findings in order to contribute towards achieving the objectives of this chapter. Therefore, the focus of this section is to summarise the discussion of the findings presented in the preceding themes.

Thematic area 1 (section 5.4.1) shows that there was divergence between findings from private sector company representative and focus group interviews on their views on private company engagement in Diepsloot. The analysis from the private company interviews shows that private companies have engaged with the community through their varied CSR projects. While the majority of the CSR projects are implemented in collaboration with organised structures, such as CBOs and schools within the community, some projects are implemented through direct liaison with the community. On the other hand, the majority of the focus group respondents indicated their awareness of companies operating in close proximity to the community, but reported having minimal awareness of community projects by the private companies in the area. These findings imply that private company initiatives are not reaching some areas of the community and suggest the need to enhance the collaborative relationship between private companies and the community. This finding is consistent with literature in that the value of collaboration is seen through the outcomes created when people enter collaborative relationships (Gray & Stites, 2013:49). And it is thus imperative that private companies reflect on their current community engagement projects in order to assess their effectiveness and thus improve their collaboration (Hardy et al., 2003:36; Czajkowski, 2007:6).

Thematic area 2 (section 5.4.2) reveals differing accounts about building effective private companies and community collaborative partnerships from both sets of interviews. On the issue discussing the need for partnership between private companies and the community, the analysis shows that there is an agreement between the views of private companies and the focus group discussions, while discrepancies with regard to community consultation for building effective collaborative partnerships are shown. In both sets of interviews, the need for consultation prior to collaboration is emphasised and agreed upon, however the findings from the focus group discussions indicate that current projects by private companies are not affective and impactful. This is due to the views from focus group respondents that private companies implement their projects based on the assumption of what the community needs are. In addition to this, both sets of interviews reported differing views about the importance of organised
community structures for collaboration. The private company respondents expressed their preference and importance to work with CBOs and schools, centring their preference on the ease in managing the relationship between them and the community; ensuring accountability and showing value in the CSR projects by working with reputable organisations within the community. While some focus group respondents were in support of organised community structures, some focus group respondents viewed organised community structures as being inaccessible suggesting the importance of private companies building relationships with the community before CSR projects can be implemented. Given that both respondents from the private companies and the focus groups see and understand the need for collaboration, it will be imperative that: 1) private companies evaluate the ways they engage the community when implementing their CSR projects; and 2) implement effective consultative processes with the community, in order to enhance the current collaborative arrangements and build effective private company and community collaborative partnerships.

In theme 3 (section 5.4.3), there is convergence about views from both sets of data about the building of the capacity of the community to respond to adverse events. The respondents from the private company interviews and the focus group discussions shared similar views about the role that private companies occupy in enhancing the economic resource and social capital capacity of the community in order to cope with disaster events. In theme 5.4.1 and 5.4.2 discussed previously, data shows that private companies recognise the socio-economic challenges that are present in Diepsloot and the challenge that Government has in responding towards addressing these challenges. Therefore, both private companies and the focus group respondents uncovered the extensive confidence in private companies to contribute towards addressing the socio-economic challenges in Diepsloot. Even though data from both sets of interviews revealed the lack of insight in disaster risk reduction, data further suggests that there is a need to create awareness on disaster risk and ways of addressing and the vulnerabilities in the community that result in disaster risk events. Furthermore, the respondents from the focus group discussion showed their willingness to collaborate with the private companies in order to learn about reducing disasters while private company interviews showed that private companies are willing and ready to assist the community of Diepsloot. Data from the focus group discussions indicated the role of community vigilantes, the CPFs and their own social networks in responding to adverse events in the community revealing their reliance on these social networks. On the other hand, private company interviews showed their reliance on their collaborative relationships with CBOs. In this regard, data indicated the dissimilar views about collectiveness between the community and the private companies. Despite this view, CSR projects in the community by private companies signify the social capital existing between businesses and the community. This shows that private companies serve as an essential
platform through which collective action to respond to adverse events can be enhanced. So, for resilience building in Diepsloot, both sets of interviews reveal that there exists a mutual beneficial relationship between private companies and the community and therefore the opportunity to build resilience through collaboration.

5.6 CONCLUSION

The focus of this chapter was to present and analyse the data collected on the perspective of private company representatives as well as the community of Diepsloot on the nature of private company engagement in Diepsloot. Two types of data collection methods were applied: semi-structured individual interviews with representatives from private companies and focus group interviews with community members using a semi-structured interview schedule. A thematic analysis and discussion was presented. The themes and sub-themes presented in this study are Nature of private company engagement in Diepsloot; Building effective private companies and communities collaborative partnerships, The need for partnership between private companies and the community, Community consultation for effective collaborative partnerships, The importance of organised community structures for collaboration; Building the capacity of communities to respond to adverse events, Availability of resources, Community competence in addressing adverse events, The importance of creating awareness on disaster risk and addressing communities’ vulnerabilities, and Enhancing collective action through social capital.

The findings of the study showed that private company engagement in Diepsloot has contributed to the reduction of vulnerabilities associated with the socio-economic challenges experienced in the community. The findings further reveal considerable converging views from both sets of interviews on the need for the community and the private companies to work collaboratively in order to build resilience in Diepsloot. Although the findings show varying views about the nature of the current community engagement projects in Diepsloot, they illuminate the evident need for private companies to evaluate their current collaborative efforts with the community in order to effectively address the community’s needs and build community resilience in Diepsloot.

The next chapter provides the conclusion and recommendations made from the research study.
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The research study aimed to contribute to disaster resilience research by looking at ways in which private companies can collaborate with communities to increase disaster risk resilience globally. Conventionally, disaster risk management and reduction has been perceived as being the responsibility of the public sector. This perception has evolved to acknowledge the vital contribution that the private sector can make towards DRR through private company intervention in community engagement (Sarmiento et al., 2014:3). Disaster risk is not only a concern for the environment, individuals and communities, but also a concern for the private sector and their operations, both directly and indirectly. Therefore, fostering collaborative relationships between the public sector and the private sector has been viewed as integral to the mitigation, reduction and management of disasters globally. The HFA and subsequently, the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 advocate the involvement of the private sector in reducing disaster risks and working towards resilience by investing in disaster risk reduction activities (UNISDR, 2007:11; UNISDR, 2015:15).

Centred on the community of the Diepsloot and the private companies operating in close proximity to the community, the study explored the nature of private company engagement in Diepsloot as well as the community’s knowledge and awareness of private company’s engagement projects in the community. The study further explored the extent to which these projects were contributing to the resilience of the community. Chapter 2 reveals that DRR and resilience building in communities enhances their ability to prepare for disasters; increases community’s self-sufficiency to respond to the occurrence of disasters and assists the community system to rehabilitate from the disaster occurrence. Largely noted in Chapter 2 is that community resilience requires a collaborative effort between private companies and the community in order to build the capacities of community to successfully build community resilience. Chapter 3 affirms the imperative role of the private companies in DRR by providing the rationale for businesses to be involved in DRR efforts and resilience building in communities. Chapter 4 outlines a comprehensive discussion of the research methods and methodology that was applied in the research process. The empirical research chapter (Chapter 5) sought to establish the nature of private company engagement in the community as well as the nature of community resilience in the community of Diepsloot. These findings are thematically presented and analysed in Chapter 5. In Chapter 6, the aim is to conclude the study with recommendations made from the study with specific attention on how private companies and community collaboration can be capitalised and directed towards building
resilience in communities. In order to achieve this, the confirmation of the accomplishment of the objectives of the study is made.

The chapter outlines the research objectives highlighted in Chapter 1 with the aim of providing an overview of how each objective has been achieved. The chapter further presents the recommendations, based on the findings from the study that can be utilised by private companies to enhance their community engagement initiatives towards building community resilience to disasters in Diepsloot by collaborating with the community.

6.2 OVERVIEW OF THE CHAPTERS

The chapters in this study are categorised and contextually arranged to show a linkage between the chapters to address the full ambit of the study. In Chapter 1, the background of the study is provided. Chapter 1 further provides an overview of the problem of private companies’ minimal contribution to building community resilience through collaboration with the community. Therefore, the chapter recognises the need for and aims to justify private company and community collaboration to build resilience in communities. The study is categorised into 6 study objectives drawn from six research questions in order to address this problem and achieve the overall goal of the study. Chapter 1 further provides the central theoretical statements on which the study is founded. A synopsis of the research methodology used to address each research objective is provided in Chapter 1 including the ethical considerations of the study. Chapter 1 is concluded with a layout of the chapters of the study.

In order to fully understand community resilience building, it was necessary to provide the theoretical explanations underpinning this concept. Chapter 2 provides a discussion on disaster risk reduction and resilience in order to facilitate the understanding of community resilience. The chapter identified the negative impact of disaster occurrences on the progress made towards achieving sustainable development in countries and its communities. To address this challenge, it is proposed that communities and businesses adopt a disaster risk reduction approach by building resilience towards disasters. The chapter discusses in detail, the importance of communities having resilience for the purposes of preparing for and responding to disaster occurrences. The concept of resilience encompasses the elements that give a system, community or society the ability to adapt and cope during adverse events, either by means of resistance or transition, in order to reach or maintain an adequate level of functioning and structure (UNISDR, 2004:16; Rutter, 2012:34). On the other hand, the concept of community resilience denotes the collective nature of the term by highlighting the collectiveness of coping capacities within communities. The chapter further identifies four critical considerations in thinking and implementing the resilience approach in the community, that is, 1) community
resilience should not encourage governments to retreat from taking responsibility for risks and ensuring the resilience of the community; 2) resilience projects in communities should be relevant to addressing not only the community as whole, but also consider resilience at the household level; 3) resilience approach discourages the application of ideal outcomes of community resilience but rather encourages the considerations of the diversity of communities and that various communities may display diverse outcomes in relation to showing or having resilience; and 4) the inability of the term resilience to address issues of power, human agency and inequity proposing that resilience building strategies in communities should consider and address these issues in order to ensure the successful implementation of resilience-based community projects. In addition to this, the chapter identifies and discusses four capacities that enable the resilience of communities to be built. These include: economic resources, information and communication, social capital and community competence. Largely noted in this chapter was that community resilience requires a collaborative effort between the community and the private companies in order to build the capacities of communities to successfully build resilience. This necessitated a discussion on collaboration in Chapter 3.

In Chapter 3, the theoretical perspective of collaboration is provided. The concept is discussed as being made up of five dimensions, that is, governance, administration, organisational autonomy, mutuality and norms. Based on the literature, each component integrates activities relating to the collaborative process and further enables the effectiveness and efficiency of the collaborative effort. The chapter further provides the determining factors that enable successful collaborations. These include 1) the recognition and acceptance of the need for partnership; 2) developing clarity and realism of purpose; 3) ensuring commitment and ownership; 4) developing and maintaining trust; 5) creating clear and robust partnership arrangements; and 6) monitoring, measuring and learning. Furthermore, the chapter discussed the strategies for collaboration and these are: networking, cooperating, coordination and collaboration. The chapter identified that each relationship of joint working begins as a network; then moves to cooperation, and then moves to coordination until it reaches collaboration depending on the degree of involvement each member acting jointly agrees to take. The final section of the chapter explored the correlation between private company and community collaboration in building community resilience, particularly on the role that the private sector can play in building resilience in the community. The chapter supported the argument that collaboration between private companies and the community is an effective mechanism through which multiple and complex societal problems particularly in the context of DRR and building community resilience towards disasters can be addressed.

Chapter 4 outlines a detailed research methods and methodology applied in the research process. The chapter is divided into three sections namely; research methodology; literature
review and empirical study and these sections are discussed comprehensively. The chapter included the empirical study section which provides an in-depth discussion of the research approach and design that was applied to the research study. The research study was based on a qualitative research approach and the motivation for using the qualitative research approach is discussed. In addition, the chapter includes an in-depth discussion on the data collection methods used in the research study. The data collection tools that were applied in the research study are also discussed and these included focus group interviews and semi-structured individual interviews. The focus group interviews were held with respondents from Diepsloot community and the semi-structured individual interviews were held with representatives from the private companies. Furthermore, the chapter included a discussion of the method of analysis applied to the study and this included thematic data analysis with inclusion of verbatim accounts from the research respondents. The chapter further includes a discussion of the issues relating to validity and reliability of the research results.

In Chapter 5, the presentation of the findings and analysis of the findings is provided. The chapter firstly included a discussion of the research context in which the research study was conducted. This discussion was followed by a discussion of the research participants and is succeeded by the presentation and discussion of the findings from the interviews. Data from the respondents in the study was collected in the means of focus group interviews with respondents from Diepsloot and semi-structured individual interviews with representatives from the private companies as outlined in Chapter 4. The findings gave rise to three major themes and 7 sub-themes, namely:

- Nature of private company engagement in Diepsloot;
- Building effective private companies and communities collaborative partnerships;
- The need for partnership between private companies and the community;
- Community consultation for effective collaborative partnerships;
- The importance of organised community structures for collaboration;
- Building the capacity of communities to respond to adverse events;
- Availability of resources;
- Community competence in addressing adverse events;
- The importance of creating awareness on disaster risk and addressing communities’ vulnerabilities; and
- Enhancing collective action through social capital.

The presentation and analysis of the findings was followed by the discussion of the summative discussion of findings of the study provided in section 5.5. The chapter revealed to a large
extent that there is a presence of community engagement projects in Diepsloot by private companies; however, the findings show that there is a need for private companies to evaluate their current collaborative efforts with the community in order to effectively address the community’s needs and build community resilience in Diepsloot.

In considering the empirical findings in Chapter 5 and the theoretical groundings of community resilience and collaboration outlined in Chapter 2 and 3, Chapter 6 provides the conclusions and recommendations made in the study highlighting how private company engagement in Diepsloot can be enhanced in order to build community resilience in Diepsloot through collaborating with the community.

6.3 ACHIEVEMENT OF OVERALL GOAL AND INDIVIDUAL OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The focus of this study is to explore ways in which private sector-community collaboration can be capitalised and directed towards building resilience in communities. The goal is to explore private company and community collaboration towards building resilience in the community. The achievement of this goal was based on realising the objectives as outlined in Chapter 1, that is, to determine the theoretical perspectives of resilience (Chapter 2); to determine the theoretical perspectives of collaboration and to explore the correlation between private company-community collaboration and resilience (Chapter 3); to establish what community engagement programmes private companies have undertaken in Diepsloot and if communities are engaged in these programmes (Chapter 4 and Chapter 5); and to provide recommendations regarding private company and community collaboration in building community resilience to physical hazards in Diepsloot (Chapter 6). The section below outlines how each objective was addressed in order to satisfy the overall goal of the study.

6.3.1 Objective 1: To provide the theoretical framework of community resilience

Objective one of the research study was addressed in Chapter 2 of the research study. As the purpose of the study was on building community resilience through private company and community collaboration, it was necessary to provide the theoretical understanding of resilience and how it can be built, particularly from a community level and in the context of disaster risk reduction.

Before a thorough discussion of resilience and community resilience was presented, it was necessary for the chapter to first build an understanding of disaster risk reduction. This was addressed in section 2.2 where the concepts of hazard, vulnerability and disaster risk were defined and this was followed by a discussion of disaster risk reduction. The chapter noted the linkage between disaster risk reduction and resilience and revealed that resilience based
disaster risk reduction programmes have the potential to strengthen the preparation and coping mechanisms of communities before, during and after disaster occurrences. The concept of resilience was defined and discussed in section 2.2 and 2.3 respectively, as a complex, multi-contextual and a multi-disciplinary concept. Because the study is set in the context of community resilience building, it was thus essential that the concept of community resilience is discussed. Section 2.4 provides a discussion of community resilience by referring to the collective capacities within communities that enables it to prepare for, respond to, cope with and recover from disaster occurrences. These capacities are discussed in section 2.5.

Further to this, the chapter also revealed that even though working towards community resilience is imperative for reducing disaster risk and enhancing DRR thereby accelerating sustainable development, it is also important to take caution in defining and applying the concept of resilience in relation to communities. The chapter made note of certain aspects and inconsistencies associated with the concept of community resilience by highlighting and challenging the various factors that need to be addressed in order to increase the efficacy of the concept and practice of community resilience. Despite these challenges, this concept of resilience and community resilience have been advocated and supported by several authors and international development agencies. Chapter two argued that the application of resilience thinking to enhance disaster risk reduction activities in communities enhances their ability to prepare for disasters; increases community’s self-sufficiency to respond to the occurrence of disasters and assists the community system to rehabilitate from the disaster. The discussion of community resilience brought to the realisation that community resilience requires a collaborative effort between private companies and the community in order to build the capacities of communities and enhance community resilience. This discussion on community resilience and collaborative working enabled the discussion on the theoretical perspectives of collaboration (in Chapter 3) and links the two chapters.

6.3.2 Objective 2: To provide the conceptual framework of collaboration and to explore the correlation between private company-community collaboration and resilience

The focus of Chapter 3 was on presenting the theoretical perspectives of collaboration and exploring the correlation between private company-community collaboration to build community resilience. In doing so that chapter addressed the second and third objectives of the study.

In order to successfully achieve objective 2 of the study, the concept of collaboration conceptualised and defined in Chapter 3 of the study. Chapter 3 further identified and discussed the factors required for successful collaboration. These factors were discussed as namely, the recognition and acceptance of the need for partnership; developing clarity and
realism of purpose; ensuring commitment and ownership; developing and maintaining trust; creating clear and robust partnership arrangements; and monitoring, measuring and learning. Chapter 3 further indicates that these factors are imperative determinants for successful collaborations. In addition, the concept of collaboration was further discussed as a strategy that develops from networking, cooperation, coordination and ultimately collaboration, depending on the level and extent of engagement between the partners.

In addition, objective 2 further sought to explore the role of private company-community collaboration in building disaster resilient communities. This discussion is addressed in section 3.5. Chapter 3 revealed, to large extent, the pivotal role that the private sector can play in DRR and building resilience in communities thus encouraging the involvement of private companies in DRR and building community resilience. Furthermore, the chapter identified the private sector as having the financial resources, the expertise as well as the capacity to assist communities to tackle DRR issues and build their resilience. To a large extent, objective 2 revealed that collaboration is an effective mechanism that can be used to address complex societal problems particularly in the context of DRR and building community resilience towards disasters.

6.3.3 Objective 3: To establish what community engagement programmes private companies have undertaken in Diepsloot and if the community is engaged in these programmes

Objective 3 incorporates Chapters 4 and 5 of the study. The main aim of this objective was to establish the community engagement projects conducted by private companies in Diepsloot and to determine if the community had knowledge of and were engaged in these projects.

In order to achieve this objective, it was necessary to discuss the methods and methodology through which the entire goal of the study would be achieved. Chapter 4 provided the literature review in order to facilitate an understanding of the research topic. This was achieved through the consultation of various sources, that is, books, reports, journal articles and documents written about the theoretical perspectives of resilience, community resilience and collaboration. The literature review further sought to explore the relationship between the concepts of resilience, community resilience, collaboration and disaster risk reduction. The literature that was reviewed aimed to further provide the researcher with related themes through which the interview questions were formulated. Furthermore, the researcher used literature review to obtain information regarding the applicable research methods and methodology applicable to the research project. The empirical study section provided in detail, the research approach and design applied to the study. As a result of the research study seeking to gain an in depth understanding of the significances respondents place on their experiences, it was required that
the study be based on the phenomenological approach and a qualitative paradigm in order to achieve the objectives of the study. A case study research design was applied and qualitative data methods were used. The data from the private companies was collected through semi-structured individual interviews. The interviews were conducted with five (05) representatives of the respective private companies operating in close proximity to the Diepsloot community. These respondents were purposefully selected and were best suited to answer questions based on their engagement with the community and the types of projects implemented in the community. The data from the respondents in Diepsloot was collected using focus group interviews. The respondents were purposefully recruited for the focus group discussions using a snowball sampling method. A total of five focus groups interviews consisting of 10 members per group participated in the study. As a result, a total of 50 community members participated in the study. The questions asked focused on their individual and shared perceived knowledge and understanding of the involvement of private companies’ engagement in their community. The data was presented and analysed through the application of thematic data analysis. The findings were presented and analysed in Chapter 5.

Chapter five of the research study focused on the presentation of data collected from the semi-structured individual interviews private company representatives and focus group interviews with the community through. The findings were presented and thematically analysed to address objective three of the study. The empirical findings in this chapter revealed that private companies have engaged with the community through their corporate social responsibility projects. Data further revealed that even though the projects are not strategically formed to address DRR, they however contribute to addressing vulnerabilities associated with disaster risks. From the focus group discussions, it was revealed that there is minimal awareness and knowledge of private company engagement in the community and thus minimal involvement of the community members in these projects. The findings from the study illuminate the evident need for private companies to evaluate their current collaborative efforts with the community in order to effectively address the community’s needs and build community resilience in Diepsloot. In response to this finding, the recommendations were drawn and are addressed in objective 4 of the study.

6.3.4 Objective 4: To provide recommendations regarding private company and community collaboration in building community resilience to physical hazards in Diepsloot

Objective 4 was addressed in Chapter 6 of the study. The aim of Chapter six was to present the conclusions and recommendations made from the research study based on the findings in Chapter 5 of the study.
In Chapter 6, the overview of the chapters of the study is outlined. The chapter further provides an outline of the goal of the study as well as the objectives of the study and discusses how each objective was addressed with the aim of achieving the overall goal of the study. Chapter 6 further presented the recommendations based on the findings from the study that can be utilised by private companies to enhance their community engagement initiatives towards building community resilience in Diepsloot. In addition, the chapter outlines the limitations of the study and the considerations for future research.

6.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The focus of the research study is to explore ways in which private company and community collaboration can be capitalised and directed towards building resilience in communities. Community resilience is considered to make a valuable contribution to the general security of a community through the improvement of risk reduction and disaster mitigation efforts (Dombrowsky, 2010:3).

The HFA and subsequently the Sendai Framework For Action encourages that local governments actively participate in building community resilience standards that focus on implementation, city to city learning and cooperation, local action planning and monitoring of progress in cities, including the strengthening of local capacities. These frameworks further encourage that private companies make similar contributions by actively taking part in disaster reduction activities in countries. Additionally, it is indicated in both frameworks that, the private sector’s contribution to disaster risk reduction and resilience building in communities is imperative in supporting the development of innovative urban risk reduction solutions (UNISDR, 2010; UNISDR, 2015). As such, the research study aims to contribute to disaster resilience research by looking at ways in which private companies, through the collaboration with communities, can build community resilience.

6.5 RECOMMENDATIONS

It has been argued throughout Chapters 1 to 5 that there is an imperative need for private companies to engage in disaster risk reduction and community resilience building. Chapter 1 identified the gap in literature in addressing private company engagement in DRR and community resilience building and in chapter 2; it is argued that community resilience entails enhancing the capacities of communities in order to build community resilience. This argument is carried over to Chapter 3, where it is argued that the collaboration between private companies and the community has the potential to enhance the capacities of communities to prepare for, respond to and cope with disaster occurrences, thus enhancing building community resilience towards disaster occurrences. The findings presented in Chapter 5 revealed that
there is a need to enhance the capacities of the community to cope with adverse events and further revealed the unifying views from the private companies and the community to work together in order to build community resilience in Diepsloot. Presented below, is a list of recommendations drawn from the empirical findings from the study and the relevant literature.

**Recommendation 1: Use existing CSR projects to implement disaster risk reduction activities**

Literature consulted (see Chapter 1 and 2) and subsequently the empirical findings in Chapter 5, identified that private companies’ engagement in the community is present and these projects addresses the vulnerabilities associated with the socio-economic challenges in the community. The findings further gathered that private companies, by engaging with the community, represent the social capital present within the relationship. Despite the findings from the private companies indicating that private companies do not consciously prioritise their projects towards DRR, they however, serve as the mechanism through which the community's resources can be generated and directed towards resilience building.

Against the backdrop of these findings and the different kinds of hazards and vulnerabilities present in Diepsloot, it is thus recommended that private companies introduce DRR related activities in their CSR projects. In order for private companies to fully address this recommendation, it is imperative that the private companies understand disaster reduction, resilience and community resilience concepts in order to establish ways in which their CSR activities can be linked to the broader objectives of the business as well as the broader objective of the community resilience focus.

**Recommendation 2: Creating awareness on disaster risk and addressing community vulnerabilities**

Having knowledge of disaster risks is important to contributing to disaster risk reduction. For instance, Longstaff (2005:55) the knowledge about disaster risks in the community and the sharing of this knowledge to educate communities about disaster risks is imperative in contributing to the resilience of communities. The findings revealed from the focus group discussions and the private company interviews, the gap in the understanding of what DRR entails.

As such, it is recommended that private company’s community engagement efforts should aim at resilience building thorough information and communication on issues of disaster risk reduction knowledge and awareness. Private companies need to educate themselves about disaster risks and how they impact on their businesses. It can be suggested that private
companies form networks with local disaster risk centres. In this way, companies can gain knowledge and understanding on issues of disaster risks and how they impact on their businesses as well as the community and thus enabling them to implement strategies that are focused on disaster risk reduction. Increasing the knowledge of disaster risk reduction will enable the private company engagement to translate this knowledge towards educating the community about disaster risks and the impact on its well-being.

**Recommendation 3: Community consultation prior to collaboration**

The findings from the focus group discussions revealed that the community has minimal awareness of and involvement in the projects implemented by private companies. For the focus group respondents, they expressed that they are often not consulted by private companies about their needs and therefore are of the view that these projects are ineffective.

In order to address this, it is recommended that private companies engage the social networks, such as the CPFs in a consultative process prior to them implementing the projects in the community.

**Recommendation 4: Building effective private company and community collaborative partnerships**

The empirical findings revealed that increasing the community’s resources and information and communication capacities are required in order to enhance the community’s resilience. Literature (see Chapter 3) indicated that the role of private companies in DRR efforts was important. Further to this and important to the objective of this research study was that, data from private company interviews and focus group discussions indicated that there is a collaborative capacity and willingness as both parties recognise the need to collaborate towards building community resilience.

The findings further revealed that private companies prefer to collaborate with the CBOs as well as the schools in order to efficiently manage the collaborative relationship. The finding revealed at the time that the collaborative relationship with CBOs and schools was ineffective with regard to their abilities to reach the larger context of the community. In order to ensure that these collaborative efforts and interventions reach other sectors of the community, it is recommended that the private companies including the CBOs they work with, to extend their community engagement projects by including the CPFs from the community. The CPFs were identified in data from the focus group discussions as serving an important mechanism through which DRR related activities can be discussed thus enhancing the competence of the community to plan for and respond to disasters. In so doing, the chances of the community being reached and
impacted by private sector engagement in its entirety will be enhanced. CPFs serve an important role for the community and therefore when CBOs form relationships with the CPFs, the chances of community intervention efforts reaching the majority of the residents in Diepsloot is increased.

6.6 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Due to the limited time and scope of the research study, the focus was on a smaller segment of the community of Diepsloot. The focus was also on one classification of hazards, which were physical hazards. It would be ideal if a study is conducted focusing on the entire Diepsloot risk areas and all hazards were studied in accordance to their occurrence in the area.

Furthermore, the research focused on a small selection of private companies that have engaged with the Diepsloot community. As such, the presence of private sector engagement in the Diepsloot community was not depictive of the larger population of private sectors that have engaged in the community of Diepsloot.

To address some of these limitations, recommendations for future research are provided in the following section.

6.7 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The recommendations for future research are as follows:

Future research prospects could include a quantitative or a mixed methods study focusing on the following:

- The impact of disaster occurrences in Diepsloot on businesses operating in and around Diepsloot;
- Assessment of private sector engagement in DRR related activities in Diepsloot;
- With the aim of creating a collaboration model between private sector and community with regard to community resilience.
- Development of a framework/models for community-public-private partnerships to build community resilience

6.8 CONCLUSIONS

The focus of this study was to explore private companies and community collaboration, with the aim of establishing ways in which this collaboration could be directed towards building resilience in the community of Diepsloot. The study applied both a review of literature and empirical
research. Through the study of literature and the contributions from the respondents in the study, the study highlighted the need for private company engagement in disaster risk reduction and resilience building in communities. The study recognised, through theory and empirical research, the motivation for private companies collaborating with the community in order to build community resilience.

Further to this, through the findings, the study could make recommendations on how the collaboration could be directed towards community resilience building. Firstly, private companies can undertake DRR related activities in their CSR projects by understanding disaster reduction, resilience and community resilience concepts in order to establish ways in which their CSR activities can be linked to the broader objectives of the business as well as the broader objectives of the community resilience focus. Secondly, knowledge and awareness on disaster risk reduction will enable private company engagement to translate this knowledge towards educating the community about disaster risks and the impact on its well-being. Thirdly, private companies should include a consultative process with CPFs. Lastly, it is proposed that the CBOs extend their community engagement projects by including the CPFs from the community in order to ensure that these collaborative efforts and interventions reach other sectors of the community and in so doing, the chances of the community being reached and impacted by private sector engagement in its entirety will be enhanced.

The limitations discussed in the study identified the limited scope of the study and presented the prospects for the study to recommend additional areas for future research. The research study aimed to contribute to disaster resilience research by making recommendations on private companies and community collaboration in order to build community resilience. This goal was achieved and the study could make recommendations on private company and community collaboration for building community resilience.
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ANNEXURE A: INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH PROJECT

To whom it may concern:

INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH PROJECT

You are invited to participate in a research project being conducted by Modiegi Moore Bopape (student no.: 25461753), a registered student from the School of Social and Government Studies, North West University, Potchefstroom Campus. The research forms part of the partial fulfilment of the Master of Development and Management (Disaster Studies) degree.

The research project is entitled, Private Companies and Community Collaboration: Towards Building Community Resilience in Diepsloot.

The purpose of this research project is to explore ways in which private sector-community collaboration can be capitalised and directed towards building resilience in communities. The goal is to therefore explore private company and community collaboration towards building resilience in Diepsloot. Should you choose to participate, you will be requested to answer research questions centered on the research project.

There will be no costs incurred by your participation in the research project.

The expected duration of your participation in the research project will take approximately 30 minutes.
The possible benefits for your organization / company are as follows:

- The proposed research study aims to contribute to assisting companies in successfully integrating disaster-resilience building in their community engagement programmes.

Should you have any enquiries regarding the research project and your participation, you are welcome to contact myself or any of my supervisors. Contact details are provided below.

Ms. Modiegi Moore Bopape

071 865 6516

Modiegimoore.bopape@gmail.com

Supervisor:

Ms. Kristel Fourie,

Researcher: African Centre for Disaster Studies

Kristel.fourie@nwu.ac.za

North West University, Potchefstroom Campus

Co-Supervisor:

Dr. Livhuwani Nemakonde,

Lecturer: African Centre for Disaster Studies

Livhuwani.nemakonde@acds.co.za

North West University, Potchefstroom Campus

Thank you,

Your participation in this study is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Modiegi Moore Bopape
ANNEXURE B: FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONNAIRE

Focus Group interviews

The questionnaire for the focus groups will be divided into themes identified in chapter two - resilience chapter. The main aim in the FGI's will be to obtain a general sense of the capacities within the community of Diepsloot. The main themes are divided into the following: Community Competence, Information and Communication, Social capital and Economic resources

1. Introductory Phase: Perceptions of risk and vulnerability
The introductory phase of the interviews will focus on identifying the perceived risks and vulnerabilities of the community in relation to natural hazards.

1.1. In the past five to ten years, what hazards and disasters have occurred in the community?
1.2. During these disaster occurrences, which population (men/women/children) was largely affected?
1.3. During these disaster occurrences, was your community accessible / could be accessed by external communities/ role players?
1.4. In what way did these disaster occurrences affect your community?

The phases to follow will focus on establishing perceived levels of capacity (community assets) amongst the community to respond to, recover from and cope with disaster occurrences.

2. Perceptions of Community Competence
2.1. In what way does the community feel is ready to respond to hazards?
2.2. Does the community have an emergency plan in place?
2.3. In what way does the community meet to engage in planning for disaster occurrences?
2.4. In what way do families / individual households involved in planning for disaster response and recovery?
2.5. Following a disaster occurrence, in what way does the community meet again to assess the plans for response?

3. Information and communication capacity
3.1. In what way is the community educated about disaster risks?
3.2. In what way does the community feel they have access to tools they can use during disaster occurrences in order to gather and share information?
4. **Perceived levels of Social Capital within the community**
   4.1. To what extent are social groups evident in the community and the level of engagement between members (social clubs, societies, churches, CBO’s)
   4.2. To what extent are community members connected across community groups during disaster occurrences?
   4.3. What is the general relationship between your community and the external community? (D/sloot vs. affluent neighbouring suburbs)

5. **Perceptions of private company engagement in DRR efforts within the community**
   (Economic resources)
   5.1. Knowledge and awareness of the different private companies lie close to the community
   5.2. Do you know of any company that has been involved in the community (in relation to community development)?
   5.3. In what way were any of the private companies engaged in disaster management/DRR efforts in the community?
   5.4. If companies are engaged in community projects, do you feel that the projects are effective for disaster reduction?
   5.5. (If companies are not engaged) Do you think private companies have the capacity to assist the community to mitigate/ respond / recover from disaster occurrences?
ANNEXURE C: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ONE ON ONE SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

ONE ON ONE INTERVIEW: SEMI-STRUCTURED QUESTIONNAIRE

1.1. Demographic profile:

Participant No.:

Name of Company:

1.2. Perceived knowledge and understanding of resilience / collaboration / DRR

Do you have knowledge about disaster risk reduction?

In your own understanding, what do you understand about collaboration?

In your understanding, what do you understand about resilience / community resilience?

1.3. Company engagement / collaboration in Diepsloot

Has your company implemented community based projects in Diepsloot?

What was the focus of this project (or projects)?

What was the motivation behind the engagement with the community?

Out of the projects mentioned which project stood out for you / made the most impact in the community?

In what way does the company still keep in contact with the community of Diepsloot?

1.4. Determining factors for community engagement / collaboration

What factors does/did your company consider before collaborating with the community?

1.5. Company engagement in DRR focused projects in Diepsloot

In what way has your company implemented any disaster risk reduction / resilience focused projects in Diepsloot?

If yes, briefly describe the project.

What was the impact of the project?
1.6. If the company has not engaged in any project-

If provided the opportunity to contribute to disaster risk reduction projects in Diepsloot, would your company consider it?