

Technical Report
Community Level Social Dynamics Survey
Design and Data Collection

Freedom House MXV Programme

1 November 2017

Citation: Social Surveys Africa and Freedom House.2017. *Community-level Social Dynamics Survey (CLSD): Data Collection Report*. South Africa, Johannesburg.



2 Upper Park Drive, Forest Town, 2193

Tel: 011-486-1025, 0832516058

www.socialsurveys.co.za

Email: tara@socialsurveys.co.za

saira@socialsurveys.co.za

Introduction

Freedom House South Africa commissioned Social Surveys Africa to implement the Community Level Social Dynamics Survey. The survey was designed to support the intervention “Combatting Drivers of Xenophobic Violence programme,” implemented by Freedom House South Africa and partners in 16 communities across South Africa. The survey in ten communities aimed to improve understanding of the factors contributing to social cohesion. It was part of a larger research programme which included in-depth qualitative case studies of all 16 communities.

Social Surveys Africa (SSA) fulfilled the following roles in the research process: instrument design, inputs to site sampling, design of in-site sampling process, field workers recruitment and training, planning and conducting fieldwork, and cleaning and analysing collected data. Staff from SSA and other partners were responsible for overseeing day-to-day technical operations, including recruitment and training of field and supervision of office and field operations. Freedom House assisted in reviewing the protocol and survey instruments to ensure that the information collected is relevant to the social cohesion programmes. Freedom House implementing partners provided technical assistance, mainly through assisting fieldworkers in accessing the sites for fieldwork.

Sample Design

The sample sites for the Freedom House *Social Cohesion Survey 2016-2017* were drawn from the *Combatting Drivers of Xenophobic Violence* programme that had been running since March 2016.

The programme was conducted in 16 sites in 6 provinces (Eastern Cape, Gauteng, Kwa-Zulu Natal, Limpopo, North West and Western Cape) in South Africa, and is guided by Freedom House’s working model of what is likely to lead to an ‘at-risk’ community.

The initial survey design was to conduct the same survey instrument as a baseline and endline 12 months apart in the same 5 sites in order to:

- a) Inform the intervention to be conducted by the local MXV implementing partner peace building teams, and
- b) Evaluate whether the intervention had had an effect.

The sites were selected purposively by FH in consultation with SSA. The sites were chosen to encapsulate the various contexts in terms of settings, that is, types of settlements (rural, peri-urban and urban) and geographical spread across provinces.

For all your training needs, contact:
training@socialsurveys.co.za



After the completion of the first phase in mid-2016 the design was changed so that the second phase would be implemented in five new sites rather than returning to the same sites. This was because:

- a) The timing of the intervention and the study: the intervention had already been active for a longer period, so the survey field work could not be taken as a baseline
- b) The timeframe of measuring impact would have to be longer than 12 months
- c) Phase 1 field work took place just before local government elections, which is a very particular period in which to ask community residents about political participation and perceptions, so findings would not be comparable with other periods of time.

The total sample of sites was therefore 10 out of the 16 possible intervention sites.

Within each broad intervention site, specific wards or sections of wards were purposively sampled by FHSA, as shown in Table 1, based on the following criteria:

- Areas where the intervention was taking place
- Areas representing a diversity of settlement types within the site, e.g. informal and formal housing areas; areas with predominantly Black or 'Coloured' residents; commercial farming areas, township areas and formal 'town' areas.
- Excluding extremely dangerous or hard to access sites, such as the Glebeland Hostel in Durban South.

Table 1: Site Selection

Province	Area	Wards
PHASE 1		
Gauteng	Diepsloot	Ward 95 Ward 113 (Diepsloot West 1 & 3)
KwaZulu-Natal	Durban South	Southern site Northern site
Eastern Cape	Grahamstown	Ward 2 Ward 5 Ward 7 Ward 10
Western Cape	Khayelitsha	Ward 18: Ikwezi park Ward 87
North West	Marikana & Nkaneng	Ward 26: Marikana North, West, East (wonderkop- Madibeng) Ward 33: Nkaneng- Rustenburg
PHASE 2		
Western Cape	De Doorns	Breede Valley

For all your training needs, contact:
training@socialsurveys.co.za



		Ward 2 Ward 3 Ward 4
Limpopo	Elim	Makhado/ Makhangele/ Waterval B Ward 1 Ward 2 Ward 5 Ward 15 Ward 16
Gauteng	Makuase	Ward 36: Primrose Ward 93: The westernmost corner of Ekshuhuleni
Gauteng	Mamelodi East	Ward 40: City of Tshwane Ward 15: eastern part
Eastern Cape	Motherwell	Ward 57: Nelson Mandela Bay (western part)

Once the sites and sub-sites had been selected, the sampling protocol for the selection of stands (residential plots), households and individuals is reflected in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Sampling principles by Level

Level	Sampling Method	#
Sites	Purposive: places where the intervention was happening & diversity of contexts (rural, urban)	10
Stands	Random interval from daily starting points chosen on map for maximum spread with site	
Households	Quota by housing type	4052
Individuals	Quota by age and gender	
Additional Shops	Purposive (149 shops- 4%)	

Teams were given a strict sample size for gender, age and nationality balance. In each area, thirty small businesses that were owned by foreign nationals were sampled to ensure a good spread of foreign nationals in our sample, and to understand the specific issues faced by shop keepers.

Instrument Design

The Community Level Social Dynamics survey instrument was developed by Social Surveys Africa with inputs from Freedom House Southern Africa, the Africa Centre for Migration Studies (ACMS), and the Safety and Violence Initiative (SaVI) of the University of Cape Town.

In the drafting process, Social Surveys Africa drew on several existing modules of questions developed over its 30 year history. These include:

- Standard demographics questions
- Mobility module questions
- Individual value system scenarios questions
- Volunteering and giving questions (Ubuntu)
- Local governance participation questions

The survey instrument also incorporated questions from past ACMS surveys on xenophobia.

The survey design was theoretically informed by the insight that the propensity for xenophobic action, both by individuals and in communities, must be understood at several levels (individual, inter-group and community) as well as through the interaction between levels (individual characteristics in relation to community characteristics). At each level, various dimensions were measured, as shown in Table 4.

Table 3: Instrument Dimensions

Level	Dimensions
Individual	attitudes toward self: self-confidence / depression individual self-concept: apathy / hope for the future individualism/collective responsibility personal values authoritarianism and response to leadership attitudes to violence in general Individual/household socio-economic status Connectivity & access to information
Individual in Community	belonging and identity

For all your training needs, contact:
training@socialsurveys.co.za



	trust in institutions/people institutional participation Giving and volunteering behaviour attitudes to different approaches to conflict resolution experience of violence/ intervention impact check relative deprivation expectations and frustration
Group to Group	in-out group formation in-out group contact horizontal trust
Community in Aggregate	collective socio-economic status infrastructure availability Income inequality Language diversity collective levels of trust / giving / interaction / participation

Data Collection Process

Personnel: Roles and Responsibilities

Several categories of personnel were recruited from the SSA fieldworker database, and trained to undertake the 2016-2017 social cohesion survey. All fieldworkers chosen for the study have worked with SSA for many years, and only those with high quality experience in administering surveys were chosen. For each phase, these personnel included 5 supervisors, 25 field interviewers, and 5 drivers who were also field interviewers, all overseen by SSA's field manager. Field workers were divided into 5 teams according to sites and languages spoken in the areas where they conducted the interviews. Each team had one supervisor, a driver, and a vehicle.

Data collection by field workers was overseen by the field manager who had also served as a field worker trainer. The supervisor assisted with logistics, and guided and monitored fieldworkers. The field manager was responsible for observing and monitoring data collection quality, ensuring uniformity in data collection procedures and fidelity to the survey protocol, providing moral support to the field teams, and replenishing field team supplies. The field manager communicated with the teams via phone with teams throughout the fieldwork.

For all your training needs, contact:
training@socialsurveys.co.za



Table 4: Field work timelines

	Field Worker Training	Instrument Pilot	Field Work	Number of Field workers
Phase 1: 2016	6 - 11 July 2016	9- 10 July 11 July- Feedback	13 - 28 July 2016	24
Phase 2: 2017	11 - 13 January 2017	N/A	17 January - 4 February 2017	25

Field Work Training

The objectives of the training were to harmonize concepts related to survey design and questionnaire content, to review effective field work techniques and strategies, to familiarize fieldworkers with training materials and equipment (tablets and digital survey platform), and to have a general refresher course on conducting surveys.

The training consisted of a detailed, question-by-question explanation of the questionnaires, accompanied by explanations from the interviewer’s manual, demonstration through role-plays, group discussions, and in-class practice. Guest speakers from Freedom House were invited to give a background on specific topics relevant to the social cohesion study. The training session included background information on the chosen sites. The two teams in the farming areas of Elim and De Doorns received additional training regarding the particularities of access and sampling procedures on farms.

Phase 1 of training for these personnel took place from July 6 to 11, 2016. Field teams travelled to their respective sites on the 12 July 2016. For phase 2, the fieldworker refresher training sessions were shorter (3 days) compared to the first phase (5 days). Field teams travelled to their respective sites on 15 January 2017.

Piloting the Instrument

SSA provided inputs to the final instrument with Freedom House, and programmed the instrument on kobotoolbox. The instrument was piloted after fieldwork training for phase 1 from 9-10 July 2016. The objectives of the piloting the instrument was (1) to train fieldworkers and supervisors to fulfil

For all your training needs, contact:
training@socialsurveys.co.za



their respective roles and to conduct high-quality interviews, (2) to test the phrasing of questionnaires in the field, and (3) to ensure that the skip patterns for the digital platform works accurately. After the pilot, fieldworkers were debriefed on 11 July 2016 where issues emanating from the pilot were discussed.

For phase 2, no changes were made to the instrument used in Phase 1 apart from updating the site and field worker names. Most of the field workers had participated in Phase 1 and therefore were already experienced with the instrument, sampling procedures and field work procedures. Therefore no instrument or field pilot was required.

Quality Control Procedures

Checking uploaded interviews: all completed and uploaded interviews were checked daily by our Field Manager for completeness and for the quality of open-ended question responses. Feedback was then given to team supervisors who passed the instructions on to the field workers.

Check back interviews: check back interviews based on the interview responses were conducted for 10% of each fieldworker's submitted work. An Afrikaans speaker was used to specifically back check interviews conducted in De Doorns to ensure that interviewers and respondents understood each other. All check-back calls confirmed that the respondents had indeed been interviewed and responses recorded by the field workers were correct.

Fieldwork-related Issues

Fieldworkers

For phase 1, 25 fieldworkers were recruited and trained. One trained fieldworker dropped out of the study prior to fieldwork. As such, the site in Kwa-Zulu Natal had 4 fieldworkers as opposed to 5 while all other sites had teams of 5.

6 fieldworkers dropped out of the field team between phase 1 and phase 2 for various reasons including pregnancy and finding other work opportunities. Thus, 7 new fieldworkers were trained for phase 2.

Weather barriers

Areas such as Marikana, Grahamstown, Kwa-Zulu Natal, Makause, and Elim were affected by heavy rains and bad weather conditions that affected travel in the area and made it difficult to reach

For all your training needs, contact:
training@socialsurveys.co.za



respondents. In addition, Elim had particularly poor road conditions, necessitating 4x4 vehicles for some of the field period.

Community Access and Site Entry

In both phases, SSA worked with Freedom House's provincial implementing partners who assisted the fieldworkers in getting in touch with the gatekeepers in each community and in some cases secured one local person who would "accompany" the team daily in the field. There were instances where the team had to use a different person each time they went to a different community section or sometimes travel by themselves when local partners were not available on a day, predominantly in Kwa Zulu Natal and the Western Cape. Fieldworkers in Makause and Marikana did not have a local contact person to assist or accompany them.

While fieldwork commenced on time in most areas, in Makause and Khayelitsha there was a delay in commencing fieldwork due to political issues between organisations, concern over intentions of the study and conflict between the leaders with some granting permission and others denying access to the areas. In Diepsloot, the community leader expressed concern as to why the area was chosen for the study and commented on the lack of notice to inform other ward committee members about the study and the fieldworkers' presence in the community. In De Doorns, fieldworkers faced the challenge of gaining access to farms and gaining access to a reasonable number of full-time farm workers. Fieldworkers were only granted the lunch time hour to conduct the interviews with the farm workers. Thus, field workers only conducted one interview each per day and interviewed seasonal workers in the evenings. Despite these challenges, all teams managed to complete fieldwork in the stipulated time and met the sample size target.

Interview Languages

The field teams were composed of field workers with the requisite language skills for each of the field sites.

Language barriers made it difficult to interview foreign nationals. Some foreign nationals could only speak the basic local language, resulting in interviews taking longer to complete (up to 2 hours) with foreign nationals. In De Doorns, the majority of the respondents were fluent in Afrikaans and spoke a fair amount of isiXhosa, but very little English, while the field workers mostly had intermediate or basic Afrikaans language skills and all spoke fluent isiXhosa. The team hired a local person to accompany them to translate into Afrikaans where isiXhosa was not sufficient. Team members with intermediate Afrikaans language skills also quickly learned common phrases of relevance to the study. The effect of the language issues was that some interviews took longer as the discussions were slower to ensure mutual understanding. With the assistance of the interpreter and the team's persistence, all interviews were completed on time. A specific quality control process was followed

For all your training needs, contact:
training@socialsurveys.co.za



for De Doors with a first-language Afrikaans speaker conducting call back interviews with a sample of respondents to ensure that questions and answers had been correctly understood. No misrepresentation of responses was found.

Safety and Security

Field teams were warned by locals regarding crime in the communities, that they should be careful with their tablets and should not be in the community after dark. To ensure safety, team members travelled in pairs while interviewing, remaining within shouting distance of each other by sampling households across the road from each other. All field workers exited the field unharmed and no property was lost.

Safety concerns experienced included taxi violence in Mamelodi East, and service delivery protest in Makause. The team in Mamelodi East avoided the immediate areas where the violence was occurring and continued with the interviews. In Makause, the team had to turn back home for the day. In Khayelitsha, data collection took place using pen and paper as it was dangerous to collect with tablets. The data from the paper questionnaires was then entered into the electronic data collection system by the fieldworkers in the evening. The implication was that GPS coordinates of respondent residences were not captured (see below). Fieldworkers in Marikana, Mamelodi East and Motherwell informed the local SAPS about their presence in the community while this was not necessary in other sites.

Geo-Location

GPS coordinates were electronically captured, and the spread of data collection points were assessed to ensure the following:

- That all interviews were conducted within the intended site boundaries
- That interviews were spread evenly across the entire selected sites and across sub-areas/wards within each site
- That there was no evidence of field worker fraud (e.g. clusters of interviews uploaded in one place, at convenience sites such as malls or taxi ranks or outside the sampled area.)

In some instances, the GPS coordinates were not an accurate reflection of interview sites as there was no reception in some areas, thus the geolocation point were only captured once the tablet was back in reception range. Furthermore, in Khayelitsha, data collection took place using pen and paper as it was deemed dangerous to collect with tablets. Therefore, there are no geolocation data points at this site. For ethical purposes, the geolocations have not been made public.