



**Power-sharing partnerships:
Teachers' experiences of participatory methodology**

by

Bathsheba Basathu Mbongwe

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree

PHILOSOPHIAE DOCTOR

Department of Educational Psychology
Faculty of Education
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA

PROMOTOR

Prof. Dr. Ronél Ferreira

CO-PROMOTOR

Prof. Dr. Liesel Ebersöhn

2012
PRETORIA

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Quite a number of people shared my dream of taking a doctoral journey and believing in me in acquiring a PhD. It was a journey of sacrifice, hard work, commitment and scholarship. Together, we shared and believed in my vision - that's the power of synergy in a partnership.

First of all, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to the participating teachers who brought this story to reality, for sharing their experiences. Through their eyes and standpoint I got to appreciate, recognise and value their world, knowledge and voices. They are a dedicated community of practice who displayed power for determination.

I am forever indebted and grateful to my supervisors, professors Ronél Ferreira and Liesel Ebersöhn who took me under their wing, by mentoring, supporting and believing in me. You encouraged and inspired me from the beginning to the end of this endeavour. Your timeless commitment, dedication and passion in producing yet another stellar doctoral product is humbling. You equipped me with research skills that will always be assets that I will treasure and contribute towards community capacity building as well.

A very special thank you to Mr. William Kemotho Sentshebeng, who was part and parcel of this endeavour from conceiving the idea to the final product. Your dedicated time to dialogue made me reflect on complex issues of power dynamics.

I want to thank Dr. Connie Kekwaletswe, Dr. Hermina Olivier and Dr. Tilda Loots, my friend and schoolmates who inspired me to endure to the end, as I strived to become an academic researcher. Your support and accommodation of my various needs is truly appreciated.

I want to express my love and appreciation to my parents, especially my dear mother Fiona Mbongwe, who believed in me and supported me throughout. This work of thesis is dedicated to my mother who never had the opportunity to put on a graduation cap at the highest academic level, but through me, she did. She sacrificed a lot for me. Your strength and faith gave me the courage to carry on to the end and keep soaring like an eagle. Mum I love you.

Thank you to my siblings: Southwood, Southwell, Braithwaite, Southill, and Anita, for showing interest and support in my work. May I be the role model to inspire good conduct and the spirit of perseverance in all of you. Thank you also for my sisters in law for your support and love.

To all my friends (you know who you are), I am thankful for your support and encouragement. Thank you for understanding that I could not always be available for social life, but for availing yourselves when I needed you.

Most importantly, I would not have made it without almighty God. I am grateful that I looked up to God for faith, strength and courage. Above all, I sought his almighty and Jesus the Christ to bless me with wisdom and surpassing intelligence and knowledge. Thank you God and Jesus the Christ.





DECLARATION OF AUTHORSHIP

I, Bathsheba Basathu Mbongwe, declare that –

Power-sharing partnerships: teachers' experiences of participatory methodology

is my own work and that all sources and citations from literature have been acknowledged in text and referenced in full.

Signature.....

Date.....



ABSTRACT & KEY CONCEPTS

I investigated the experiences of teachers as co-researchers in a long-term partnership with university researchers in an asset-based intervention project known as STAR¹. The goal of STAR is to investigate how teachers can promote resilience in scarce-resource and high need schools. To inform participatory research methodology, I explored and described how co-researchers (teachers) experience power relations. I conducted the participatory reflection and action (PRA) study by using feminist standpoint theory as guiding epistemological paradigm, Gaventa's power cube as theoretical framework and participatory research as methodological paradigm.

I conveniently chose two cohorts (schools) in the STAR project to partner as the unit of analysis. I thus applied convenience sampling to select information-rich cohorts. The school-cohorts included a primary school in the Eastern Cape Province and a secondary school in a remote area in the Mpumalanga Province. I then purposefully selected participating co-researchers (n=15: 14 females, 1 male) from the participating schools.

Over a two year period, I employed multiple PRA data generation techniques (observation, four focus groups and two semi-structured interviews) and documentation procedures (field notes, research journal, visual data and verbatim transcriptions). I used thematic analysis and categorical aggregation for data analysis, with three themes emerging.

In terms of **the nature of power in participatory partnerships**, co-researchers expressed factors which influenced power and partnership in a participatory project. For co-researchers, these factors enabled them to experience a sense of power-sharing. Regarding **the role of agency in relation to power and partnerships**, co-researchers indicated that agency resulted from power-sharing and partnerships they had established. The agency meant that they took action through leadership to empower others in school-communities. Co-researchers' **meaning-making of power and partnerships** culminated in their construction of power in a participatory project as both a way in which their working environment enabled them to do what they wanted to do, and also as a personal space where they felt capable and had initiative to coordinate project activities.

¹ STAR (Supportive Teachers, Assets and Resilience): Ferreira & Ebersöhn, 2012.

Findings of this study correlate with existing literature where (i) power is seen as the ability of actors to express and act on desires, (ii) power can be redistributed as action for inclusive benefits, (iii) partnerships imply balancing time, and (iv) partnerships evolve over time, are dynamic and involve issues of trust and confidence. In contrast to existing knowledge on power in participatory research, I found that teachers did not view power as dominance or as exclusively owned.

I developed a framework of **power sharing partnerships** to extend Gaventa's power cube theory. This framework, and its five interrelated elements (leadership as power, identifying vision and mission, synergy, interdependent role of partners, and determination), provide insight into the way co-researchers shared their experiences of participatory research methodology. I posit an evidence-based conceptualisation of power as leadership where community partners play influential roles as co-researchers. I theorise power sharing partnerships as a complimentary platform hosting partners' shared strengths, skills and experience, creating synergy in collaborative projects. I argue that synergy in power sharing partnerships relies on recognition, appreciation and mutual respect inherent in interdependent roles of partners. Furthermore, the power sharing partnership framework explains how power and partnership depends on determination amongst partners which manifests as agency to drive social change.

Key Concepts

- Change agents
- Collaborative research
- Community capacity building
- Co-researchers
- Feminist standpoint
- Participatory Reflection and Action/ Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA)
- Participatory research
- Partnership
- Power
- Power relations



	Page
CHAPTER 1	
INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY	
1.1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.2 CONTEXTUAL BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY	4
1.3 RATIONALE OF THE STUDY	6
1.4 PURPOSE AND POSSIBLE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE STUDY	8
1.5 RESEARCH QUESTIONS	9
1.6 KEY CONSTRUCTS	10
1.6.1 PARTNERS IN RESEARCH	10
1.6.2 POWER	11
1.6.3 TEACHERS	12
1.6.4 EXPERIENCE	12
1.6.5 COLLABORATION	13
1.6.6 PARTICIPATORY RESEARCH (PR) PROJECT	13
1.7 PARADIGMATIC ASSUMPTIONS	13
1.7.1 METATHEORETICAL PARADIGM: FEMINIST STANDPOINT THEORY	14
1.7.2 THEORETICAL PARADIGM: GAVENTA'S POWER CUBE	15
1.7.3 METHODOLOGICAL PARADIGM: PARTICIPATORY APPROACH	16
1.8 WORKING ASSUMPTIONS	17



	Page
1.9 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND STRATEGIES	18
1.9.1 RESEARCH DESIGN	18
1.9.2 SELECTION OF RESEARCH SITES AND PARTICIPANTS	19
1.9.3 DATA GENERATION AND DOCUMENTATION	19
1.9.4 DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	20
1.10 QUALITY CRITERIA OF THE STUDY	21
1.11 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS	23
1.12 OUTLINE OF CHAPTERS	24
1.13 CONCLUSION	25



CHAPTER 2

EXPLORING EXISTING LITERATURE AS BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

2.1	INTRODUCTION	26
2.2	POWER IN PARTICIPATORY RESEARCH (PR)	26
2.2.1	OVERVIEW AND MEANING OF POWER	26
2.2.2	OVERVIEW OF POWER THEORISTS	28
2.2.2.1	Mills (1916-1962)	29
2.2.2.2	Foucault (1926-1984)	29
2.2.2.3	Freire (1921-1997)	30
2.2.2.4	Bourdieu (1930-2002)	31
2.2.2.5	Lukes (1948–current)	31
2.2.3	POWER AND PARTICIPATORY METHODOLOGIES	32
2.2.4	POWER AND PARTICIPATION	35
2.2.4.1	Participation in PR	35
2.2.4.2	Participation and agents of change	40
2.3	EMPOWERMENT AND PR	42
2.3.1	A PHILOSOPHY OF EMPOWERMENT AS CENTRAL TO PR	42
2.3.2	EMPOWERMENT AND POWER	44
2.3.3	EMPOWERMENT AND PARTNERSHIP	45
2.4	PARTNERSHIPS IN PR	47
2.4.1	NATURE OF PARTNERSHIPS IN PR	50
2.4.2	FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO SUCCESSFUL PARTNERSHIPS	52
2.4.3	FUNCTIONS OF RESEARCH PARTNERSHIPS	53
2.4.3.1	Partnerships as knowledge generation, research education and training	54
2.4.3.2	Partnerships as knowledge sharing: communities of practice	55



	Page
2.4.4 BENEFITS AND CHALLENGES OF PARTNERSHIPS	58
2.4.5 COMMUNITY AND UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS	61
2.5 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: GAVENTA'S POWER CUBE	64
2.5.1 SPACES OF POWER IN THE POWER CUBE	65
2.5.2 FORMS AND DEGREES OF POWER IN THE POWER CUBE	68
2.5.3 LEVELS OF POWER IN THE POWER CUBE	69
2.5.4 THEORETICAL ASSUMPTIONS FLOWING FROM UNDERSTANDING THE POWER CUBE AND POWER RELATIONS IN PR	70
2.6 CONCLUSION	71



CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND STRATEGIES

3.1	INTRODUCTION	72
3.2	PARADIGMATIC APPROACH	73
3.2.1	META-THEORETICAL PARADIGM: FEMINIST STANDPOINT THEORY	73
3.2.2	METHODOLOGICAL PARADIGM: PARTICIPATORY RESEARCH	79
3.3	RESEARCH DESIGN	82
3.3.1	CONCEPTUALISING PRA	82
3.3.2	SELECTION OF RESEARCH SITES AND PARTICIPANTS	86
3.4	OVERVIEW OF THE RESEARCH PROCESS AND ACTIVITIES	87
3.5	DATA GENERATION AND DOCUMENTATION	89
3.5.1	VISUAL PRA-BASED DATA GENERATION AND DOCUMENTATION TECHNIQUES	90
3.5.2	FOCUS GROUPS	96
3.5.3	INTERVIEWS	100
3.5.4	OBSERVATION	101
3.5.5	FIELD NOTES (RESEARCH JOURNAL) AND AUDIO/VIDEO-RECORDINGS	103
3.6	DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	103
3.7	MY ROLE AS RESEARCHER	106
3.8	ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS	108
3.8.1	INFORMED CONSENT AND VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION	110
3.8.2	PROTECTION FROM HARM	111
3.8.3	CONFIDENTIALITY AND ANONYMITY	111
3.8.4	TRUST	112



	Page
3.9 QUALITY CRITERIA OF THE STUDY	112
3.9.1 CREDIBILITY	113
3.9.2 TRANSFERABILITY	114
3.9.3 DEPENDABILITY	114
3.9.4 CONFIRMABILITY	115
3.9.5 AUTHENTICITY	116
3.10 CONCLUSION	116



CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

4.1	INTRODUCTION	117
4.2	THEME 1: THE NATURE OF POWER IN PARTICIPATORY PARTNERSHIPS	118
4.2.1	SUBTHEME 1.1: CHARACTERISTICS OF POWER	120
4.2.1.1	Category A: Leadership	121
4.2.1.2	Category B: Decision-making	122
4.2.1.3	Category C: Empowerment	122
4.2.1.4	Category D: Achieving personal goals	123
4.2.1.5	Category E: Appropriating (owning) power	123
4.2.1.6	Category F: Trust	123
4.2.2	SUBTHEME 1.2: FACTORS IMPEDING POWER AND PARTNERSHIPS	124
4.2.2.1	Category A: Time constraints	124
4.2.2.2	Category B: Lack of commitment	125
4.2.2.3	Category C: Work overload	125
4.2.2.4	Category D: Limited self-confidence	125
4.2.2.5	Category E: Lack of role clarity	126
4.2.3	SUBTHEME 1.3: POWER DYNAMICS	127
4.2.3.1	Category A: Trust and confidence	127
4.2.3.2	Category B: Knowledge brings ability	128
4.3	THEME 2: PARTICIPANTS' UNDERSTANDING AND MEANING-MAKING OF POWER AND PARTNERSHIPS	129
4.3.1	SUBTHEME 2.1: FORGING EQUITABLE AND MUTUALLY BENEFICIAL PARTNERSHIPS	131
4.3.1.1	Category A: University researchers	132
4.3.1.2	Category B: Peers (fellow participants)	134
4.3.1.3	Category C: Wider community	135

	Page
4.3.2	SUBTHEME 2.2: ESTABLISHING AN ENABLING ENVIRONMENT..... 136
4.3.2.1	Category A: Local level enablement..... 137
4.3.2.2	Category B: National level enablement..... 138
4.4	THEME 3: THE ROLE OF AGENCY IN RELATION TO POWER AND PARTNERSHIP..... 140
4.4.1	SUBTHEME 3.1: AGENCY..... 142
4.4.1.1	Category A: Capacity to empower others..... 144
4.4.1.2	Category B: Capacity for leadership..... 146
4.4.1.3	Category C: Taking action ('lighting the fire')..... 147
4.4.2	SUBTHEME 2.2: TEACHERS AS AGENTS OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION..... 149
4.4.2.1	Category A: Transferring knowledge..... 150
4.4.2.2	Category B: Providing resources..... 155
4.4.2.3	Category C: Creating community networks..... 156
4.5	CONCLUSION..... 158



CHAPTER 5 RELATING RESEARCH FINDINGS TO EXISTING LITERATURE

5.1	INTRODUCTION	159
5.2	LITERATURE CONTROL: TOWARDS FINDINGS	159
5.2.1	RESULTS THAT CORRELATIONS WITH EXISTING LITERATURE ON POWER AND PARTNERSHIPS	159
5.2.1.1	Power as capability for leadership	166
5.2.1.2	Challenges of partnerships	169
5.2.1.3	Partnership relationships evolving over time	170
5.2.1.4	Mutual collaboration in partnerships	172
5.2.1.5	Visible spaces of participation	176
5.2.1.6	Community capacity building in partnerships	177
5.2.1.7	Community of practice in partnerships	179
5.2.2	RESULTS THAT CONTRADICT EXISTING KNOWLEDGE ON POWER AND PARTNERSHIPS	183
5.2.2.1	Power as dominance	186
5.2.2.2	Partnerships as platform for political negotiations	186
5.2.2.3	Hierarchy system based on creation of decision-making bodies	188
5.2.3	SILENCES IN THE DATA OF THIS STUDY	189
5.2.3.1	Psychological manipulation of power	190
5.2.3.2	Communities not homogenous	190
5.2.3.3	Governance in partnership structures	191
5.2.4	NEW INSIGHTS FLOWING FROM THIS STUDY FOR KNOWLEDGE ON POWER, PARTNERSHIPS AND PARTICIPATORY METHODOLOGY	192
5.3	CONCLUSION	197



CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1	INTRODUCTION	198
6.2	OVERVIEW OF THE PRECEDING CHAPTERS	198
6.3	CONCLUSIONS IN TERMS OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS	199
6.3.1	SECONDARY RESEARCH QUESTION 1	200
6.3.2	SECONDARY RESEARCH QUESTION 2	201
6.3.3	SECONDARY RESEARCH QUESTION 3	202
6.3.4	SECONDARY RESEARCH QUESTION 4	203
6.3.5	SECONDARY RESEARCH QUESTION 5	204
6.3.6	SECONDARY RESEARCH QUESTION 6	205
6.4	FINAL REFLECTIONS	206
6.4.1	PRIMARY QUESTION	207
6.4.2	REFLECTING ON LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	213
6.5	RECOMMENDATIONS	215
6.5.1	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	215
6.5.2	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRACTICE	216
6.5.3	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TRAINING	217
6.6	CONCLUSION	218



LIST OF REFERENCES	219
---------------------------------	-----

ADDENDA	254
----------------------	-----



LIST OF TABLES & FIGURES

	Page
Table 2.1: Dimensions of power and implications for empowerment	45
Table 3.1: Outline of methodological choices	72
Table 3.2: Summary of participants at each site	87
Table 3.3: Summary of research process	88
Table 4.1: Summary of themes, subthemes and categories	117
Table 4.2: Inclusion and exclusion indicators for Theme 1	119
Table 4.3: Inclusion and exclusion indicators for Theme 2	130
Table 4.4: Inclusion and exclusion indicators for Theme 3	141
TABLE 5.1: Results that support existing knowledge	160
TABLE 5.2: Comparing results to existing knowledge: contradictory evidence	183
Table 5.3: Comparing results to existing knowledge: silences in data	189
Table 5.4: Comparing results to existing knowledge: new insights	192
Figure 6.1: Power-sharing partnership framework	209



LIST OF PHOTOGRAPHS

	Page
Photograph 3.1: School 1: 1 March, 2009	86
Photograph 3.2: School 2: 19 May, 2010	86
Photograph 3.3: Teachers' drawing, depicting how they perceived their role as a cow with an udder that the community could drink from, school 1: 19 March. 2009	90
Photograph 3.4: Conceptualisation and meaning making of concepts, school 1: 18 March, 2010	91
Photograph 3.5: Photo poster to indicate power retrospectively: school 1: 18 March, 2010	92
Photograph 3.6: Photo poster to indicate power retrospectively: school 2: 15 November , 2010	92
Photographs 3.7: Using sunrays to indicate factors that enabled power and partnerships, school 2: 15 November, 2010	93
Photographs 3.8: Using clouds to indicate factors that impeded power and partnerships, school 1: 15 November, 2010	93
Photograph 3.9: Focus group discussion to augment PRA visual activities, school 1: 19 March, 2010	94
Photograph 3.10: Focus group, school 1: 19 March, 2010	97
Photograph 3.11: Focus group, school 2: 15 November, 2010	97
Photograph 4.1: Conceptualisation of the concept 'power', school 1: 18 March 2010	121
Photograph 4.2: Conceptualisation of the concept 'power', school 2: 15 November 2010	121

Photograph 4.3: An activity illustrating participants' ideas around limited role clarification as an impeding factor in PR, school 1: 19 March 2010	126
Photograph 4.4: Participants using drawings of clouds and sun rays to indicate movement/shift in power, school 1: 19 March 2010	127
Photograph 4.5: Participants using drawings of clouds and sun rays to indicate movement/shift in power, school 1: 15 November 2010	127
Photograph 4.6: Conceptualisation of the concept of partnership, school 1: 18 March 2010	132
Photograph 4.7: Conceptualisation of the concept of partnership, school 2: 15 November 2010	132
Photograph 4.8: Participants gave beaded products to university researchers to sell on their behalf, school 2: 15 November 2010	134
Photograph 4.9: Participants at a group seminar in Amanzingwe where they met fellow teachers, who participated in the project from different schools, viz. school 1 & 2: 3 March 2009	135
Photograph 4.10: Information Centre to discuss HIV and AIDS issues openly, school 1: 18 March 2010	138
Photograph 4.11: Beaded AIDS ribbons showing an enabling environment to discuss AIDS and HIV issues openly, school 2: 15 November 2010	138
Photograph 4.12: Participants sharing experiences at a national seminar, demonstrating the presence of enabling environment, schools 1 & 2: 3 March, 2009	140
Photograph 4.13: Photo poster activity illuminating participants' perception of how they gained power, due to their perceived empowerment of others in their role as facilitators, school 1: 18 March 2010	143
Photograph 4.14: Vegetable garden established by teachers taking action, school 1: 19 March, 2010	148

Photograph 4.15: Clothes donated and produce from vegetable garden, signifies participants' capacity to take action, school 1: 19 March, 2010	148
Photograph 4.16: Participants' view of themselves as keys unlocking realities and being agents of transformation, school 2: 3 March 2009	149
Photograph 4.17: Drawing of the sun that emits light and hope as source of knowledge transfer to the community, school 1: 3 March, 2009	150
Photograph 4.18: Using PRA visual activity of sun rays as an indication of having the power to give light to parents, school 1: 19 March 2010	152
Photograph 4.19: Using PRA visual activity of sun rays as an indication of having the power to give light to parents, school 2: 15 November 2010	152
Photograph 4.20: Umbrella that depicts bringing the community together, school 2: 3 March 2009	154

